

Impact of Personality Match/Mismatch on Employee Level Performance Which Ultimately Affects Organizational Performance

Dr. Sara Khan¹ and Muqaddas Bin Tahir²

¹ International Islamic University

Received: 10 May 2012 Accepted: 2 June 2012 Published: 15 June 2012

Abstract

The quality of the relationships employees have with each other determines the quality of the work outcomes. Personality of employees effects their roles and responsibilities in the organization. However, personality match between employee/employer has a strong impact on the interaction and communication patterns of the employees, as well as the subjective experiences of individuals which results in different forms of organizational integration and also in managing the interrelationships synergistically. On the other hand, every good employee that an organization fails to retain, walks out the door costing the business money, every poor or mismatched recruit can result in missed opportunities and can severely damage your culture and organizational reputation. Our paper is about how personalities matter in work environments and ultimately results in superior organizational performance. Too much difference among personalities at the work place creates difficulty in retaining employees. Mismatch can cause coordination problems. While matching personalities complement each other which lead to motivation at work place. We propose that personality match leads to positive attitudes. Furthermore, it creates emotional alignment at employee level, which contributes to increased organizational performance; develops emotional integration and a deep collaborative culture. Once all these factors are established the whole organization creates fit or connectedness which of course complements other aspects of emotional integration, collaborative culture and positive attitudinal alignment.

Index terms—

1 I. Introduction

Although recent research has clearly demonstrated the effects of "implicit theories," of leadership on leader ratings, their impact on performance and overall output, still there has been a lack of attention to the aspect that shows the impact of match / mismatch of personalities of leaders and members on performance, both on individual level and organizational level. Theoretical analysis of leadership argue that leaders shift their emphasis from task to relationship orientation which pays more consideration to the phenomenon of personality match/ mismatch among leaders and followers, specially, in the context of Pakistan, a collectivistic country.

Leader-follower similarity and personality match in the workplace is a crucial element which affect the Author ? : International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan. outcomes as quality of leader-member relationships (Bauer and Phillips) as well as performance ??Pulakos & Wexley, 1982) . Early research on attraction and similarity carries the view that individuals prefer others who are similar to themselves (Berscheid and Kandel). Individuals select partners who are similar in terms of attitudes, values, and traits (Byrne; Caspi and Hill). Once

3 PROPOSITIONS A) PROPOSITION 1

41 there is seen to be a large discrepancy between the way an organization functions with the individuals preferences
42 and values it is clear that the organization will fail to retain thus costing it highly therefore a collaborative culture
43 which recruits similar others from the start is crucial.

44 Match of leader-followers personalities builds the grounds for values alignment and attitudinal similarity. It
45 plays a pivotal role in emotional integration of individuals, leading them to go an extra mile. If the personality
46 of leaders and followers match is established then it creates the basis for culture of collaboration as well as it
47 enables employees to fit with their work and organization.

48 The personality match of leaders and followers can be beneficial in the development of a climate of high
49 performance such as ; Enhanced performance of leaders even when they or the employees are under pressure;
50 Increased levels of empathy in leadership group; Leaders learn to adapt their behaviour as well as to create
51 positive and productive environments for their workgroups; Leaders increase their range of their responses to suit
52 the demands of different situations they face; and leaders learn to develop the mental toughness and flexibility
53 which is required to lead their workgroups through times of instability and uncertainty.

54 Alternative to theories which promote the importance of universal traits and behaviors for leaders, some have
55 proposed that the effectiveness of leader behaviors depends on the environment. These "contingency" theories
56 contend that leader behaviors may be helpful or harmful, depending on the personality traits of subordinates
57 and the situation. For instance, the Vroom-Yetton model of supervisory decision-making promotes a careful
58 consideration of situational factors before determining the most effective decision-making strategy ??Vroom
59 & Yetton, 1973). Also, the Path-Goal theory calls for leaders to consider the needs of If employees have a
60 personality match, each person's some personality characteristics compliment the other personality in such a
61 way that their motivation level is increased and they work together more willingly and will do their best in a
62 particular situation. For example, according Harris, Harris & Eplion, (2007) 'The personality traits each tap
63 into different aspects of a subordinate's motivation, confidence, and initiative and thus would be expected to be
64 positively related to LMX quality'. Which pin points the fact that personality match would create high quality
65 of relationship. This kind of relation can also create a high-high style of leadership, which is the most effective
66 style according the 'style approach' of leadership. This means that the quality of work (tasks assigned) as well
67 as of the employee/employer relation is quite high which makes it more effective. It creates a relationship of
68 mutual trust and friendship. . These relations express emotions to each other and also influence each others'
69 attitudes. People having positivity in their personality is shown through their positive emotions, are more likely
70 to be favoured by others and get positive responses (Staw, Sutton & Pelled, 1994). Such people reflect a positive
71 image on others. Positive outcomes are experienced by positive people ??Dunning and Story, 1991).Similarly
72 Emotional alignment depends on mutual trust as well. Therefore, the quality of relationship that exists between
73 employee/employer impacts their performance. Thus we propose that a personality match can help employees to
74 develop an emotional connection which further integrates the whole organization to perform better.

75 2 II.

76 3 Propositions a) Proposition 1

77 Positive alignment and similarity between attitudes of employee/employer enhance performance.

78 An attitude represents an individual's degree of like or dislike for something. Attitudes are generally positive
79 or negative views of a person towards some, place, thing, or event-this is often referred to as the attitude object.

80 Little empirical research has focus on personality differences of the leaders and followers, and their consequent
81 impact on attitude similarity of individuals. In leadership research, similarity between leaders and followers
82 attitudes has predominantly been analyzed as a predictor of leader-member exchange (e.g., ??eluga, 1998; ??ose,
83 1999). Similarity has also been examined in terms of value congruence (e.g., ??ung & Avolio, 2000).

84 When discussing similarity, the following distinctions have to be made. First, one should distinguish between
85 surface-level and deep-level similarity ??Hiller & Day, 2003 A lot of studies highlight the importance of attitude
86 alignment between employee/employer for increased performance. Similarity is one of the most central theoretical
87 and empirical constructs in cognitive psychology (Medin, Goldstone, & Gentner, 1993).

88 The impact of deep-level attitudinal similarity between Leaders and followers has been tested on interrelations
89 between leaders and members, and outcomes was analyzed. It is noted that similarity in terms of subjective
90 meaning of work, occupational selfefficacy, and emotionality, impacts the overall performance.

91 Empirical study found a negative interrelation between leaders and their teams' goal fulfillment when followers
92 scored higher than their leaders on subjective meaning of work and when followers were more emotionally irritated
93 than their leaders.

94 The LMX model also suggests that attitudinal similarity is an important influence on leader and follower
95 interaction, being a prime determinant of successful ongoing relationships. Employees who are less at attitudinal
96 fit to a work group and leader participate less in performing activities associated to them, thus hampering the
97 overall performance (Lichtenstein, Alexander, Jinnett, & Ullman, 1997). Individuals with no match of their
98 attitude with their leaders, they are perceived as less effective workers, and lack on output (Baugh & Graen,
99 1997) resultantly making them feel low in their self esteem, discouraging them to put in extra efforts which
100 will ultimately affect their performance negatively. Thus, dissimilarity of attitudes may limit an individual's

101 integration or involvement in work, yet this integration is critical for performance (Maznevski, 1994; Shaw &
102 Barrett -Power, 1998).

103 (Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993) has investigated the influence of attitudinal similarity on leader member
104 relationship. Attitudinal similarity would make it an entire process. It is really necessary for the leader to change
105 employees' attitudes from negative to positive, create attitudinal alignment and enhance employees performance
106 as well as organizational success. The factors that influence positively to attitudinal alignment and increase
107 worker performance requires that leaders must understand some of the underlying elements that may create
108 behaviorally distant workers. Researchers in the study reported that five elements contributed negatively to
109 attitudinal similarity of employees, which include excessive workload; concerns about leadership effectiveness;
110 anxiety about job and frustration; and insufficient recognition. No or less attitude match among leaders will
111 ultimately hamper the employee performance. Increased alignment of attitudes in turn generates the atmosphere
112 of understanding, self respect and trust, which further effects performance positively Match of personalities of
113 leaders and followers, in addition to understanding and maintaining fit, also effects outcomes of leader-member
114 exchange by creating attitude similarity which positively affects the workgroup cohesion, follower's affective
115 commitment and overall performance. There are some elements within organization that contribute positively to
116 create attitudinal alignment of employees and leader, such as: having a sense of self-worth i.e. having confidence,
117 feeling competent and in control of their work and work experience; the contributions workers as well as leader
118 helping their organizations succeed; and being rewarded and recognized i.e. knowing that their contributions are
119 recognized and compensated, emotional integration of leaders and members etc. Knowing some of the factors
120 that cause employees to be emotionally distant from their work, as well as some of the elements that are valued
121 by employees are mandatory to create and enhance attitudinal similarity among members, which will ultimately
122 boost the employee performance. Individuals with no or less attitudinal alignment with leader fit less to work
123 group, resultantly contribute less to group tasks ??Kirchmeyer, 1993).

124 It is important to discuss that only positive attitudinal match can contribute to performance. Leaders can
125 start changing employees' attitudes to a positive mindset by identifying and communicating priorities. Setting
126 priorities with employees helps them to focus on important tasks, and may help to lessen some of the stress
127 they feel when they're overwhelmed by a heavy workload. Leaders should set expectations for the outcome, and
128 provide direction only when needed. Allowing workers a greater sense of autonomy and authority in deciding how
129 to conduct the work breeds trust, and invests employees in the process, as well as the outcome. To build positive
130 attitude leader must talk to employees about their workplace concerns, address them quickly and confidently.
131 Dispel rumors with the facts. Be honest about mistakes and problems. The alignment of these positive attitudes
132 of leader and followers will enable employees to fall in discretionary behaviors which in turn enable them to go an
133 extra mile. Attitudinal similarity of leaders and followers will make employees to own the organizational goals,
134 which will ultimately have a positive influence on performance. Personality match between leader\member has a
135 strong impact on the patterns of interaction of individuals, which bring leaders and followers on the same page,
136 thus contributing to attitudinal alignment According to Zenger & Lawrence(1989), individuals with personal
137 attitudes mismatch engage in less frequent output, and negatively impact overall performance. Thus, personality
138 match creates an environment of respect, trust and friendship which help individuals to associate them in a
139 bonding and help the organization to be more emotionally integrated as stated in our next proposition.

140 4 b) Proposition

141 Employer\employee personality match facilitates an organization to achieve emotional integration.

142 An organizations main challenge today is retention of good employees and to manage their working relations
143 synergistically. If personalities working in it matches with each other, it may result in better interrelationships.

144 Emotional alignment among the people of an organization results in an emotional integration of the whole
145 organization. This further can help people understand each other's capabilities and only then their best utilization
146 is possible. In a broader perspective, linked with the same identity, gives individuals a sense of belonging that
147 emotionally connects every employee to the ethos of their work place (Samantra & Goshal, 2002). Employees
148 working collectively through shared knowledge with common objectives, integrates the organization in a social,
149 emotional and intellectual, way.

150 Emotional alignment among employees keeps them focused on their shared future. It keeps the financial
151 security; lack of challenging work, boredom, Phillips & Bedeian in 1994 found a positive relation of attitudinal
152 similarity with the exchange quality. Research finds that attitudinal similarity of leaders and employees' about
153 work can positively affect the organizational success. It is noted that less or no attitudinal alignment among
154 leaders and followers have a negative impact on performance and adversely affect productivity, profitability,
155 performance, and retention which are the key factors in organizational success. Attitudinal similarity of leaders
156 and followers bring similarity of values among them, which ultimately improves the quality of working relationship,
157 leading to enhanced level of productivity. The phenomenon of personality match has a positive influence in
158 bringing the attitude alignment of leaders and followers which enhances the quality of relationships employees have
159 with each other, which further determines the quality of the work outcomes. Moreover, personality match between
160 leader\member has also strong impact on the interaction and communication patterns of the employees which
161 positively effects owning their roles and responsibilities in the organization, leading to improved performance.
162 employees engaged across different work styles, departments and businesses.

5 C) PROPOSITION

163 To engage employees, an organization must capture their minds and hearts by sharing and communicating its
164 strategic direction and goals, and this phenomenon stems from leadership ??Seijts & Crim, 2006). The role of
165 leader in engaging employees at work place is very important. Leader/member or colleagues and match between
166 their personalities facilitates the communication process in a more friendly way. The nature of their relationship
167 affects their performance. These factors make them emotionally aligned and emotionally engaged at the work
168 place. They understand each other's interests and perceptions easily and will be more professionally engaged as
169 well.

170 According to Law et al. (??004) employee emotional intelligence influences work outcomes via the quality of
171 interpersonal relationships of employees, inside the organization. These relationships in turn allow employees to
172 perform effectively.

173 Personality match can align employees emotionally, creating a connection among the workers of the whole
174 organization into the business objectives. Indeed if supervisors and subordinates share a similar tendency to
175 manage and utilize emotion in their workplace interactions (e.g. Law et al. 2000), thus may validate self
176 perceptions regarding their use of emotion, resulting in increased interpersonal attraction and LMX.

177 According to LMX theory, supervisors assign roles to those who they view as more competent, trustworthy
178 and the subordinates develop a strong relationship with their supervisors, characterized by trust and emotional
179 support (Harris, Harris & Eplion, 2007). It makes them feel that they are treated with respect and trust, where
180 they invest most of their time throughout the week. This is possible usually when employee/employer share
181 the same personality traits as the general idea that prevails says that one's own actions/ perceptions are over
182 estimated and though to be better than others.

183 However, it's the emotional aspects of the business that form the core of the working environment, they connect
184 all other elements and that make the real difference in employees' minds. These emotional aspects include the
185 unique culture that differentiates each business from others. This kind of emotional connectivity makes employees
186 show up each day at the work place. It actually makes people tick, who are motivated more because of their
187 match with the supervisor/colleague. They tap into each others mental and emotional aspects and develop a
188 long lasting motivation thus enhancing both individual and organizational performance. Emotional alignment
189 cannot be imitated and be used as a source of sustainable competitive advantage.

190 If the employees are emotionally connected, it makes them feel special, as if they fit the working environment
191 and they are investing more than forty hours a week, it shows that they want to contribute to a business
192 ,as well as they care for where the business is going. Their supervisors having a personality match can
193 develop trust and emotional support with them. Employees with similar personalities have tendency to work
194 together more conveniently and willingly, and are more likely to form an emotional connection between them.
195 Emotional integration amongst employees thus creates a deep collaborative culture which is proposed in our
196 second proposition.

197 5 c) Proposition

198 Similar personality traits of (employee/employer) will create a deep collaborative culture and a superior
199 organizational performance.

200 The pervasiveness and importance of values in organizational culture are fundamentally linked to the
201 psychological process of identity formation in which individuals appear to seek a social identity that provides
202 meaning and connectedness ??Ashforth & Mael, 1989).A substantial body of research has shown that individuals
203 tend to classify themselves into social categories, such as gender, race, ethnicity, and organizational affiliation,
204 and to use those categories to define themselves. For instance, people appear particularly able to discriminate
205 between in-groups and out-groups and to be attracted to those seen as similar to themselves ??Brewer, 1979;
206 ??oreland, 1985).

207 Thus, congruency between an individual's values and those of an organization may be at the crux of person-
208 culture fit.

209 Collaboration depends on mutual trust and friendship. Employees with complementary traits or with a
210 personality match can develop trust and friendship quickly. These two factors help in the execution of shared
211 knowledge and create value. These aspects are the key factors towards building a more collaborative and
212 transparent culture. Such a culture of the organization is clearly connected to its business purpose. The people
213 it employs are more aligned right from the outset, as the culture of any organization plays a role in attracting
214 talent.

215 Developing such a collaborative culture will be easier with similar personality traits. This kind of Insightful
216 way will ensure that employees you attract will be a natural cultural fit right from the beginning.

217 More and more companies are beginning to recognize that intellectual capital is dependent on cultural capital.
218 Emphasis on cultural attributes like collective actions and information sharing contribute towards developing
219 a collaborative culture. The degree to which employees are willing to share their creativity and knowledge
220 is dependent on how aligned they feel with the organization and the relationship they have with their direct
221 supervisor. When there is a lack of alignment between employees' values and the organization's values, employees
222 are less willing to share their ideas. Match between personalities plays an important role to to go an extra
223 mile. These kinds of relationship among leader/member develop of a positive culture that supports employee
224 collaborative environment. By focusing on the needs of its people, the organization encourages higher levels of

225 personal productivity and creativity. This occurs as a natural byproduct of building trust, community spirit and
226 internal cohesion.

227 Culture resulting from personality match among employees can be strong based on shared values. Culture
228 cannot be imitated by the competitors and organizations having strong cultures perform better.

229 In "Corporate Culture and Performance," Kotter and Heskett show that companies with strong adaptive
230 cultures based on shared values outperformed other companies by a significant margin. Over an eleven-year
231 period, companies that emphasized all stakeholders employees, customers and stockholders, and focused on
232 leadership development, grew four times faster than companies that did not. They also found that these companies
233 had job creation rates seven times higher, had stock prices that grew twelve time faster and profit performance
234 that was 750 times higher than companies that did not have shared values and adaptive cultures.

235 In "Built to Last," Collins and Porras show that companies that consistently focused on building strong
236 corporate cultures over a period of several decades outperformed companies that did not by a factor of 6 and
237 outperformed the general stock market by a factor of 15.

238 The secret to a more collaborative culture lies in building and strengthening relations between supervisor
239 \subordinate and also among the colleagues working at the same level. And this can be more conveniently
240 developed where personality matches exist.

241 According to Towers Perrin global workforce survey conducted in 2005, emphasis on collaboration and
242 information sharing contribute to the innovativeness of an organization. They also foster learning orientation
243 sharing of new ideas.

244 Information sharing can be utilized for positive organizational outcomes like productivity and creativity.
245 Personality match improves interpersonal communications and is important for coordination. Thus information
246 sharing and generating new ideas depends on the relationship people have at the work place. These relations
247 further make a collaborative culture.

248 The notion of organizational culture has been important in the study of organizational behavior for the past
249 decade (e.g., ??arley, Meyer, & Gash, 1988; ??'Reilly, 1989; ??mircich, 1983). In spite of disagreements over some
250 elements of definition and measurement, researchers seem to agree that culture may be an important factor in
251 determining how well an individual fits an organizational context (e.g., Kilmann, Saxton, & Serpa, 1986; Schein,
252 1985). Thus another proposition that we propose is that personality match creates a deep collaborative culture
253 which offers unique potential for improving fit within the organization d) Proposition 4 Personality match offers
254 unique potential for understanding and improving fit within organizational environment.

255 Much previous research has suggested that person-culture fit increases commitment, satisfaction, and
256 performance, but very little empirical research on these relationships has been done.

257 The general notion of fit, or congruence, has long been important in psychology and organizational behavior
258 ??Nadler & Tushman, 1980). In studying personsituation fit, organizational behavior researchers have typically
259 taken one of two broad paths. One has led to exploration of the interaction of individual characteristics and broad
260 occupational attributes, the other to exploration of the fit between specific characteristics of an organization and
261 the people in it. Examples of the second approach range from studying the match of individual skills to job
262 requirements to studying the relationship between individual characteristics and organizational climate (e.g.,
263 ??owney, Hellriegel, & Slocum, 1975).

264 Byrne ??1971, ??997) proposed that people choose to interact with similar others. Variants of this idea have
265 been promoted in diverse contexts (e.g., ??auer & Green, 1996; ??almer & Byrne, 1970; ??ubin et al., 1994;
266 ??ushton, 1995; ??etzel, Schwartz, & Vasu, 1979). ??cClane (1991) hypothesized that high quality leader-member
267 exchange results from similarity. Now a day's organizations are increasingly structuring jobs in terms of groups
268 ??Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, & Mount, 1998; ??uzzo & Dickson, 1996; ??evine & Moreland, 1990), yet relatively
269 little is known about intragroup processes mediating individuals' contributions to team performance. Personality
270 match is an important phenomenon which offers unique potential for understanding and improving fit within work
271 groups. People feel most welcome in a culture where others think and behave as they do ??Schneider, 1987).
272 The level of their comfort highly depends on their personality and the others with whom they are interacting.

273 Muchinsky and Monahan (1987) distinguished between two types of person-environment congruence. Supple-
274 mentary congruence occurs when "an individual supplements, embellishes, or possesses characteristics which are
275 similar to other individuals in the environment". Complementary congruence occurs where "the characteristics of
276 the individual serve to 'make whole' or complement the characteristics of an environment" Thus, supplementary
277 is defined in terms of similarity, and complementarily in terms of mutual need. make workers feel encouraged to
278 share their ideas and Complementarity offers a unique basis for interpersonal attraction and group effectiveness.
279 And that too depends on the degree of supplementary.

280 Although suggesting distinct explanations of compatibility, the similarity hypothesis can be derived as a special
281 case of complementary, where similarity promotes mutual trait.

282 A key feature of interpersonal models is that trait expression is viewed reciprocally: personality compatibility
283 results when one person's trait expression offers opportunities for the other's trait expression If trait expression
284 is inherently rewarding (i.e., anxiety reducing), then social exchange theory implies that people will be more
285 comfortable in a relationship to the degree that it provides opportunities for trait expression. This level of
286 comfort then ultimately effects how individuals are going to contribute to their organization. ??ett et al. (1999)
287 suggested that personality can contribute to three levels of person-job fit. Task-level fit occurs with respect to the

288 immediate activities, goals, and duties that define a given job; group-level fit denotes a matching of the person
289 to his or her coworkers; and organization-level fit results when a person's traits match the organization's culture.
290 All these three aspects are also complementary as group cohesiveness depends on how well you interact and the
291 interaction further depends on how well your personality matches thus creating an overall environment of mutual
292 understanding. ??Carson, 1969; ??iesler, 1983 past research found that when used appropriately(i .e., there is a
293 fit between the Group support system structures and the task, and the group receives appropriation support),
294 GSS use increased the number of ideas generated, took less time, and led to more satisfied participants than if
295 the group worked without the GSS. Fitting the GSS to the task had the most impact on outcome effectiveness
296 (decision quality and ideas), while appropriations support the most impact on the process (time required and
297 process satisfaction). Group support system is also complemented by individuals who have congruence in some
298 aspects or other.

299 Thus, personality match plays a pivotal role in in building, understanding and managing the work fit within
300 the organization. Personality match make the individuals more adaptive toward their roles which build a culture
301 of mutual understanding, responsibility and care, consequently leading to better standard s of performance.

302 6 III.

303 7 Conclusion

304 Individuals like to be lead by personalities that are similar to them. They can influence them easily. The influence
305 employer have on employees changes their attitudes. Personality match can be used to engage the employees
306 emotionally at the working environment and fosters a deep collaborative culture. Cultures that are strong;
307 especially built on emotional basis i.e. emotional integration between the employees which are also difficult to
308 imitate and can be a competitive advantage for organizations. Understanding personalities at the workplace can
309 establish FIT in groups throughout the organization.

310 The similarity of personalities of employee and employer determines the worth of the relationships and level
311 of exchange among them which in turn has a strong impact on employees as well as overall organizations
312 performance. Personality match creates an invisible way by which the knowledge, talent and skills of employee
313 and employer are harnessed. It arouses the feeling of trust, mutual help, friendship and cohesion which ensures
314 productivity both at individual and organizational level.

315 Similar personalities not only help creating the culture of deep collaboration and understanding, it also is
316 essential for the individuals to prove their worth and fit in organizations. It helps creating attitude alignment
317 which in turn affects employees roles, responsibilities and collaboration in the organization. Working without the
318 environment that promotes similarity is like many haphazard directions ending in one place putting everyone in
319 confusion.

320 Thus we conclude that matching personalities complements and influences attitudes and emotions at personal
321 level, and can lead to some very unique outcomes at organizational level like emotional integration and a deep
322 collaborative culture which gives a company a winning edge among its competitors. ^{1 2 3 4 5 6}

¹Global Journal of Management and Business Research Volume XII Issue XI Version I

²© 2012 Global Journals Inc. (US)Julysubordinates before deciding on a leadership strategy (House, 1996).

³July

⁴© 2012 Global Journals Inc. (US) July

⁵July

⁶July

323 [Crant and Bateman ()] 'Charismatic Leadership Viewed from above: The Impact of Proactive Personality'. M
324 Crant , T Bateman , S . *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 2000. 21 (1) p. .

325 [Robie et al. ()] 'Do People Fake on Personality Inventories? A Verbal Protocol Analysis'. C Robie , D Brown ,
326 J Beaty , J , C . *Journal of Business and Psychology* 2007. 21 (4) p. .

327 [Cellar et al. ()] 'Effects of Leader Style, Leader Sex, and Subordinate Personality on Leader Evaluations and
328 Future Subordinate Motivation'. D Cellar , F Sidle , S Goudy , K Brien , D . *Journal of Business and*
329 *Psychology* 2001. 16 (1) p. .

330 [Smith and Canger ()] 'Effects of Supervisor "Big Five" Personality on Subordinate Attitudes'. A Smith , M
331 Canger , J . *Journal of Business and Psychology* 2004. 18 (4) p. .

332 [Staw et al. ()] 'Employee Positive Emotion and Favorable Outcomes at the Workplace'. B M Staw , R I Sutton
333 , L Pelled , H . *Organization Science* 1994. 5 (1) p. .

334 [Avey et al. ()] 'Experimentally analyzing the impact of leader positivity on follower positivity and performance'.
335 J Avey , B Avolio , B , J Luthans , F . *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 2011. 22 (5) p. . (The
336 Leadership Quarterly)

337 [Carmeli et al. ()] 'How CEO empowering leadership shapes top management team processes: Implications for
338 firm performance'. A Carmeli , A Carmeli , J Schaubroeck , A Tishler . *The Leadership Quarterly* 2011. 22 p. .

339 [Rotemberg ()] 'Human Relations in the Workplace'. J Rotemberg , J . *The Journal of Political Economy* 1994.
340 102 (4) p. .

341 [Subramaniam et al. ()] 'Implicit leadership theory among Malaysian managers; Impact of the leadership
342 expectation gap on leader-member exchange quality'. A Subramaniam , R Othman , M Sambasivan .
343 *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 2010. 31 (4) p. .

344 [Chatman ()] 'Improving Interactional Organizational Research: A Model of Person-Organization Fit'. J
345 Chatman , A . *The Academy of Management Review* 1989. 14 (3) p. .

346 [Ghoshal and Gratton ()] 'Integrating The Enterprise'. S Ghoshal , L Gratton . *MIT Sloan Management Review*
347 2002. 44 (1) .

348 [Parkinson and Taggar ()] 'Intelligence, Personality and Performance on Case Studies'. J Parkinson , S Taggar .
349 *Journal of Business and Psychology* 2006. 20 (3) p. .

350 [Shani and Somech ()] 'Leadership, OCB and individual differences: Idiocentrism and allocentrism as moderators
351 of the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and OCB'. I Shani , A Somech .
352 *The Leadership Quarterly* 2011. 22 p. .

353 [Judge and Cable ()] 'Managers' Upward Influence Tactic Strategies: The Role of Manager Personality and
354 Supervisor Leadership Style'. T Judge , A Cable , D , M . *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 2003. 24 (2)
355 p. .

356 [Granrose and Portwood ()] 'Matching Individual Career Plans and Organizational Career Management'. C
357 Granrose , S Portwood , J , D . *The Academy of Management Journal* 1987. 30 (4) p. .

358 [Berneth et al. ()] 'Perceived Fairness in Employee Selection: The Role of Applicant Personality'. J Berneth , B
359 Field , H , S Giles , W , F Cole , M , S . *Journal of Business and Psychology* 2006. 20 (4) p. .

360 [Burke and Witt ()] 'Personality and High-Maintenance Employee Behavior'. L Burke , A Witt , L , A . *Journal*
361 *of Business and Psychology* 2004. 18 (3) p. .

362 [Burke and Witt ()] 'Personality and High-Maintenance Employee Behavior'. L Burke , A Witt , L , A . *Journal*
363 *of Business and Psychology* 2004. 18 (3) p. .

364 [Ashton ()] 'Personality and Job Performance: The Importance of Narrow Traits'. M Ashton , C . *Journal of*
365 *Organizational Behavior* 1998. 19 (3) p. .

366 [Tett and Murphy ()] 'Personality and Situations in Co-Worker Preference: Similarity and Complementarity in
367 Worker Compatibility'. R Tett , P Murphy , P , J . *Journal of Business and Psychology* 2002. 17 (2) p. .

368 [Sanna and Robinson ()] 'Personality as Performance: Categorization Tendencies and Their Correlates'. L Sanna
369 , J Robinson , M , D . *Mental Simulation, Affect, and*, 2000. 2004. 13 p. .

370 [Chauhan and Chauhan ()] 'Personality at Workplace'. D Chauhan , S Chauhan , P . *Indian Journal of Industrial*
371 *Relations* 2006. 41 (3) p. .

372 [Bolin and Neuman ()] 'Personality, Process, and Performance in Interactive Brainstorming Group'. A Bolin , U
373 Neuman , G , A . *Journal of Business and Psychology* 2006. 20 (4) p. .

374 [Nemiroff and Ford ()] 'Task Effectiveness and Human Fulfillment in Organizations: A Review and Development
375 of a Conceptual Contingency Model'. P Nemiroff , M Ford , D , L . *The Academy of Management Review*
376 1976. 1 (4) p. .

377 [Greaney ()] 'Teachers' Perceptions of Pupil Personality'. V Greaney . *The Irish Journal of Education* 1974. 8
378 (2) p. .

7 CONCLUSION

379 [Buss and Craik ()] 'The act frequency approach to personality'. D M Buss , K H Craik . *Psychological Review*
380 1983. 90 p. .

381 [Davis and Rothstein ()] 'The Effects of the Perceived Behavioral Integrity of Managers on Employee Attitudes:
382 A Meta-Analysis'. A Davis , L Rothstein , H , R . *Journal of Business Ethics* 2006. 67 (4) p. .

383 [Guillen and Gonzalez ()] 'The Ethical Dimension of Managerial Leadership: Two Illustrative Case Studies in
384 TQM'. M Guillen , T Gonzalez , F . *Journal of Business Ethics* 2001. 34 (3) p. .

385 [Howell and Shamir ()] 'The Role of Followers in the Charismatic Leadership Process: Relationships and Their
386 Consequences'. J Howell , M Shamir , B . *The Academy of Management Review* 2005. 30 (1) p. .

387 [Gumusluoglu and Ilsev ()] 'Transformational leadership, creativity, and organizational innovation'. L Gumuslu-
388 oglu , A Ilsev . *Journal of Business Research* 2009. 62 p. .

389 [Jacobson ()] 'Unobservable Effects and Business Performance'. R Jacobson . *Marketing Science* 1990. 9 (1) p. .

390 [Caspi and Moffit ()] 'When Do Individual Differences Matter? A Paradoxical Theory of Personality Coherence'.
391 A Caspi , T E Moffit . *Psychological Inquiry* 1993. 4 (4) p. .