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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this review is to systematically examine and classify the multitude of personality traits that have emerged in the literature beyond the Big Five (Five Factor Model) since the turn of the 21st century. We argue this represents a new phase of personality research that is characterized both by construct proliferation and a movement away from the Big Five and demonstrates how personality as a construct has substantially evolved in the 21st century.

Design/methodology/approach – We conducted a comprehensive, systematic review of personality research from 2000-2020 across 17 management and psychology journals. This search yielded 1,901 articles of which 440 were relevant and subsequently coded for this review.

Findings – Our review uncovers 155 traits, beyond the Big Five, that have been explored, which we organize and analyze into 10 distinct categories. Each category comprises a definition, lists the included traits, and highlights an exemplar construct. We also specify the significant research outcomes associated with each trait category.

Originality – The review categorizes the 155 personality traits that have emerged in the management and psychology literatures that describe personality beyond the Big Five. Based on these findings, we propose new avenues for future research and offer insights into the future of the field as the concept of personality has shifted in the 21st century.

Keywords: Personality, Systematic literature review, Traits
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Personality remains one of the most studied topics within both organizational behavior and psychology, with scholars publishing on the subject for over a century. In recent decades, the Big Five (or Five Factor Model) of personality has dominated the personality literature (Barrick and Mount, 1991) as scholars have focused their efforts onto a framework that helps them understand personality in a manner that is useful and relevant across contexts and cultures (McCrae and John, 1992). Yet, in the 21st century, researchers began to move away from a strict focus on the Big Five when investigating various workplace phenomena. As a result, we contend that personality research has entered a new era, marked by investigations of different personality traits and individual differences.

Particularly since the year 2000 these advancements have moved the field of personality research in interesting new directions. Whereas this dispersion is a credit to the wide interest in personality and individual differences research by scholars across numerous disciplines, challenges arise for researchers to identify and understand all of these advancements. To address this issue, we conducted a comprehensive, systematic review of the personality literature across management and psychology journals. Due to the volume of research on personality traits, we chose to focus our review on personality traits beyond those of the Big Five that have been studied during the first two decades of the 2000s. We do this to highlight the newer, underexamined personality traits that have emerged in this timeframe and that can provide new insights for personality scholars and demonstrate the historical development of personality as a research construct in the 21st century. Moreover, we categorize these traits into 10 different themes, each with corresponding outcomes. Thus, our review seeks to help classify the multitude of traits that have been examined in the new millennium—not to replace the Big Five—but to
complement them and help further advance personality research. Additionally, classification is at the heart of our systematic review and our aim is to organize and categorize the traits, to integrate disparate literatures, and to provide a new way of viewing traits rather than to identify the mechanisms by which these traits influence their corresponding outcomes. Lastly, we conclude our review with suggestions for scholars interested in researching personality traits and with proposed avenues for future research. We first provide a brief review of personality research and its two established phases – and present a case for why we contend that the field has advanced to a third phase of personality research, thereby necessitating a new, systematic review of the field.

Overview of Previous Phases of Personality Research

Over time, constructs go through various changes, with the relevance of management research being reevaluated over a 140-year span (Wood et al., 2022), and changes within the management literature (Pollach, 2022) being no different when it comes to how constructs are viewed. Indeed, some concepts become more focused, such as performance management which in the last 20 years, has undergone a change from firms conducting a once or twice a year evaluation to having “forward-looking, feedback-enriched” systems (Justin and Joy, 2022, p. 428). Concepts can also be influenced by various periods of history. For example, Bendickson et al. (2016) explored how four main areas within management history influenced the development of agency theory’s core tenets. Concepts also decline in their usefulness over time. Zoller and Muldoon (2020) show this by investigating how span of control, which dominated the management literature in the 1970s, has steadily declined as research in the management field became more scientific in nature. Indeed, as these studies demonstrate, there is value in examining constructs and how they evolve over time.
Similarly, personality, one of the most studied constructs in management research, has also evolved over the years as researchers have attempted to focus their efforts on understanding how this construct is relevant in organizational settings. Personality refers to the structures and propensities that reflect or explain characteristic patterns of an individual’s thoughts, emotions, and behaviors (Funder, 2001). Barrick *et al.* (2001) divided personality research into two phases. In Phase 1, occurring between the 1900s and the 1980s, investigators evaluated the relationships of individual scales from numerous personality inventories to various aspects of job performance. The conclusion from this phase was that personality and job performance were not related in any meaningful way across traits and situations. Moreover, as suggested in Guion and Gottier’s (1965) review: there is no evidence that personality measures are good tools for employee selection. This view of personality remained unchallenged for the next 25 years.

Phase 2, beginning in the mid-1980s, is characterized by the use of the Big Five or the Five Factor Model (FFM) or some variant thereof (Barrick *et al.*, 2001). The use of meta-analyses also increased during this time to summarize results quantitatively across studies. Over 15 meta-analytic studies examined the personality-performance relationship, which led to more optimistic conclusions than in the prior phase (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Tett *et al.*, 1991). In fact, Guion (1998) reversed course from earlier conclusions (in Phase 1) about the usefulness of personality and stated that at least some aspects of it are related to job performance. Barrick *et al.* (2001) contend that this phase continues until the present. We contend, however, that personality is in now a third phase, beginning around the turn of the 21st century, in which scholars focus on constructs that offer an alternative perspective on personality.
Personality Research Since 2000 (Phase 3)

In the new millennia, researchers began to take a different perspective on personality. Specifically, researchers began to identify other kinds of personality traits beyond the Big Five. It is this phase of personality research exploring beyond the Big Five that is the focus of the present review.

[Table I about here]

Methodology of Review

To identify articles to examine for our review, we first determined the parameters for our search. We reviewed publications across 21 years, from 2000 to 2020. To identify new personality constructs that have emerged and been studied in the new millennium, we searched for two terms (“personality” and “trait”) in either the title, abstract, or keywords, in 17 top management and psychology journals (see Table I). To identify these journals, we first referenced popular journal lists, including the Association of Business Schools (ABS), the Financial Times 50 (FT50), and the Australian Business Dean’s Council (ABDC) lists. From the ABS list, we identified journals from general management, organizational studies, psychology (general and organizational) that were ranked a 4*, 4, or 3, resulting in 66 different journals.

From the FT50 list, we identified those journals which were related to management, yielding 14 journals. From the ABDC list, we narrowed down our search to include management journals (area 1503 from the list), and journals which were ranked as A*, as well as searching for journals which contained “personality” in their title, regardless of its place on the journal list, resulting in 62 journal titles. To be included in the review, we identified those journals which appeared on two or more of the lists, those which contained “personality” in the title of the journal, and those which contained empirical articles.
Ultimately, this resulted in a review of 17 journals. Using a combination of an EBSCOhost search and searching through the journal archives themselves for the two keywords, our search within these 17 journals resulted in 1,901 total articles, 440 of which were relevant to our personality review. Articles were excluded from our review for several reasons, such as: focusing only on the Big Five (including a facet-level approach), pertaining to a field outside of management or psychology (e.g., marketing), using personality as a theory rather than a construct, using personality as a state or attitude rather than a trait, using personality only as a statistical control variable, and being a meta-analysis or review, among others. Moreover, we assessed how the personality trait was operationalized; in other words, manuscripts were excluded from our coding if the operationalization did not correspond to the conceptual definition of personality, which we define as *structures and propensities that reflect or explain characteristic patterns of an individual’s thoughts, emotions, and behaviors* (cf. Funder, 2001).

[Tables II & III about here]

**Personality Constructs of the New Millennium**

Our review of these 440 articles yielded 154 distinct personality characteristics and traits, which we organized into 10 categorizes. To create the 10 categories and classify the traits into each category, the author team independently (four individual personality researchers) grouped the traits into groups based upon similarity of the trait definitions and focus of the traits. Next, the author team together compared our findings and generated a list of agreed-up categories and the included traits. Table II provides an overview of the personality traits that have been studied from 2000 to 2020, beyond the Big Five, including exemplar citations for authors that have explored these constructs. Table III identifies the outcomes that emerged from each of these 10
categories and selected citations of work in these areas. These categories are discussed below in more detail.

**Career, Performance, and Work-Oriented Traits**

Career, performance, and work-oriented traits involve those personality traits which directly involve an individual’s career and work-life, including performance-related traits and leader-specific traits. There are 32 traits in this category. A trait that illustrates this category is protean career orientation, which refers to a relatively stable career preference which values self-directedness and defines career success according to the person’s personal values (Baruch et al., 2005). Protean career orientation was found to predict career behaviors and career satisfaction (Herrman et al., 2015). A commonly studied trait within this category is creative personality, which is an antecedent of firm performance (Gong et al., 2013). However, a lesser known trait to predict performance is growth need strength, which is defined as “an individual’s desire to grow and develop within his/her job” (Shalley et al., 2009, p. 489), and is related to intrinsic motivation, but distinct in that those individuals desire to learn new things, push themselves, and improve in their job, regardless of whether they are interested in or enjoy their work (Shalley et al., 2009). This trait might hold interest for personality scholars interested what innately motivates and compels individuals to succeed in their job. It would be interesting to explore this trait in the context of “dark” or abusive environments and to examine this in the team context.

This category also included organizational personality traits (the personality of the organization, i.e., Slaughter et al., 2004) – highlighting an important movement by looking at personality at more than just the individual or team level (Schneider and Bartram, 2017). Holistically, the outcomes for this category are job-related and typically studied outcomes in management, including individual and team performance outcomes, such as creative
performance (growth need strength; Shalley et al., 2009), job performance (PALS; Tews et al., 2011), and team task performance (leader goal orientation; Porter et al., 2016). Career-specific outcomes, such as career satisfaction (protean career orientation; Herrman et al., 2015), specialty choice for doctors (abstractedness; Borges and Osmon, 2001), and management advancement (managerial aspirations; Tharenou, 2001) were also common. Lastly, these personality traits have been linked to organizational-level outcomes, including organizational attractiveness (organizational personality; Slaughter et al., 2004), strategic decision outcomes (cognitive style; Hough and Ogilvie, 2005), and venture growth (passion for work; Baum and Locke, 2004).

**Dark Side Traits**

The dark side traits involve personality characteristics that are generally viewed to be negative or destructive to both individuals that possess them and those surrounding them (Spain et al., 2014). In total, 12 traits emerged that fit this category, and, from our review, the Dark Triad (DT) traits (Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy) emerged as the most common. Narcissism, as the most commonly studied trait in our review, has been explored through more narrow iterations such as CEO narcissism (Gerstner et al., 2013), CEO grandiose narcissism (Reina et al., 2014), and sexual narcissism (Day et al., 2017). Interested scholars might also consider some of the other unique traits that emerged in this category such as temptation. Temptation is an individual difference that includes five factors—desire for obtaining wealth, impulsive behavior, cognitive impairment, social moral values, and a lack of self-control (Chen et al., 2014). Temptation has interesting applications for management researchers as it has some conceptual similarities to the DT but might be less subject to social desirability. Overall, the traits in this category tended to be linked to negative outcomes such as unethical behaviors (e.g., Machiavellianism; Greenbaum et al., 2017), dyad aggression level
(e.g., trait aggression; Anderson et al., 2008), and state hostility (e.g., trait hostility; Lindsay and Anderson, 2000). It was less common for these dark traits to be studied as predictors of positive outcomes, although there are notable exceptions (e.g., innovative performance, Zhang et al., 2017; and presidential performance, Lilienfeld et al., 2012), thereby warranting future research.

**Emotionality and Trait Emotions**

Emotionality and trait emotions describe those traits which concern emotional expression or emotions which are operationalized as traits. Overall, 11 traits arose in this category. Two popular traits within this category are positive and negative affectivity. While these two traits have been linked to outcomes, including mood (Judge and Ilies, 2004), creative performance (Gilmore et al., 2013), and concern for others or self (Rhoades et al., 2001), scholars might be interested in exploring the similar, but less well-known, constructs of positive and negative emotionality (Tellegen, 1982). Individuals with high positive emotionality are predisposed to be actively engaged with their environments and to experience positive emotions such as enthusiasm and zest. In contrast, individuals with high negative emotionality tend to experience more negative emotions, such as anxiety and resentment (Shiner et al., 2002). Overall, the constructs in this category were linked to a wide variety of outcomes including marital dissatisfaction (e.g., trait anxiety; Caughlin et al., 2000), discrimination legal claims (e.g., trait anger; Goldman, 2003), probability of having children (e.g., emotionality; Jokela et al., 2009), and transformational leadership (e.g., emotional intelligence; Rubin et al., 2005). The diversity of these outcomes can be explained by the demarcation between the outcomes studied in psychology (especially social psychology) journals and management journals.
Fortitude and Strength Traits

The fortitude and strength traits involve those personality traits which represent an individual’s mental strength and tendency to persevere in difficult situations. These 10 traits focus on capabilities that enables individuals to stand up for themselves in front of others or in the face of difficult situations. A trait in this category that has recently received attention in the public eye is grit (Duckworth et al., 2007). Another related trait is tenacity, which involves sustaining goal-directed action, even when faced with obstacles (Baum and Locke, 2004). Tenacity has important implications for organizations as it has tangible outcomes (e.g., venture growth; Baum and Locke, 2004). Holistically, traits in this category have been linked with positive, success-oriented outcomes, including goal attainment (grit; Sheldon et al., 2015), extrinsic career success (self-control; Converse et al., 2012), and life satisfaction (core confidence; Stajkovic et al., 2015). Overall, the traits within this category were the least explored, providing ample opportunity to scholars interested in the outcomes associated with these “tough” traits and in the contexts in which these traits flourish or wither.

Light Side Traits

The light side traits involve those personality traits which are generally viewed as positive or beneficial. A total of 12 traits emerged in this category. The most dominant trait in this category is proactive personality. Over 35 studies from our review explored proactive personality, which influenced various outcomes, including thriving at work (Jiang, 2017), team innovative performance (Chen et al., 2013), taking charge behavior (Fuller et al., 2012), and trust (Gong et al., 2012). An interesting trait that emerged was that of curiosity and all its iterations (epistemic, Mussel, 2013; specific and divertive, Harrison et al., 2011). Curiosity refers to a desire for new information that stimulates inquisitive and exploratory behaviors (Berlyne, 1966).
As one would presume, most of the outcomes in this category are also beneficial, such as affective organizational commitment (proactive personality; Chan, 2006), whistleblowing (self-efficacy; MacNab and Worthley, 2008), and career exploration (hope; Hirschi et al., 2015). Yet, the relationships between these positive traits and positive outcomes are not straightforward, as scholars have investigated the role of CEO gender, the traits expressed (communal vs. agentic), and company profits (Pillemer et al., 2014). This illustrates an important trend in personality research, where “obvious” relationships are receiving more scrutiny.

**Morality Traits**

Morality traits involve an individual’s treatment of others and their moral character, which include 11 unique traits. The most researched of these traits was that of honesty-humility from HEXACO (Lee and Ashton, 2004). Outcomes of honesty-humility include prosocial behavior (Hilbig et al., 2014) and ethical leadership (de Vries, 2012). An emerging trait in this category is modesty, which refers to a stable personality characteristic that involves individuals’ thoughts and feelings about themselves in comparison to other people (Chen et al., 2009).

Holistically, morality traits are useful in predicting ethical outcomes and are valuable to scholars interested in why some individuals engage in ethical behaviors while others do not. While ethical outcomes are common in management research, our review revealed that morality traits are currently underutilized. Thus, we contend that scholars who are interested in organizational ethics should consider including some relevant morality traits in their research, as they might explain additional variance in ethical outcomes.

**Outlook Traits**

Outlook traits reflect how individuals view or approach the world – either positively or negatively. This category, which included 22 traits, contained some of the most unique traits in
our review, such as zest, xenophilia, and equity sensitivity. Zest is a positive trait which reflects a person’s approach to life with anticipation, energy, and excitement with high levels being associated with higher life satisfaction (Peterson et al., 2009). Xenophilia, the opposite of xenophobia, involves an attraction to foreign people, cultures, or customs that manifests itself in curiosity and hospitality toward foreigners and benevolent cross-cultural exploration (Antweiler, 2009). Those who exhibited high levels of xenophilia were more likely to engage in habitual cross-cultural exploration and influenced their attitudes toward indigenous people (Sturmer et al., 2013). Equity sensitivity is a trait that explains differences in individual reactions to inequity, with those high in equity sensitivity wanting more than others for a given level of input (Sauley and Bedeian, 2000). Additionally, a well-known trait within this category is locus of control. Scholars interested in this trait might likewise be interested in the less explored trait of psychological empowerment, which refers to a form of intrinsic motivation, which manifests in four dimensions – meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact (Newman et al., 2017).

Holistically, the outcomes of this category are diverse, given the multiple types of outlooks that exist. Examples of outcomes in this category include moral disengagement (e.g., cynicism; Detert et al., 2008), view of work as a calling (e.g., zest; Peterson et al., 2009), and career indecision (e.g., pessimism; Braunstein-Bercovitz et al., 2012). These diverse set of traits have potential implications for organizations that have been underexplored, proving an opportunity for personality researchers.

**Inclinations**

This theme involves traits that reflect an individual’s inclinations, with 12 traits emerging in this category. Some of these traits include activity (expressed as energetic and vigorous behavior in daily routines; Buss and Plomin, 1984), preference for solitude (Long et al., 2003),
self-verification striving (the tendency for individuals to promote the survival of their self-conceptions, regardless of whether they are positive or negative; Swann, 1987), and willingness to communicate (McCroskey and Richmond, 1987). This category predicts a wide range of outcomes, from personal to professional. For example, high activity in men was found to increase the probability of having children (Jokela et al., 2009). Willingness to communicate directly influences an individual’s likelihood of speaking up (i.e., voice; Kumar and Mishra, 2017). Meanwhile self-verification striving was linked to newcomer performance (Cable and Kay, 2012). These traits also influence job search behavior (procrastination; van Hooft et al., 2005) and are associated with cognitive ability (tidiness; Major et al., 2014).

**Social, Other-Oriented, and Group-Level Traits**

This category includes traits that reflect how individuals act around others and in social situations, and includes 20 traits. The most dominant trait in this category was self-monitoring, which has been linked to numerous outcomes such as workplace performance (Mehra et al., 2001), rating and decision accuracy (Jawahar, 2001), and friendship (Sasovova et al., 2010). An emergent trait in this category is blirtatiousness, which refers to the disinhibition of verbal expression (Swann and Rentfrow, 2001). High blirters tend to “blurt out” their thoughts as they are thinking them in contrast to being slow to respond. Others see them as more intelligent, likeable, and attractive (Swann and Rentfrow, 2001). Additional outcomes for this category include advancement potential (e.g., team-oriented proactivity; Hirschfeld et al., 2011), group member performance (e.g., psychological collectivism; Jackson et al., 2006), and the propensity to mentor others (e.g., prosocial personality; Allen, 2003).
**Well-Being and Self-View Traits**

The well-being and self-view traits reflect both how individuals view their inner world and their overall well-being. With 13 traits in this category, outcomes range from popularity (e.g., CSE; Scott and Judge, 2009) to work-family balance (e.g., mindfulness; Allen and Kiburz, 2012) to hope (e.g., authenticity; Davis and Hicks, 2013). The dominant trait within this category is core self-evaluations (CSE). Outcomes within this category include employee health (Judge et al., 2012), job satisfaction (Wu and Griffin, 2012), life satisfaction (Jaensch et al., 2015; Rode, 2004), and work-family balance (Allen and Kiburz, 2012).

**Discussion**

Our review of the research on personality from 2000 – 2020 across 17 top management and psychology journals revealed several key trends that reflect the third phase of personality research. The first trend we observed was that this third phase of personality research is characterized by a breadth of traits covering multiple topic areas. This is a distinction from the past two phases of personality research, which have been dominated by the Big Five and a more cohesive examination of personality. Thus, while this phase provides many opportunities for exploring and understanding the effects of personality through a more tailored approach, there is a challenge presented by the content depth of this phase. Specifically, the challenge the field of personality research now faces is to make sure there is depth by distinguishing among theoretically similar constructs. Before researchers propose a new trait and develop a subsequent scale, have they done an extensive search for similar constructs? While we contend that the development of new constructs ultimately works to better the field, we must ensure that the constructs proposed are empirically distinct and offer incremental validity over theoretically similar constructs. Furthermore, when it comes to examining the effects of these new traits,
scholars should control for the effects of these theoretically similar traits, or a Type I error could occur (Becker, 2005).

A second trend we observed was the contrast between the management and psychology journals regarding the personality variables examined. Given the focus of the journals, it is no surprise that the dependent variables are often different (e.g., life satisfaction in psychology journals vs. job satisfaction in management journals). Yet, we noted that management journals were the most likely to explore the Big 5 global traits (e.g., conscientiousness) and the psychology journals were more likely to explore a greater breadth of traits. This highlights the need for personality researchers of both management and psychology to investigate personality trends across disciplines and to be aware of the current research in both fields. To this end, we hope our review is useful to personality scholars by consolidating and categorizing the traits explored in both disciplines.

A third trend we noticed, which could simply be an echo of what is popular and interesting to practitioners and the public, is a focus on positive strengths. The dark traits, however, were still explored, although to a lesser degree. This leads to an avenue for future research: the interaction of these light and dark traits. For example, how do these traits interact in a team context? Is one category of traits stronger than the other, whereby a member high in honesty-humility could dampen the negative effects of narcissistic teammates? Moreover, while we explore the dark and light traits separately as if on different continuums (such as is done with positive affectivity and negative affectivity), is the reality true that some light traits might empirically be indistinct from low scores on certain dark traits (e.g., high honesty-humility and low narcissism) and that they are opposite poles of the same continuum? Thus, researchers
investigating either light or dark traits might consider investigating these two categories in tandem.

A fourth trend we observed was the lack of an underlying theory or framework in these studies. Researchers investigating light side traits utilized the largest number of distinct theories/frameworks (79 total) to explore these positive traits and their corresponding effects. Yet, the inclinations category only utilized eight distinct theories. Though beyond the scope of our review, we did capture some of these theoretical aspects (contact the first author for a table with these theories/frameworks for the categories).

For practitioners, our review highlights the need to examine personality traits of employees and managers that exist beyond the Big Five. For instance, organizations use realistic job previews as a mechanism to screen potential employees, yet, as Baur et al. (2014) demonstrated, different job candidates have different needs, resulting in expectation lowering procedures for a given job. Identifying a new hire’s personality traits, primarily in one of the categories we identified, can assist organizations in identifying the individual needs to create a better long-term relationship with a new employee. Similarly, many organizations use specific personality dimensions—primarily the Big Five (Moy and Lam, 2004)—in their hiring decisions; however, by focusing solely on the Big Five, it is possible that these organizations are excluding employees who may excel in other areas based on their personality outside the confines of the Big Five.

Indeed, the requirements of organizational culture, jobs, and the work environment make some candidates more suitable than others due to their unique characteristics. The various personality categories we identified can enable organizations to find candidates that fit well with the job and the environment. For instance, if a specific job and the work environment is
challenging and maintaining grit and resilience is critical, employers will find that traits in the fortitude and strength category can be used during the screening process to find candidates that could be more suitable for the job. Similarly, if the position calls for showing compassion for others, the traits in the morality category might be used to screen more suitable candidates.

In summation, the classification focus of our systematic review allowed us to identify common themes for these traits beyond the Big Five that have been examined in the 21st century and draw conclusions about current trends in this new era of personality. In terms of future research, we argue that personality scholars should focus less on construct development and more on testing construct across different contexts. Moreover, as highlighted in our discussion of each of the categories, there are several fascinating, under-explored traits that could add nuance to well-understood phenomena. Additionally, we contend that our classification system could serve as starting point for building a nomological network for many of these constructs. Thus, we argue that a new era of personality research is also full of opportunity for future research. We believe our review indicates that we are witnessing a most exciting and potentially powerful era of personality research.

Limitations

Despite the strengths of our review, there are several limitations. First, due to the breadth of the field and the number of articles in the review, we focused on only reporting the outcomes of personality in Table II. Thus, articles were excluded from the table if the personality variable had no direct or indirect effect on an outcome or if personality was the dependent variable. Additionally, we do not investigate the mechanisms by which these traits influence outcomes, nor do we explore the boundary conditions of those relationships. Ultimately, this limits the scope of our review and the conclusions we can draw. Finally, due to the sheer volume of
personality research, we were only able to classify studies from 17 journals. While we suspect that we would find a similar pattern of results if we examined studies from the dozens of other journals that publish personality research, this is only conjecture.

**Conclusion**

While the past two phases of personality research have been instrumental in the development and credibility of the field, they have had their drawbacks—namely an overreliance on the Big Five. We argue—and believe that our comprehensive, systematic review supports—that the third phase of personality research in the 21st century is characterized by content breadth (the abundance and proliferation of new personality traits beyond the Big Five). Further, the movement towards studying personality at different levels of analysis (e.g., team, organization), has added richness to the field. This third phase of personality research is not without its limitations, however, as the abundance of traits results in issues of potential problems related to convergent and discriminant validity amongst the traits within the same categories. Yet, we view these limitations not as obstacles to be overcome but as challenges to conquer. Indeed, as constructs evolve over time, as demonstrated by other historical assessments (e.g., Bendickson *et al.*, 2016; Justin and Joy, 2022; Zoller and Muldoon, 2020), we have shown that personality has evolved as well and has become even more robust as researchers attempt to explore all of the ways by which different facets of personality can influence how individuals impact organizations. Thus, we end our review by figuratively “throwing down the gauntlet” to current and future personality scholars, calling upon them to take up the mantle of tackling the new challenges of personality research in the 21st century and hope that this review serves as a useful steppingstone in that endeavor.
References


* denotes article was included as part of the review
Table I

Journal List for Systematic Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Number of Articles (Total)</th>
<th>Number of Relevant Articles (Coded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Management Journal</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Science Quarterly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Applied Psychology</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Business Ethics</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Management</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Management Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Vocational Behavior</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Quarterly</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Science</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Psychology</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Bulletin</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N = 1,901\] \[N = 440\]
Table II

*Personality Constructs for the New Millennium*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Category</th>
<th>Category Definition</th>
<th>Included Traits</th>
<th>Exemplar Construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career, Performance, and Work-Oriented Traits</td>
<td>Deal with an individual's career and work life, including performance-related traits and leader-specific traits</td>
<td>Abstractedness; Achievement Orientation; Ambition; Approach Orientation / Avoidance Orientation; Cognitive Style / Ability; Career Indecisiveness; Career Identity Salience; Charismatic Leadership; Competence; Creativity; Duty Orientation;</td>
<td>Protean Career Orientation - a relatively stable career preference that values self-directedness and defines career success according to the person's personal values (Baruch et al., 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Side Traits</td>
<td>Generally viewed as negative or destructive</td>
<td>Aggression; Contempt; Hedonism; Hostility; Impulsivity; Machiavellianism; Moral Disengagement Propensity; Narcissism (CEO, Grandiose, Leader, Sexual); Psychopathy; Sadism; Temptation; Thrill-seeking</td>
<td>Machiavellianism - one's propensity to distrust others, engage in amoral manipulation, seek control over others, and seek status for oneself (Dahling et al., 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality and Trait Emotions</td>
<td>Deal with emotional expression or emotions operationalized as traits</td>
<td>Anger; Anxiety; Calmness; Depression; Emotional Intelligence; Emotionality (Positive/Negative); Negative and Positive Affectivity; Negative Mood; Nostalgia</td>
<td>(Trait) Anger or Anger Proneness - an individual difference in the frequency that state anger is experienced over time (Spielberger et al., 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Category</td>
<td>Category Definition</td>
<td>Included Traits</td>
<td>Exemplar Construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortitude and Strength Traits</td>
<td>Represent an individual's mental strength and tendency to persevere in difficult situations</td>
<td>Assertiveness; Core Confidence; Emotional Coping; Grit; Self-Control; Self-Reliance; Tenacity; Tough-mindedness; Vigilance; Vigor</td>
<td>Grit - perseverance and passion for long-term goals (Duckworth et al, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Side Traits</td>
<td>Generally viewed as positive or beneficial</td>
<td>Adaptable; Communal/Communion (vs. Agentic/Agency); Cooperation; Curiosity / Epistemic Curiosity; Helping; Hope; Intrinsic Motivation; Proactive Personality; Self-Confidence; Self-Efficacy; Self-Esteem; Warmth</td>
<td>Proactive Personality - a dispositional characteristic defined as a behavioral tendency toward taking personal initiative in creating a favorable environment (Bateman &amp; Crant, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality Traits</td>
<td>Deal with an individual's treatment of others and their moral character</td>
<td>Compassion; Empathy; Forgiveness; Gratitude; Harmony; Honesty-Humility (HEXACO); Integrity; Modesty; Moral Identity; Spirituality; Virtue</td>
<td>Empathy - the tendency to feel warmth, compassion, and concern for others (Davis, 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlook Traits</td>
<td>Reflect how an individual views or approaches the world</td>
<td>Cynicism; Entitlement; Future Self-Continuity; Equity-Sensitivity; Guilt Proneness; Happiness; Internal Locus of Control; Optimism; Personal Fear of Invalidity; Pessimism; Propensity to Trust; Psychological Empowerment; Rigidity; Risk-taking; Rule-consciousness; Savoring; Social Dominance Orientation; Traditionalism; Unconventionality; Venaciousness; Xenophilia; Zest</td>
<td>Zest - a positive trait reflecting a person's approach to life with anticipation, energy, and excitement (Peterson et al. 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Category</td>
<td>Category Definition</td>
<td>Included Traits</td>
<td>Exemplar Construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclinations</td>
<td>Reflect an individual's predispositions towards aspects of their life</td>
<td>Activity; Dispositional Resistance to Change; Flexibility; Indecisiveness; Independence; Preference for Solitude; Procrastination; Self-Verification Striving; Sensation Seeking; Straightforwardness; Tidiness; Willingness to Communicate</td>
<td>Self-Verification Striving - the tendency for individuals to promote the survival of their self-conceptions, irrespective of whether they are good or bad (Swann, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, Other-Oriented, and Group-Level Traits</td>
<td>Reflect how an individual acts around others and in social situations</td>
<td>Blittatiousness; Conformance; Core Group Expression; Dysphoric Personality; Emotional Labor Variability; Face; Perceived Positivity Resonance; Prosocial Personality; Psychological Collectivism; Self-Disclosure; Self-Monitoring; Shyness; Sociability; Social Boldness; Social Closeness; Social Potency; Social Presence; Social Sensitivity; Sociotropy; Team-oriented Proactivity</td>
<td>Sociability - a tendency for an individual to enjoy the company of others more than a solitary lifestyle (Buss &amp; Plomin, 1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Being and Self-View Traits</td>
<td>Reflect how an individual views their inner world and their overall wellbeing</td>
<td>Authenticity; Core-Self Evaluation; Femininity / Masculinity; Mindfulness; Privateness; Psychological Gender; Self-Acceptance; Self-Compassion; Self-Concept Clarity; Self-Critical Perfectionism; Stress Reactivity; Well-Being</td>
<td>Authenticity - the free and unhindered operation of one's true or core self in daily life (Kernis &amp; Goldman, 2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Full citations in this table are available from the authors.
Table III

**Personality Category Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Category</th>
<th>Category Linked Outcomes</th>
<th>Selected Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career, Performance, and Work-Oriented Traits</td>
<td>Burnout; Career Adaptability; Career Satisfaction; CSEs; Competitive Climate; Creative Performance; Creative Process Engagement; Enterprising Interest; Group Influence; Idealism; Income; Innovation Implementation; Job Performance; Learning performance; LMX; Management Advancement; Medical Specialty; Occupational Self-Efficacy; OCBs; Organizational Attractiveness; Organizational / Firm Performance; Perceived Career Barriers; Perception of Novelty; Personality-Work Congruence; Proactive Career Behaviors; Team Information Sharing; Team Innovation; Team Learning; Team Task Commitment; Team Task Performance; Training Performance; Self-Efficacy; Skill Attainment; Solitude; Strategic Decision Outcomes; Unemployment Outcomes (Mental Health, Motivational Control, Self-Defeating Cognition, Time Spent on Job Search); Venture Growth; Victimization; Voice</td>
<td>Anderson &amp; Kilduff (2009); Baum &amp; Locke (2004); Betancourt et al. (2001); Bierly et al. (2009); Borges &amp; Osmon (2001); Chen et al. (2000); Chiu et al. (2016); Donohue (2006); Dul et al. (2011); Fletcher et al. (2008); Hough &amp; O'gilvie (2005); Jaensch et al. (2015); Kim &amp; Glomb (2010); Kozlowski et al. (2001); Long et al. (2003); Madrid et al. (2016); McCarthy et al. (2013); Nichols &amp; Cottrell (2014); Porter et al. (2016); Pryor et al. (2017); Schröder &amp; Schmitt-Rodermund (2006); Shalley et al. (2009); Sherman et al. (2015); Slaughter et al. (2004); Somech &amp; Drach-Zahavy (2013); Taber et al. (2011); Tangirala et al. (2013); Tews et al. (2011); Tharenou (2001); To et al. (2015); Tolentino et al. (2014); Wanberg et al. (2012); Watson et al. (2013); Zhou et al (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Category</td>
<td>Category Linked Outcomes</td>
<td>Selected Citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Side Traits</td>
<td>Abusive Supervision; Advice Taking; Anti-intellectualism; Approach / Avoidance Motivation; Attitudes Towards Cheating; Big Five Similarity; Bullying Others; Career Engagement; Careerism; CEO (Executive) Compensation; Contextual Performance; CWBs; Deviant Behavior; Dyad Aggression Level; Dysfunctional Impulsivity; Ethical Orientation; Follower Behaviors; Frequency of Transgressions; Group Effectiveness; Helping Behavior; Innovative Culture / Performance; Job Satisfaction; Leader Behaviors; Leadership Style Preference; Marriage Propensity; Mental Health; Narcissism; OCBs; Organizational / Firm Performance; Presidential Performance; Prioritization of Needs (Own vs. Group); Problem Behaviors; Prosocial Behavior; Relationship Commitment; Role Satisfaction; Self-Ratings of Leadership; Sexual Comparison / Satisfaction; Social Activity; Social Desirability Response Bias; State Hostility; Status; Successful Interpersonal Behavior; Task Performance; (Discontinuous) Technology Adoption; Undergraduate Major Choice; Unemployment (risk, duration); Unethical Behaviors / Decision-Making / Intentions; Victimization; Work-Family Conflict; Workplace Deviance</td>
<td>Anderson et al. (2008); Aquino &amp; Bradfield (2000); Baysinger et al. (2014); Benson et al. (2016); Bing et al. (2007); Bloodgood et al. (2010); Brown et al. (2009); Buffardi &amp; Campbell (2008); Campbell &amp; Foster (2002); Carlson &amp; DesJardins (2015); Chen et al. (2014); Chiaburu et al. (2013); Cooper et al. (2003); Day et al. (2017); Dubbelt et al. (2015); Dahling et al. (2009); Foster &amp; Trimm (2008); Gerstner et al. (2013); Hakulinen et al. (2013); Johnson et al. (2004); Judge et al. (2006); Kausel et al. (2015); Larson et al. (2010); Liang et al. (2016); Lilienfeld et al. (2012); Lindsay &amp; Anderson (2000); Liu et al. (2017); Maas et al. (2016); Martin et al. (2016); McCullough et al. (2003); Nilforooshan &amp; Salimi (2016); O'Reilly et al. (2014); Pilch &amp; Turska (2015); Resick et al. (2009); Wales et al. (2013); Stevens et al. (2012); Zhang et al. (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality and Trait Emotions</td>
<td>Aggression Towards Targets; Career Exploration / Indecision; Competitive Behavior; Concern for Self; Creative Process Engagement; CWBs; Discrimination Legal Claims; Feelings of Powerlessness; Hostile Priming Effect; Job Performance; Leader Development; Life Satisfaction; Maladaptation; Marital Dissatisfaction; Medical Specialty; Memory Distortion; Petty Tyranny; Probability of Having Children; Relationship Happiness / Success / Quality; Transformational Leadership;</td>
<td>Braunstein-Bercovitz et al. (2012); Caughlin et al. (2000); Donnellan et al. (2005); Goldman (2003); Farh et al. (2012); Inness et al. (2008); Jokela et al. (2009); Kant et al. (2013); Law et al. (2004); Popper &amp; Amit (2009); Rhoades et al. (2001); Robins et al. (2000); Rubin et al. (2005); Safer et al. (2002); Shiner et al. (2002); To et al. (2015); Wilkowski &amp; Robinson (2007); Vignoli (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Category</td>
<td>Category Linked Outcomes</td>
<td>Selected Citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fortitude and Strength Traits</strong></td>
<td>Abusive Supervision; Academic Achievement; Career Success; Cynicism; Decision Effectiveness; Defensive Processing; Educational Attainment; Employee Exit; Goal Attainment; GPA; Life Satisfaction; Medical Specialty; Occupational Opportunity for Achievement; Organizational Attractiveness; Performance; Problem Behaviors; Team Performance; Team Satisfaction; Workplace Deviance</td>
<td>Borges &amp; Osmos (2001); Converse et al. (2012); Cooper et al. (2003); Guarana &amp; Hernandez (2016); Hartung et al. (2005); Kausel &amp; Slaughter (2011); Naus et al. (2007); Pearsall &amp; Ellis (2006); Restubog et al. (2015); Rimfeld et al. (2016); Ruttan &amp; Nordgren (2016); Sheldon et al. (2015); Stajkovic et al. (2015); Taber et al (2011); Yam et al. (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Light Side Traits</strong></td>
<td>Affective Organizational Commitment; Behavioral Schemas; Boundaryless Career Mindset; Career Adaptability / Concern / Confidence / Control / Curiosity / Engagement / Exploration / Indecisiveness / Initiative / Monitoring / Satisfaction / Success; Charismatic Leadership; Company Profits / Rank; Creative Performance; Creativity; CWBs; Educational Attainment; Entrepreneurial Alertness; Feedback Acceptance; Financial Accomplishments; Future Work Self; Goal Attainment / Self-Concordance; Information Seeking Behaviors; Innovative Behavior / Performance; Job Control; Job Demands; Job Satisfaction; Job Performance; Job Search Outcomes; Leadership Style Preference; Learning Performance; Life Satisfaction; Loneliness; Mate Preferences; Medical Specialty; Memory Distortion; Mental Health; Mentoring; Negative Affect; OCIs; Occupational Attainment; Organizational Constraints; Performance Evaluations; Political Knowledge; Positive Affect; Positive Framing; Proactive Work Behavior; Procedural Justice; Productivity Performance; Psychological Need Satisfaction; Resource Power; Safety Performance; Self-Concept Clarity; Social Adjustment; Social Integration; Social Power; Supervisor Support; Task Performance; Team Performance; Training Behavioral Intentions / Motivation; Transactional Contracts; Trust; Whistleblowing</td>
<td>Bakker et al. (2012); Bertolino et al. (2011); Brown et al. (2006); Brown et al. (2009); Byrne et al. (2008); Cai et al. (2015); Chan (2006); Chen et al. (2000); Chen et al. (2013); Converse et al. (2012); Crant &amp; Bateman (2000); Duffy &amp; Lent (2009); Ehrhart &amp; Klein (2001); Erdogan &amp; Bauer (2005); Fisher et al. (2012); Gebauer et al. (2012); Gong et al. (2012); Greguras &amp; Diefendorff (2010); Harrison &amp; Dossinger (2017); Harrison et al. (2011); Hirschi et al. (2015); Jaensch et al. (2015); Jiang (2017); Kammrath (2011); Lent et al. (2012); Li et al. (2010); Li et al. (2014); Liang &amp; Gong (2013); Long et al. (2003); MacNab &amp; Worthley (2008); Miceli et al. (2012); Mussel (2013); Ng &amp; Feldman (2013); Nilforooshan &amp; Salimi (2016); Parker et al. (2006); Pillemer et al. (2014); Raja et al. (2004); Roberts et al., (2003); Saragovi et al. (2002); Seibert et al. (2001); Shalley et al. (2009); Stinson et al. (2008); Sun &amp; van Emmerik (2015); Taber et al. (2011); Tews et al. (2011); Thompson (2005); Tolentino et al. (2014); Uy et al. (2015); Van der Horst et al. (2017); Wallace et al. (2009); Wang et al. (2017); Wood &amp; Harms (2017); Zhang et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Category</td>
<td>Category Linked Outcomes</td>
<td>Selected Citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morality Traits</strong></td>
<td>Abusive Supervision; CWBs; Emotional Social Support; Ethical Behaviors / Choices; Job Burnout; Job Pursuit Behaviors; Interpersonal Contextual Behaviors; Moral Disengagement; OCBs; Personal Improvement; Prosocial Behaviors; Revenge; Servant-Oriented OCBs; Unethical Bargaining / Decision-Making; Wellbeing</td>
<td>Agnihorti et al. (2012); Bettencourt et al. (2001); Breevaart &amp; de Vries (2017); Cohen (2010); Connelly et al. (2004); Detert et al. (2008); Hilbig &amp; Blöckner (2014); Joireman et al. (2006); Kashdan &amp; Nezlek (2012); Kwong and Cheung (2003); Marcus et al. (2007); Ogunfowora (2014); Wang et al. (2018); Zelars &amp; Perrewe (2001); Zhang &amp; Chen (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outlook Traits</strong></td>
<td>Attentional Bias; Career Indecision; Compassion; Creativity; Ethical Behavior; Enterprising Interest; Group / Team Performance; Leader Emergence; Leadership Style Preference; Life Satisfaction; Marriage Propensity; Medical Specialty; Memory Distortion; Moral Disengagement; Moral Identity; Organizational Attractiveness; Personal Contextual Behaviors; Proactive Work Behavior; Time to Complete Dull Task; Transactional Contracts; Unethical Behavior; Venture Growth; View of Work as a Calling</td>
<td>Agnihorti et al. (2012); Borges &amp; Osmon (2001); Braunstein-Bercovitz et al. (2012); Detert et al. (2008); Ehrhart &amp; Klein (2001); Ferguson &amp; Peterson (2015); Fisher et al. (2012); Gong et al. (2012); Hershfield et al. (2012); Johnson et al. (2004); Kausel &amp; Slaughter (2011); Kwong &amp; Cheung (2003); Lee &amp; Tsang (2001); Marinova et al. (2013); Martin et al. (2015); O'Brien et al. (2011); Parker et al. (2006); Peterson et al. (2009); Raja et al. (2004); Safer et al. (2002); Schröder &amp; Schmitt-Rodermund (2006); Segerstrom (2001); Sosik et al. (2014); Taber et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclinations</strong></td>
<td>Career Adaptivity / Engagement / Success; Concession Making; Employee Compliance / Championing; Inner-directed Solitude; Intelligence; Job Satisfaction; Job Search Behavior; Medical Specialty; Newcomer Work Performance; Organizational Commitment; Probability of Having Children</td>
<td>Byrne et al. (2008); Cable &amp; Kay (2012); DeRue et al. (2009); Fugate &amp; Soenen (2018); Hartung et al. (2005); Jokela et al. (2009); Long et al. (2003); Major et al. (2014); Nilforooshan &amp; Salimi (2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Personality Category

**Social, Other-Oriented, and Group-Level Traits**
- Advancement Potential; Creation of New Friends / Friend Groups; Ethical Behaviors; Group Member Performance (Task, OCB, CWB, Withdrawal); Image Outcomes; Intelligence; Intention to Report Fraudulent Behaviors; Interpersonal Contextual Behaviors; Interpersonal Stress; Job Satisfaction; Job Performance; Marriage Propensity; Medical Specialty; Position or Role Occupancy; Probability of Having Children; Propensity to Mentor Others; Social Network Position; Trust; Work Withdrawal

**Well-Being and Self-View Traits**
- CWBs; Employee Health; Ethical Perceptions; Goal Orientation; Goal Commitment; Goal-Setting Behavior; Hope; Income; Job Satisfaction; Job Performance; Life Satisfaction; Marriage Propensity; Medical Specialty; OCBs; Organizational Commitment; Perceptions of Support; Popularity; Productivity; Task Complexity / Motivation / Performance / Satisfaction; Turnover Intentions; Voice Behavior; Work-Family Balance; Work Stress; Work Success

### Category Linked Outcomes

### Selected Citations

- Allen (2003); Hirschfeld et al. (2011); Jackson et al. (2006); Jokela et al. (2009); Johnson et al. (2004); Kwong & Cheung (2003); Major et al. (2014); Mehra et al. (2001); Oh & Kilduff (2008); Ross & Robertson (2003); Sasovaova et al. (2010); Scott et al. (2012); Shih (2006); Taber et al. (2011); Tasselli & Kilduff (2017); Turnley & Bolino (2001); Uddin & Gillett (2002)

- Allen & Kiburz (2012); Aryee et al. (2017); Bono & Colbert (2005); Bowling et al. (2010); Davis & Hicks (2013); Erez & Judge (2001); Ferris et al. (2011); Grant & Wrzesniewski (2010); Johnson et al. (2004); Judge & Hurst (2008); Judge et al. (2000); Judge et al. (2003); Judge et al. (2009); Judge et al. (2012); Kacmar et al. (2009); Luria & Torjman (2009); McCabe et al. (2006); Piccolo et al. (2005); Scott & Judge (2009); Srivastava et al. (2010); Taber et al. (2011); Westring & Ryan (2010); Wu & Griffin (2012); Zhang & Chen (2016)

Note: Full citations are available from the authors.