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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

It is undeniable that human capital is the most important asset an organization has. Individuals are responsible for making key decisions to strategically shape the future of an organization. These distinct, seemingly individual judgments accumulate over time to impact the ultimate survival or demise of a company.

Therefore, selecting the right personnel for the job is one of the best investments an organization can make. Utility analyses have been used to show the value of a poor hire, indicating that as much as $1.5 million could be lost on a high-stakes candidate that turns over soon after being selected (Smart & Street, 2009). Hiring well is particularly important for complex, high stakes roles where individuals could greatly impact the reputation of the organization and the brand. Top talent, particularly seasoned individuals with strong job-relevant technical skills, is highly coveted in the market. The literature has also demonstrated that an individual’s fit with the organization, defined as the congruence of an individual’s beliefs and values with the culture, norms, and values of an organization (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007), can be useful information that can be used to reduce turnover, increase employee satisfaction, and improve organizational commitment (e.g., O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). Without considering fit in hiring decisions, organizations could potentially recruit top talent, but fail to retain them.

The manner in which personnel are selected varies widely across organizations, given the plethora of different tools available and varying professional opinions on how such information should be utilized. Most importantly, information used to evaluate candidates should be tied to specific role requirements and responsibilities. However, this focused approach does not always consider the value of organizational fit, defined as the compatibility between one’s personal
values and beliefs and those promoted by a company, since they are not necessary for legal
defensibility.

The core values and mission statement of a company are explicit in the embodied values
held by its employees, yet such information from candidates is not as readily available and is
often subjectively discussed based on an interviewer’s intuition following an interview. Often
discounted are personality characteristics that could serve as a logical indicator of fit, since
different industries and/or companies value different tendencies and preferences. Incorporating
measures of personality into hiring decisions for precisely this reason is expected to improve
retention and performance (O’Reilly et. al, 1991), ultimately leading to higher gains and lower
losses. Though personality assessments are often used holistically in practice, there is paucity in
the research centered on the use of personality characteristics captured in complex ways (Kulas,
2013).

Still, the concept of assessing personality characteristics for the purpose of gauging
person-organization (P-O) fit poses several methodological challenges. Personality is
multidimensional, yet contemporary research within organization psychology has typically
utilized variable-centered approaches that identify specific characteristics accounting for unique
variance with a given criterion while controlling for other characteristics. This approach may be
useful to identify traits theoretically relevant to a given outcome, but may be less suited to
identify patterns of personality characteristics ascribed by an individual job candidate. To more
accurately assess candidate P-O fit, practitioners would benefit from utilizing a more holistic
approach that characterizes multiple elements of individual’s personality.

Furthermore, recent work by Kulas (2013) suggests that many practitioners (up to 62%)favor a holistic, ‘profiling matching’ method for selection. This practitioner preference is not
well supported, relative to the mechanical combining strategies advocated by academics (e.g., multiple regression). Yet, surely, there must be other ways to combine candidate characteristics in a more holistic way without sacrificing rigor or predictive effectiveness.

In a study on the topic of profile matching, Kulas (2013) discusses the prevalence of such seemingly unconventional approaches in business and offers several exploratory strategies for creating a predictive selection-oriented profile. Recent book chapters written by leaders in the field of personality in the workplace have called for the need to consider profiles holistically in a configural manner, rather than oversimplifying personality as stand-alone, individual traits or more complex, but still lacking, trait-by-trait interactions (Shoss & Witt, 2013). To this point, the current research explores the use of latent profile analysis to classify individuals based on shared characteristics. This person-centered approach is relatively under-utilized in organizational psychology, though it may advance the research on and practice of personality profile interpretation for personnel selection.

Continuous data from one personality tool and a measure of mental ability from former and/or current employees at a global professional services firm were used to empirically and theoretically characterize meaningful profiles, and test whether these profiles relate to key organizational outcomes (e.g., tenure, performance, and turnover). The use of profiling based on characteristics valued by the company during selection could bridge the gap between science and practice, as it is expected to offer a rigorous and systematic approach that considers the “whole person” in the context of his or her environment. Incorporating analytic techniques that capture co-occurring patterns of personality could result in an improved selection methodology that leaders are more likely to accept and practicing professionals are more likely to implement. Through improved selection decisions, a cascade effect is likely to take place. The high cost of
attrition has been demonstrated repeatedly, both in the actual costs associated with hiring activity and the overall impact to the firm’s performance (Park & Shaw, 2013). Therefore, the potential link between personnel selection and organizational fit is undoubtedly of interest to an organization’s bottom line. Additionally, employees who consider themselves to be a good fit are less likely to turnover and tend to have fewer absences (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979); they are also more likely to engage in extra-role behaviors (Organ & Ryan, 1995) and demonstrate increased productivity and higher performance (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005). These outcomes only cover the surface of possible positive outcomes for organizations.

The use of “profile matching” for selection purposes has been a focus in recent years but lacks empirical evidence. This approach is worthy of additional attention because the linkages between valued work outcomes and multivariate combinations of characteristics within an individual is more consistently used by psychologists in practice. Further, this method more closely captures the influence of organizational fit on personnel selection, further validating Schneider’s (1987) attraction-selection-attrition model. By selecting employees in a more holistic way using a person’s fit with the organization as an underlying driver, focusing on the interplay between characteristics in unique patterns within the individual using person-centered methodology, researchers can build out the literature in the intersection of organizational (culture fit) and industrial (selection) topics within the field. That is, organizations differentially value certain personality characteristics, and simultaneously are indifferent to or undervalue other characteristics. Consequently, selecting employees high in characteristics consistent with a company’s values and low in characteristics that are unappreciated by the company should subsequently lead to greater P-O fit and, ultimately, employee effectiveness.
The present study is novel in its person-centered approach to the creation and use of profiles that classify meaningful interactions within personality characteristics in a way that is useful to predict performance, turnover, and tenure using person-organization fit. Given the conceptual contribution with respect to aligning selection information with the specific organizational culture, the profiles identified within this study may not generalize to other companies. Given the novelty and paucity of profiling for selection within the literature, capturing latent profile groups based on patterns of intrapersonal characteristics that may have been lost focusing only on independent variables or simple interactions alone is a logical next step conceptually and practically. In the following chapter, literature on personnel selection methods, organizational fit, and the foundation for a profile matching approach is reviewed as it relates to the present study.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Practitioners regularly rely upon a battery of selection tools, in some combination, to predict the future behavior of candidates being considered for a role or job placement. Having these different sources is useful in prediction, similar to the value of a multi-trait multiple method approach offers in research (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). Ultimately, the results of a test battery are typically compiled and compressed into a final selection decision or recommendation.

Many decision points exist throughout the candidate evaluation process. Different assessment tools and methods yielding different types of information could be chosen. To more clearly understand the proposed concept of profiling for personal selection, definitions and descriptions from many perspectives in the literature are reviewed in this chapter, embedded within the review on current personnel tools and various methods of combining predictor information. The first section of this chapter provides background on selection tools and the various options for combining the resulting material based on theoretical evidence. Measures of personality are discussed as they relate to success in the workplace. Because these traits are job-related, evidence on attrition and turnover suggest that these are also highly relevant in effective selection decisions. This is followed by a review of the literature on the merits of person- and variable-centered approaches, as it is theoretically and practically relevant to consider each approach. Finally, a discussion of the role of organizational fit and matching individual and organizational values in making selection decisions will follow.

Methods of Personnel Selection

A selection procedure is considered valid if a clear relationship can be demonstrated between the selection procedure used and performance in the job for which the individual is selected. At the heart of personnel selection is job analysis, which offers a thorough investigation
of which knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) are essential or important for any given job. This information, or deep understanding of what it looks like for an individual to be successful in the role, can be used to determine if the selection procedure is targeting appropriate information (Gatewood, Feild, & Barrick, 2010).

Practitioners can add significant value when helping organizations find the right talent to fill their vacancies by collecting information about positions and candidates to find suitable matches between what candidates offer and what the organizations need. Thus, the process of personnel selection involves collecting information about individuals for the purpose of determining suitability for employment in a particular job. At the onset of an employment relationship, applicant materials may be reviewed and checked to determine whether the candidate meets the minimum qualifications of a role. This may be accomplished through reviewing training, knowledge, education, and experience information gathered from a resume. Reference checks could also be used to capture information about a candidate’s character and ability to build successful, lasting relationships.

Once candidates are initially screened, those that rise to the top could be selected to progress to a round of interviews. The amount of structure across interviews can vary greatly, and the content could range from highly technical to an interview that is more situational or behavioral in nature. Since past behavior is the best predictor of future behavior (e.g., Aarts, Verplanken, & van Knippenberg, 1998), interviews tend to be a favored method of learning about a candidate in selection decisions.

Other tools that offer predictive value at little cost could include biodata, application blanks, weighted application blanks (WAB), and work samples. Biodata, application blanks, and WABs rely on the type of information about candidates that could be typically found on an
application, whereas work samples require candidates to engage in a behavior or activity that is highly relevant for the job in question. This method can reveal job-relevant skills and knowledge arguably better than many other methods and serves a dual purpose of further informing the job-seeker about job requirements and responsibilities (e.g., Wanous, 1973).

Some tools are used to test potential aptitude, ability, or specific skills relevant to the job. Mental ability tests measure problem-solving capability and intellectual flexibility, and have been shown to be the best predictor of job performance regardless of job difficulty or level (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Knowledge-based tests or physical tests can be especially useful for jobs that require a specific skillset. Such tests can be used to verify credentials (knowledge-based) or confirm that the individual can physically engage in job-relevant work.

Finally, personality tests can be used in selection when important personality traits linked to job and role success have been identified. They are often used to complement other tools, as personality tends to be a weak predictor of job performance compared with other methods when used on their own (e.g., Guion, 1965; Guion & Gottier, 1965; Morgeson et al., 2007). Still, personality tests have been touted as having less adverse impact than other tests, and they are particularly effective and value-adding when used in combination with other methods, particularly tests of general mental ability (e.g., Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). The complex dynamic of personality traits, controlling for mental ability, appear to be the most useful tool to consider when designing culture-capturing profiles.

**Use of Personality Characteristics for Personnel Selection**

As noted in the previous section, personality impacts job performance. Personality may also have a distinctive influence on motivation and goal setting, above and beyond the influence of one’s values (Parks & Guay, 2009). Previous research has demonstrated that individual
differences, including personality, mental ability, and performance on standardized tests, are connected to success in a number of specific and broad domains (academic, work, life outcomes; Kuncel, Ones, & Sackett, 2010). For the purpose of this study, further investigation into personality characteristics, specifically, were examined.

Personality can be defined as "the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his [or her] unique adjustments to his [or her] environment" (Allport, 1937, p. 48). Over the course of the last twenty-five years, interest in personality in the workplace has increased dramatically (Hough & Ones, 2001). As a result, a number of independent studies and multiple meta-analyses have demonstrated the utility of the use of personality measures for selection purposes. Specifically, some personality characteristics, most notably conscientiousness and emotional stability (Barrick, Mount & Judge, 2001; Salgado, 1997), offer incremental validity above and beyond general mental ability (GMA; Dunn, Mount, Barrick, & Ones, 1995) when predicting organizational outcomes. It stands to reason that how a person is hardwired to engage in their work, the type of tasks they find appealing, and the behavioral choices they make on the basis of their natural tendencies and predispositions is important to understand and predict effective performance in a number of roles.

Through the course of the study of personality, psychologists have debated the appropriate number of factors or dimensions and their labels. In recent decades, the Five Factor Model (FFM; “Big Five”) of personality has emerged the dominant taxonomy within the field, which is a taxonomy that includes five broad traits, each comprised of a number of facets that create the overarching construct. The broad level factors for the Big Five personality traits include conscientiousness (dependable, organized, self-disciplined), extraversion (sociable, talkative, active), emotional stability (the opposite of neuroticism; calm, unemotional, secure),
agreeableness (altruistic, nurturing, caring), and openness to experience (imaginative, cultured, broad-minded; Digman, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1987). Though not all personality measures have been studied as they relate to the Big Five, most measures can be at least indirectly linked to these measures. Using this wide-shared empirical knowledge as a platform to understand personality is not uncommon, despite a variety of personality measures currently used in practice.

The Big Five describes behaviors in light of a person’s dispositional characteristics (Hogan, 1991) and these characteristics have been associated with organizational outcomes (e.g., job performance ratings; Barrick & Mount, 1991; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991). Meta-analytic evidence from the early 1990s (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991; Tett et al., 1991) purported the beneficial, albeit modest, impact of personality measures in predicting job performance ratings using this taxonomy. For example, the highest estimated true correlation – corrected for unreliability (in the predictor and the criterion) and range restriction – reported by Barrick and Mount (1991) was .22 for the relation between conscientiousness and job performance. Another meta-analysis published in the same year (Tett et al., 1991) found a similar corrected mean validity of .18 for conscientiousness. Moreover, personality variables have been found to be important in explaining incremental variance in job performance above and beyond general mental ability, as noted above (e.g., Dunn et al., 1995; Day & Silverman, 1989; McCrae & Costa, 1987; Salgado, 1998).

Of each of the Big Five, conscientiousness is most consistently linked to job performance across a variety of different position (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Salgado, 1997). This construct is exhibited in three related facets, including achievement orientation (hardworking, persistent), dependability (responsible, careful), and orderliness (planful, organized). Thus,
conscientiousness is related to an individual’s degree of self-control, as well as need for achievement, order, and persistence (Costa, McCrae, & Dye, 1991).

How an employee handles stress and pressure on the job, and their natural reaction to new challenges, can be derived from a measure of emotional stability (previously known as neuroticism). Neuroticism is comprised of anxiety (instability and stress proneness) and one’s wellbeing (personal insecurity and depression). Costa and McCrae’s (1992) identified six facets that play a role in neuroticism: anxiety, hostility, depression, self-consciousness, vulnerability, and impulsiveness.

Extraversion speaks to how an individual might prefer to interact with and engage others, and the extent to which they are willing to take charge of groups and practice assertiveness. While most people recognize the social orientation of extraverts (outgoing and gregarious), it is less commonly noted that other facets of extraversion include their surgent (dominant and ambitious) and active (adventuresome and assertive) natures. Unsurprisingly, extraverts are more likely to take on leadership roles (Watson & Clark, 1997).

Openness to experience is characterized by intellectance (philosophical and intellectual) and unconventionality (imaginative, autonomous, and nonconforming). Employees who are higher on this factor tend to be more creative, original, adventurous, questioning, and willing to try new things. While it would stand to reason that the flexibility, creativity, and intellectual orientation of open individuals may be instrumental to success in many occupations, the findings have not as clearly or consistently linked openness to experience with job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

Finally, agreeableness taps into one’s predisposition to getting along with others. It is comprised of cooperative (trusting of others and caring) as well as likeable (good-natured,
cheerful, and gentle). Though the cooperative nature of agreeable individuals may lead to higher performance in some occupations where teamwork or customer service is relevant, it could potentially hinder an individual’s success in the role if too much of their time is dedicated toward serving others.

Many articles on the Big Five personality characteristics focus on correlations between personality traits and performance. One of the most highly cited overviews summarized the relationship between the Five Factor Model of personality and job performance (Barrick et al, 2001). Their investigation of 15 prior meta-analytic studies suggests that Conscientiousness is a valid predictor of success across all performance measures in all occupations studied. Emotional stability was also found to be a sound generalizable predictor for overall work performance, although some predictive ability was lost when examining specific performance criteria (Barrick et al., 2001).

Five years later, another study found similarly strong relationships between the Big Five personality factors and behavior in organizations, with a particular focus on Conscientiousness (Ones, Dilchert, Viswesvaran, & Judge, 2007). In addition to replicating previous relationships, Ones and colleagues’ (2007) results demonstrated the incremental validity of personality measures over mental ability. This signifies even greater utility for the use of personality measures in conjunction with other tools.

Research has also demonstrated the linkage between some of the Big Five personality traits with other variables. In one study, Judge, Heller, and Mount (2002) found the strongest correlations between job satisfaction and neuroticism (r = -0.29), conscientiousness (0.26), and extraversion (0.25), though only neuroticism and extraversion generalized across studies. As a
Swider and Zimmerman (2010) found significant relationships between the Five-Factor Model personality traits with relevant work outcomes, including each of the dimensions of job burnout, absenteeism, turnover, and job performance. They identified a meta-analytic path model to show that job burnout partially mediated the relationships between the Big Five personality traits and turnover and the Big Five and performance. Job burnout fully mediated the relationship with absenteeism. Thus, personality is important in selection, in part, due to the resulting relationships between personality and other non-desirable work outcomes (Swider & Zimmerman, 2010).

Though the Five Factor Model is widely recognized as the model with the most support, debate continues around the usefulness of broad level traits relative to narrowly defined facet-level traits, and most personality measures used in practice are not empirically linked to the Big Five, despite a great degree of overlap between these measures. One study compared the link between specific and broad measures of personality against work behaviors to investigate which level of specificity revealed stronger relationships. Main effect results showed that significant linkages between broad personality and criterion variables (i.e., factors) were explained by stronger relations among relatively few specific variables (Tett, Steele, & Beauregard, 2003). Weak relationships among broad measures obscured important linkages at the specific level, including several cases of cancellation (i.e., valuable facet-level traits were suppressed by other traits in the same domain). Still, Tett and colleagues’ (2003) findings are unique in demonstrating the value of specificity on both sides of the prediction equation, indicating the added value of using narrow predictors with specific criteria.
At first glance, the findings of Tett and colleagues’ study might seem to prompt further examination of narrow traits. However, other studies have found contradicting results. For example, Timmerman (2006) investigated how well one could predict the voluntary turnover of call center employees using broad and narrow personality traits. Broad traits were captured by the Five Factor Model domains; these domains were then broken down to the facet level to comprise the narrow traits. The findings reflected significant positive correlations between voluntary turnover with Extraversion and Openness to Experience at the broad domain level for this type of role. Though he was able to find several facet-level traits that predicted voluntary turnover, the common variance shared among the narrow facets to create the broad dimensions was a better predictor overall.

Though predicting performance is of utmost interest in selection, personality characteristics are also useful in predicting other work-related outcomes. Bowling and Burns’ (2010) study compared work-specific and general personality as predictors of non-performance work criteria. Their findings suggest that when personality characteristics were specific to work, they resulted in stronger relationships with job satisfaction, work frustration, turnover intentions, and absenteeism than did personality characteristics that are general (Bowling & Burns, 2010). Also, work-specific personality measures predict general criteria as well as general personality, so they are favored when considering personality measures for selection purposes and were used in the current study.

Examining the interactions of broad level factors, Witt, Burke, Barrick, and Mount (2002) found support for simple interaction effects between those with various levels of conscientiousness and agreeableness in most samples they studied. Workers who received high scores in conscientious but low in agreeableness received lower ratings of job performance. Witt
and colleagues (2002) concluded that the lower agreeableness may impact workers’ effectiveness on the job because it might appear that they lack interpersonal sensitivity or appear less willing to cooperate than others.

Researchers in personnel selection often use the Big Five, as well as the sub-facets of personality captured by the NEO Personality Inventory, to describe personality characteristics of high-functioning employees (Detrick & Chibnall, 2006). When NEO PI-R profiles were compared for high performing and low performing police officers entering into the workforce, meaningful differences on three personality dimensions (neuroticism, extraversion, and conscientiousness) emerged that could be used to differentiate the groups. Specifically, low-performers had higher Neuroticism and lower Conscientious scores than the high performing group (Detrick & Chibnall, 2006).

The research reviewed here has relied heavily on the Five Factor Model to understand how personality predicts outcomes, given the prevalence of its use for academic study. However, it should be noted that organizations use a wide range of different tools to capture elements of personality. While most, if not all, are valid predictors linked closely with the constructs of the Big Five, the experimental or correlational study of other personality tools in the literature is not nearly as widespread. This broad framework aids in the understanding of personality as it pertains to organizational outcomes and it serves a very clear theoretical purpose. Measures used in practice, including the tool being used for this study, often overlap with these theoretical constructs, yet the link is not often explicit in research.

Overall, these studies highlight the importance of interacting effects and emphasize that individuals are not inclined to exhibit their personality one trait at a time. Instead, a person’s behavior is the result of the concurrent influence of multiple traits playing off of one another
(Brandt & Devine, 2000). These relatively stable personality characteristics that help to predict behavior are undeniably multifaceted and hard to define and measure.

**Conceptual Description of Profiling Using Personality Characteristics**

Personality is incredibly complex, as different traits present under different conditions and circumstances, yet an individual’s underlying preferences and tendencies remain reasonably constant (e.g., Block, 1977; Costa & McCrae, 1990). Given its intricacy, most current measures of personality target individual characteristics, honing in on the unique value of any given trait, but downplaying how other traits impact the manifestation and importance of the trait being studied for job performance and other organizational outcomes.

Personality has a limited utility for explaining an individual’s behaviors, attitudes, and cognitions because of the way variables are often considered. Individual traits should not be considered as competing predictors in a regression model. Intuitively, we know that one word or trait provides a limited representation of a person. Thus, personality traits, in combination, influence behavior and examining them in a more holistic way can provide a more powerful way of understanding and capturing personality’s influence on behavior (Shoss & Witt, 2013). A method of looking at several characteristics in combination to understand how they interact with each other in more compound ways is profiling.

Profiling, or profile matching, is a method that utilizes the need for combining many facets of personality for the sake of understanding the comprehensive profile of a person. It has received little attention in I/O psychology historically, yet it has been embraced in the clinical and educational domains. Additionally, recent research has shown that as many as 62% of current businesses employ this type of strategy in their selection process (Kulas, 2013). Essentially, this method uses various personal characteristics or behavior patterns to make
generalizations about a person. Objective information is collected in a mechanical way, but then combined judgmentally, resulting in an overall holistic view. Certain combinations of traits have potential to predict behavioral patterns later in life. Early detection can allow for preemptive intervention and it can serve to increase awareness of differing needs and behavioral expression.

This approach is unconventional for personnel selection purposes given the historical lack of empirical support. Consideration for profiling dates back to Meehl (1954). In his article, Meehl describes the “paradox” using a fictitious example in which two individual items were not individually correlated with the occurrence of schizophrenia, yet if item interactions were considered in combination, they could accurately predict schizophrenia. This example, though theoretical, demonstrates the purpose capturing complex interactions of various traits through profiling.

Since Meehl’s initial article, this topic has been revisited time and time again throughout personality assessment history (e.g., Hattrup, 2012). The practice of profiling for personnel selection continues yet today, as evidenced by a recent study conducted by Kulas (2013), which convincingly suggests that many I/O practitioners engage in these practices. It is not uncommon for those in industry to synthesize information, identify trends, and use predictive patterns holistically to identify individuals who have the highest probability of success through the profile matching method. Job descriptions and job analyses, when available, can be used to guide a practitioner to align desired traits with role requirements in a way that is less mechanical, objective, and quantitative.

The profiling method considers information in context, relative to other characteristics, accounting for the richness and uniqueness of the human condition as it is expected to manifest in a work setting. Some unique interactions of traits might suggest a stronger likelihood of
success than others. Hiring decisions, particularly when the investment is great and/or the job requirements are not static, can be complex, and this approach accounts for such complexities.

Despite personality research up to this point emphasizing the predictive value using a variable-centered approach, personality characteristics do not manifest independently of one another. Rather, the traits manifest in behavior in highly interdependent ways. This also raises an important discussion on the use of different theoretical approaches for analyzing personality data for the purpose of profiling.

**Variable-centered vs. Person-centered Approach**

Historically, individual personality characteristics have been examined as stand-alone predictors of various outcomes across much of the literature, given its strong quantitative focus. Isolating variables of interest as targeted, discrete predictors, then combining relevant correlational relationships through multiple regression, is the most widely used approach.

Variable-centered approaches describe relationships between variables, and often answer questions intended to gauge the relative contributions that predictor variables make to an outcome. According to Magnusson (2003), “The focus of interest is the relation between individuals’ positions on latent dimensions, statistically studied across individuals (p. 14).” Variable-centered analytic models can be predicated on the assumption that predictors influence outcomes the same way across all members of a population, but miss opportunities to show how different variables are integrated within a person’s environment (e.g., Hart, Atkins, & Fegley, 2003).

Using a variable-centered approach aligns most closely with Classic Personality Theory as described by Furnham (1992), where single or multiple traits are measured. A single trait is considered individually (e.g., conscientiousness) though, using this approach, is not as rich a
source of hypotheses, as the basic premise is to measure personality as the independent variable and see how it correlates with often highly complex work-related behavior.

Researchers prefer to use the rule of parsimony, even though the ‘real world’ never allows for such simplistic prediction. Thus, using univariate interactions to capture a much more complex interaction of traits could be enhanced, despite the prevalence of univariate study in the literature. Variables do not present as single parts of an employee’s personality in reality; it is the unique contribution of multiple personality traits that result in behavior, based on the situation and environment. Thus, to consider personality traits in a vacuum, devoid of such influences that potentially have the power to suppress or underscore dimensions of an individual’s personality, could be too basic. More effort should be taken to understand how such factors play off one another as they are embedded within the individual, rather than examining the unique contributions of each trait ignoring highly relevant contextual information. Just as personality is complex, the culture of a workplace is multidimensional and multifaceted; good fit requires varying interactions among multiple individual personality characteristics.

In contrast, person-centered approaches identify groups of individuals who share particular attributes or associations among their characteristics. This approach is preferred when examining group differences with respect to patterns within the individual. This approach is based on the assumption that the population is heterogeneous with respect to how specific characteristics covary with one another. Specifically, “The identification of groups of individuals who function in a similar way at the organism level and in a different way relative to other individuals at the same level” (Magnusson, 2003, p. 16).

This “variable” and “person” terminology can be traced to Block (1971). In his article, he describes the difference in this way: “Variable-centered analyses are useful for understanding the
differences between people and what characteristics go with what characteristics in a group of
individuals. But as well, and ultimately, psychology will need to seek understanding of the
configuration and systematic connection of personality variables as these dynamically operate
within a particular person (Block, 1971, p. 13).”

While many could be argue that the interactions evident in regressions or between group
factors in an analysis of variance (ANOVAs) capture individual differences in patterns such that
person-oriented techniques are not necessary, one or two variables at a single point in time may
not adequately define categories of individuals. Rather, personality variables should be treated
less as predictors and outcomes and more as properties of individuals and their environments.
These properties may be bundled uniquely in different types of individuals, and the focus is on
identifying those groups as they pertain to different life experiences.

It is argued here that a person-centered approach examining how psychological measures
comprise configurations of personal attributes (Crockett, Moilanen, Raffaelli, & Randall, 2006)
is valuable to identify different personality profiles with practical and theoretical significance for
personnel selection. By considering a person-centered approach (i.e., cluster analysis or latent
profile analysis), this research can be used to show whether differences exist in the outcomes
when different constellations of psychological variables are used to inform selection decisions.
Because person-centered approaches rely on more than individual traits, the profiles that emerge
will likely reflect the organization’s culture, which can aid in the assessment of fit.

Selecting for Person-Organization Fit

It is difficult to imagine a single environment more significant to an individual’s identity
than one’s place of employment because many of people define themselves by the work they do
(Hulin & Judge, 2003). Yet, in much of personality research, it is studied as if it were not part of
an organized system, and a fixed set of traits wholly independent of the environment (Judge & Kristof-Brown, 2004).

Personality characteristics can be considered for a number of different purposes, though one of the most widely studied topics is the focus on how well these individual traits align with the needs of the environment in which the person is placed. As the name suggests, person-environment fit (P-E fit) captures the degree to which a person’s characteristics match his or her surrounding environment (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). This match can be assessed by examining aspects of the individual, including his or her values, needs, goals, interests, abilities, and natural tendencies, against aspects of the environment, including any rewards, demands, cultural values, and the traits and tendencies of other person(s) in this environment.

Given the broad nature of this construct, P-E fit in a selection context is focuses on the fit between a person and an organization, or person-organization fit (P-O fit), and the fit between a person and their unique job (person-job fit; P-J fit). Essentially, P-E fit serves as a broad term to cover all types of fit, though some more specific types may be more a more appropriate level of study for profiling. Though P-O fit differs only slightly from P-E and P-J fit in terms of how they are understood and operationalized, the key distinction between the different “fit” constructs is the specificity and level of analysis (Kristof, 1996). As a point of reference, other forms of fit exist within person-environment fit that become increasingly narrow in scope. Though not described in detail for the purpose of this research, these could include person-vocation fit, person-group fit, person-supervisor fit, and person-job fit (Kristof, 1996).

P-O fit is the compatibility between individuals and their organization, though this compatibility can be used to determine supplementary or complementary fit. In some cases,
organizations seek talent that is largely similar in terms of personality traits, abilities, values, interests, and goals (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). By contrast, compatibility could reflect complementary fit through selecting for characteristics that might otherwise be missing, in an effort to diversify the characteristics represented in the workforce (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987).

Given the challenges that many organizations face in a change-centric, global, and technology-driven environment, selecting for P-O fit could be critical to retaining a workforce with the adaptability and organizational commitment necessary for the company to thrive. More specifically, research highlights the value of P-O fit as it relates to many different antecedents of relevant outcomes: candidate perceptions of fit influence hiring decisions (Cable & Judge, 1996; Turban & Keon, 1993), fit can be used to predict behaviors and attitudes of employees (Tziner, 1987; Westerman & Cyr, 2004), and understanding P-O fit can help to anticipate intentions to quit and actual turnover in organizations (O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). P-O fit can be instrumental in understanding how personality characteristics could aid one person in being met with success, while another is destined to struggle. Schein (1996) would add that members within a given organization often share ideologies surrounding a set of beliefs about how things work, values that indicate what things are worthwhile or not, and norms that tell the collective how to behave.

Relative to other types of predictor information, measuring personality characteristics holistically and considering the blend of unique combinations can more aptly allow for an assessment of ‘fit’ within an organization. Such a process requires that important personality traits are consistent across high performing individuals – and, importantly, consistently different from low performing individuals. This introduces an opportunity for practitioners to exercise
judgment in determining the appropriate magnitude and importance of each targeted personality trait as it relates to fit with the target organization. Using a collection of such traits creates a customizable personality profile, in which individual characteristics could be funneled into a general representation.

Beyond the concerns of selection practices with a dynamic criteria or “moving target,” the organizational fit literature reflects the value of considering alignment of one’s values with those of their firm as a key to successful hiring. Studies have shown that productivity and satisfaction are directly related to the fit between characteristics of individuals and the demands of the job (P-J fit). Furthermore, individuals are looking for congruence of norms and values within their organization (P-O fit; Holland, 1973).

O’Reilly and colleagues (1991) proposed a number of potential situations regarding P-O fit and personality. When a person with discrepant values enters organization with strongly defined values, a few things might result. The person’s values might change if they are open to it and the person will act in accordance with the specified norms. The person’s values will not change if they are not open to it, and they will likely leave. Or, if they join with others in a cohort who share a set of values even if they differ from the organization, over time, the norms will shift to be more like the new joiners.

Thus, the values and mission of the organization play a part in determining which employees are likely to be retained in the role, considering that some characteristics are prized by the organization and thus rewarded for high performance. According to Schneider’s (1987) ASA model, candidates are often attracted to organizations that portray and embrace their value system and seem to be a good match for them.
Building on this theory, De Cooman, De Gieter, Pepermans, Hermans, Du Bois, Caers, and Jegers (2009) studied this phenomenon longitudinally over a two year time period to better understand the relation between an individual’s work values and their organization’s values. Researchers found that socialization resulted in more homogeneity and perception of organizational fit became stronger with time. However, individuals who did not perceive as much similarity between their values and those of their organization were more likely to leave voluntarily (attrition). In a similar vein, the personality traits that an individual embodies are most likely to be encouraged and rewarded in an organization that values such traits. Thus, De Cooman and colleagues (2009) concluded that elements of both socialization and attrition from the Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) framework were present and building on each other.

Another study found that job seekers’ P-O fit perceptions were predicted by the congruence between their values and their perceptions of the recruiting organizations’ values, while demographic similarity with organizational representatives had no effect (Cable & Judge, 1996).

While performance is arguably the most critical criteria to consider in when identifying new hires, other outcomes are also relevant for long-term success, and should be factored into hiring decisions. Measures of retention, organizational commitment, and perceived interpersonal effectiveness are also valuable and worth consideration. In the most recent meta-analytic review of the relationship between P-O fit and behavioral criteria, which included performance, OCBs, and turnover, findings revealed that P-O fit is weakly to moderately related to each of these outcome variables (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006). Importantly, however, the method in which fit is measured is an important moderator of these relationships, although the definition of P-O fit is not (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006). Of note, the impact of method as a moderator was also found in earlier studies, including one by Verquer, Beehr, and Wagner (2003). In their meta-analysis, they
found that some measures and methods resulted in elevated effect sizes, which should be considered when comparing results of such studies.

P-O fit has also been considered as a predictor of extra-role behaviors or organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), since it was hypothesized that employees would feel more obligated to help others in such environments (Goodman & Svyantek, 1999). However, researchers found that perceptions of the organizational culture and the discrepancy between an individual’s ideal and actual culture were important for predicting both contextual and task performance (Goodman & Svyantek, 1999).

As a company grows over the course of its life cycle, an organization’s perceived culture may become stronger and more distinctive, attracting candidates that perceive a match with others that have been met with success. In a longitudinal study examining the importance of person-environment fit, Tak (2011) found that fit between person and organization, job, and supervisor all correlated with turnover intentions, measured during the second half of employees’ first year with their organizations. While all three predictors were significant, only P-O fit correlated significantly with actual turnover six months later (Tak, 2011).

Although much of the research (Schneider, 1987; Schneider et. al, 1998) suggests that similarity between individuals and their supervisors are likely to result in positive individual outcomes, other studies demonstrate that dyadic relationship are more complex (Glomb & Welsh, 2005). Personality heterogeneity, with respect to control, in supervisor-subordinate dyads is positively associated with the subordinate’s satisfaction with the supervisor (Glomb & Welsh, 2005). For other outcomes, including OCBs and work withdrawal, neither similarity nor dissimilarity was important. These findings highlight the importance of relationship complexities in organizational dyad research (Glomb & Welsh, 2005).
Focusing more on the other types of fit, compatibility with an organization’s values is associated with commitment and loyalty to the company, particularly during periods of change. One recent study examined the relationship between P-O fit and employee commitment during unstable times of strategic organizational change (Meyer, Hecht, Gill, & Toplonytsky, 2010). Authors collected employee perceptions and preferences, as well as two measures of P-O fit before and after the change, to see how it impacted an individual’s affective commitment to the organization and turnover intentions. Results indicated that perceived culture fit was positively correlated with the criterion values within and across time (Meyer et al., 2010). Thus, employees who perceive a fit with their organization appear more likely to remain committed, even during times of uncertainty and change.

Some studies consider elements of person-organization fit in combination with personality measures. One study examined two types of entrepreneurial environments to better understand what type of profile was met with success in each situation. Results indicated that entrepreneurs in high novelty and high technological uncertainty ventures had higher education, loved challenges, and were more committed, innovative, intuitive, and ambitious. Entrepreneurs in low novelty or technological uncertainty ventures tended to be more “Type A,” which is often defined by high achievement-orientation, impatience, anxiety, and assertiveness. While both groups were met with success, the first group tended to be more successful on measures reflecting strategizing for the future, while the second group was particularly strong when assessed on their ability to achieve short-term goals (Dvir, Sadeh, & Malach-Pines, 2010). This speaks to the importance of the match between entrepreneur personalities and ventures, both on the basis of initial attraction to the opportunity, as well as how the new venture is managed (Dvir et al., 2010). Still, “attempts to make connections between personality and organizational culture...
have been sparse” (Smith & Schneider, 2004, pg. 348), even though Resick, Giberson, and Dickson (2002) found that aggregate employee personality predicts perceptions of organizational culture.

Although “fit” is often used as a general measure, the correlation between person-organization (P-O) fit and person-job (P-J) fit is only 0.18, and each construct has been shown to have a different impact on key behavioral outcomes (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). Namely, P-O fit was a better indicator of intentions to quit and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) than was P-J fit. However, little difference exists between type of fit and job satisfaction (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001).

Furthermore, policy-capturing studies have been used to investigate how P-O fit and P-J fit information are weighed and combined to make hiring decisions (Sekiguchi & Huber, 2011). Specifically, contract duration (permanent vs. fixed-term) was reflected in the extent to which P-O or P-J fit was weighted, as P-O fit was found to be more important for permanent than contract positions, whereas P-J fit was more critical for knowledge-intensive than managerial roles in the company (Sekiguch & Huber, 2011). Given that the fit measure for this study is more general and focused on broad outcomes, the current study will consider personality to capture person-organization fit for full-time, permanent hires.

Subjectively considering personality information is prevalent in corporate hiring decisions and there is continued interest in this method, contrary to the lack of evidence in the literature. This suggests that further exploration of possible relationships between outcome-based criteria and multivariate specifications of trait patterns is necessary, while also considering employee heterogeneity and homogeneity.
Referring back to Schnieder’s (1987) classical study, a central proposition of the Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) model is that the individuals comprising a wider organization are likely to become more homogeneous over time based on perceived fit within the organization. On one hand, homogeneous environments foster similarity, which could enhance cohesion, communication, and motivation to work together on collective tasks. Thus, productivity is the result of cohesive interpersonal processes (Steiner, 1972).

Hiring individuals with a similar mindset has been shown to have other consequences as well. For example, one study by Barrick and colleagues (1998) found that greater variance in conscientiousness and a lower group level mean on this trait was linked to lower team performance, suggesting that a mix of high and low conscientious people leads to reduced performance. Similarly, this diversity could lead to group process issues. When high conscientious individuals are focused greatly on details and meeting the expectations of others, conflict could arise when those who are not as conscientious seek information from them. This puts strain on some group members’ willingness to share (Bond & Shui, 1997).

With respect to personality heterogeneity at work, different perspectives could promote a division of labor. This could allow everyone to play a different role that plays to their strengths or interests. Productivity is the result of task-focusing behaviors (Steiner, 1972). For example, diversity within the team might result in higher quality solutions when problem-solving (Hoffman & Maier, 1961).

In a recent study to investigate the effect of personality heterogeneity on team performance, relationships between predictors and criteria differed depending on the type of task performed. Specifically, more variability on agreeableness and neuroticism resulted in lower oral presentation scores, whereas greater variability on extraversion resulted in higher oral
presentation scores (Mohammed & Angell, 2003). However, while team heterogeneity is important in some ways, teams with higher mean mental ability (more homogeneous scores) scored higher on written reports (Mohammed & Angell, 2003). These studies emphasize the value of multiple profiles capturing organizational culture, recognizing that some similarities across individuals, including strong general mental ability, may be important for enhanced company success.

**General Mental Ability as a Covariate**

This literature review has focused on capturing personality traits to comprise a profile that could be employed in personnel selection. As described early into the review, measures of mental ability were found to be the most predictive type of assessment for assessing future job performance (e.g., Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). By accounting for differences in general mental ability (GMA), the personality profiles are more likely to highlight underlying patterns within the data that really speak to performance on the job.

Accounting for a person’s intellect before interpreting a profile makes good sense, given that it will allow one to more narrowly identifying the actual effect of each profile on the outcome, job performance. Considering mental ability within the profile would likely create “noise” in the result, and the result would include a good deal of unexplained variation.

While it is has been demonstrated that personality adds incremental predictive ability above and beyond that of mental ability alone (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998), only recently has the interaction between general mental ability and personality been examined to predict perceived influence in groups (Deuling, Denissen, van Zalk, Meeus, & van Aken, 2011). Deuling and colleagues’ findings indicate that extraversion allows a person to seem leader-like and credible quickly in groups, though over time, mental ability had a greater impact on perceived group
influence. This effect was partially mediated by perceived intelligence. When even more time had passed, personality became important to changes in perceived influence, as openness to experience was positively related, and neuroticism and conscientiousness were negatively related (Deuling et al., 2011). Because both mental ability and personality characteristics play a role in job performance, controlling for mental ability in an organization where employees are more similar than different is preferred.

Other work has also investigated how mental ability, personality, and job-specific skills work together in such a way that different parts surface as being relevant for success at the team-level. Specifically, Neuman and Wright (1999) have found that agreeableness predicts interpersonal skills at both the individual and group levels. Additionally, personality characteristics, particularly agreeableness and conscientiousness, predicted peer ratings of team member performance, above and beyond that of job-relevant skills and general mental ability (Neuman & Wright, 1999). These personality measures predicted supervisor ratings of team-level performance, objective measures of team accuracy, and amount of work completed.

The complex interaction of these individual differences is also evident when evaluating leaders, at least indirectly. Leadership effectiveness, as measured by attainment of organizational outcomes, is a direct function of a leader’s transformational behaviors, and is an indirect function of a combination of the leader’s experience, intelligence, and conscientiousness, that work through transformational behaviors (Cavazotte, Moreno, & Hickmann, 2012). The authors determined that emotional intelligence seemed to be statistically related to transformational leadership when considered in isolation, yet the same effect was not found when controlling for ability and personality. This study illustrates how complex the interaction of such factors can be (Cavazotte, Moreno, & Hickmann, 2012).
General mental ability (GMA) measures represent a highly desirable type of assessment in personnel selection, given the advantages for predicting job performance across a wide range of roles. Zysberg and Nevo (2004) investigated how psychologists consider different information sources when making selection decisions for managerial positions, and found that mental ability was weighted more heavily than other information in the overall decision. Even when other indices were used, the effective integration of such sources was limited, as perceptions had already been formed by the mental indices, suggesting a halo effect (Zysberg & Nevo, 2004).

Similarly, Denis and Gilbert (2012) caution against the exclusive use of timed mental measures to make selection decisions. Their review suggests that only GMA assessed without time constraints predicts job performance in the field for most positions. Furthermore, individual differences also play a role; those who are nervous, low-impulse, low value-questioning and highly reflective were penalized in the time constraint condition for their preferences. As a result, these individuals were more likely to be mistakenly rejected in a selection process (Denis & Gilbert, 2012).

To this point, not all candidates will feel equally confident in their problem-solving capabilities under pressure, or as willing to engage in mental testing. One study suggests that personality plays a role in this. Freund and Holling (2011) found that three of the Big Five personality traits predicted achievement motivation (openness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism), and the likelihood of success was increased when a training intervention was introduced. With respect to mental ability, more intelligent individuals were more comfortable participating in mental testing exercises. As a result, certain individuals are likely to enjoy the challenge of intelligence testing and may yield higher performance (Freund & Holling, 2011).
One advantage to creating a personality-focused profile, controlling for mental ability, is to reduce concerns around adverse impact. The Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (2011) cautions against the exclusive use of mental testing for selection, as it could result in unfair selection of individuals from majority groups who have had privileges that allow them to be more successful on such measures.

Based on this review of the field’s longstanding and deep research on the advantages of mental ability as a predictor of success across jobs, it would make sense to consider candidate’s results on a test of general mental ability as a covariate in predicting job-related outcomes, including performance, for the purpose of this study. This will allow for a comparison of effect sizes across the two predictors. Specifically, this presents a novel opportunity to benchmark the amount of unique variance accounted for through profiling and using just mental ability.

**Current Study**

The purpose of this study is to explore the application of profile matching for personnel selection, given the pervasive influence of person-organization fit on attraction, selection, and attrition within organizations. The design utilizes a person-centered approach to identify organizationally relevant profiles by combining predictive information holistically. The purpose is to examine personality dimensions in a way that more accurately captures the unique interplay between variables relevant to success within a given organization and the richness of personality as it manifests in behavior as evident through that employee’s performance given those situation and contextual factors. In addition, the profiles created through a person-centered approach make sense theoretically compared with dissecting personality traits as stand-alone parts of a person’s unique inclinations. This work also extends upon previous efforts by exploring the utilization of this method measuring work outcomes beyond performance.
Further evidence is necessary to determine the justifiable use of profiling for selection purposes, particularly given outcomes of interest beyond performance alone. This study was conducted to build upon recent efforts to demonstrate that a profile matching strategy could be useful when making selections decisions based on P-O fit.

Historical organizational data collected on the personalities of candidates applying for employment at a professional services firm over the last 19 years were used. These candidate data was used to identify the specific profiles that are likely to represent the population of individuals interested in employment in this industry. Using a hire or no hire criteria, one profile is believed to be a better match for the specific organization and will persist to the next round of analysis, while others are likely to drop out. Of those individuals that transition from candidates to employees, the profiles were analyzed against several work-relevant criteria: annual performance ratings, organizational tenure, and separation. For these analyses, general mental ability was controlled for in an effort to identify the unique effects of personality on such outcomes, as they relate to cultural fit with the organization.

As cited by Kulas’ (2013) article, the continued use of holistic hiring in the form of profile matching persists, despite the lack of empirical evidence. If so many highly trained professionals favor this approach, it is worth exploring possible, feasible methods for its use. Additionally, the use of person-centered approach is a more conceptually consistent way to think about P-O fit and selection. Using other possible outcomes as criterion measures may also shed light on the value created when using multiple predictors in unique combinations.

This study will aim to answer several research questions with associated hypothesizes aimed at understanding personality profiles in practice longitudinally. First, it is expected that clusters of different trait combinations are likely to group together. However, personality
profiling is not broadly done, so little prior research has investigated how many clusters exist in the general population, or which personality characteristics are more likely than others to group together beyond those offered by a framework like the Big Five.

The closest literature that speaks to the distribution of personality traits in the general population was researched to investigate geographical, cultural differences using aggregate measures on the Big Five (Schmitt, Allik, McCrae, & Benet-Martinez, 2007). In this study, representatives from 56 nations were surveyed using the Big Five Inventory (BFI). The results were clustered by region (i.e., North America, South America, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Southern Europe, Middle East, Africa, Oceania, South Asia, East Asia). Notable differences across regions include East Asia, which scored at least one standard deviation below the other regions on Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness, yet more than one standard deviation above the others on Neuroticism. Using the same criteria (i.e., one standard deviation), South Americans scored higher on Openness. Representatives from Africa scored higher on Conscientiousness and Agreeableness, but lower on Neuroticism. While some discussion was necessary around language confounds and theoretical/interpretative differences, clearly some differences exist based on Schmitt and colleagues’ (2007) research.

The current study includes data that is global in nature, so several of these differences might be evident in the patterns that emerge. However, much of the focus of the business is in the North American geography. Based on Schmitt and colleagues’ (2007) study, the average North American profile appears to be slightly higher on Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Extraversion, moderate on Openness, and moderate/low on Neuroticism, relative to other regions globally. It might be expected that more of the clusters emerging from this study might show
similar patterns, especially as it relates to higher Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Extraversion.

Many empirical studies on personality in the industrial-organizational (I/O) literature rely on the Five Factor Model for personality. This model is widely accepted by academics as a sound nomenclature to understand the various constructs of personality. However, a plethora of other tools to capture personality traits exist, so the Big Five structure appears more theoretically relevant than practically representative by the tools used by practitioners. Though many personality measures have face-validity in terms of linking with the Big Five, it would be uncommon to expect organizational data to contain the exact measures of each of the Big Five constructs.

The limited research on personality profiles in the general population further highlights the need to understand configural combinations going forward, outside of simply comparing a narrowly defined group against all others, as is often demonstrated in clinical psychology research (e.g., dyslexia: Tops, Verguts, Callen, & Brysbaert, 2013; chronic residential substance abusers: Yeager, DiGuisepppe, Resweber, & Leaf, 1992). There is a clear theoretical need to demonstrate that unique profiles exist and identify their distribution in the population. While this study is not broad enough to capture personality on that scale, it can be used to better describe the personality profiles of individuals interested in working for a professional services firm. Thus, several hypotheses are proposed below:

\[ H1: \text{Candidates who apply for employment will collapse into meaningful profiles based on the personality characteristics representative of individuals interested in working in professional services.} \]
The results of the identified profiles were used to understand the extent to which the unique groupings identified capture the dynamic interaction between personality traits, accounting for intellectual capability. As the original famous phrase of Gestalt psychologist Kurt Koffka states: “The whole is greater than the sum of the parts” (Heider, 1977).

Of these different profiles, not all are expected to be equally successful in achieving employment within the target organization. The first hypothesis will specify one of the anticipated profiles which is expected to be most hired and successful in the organization of interest, based on their face validity with the Big Five factors that are shown to relate to job performance theoretically, as well as specific traits desired for value-alignment and organization fit.

Since an organization’s leadership is motivated to hire candidates that align well with the organization’s culture, mission, and core values, not all profiles are likely to be valued the same way. As far as generalizability is concerned, the desirability of each profile is likely to vary as broadly as organization itself. The professional services organization examined for this study is expected to hire employees whose values match the values of the firm. Thus, these values are prioritized above others. These values pertain to individuals making rational decisions based on common sense, acting professionally across situations, showing each other and external entities respect, demonstrating a strong degree of commitment to one’s work, collaborating and partnering with one another and with clients, and creating open lines of communication to avoid misunderstandings.

As mentioned during the overview, organizations use a wide range of personality assessments in their selection batteries, as new tools and administration methods are consistently emerging. Though many of these tools have much in common with the FFM traits, many
measures have not been explicitly linked with the Big Five. Along these lines, the personality measures and subsequent profiles identified through this research were investigated using historical organizational data that does not overtly link to the Big Five, despite a great deal of similarities. However, other advantages are evident by using observed organizational data that counter these limitations, including the examination of longitudinal outcomes for such profiles within a given context. Given these acknowledgements, the ideal organization-relevant profile, based on face validity with the Big Five, is described below.

The client-serving nature of the work performed in a service-oriented professional services firm requires work to be performed efficiently and accurately, which requires employees to be dependable and motivated by achievement by the quality of high quality solutions. The natural drive to organize, prioritize, and structure work to set clear expectations for others are highly valued in any organization, though it is critical in a fast-paced, high pressure environment. These qualities are represented by an individual’s high Thinker score by the personality tool used in this study (Kahler, 1982, 2001, 2008; see Methods).

Kahler (2008) refers to the Thinker character strengths as “logical, responsible, and organized” and inclined to “think logically, take in facts and data and synthesizes them” (pg. 40). Those with high Thinker score think “the secret to success and prosperity is to work hard, think clearly, be logical, and structure your time” (Kahler, 2008, pg. 50). Additionally, those with high Thinker scores are achievement-oriented; they are motivated by recognition of work and time structure (Kahler, 2008, pg. 114). Of all the personality characteristics, these qualities align most closely with the evidence for using the Big Five dimension of conscientiousness for selection across a wide range of professions, and to a lesser extent, openness to experience. These
individuals are expected to be detail-attentive, conscientious, cautious, and diligent, consistent with the firm’s core values of using good sense and acting in a professional manner.

Additionally, clients seek the expertise and effective implementation of high quality solutions from professional service experts, so the engagements require employees who are resilient and not easily deterred from persisting through difficult challenges. Commitment to results and follow-through are critical to build trust and carry out the delivery of high quality solutions, especially when fees are charged to the client based on the success of the project. Thus, a high level of dedication, loyalty, and personal sacrifice for the good of the project and firm is highly valued, consistent with the firm’s value of showing respect for one another and dedicating oneself to completing the work. These qualities are represented by an individual’s high Persister score (Kahler, 1982, 2001, 2008).

Kahler (2008, pg. 40) refers to the Persister character strengths as “dedicated, observant, and conscientious” and individuals with high Persister scores are likely to “express opinions, beliefs, and judgments.” Those with high Persister scores believe “the secret to success and prosperity is to be conscientious, follow the rules, and conform to the right standards” (Kahler, 2008, pg. 50). Like Thinkers, those with high Persister scores are also achievement-oriented, and motivated by recognition of work when one believes in his/her mission (Kahler, 2008, pg. 115). They also need to be recognized for their convictions; “people need to listen to their beliefs... and they must be respected” (pg. 115). It overlaps with elements of conscientiousness and taps into elements of emotional stability. Given the sometimes stressful, often difficult, and time sensitive nature of work in professional services, these qualities are valued most in new hires, and prized qualities in the firm.
While work quality and timeliness are critical for business success, building connections is also important in a service-oriented business relative to others that produce products or goods. Much of the leads generated are based on factors including reputation and repeat business from previous clients. Additionally, the firm has a global reach and competes within the international market. Some clients seeking the organization’s services come from collectivist cultures where taking time to develop close, personal relationships are vital for building trust and rapport, consistent with the firm’s value of getting along with one another and communicating frequently.

These qualities are represented by an individual’s Harmonizer score (Kahler, 1982, 2001, 2008). Kahler (2008) refers to the Harmonizer character strengths as “compassionate, sensitive, and warm” (pg. 40) and inclined to “nurture and give to others” (pg. 41). Those with high Harmonizer scores feel “the secret to success and prosperity is to be giving, loving, considerate of other people’s feelings, and be unconditionally accepting” (Kahler, 2008, pg. 50). These individuals “need for others to accept [them] just the way [they] are, without conditions or strings, or performance required” (Kahler, 2008, pg. 115). Those with high Harmonizer scores also have sensory needs; they “intensely appreciate sights, smells, touches, tastes, and sounds” (pg. 115). This aligns most closely with the Big Five dimensions of agreeableness and extraversion. Though these characteristics are not as highly valued as the previous two, a moderate degree of interpersonal sensitivity is likely ideal. Too much interpersonal sensitivity and agreeableness, and the employee might naturally shy away from candor, directness, and delivering difficult messages. Too little, and the person might be perceived as cold, transactional, and lacking empathy. These qualities are represented by an individual’s moderate Harmonizer score.
Similarly, employees in this entrepreneurial organization are encouraged to proactively pursue their goals, take initiative to make their goals happen, and persuasively convince others of their value and capability. These qualities are represented by an individual’s high Promoter score (Kahler, 1982, 2001, 2008). Kahler (2008) refers to the Promoter character strengths as “charming, adaptable, and persuasive” and inclined to “be firm and direct” (pg. 41). Those with high Promoter scores take action, and follow the mantra: “the secret to success and prosperity is to do exciting things, be charming and persuasive, and look out for number one” (Kahler, 2008, pg. 50). Those with high Promoter scores desire “a great deal of excitement in a short period of time” (Kahler, 2008, pg. 116). This also aligns with the Big Five dimension of extraversion, as it focuses on one’s willingness to take charge of groups, practice assertiveness, and take a dominant “expert” stance on issues. These characteristics are valued in moderation, as too much might lead to an employee seeming controlling, pushy, or too quick to action, whereas too little might lead to less forward movement and self-initiated accomplishment. These qualities are represented by an individual’s moderate Promoter score.

Personality traits that are not actively sought in candidates include unbridled creativity, spontaneity, and fun-seeking behavior. These qualities are represented by an individual’s high Rebel score (Kahler, 1982, 2001, 2008). Kahler (2008) refers to the Rebel character strengths as “spontaneous, creative, and playful” and inclined to “be humorous, play, and enjoy the present” (pg. 41). Those with high Rebel scores are unconventional and reactive: “the secret to success and prosperity is to be yourself, do your own thing, have fun, and be creative” (Kahler, 2008, pg. 50). They need contact and desire “an environment that ‘turns them on’” (Kahler, 2008, pg. 116). Despite the magnetic impact of such personalities, interests that span too wide could lead a person to become spread too thin, leading to less follow-through. The innovative ideas proposed
by such individuals may be more intuitive and less feasible by their nature, and lead to interesting concepts without a logical or analytic foundation.

Additionally, the values of the organization do not call for much introspection, self-reflection, or imagination, despite the unique value that deeply thoughtful and meditative individuals possess. These qualities are represented by an individual’s high Imaginer score (Kahler, 1982, 2001, 2008). Kahler (2008) refers to the Imaginer character strengths as “reflective, imaginative, and calm” and inclined to “see the big picture and work well with things and directions” (pg. 42). Those with high Imaginer scores are likely to ponder on information; they think “the secret to success and prosperity is to be reflective and not get overly excited; it is important to get some alone time every day to reflect and be introspective” (Kahler, 2008, pg. 50). They need solitude, so they “enjoy being within themselves, and prefer alone time” (Kahler, 2008, pg. 115). Because such individuals require more prompting to move ahead and take action, these qualities are not as prized. Thus, the magnitude of such characteristics is expected to be small in a desirable profile. These qualities are represented by an individual’s low Rebel and Imaginer scores. Thus:

\[ H1a: \text{Individuals clustered into profiles high in personality characteristics consistent with the values in the firm will be more likely to be hired than other profiles.} \]

Additional profiles are likely to emerge that blend these preferences and qualities. All individuals have aspects of each of these areas embedded within them, yet the categories yielded from applying a person-centered approach to the data are expected to highlight some traits more strongly than others (Kahler, 1982). These profiles may be of varying interest to the organization if some of the desired qualities are strong (high Thinker or high Persister, but not both). However, there are other profiles expected to emerge that highlight qualities that are not as
desired by the organization. Because these profiles are not viewed as favorably against the organization’s mission and values, they are less likely to be selected by the firm. Specifically, it is expected that another profile will emerge that highlights the other characteristics not described above. That is:

\[ H1b: \text{Individuals clustered into profiles high in personality characteristics inconsistent with the values in the firm will be less likely to be hired than other profiles.} \]

Secondly, these unique profiles are expected to be differentially associated with initial performance at the hiring firm. Some qualities are valued more than others and subsequently prioritized over others. Thus, it is hypothesized that:

\[ H2: \text{The profiles of personality characteristics will be differentially associated with indicators of job performance valued by the organization.} \]

Specifically:

\[ H2a: \text{Individuals clustered into profiles high in personality characteristics consistent with the values in the firm are more likely to demonstrate higher job performance relative to the other profiles.} \]

\[ H2b: \text{Individuals clustered into profiles high in personality characteristics inconsistent with the values in the firm are less likely to demonstrate higher job performance relative to the other profiles.} \]

In contrast, the profile(s) that are not expected to be hired into the firm often are not likely to perform as well as others in this organization’s culture or thrive in this environment, using performance as a proxy for success. Thus:

\[ H2b: \text{Individuals clustered into profiles high in personality characteristics inconsistent with the values in the firm are less likely to demonstrate higher job performance relative to the other profiles.} \]

Past research has also focused primarily on predicting performance. While this is certainly key to success on the job from the organization’s perspective, other factors are also
important when selecting for fit with the role, as the result can be a reduction in turnover and
tenure. Thus, employees who align well with the cultural fit – on the basis of profile matching –
are expected to stay with the firm longer over time and have greater success over the course of
their tenure. Thus:

\[ H3: \text{The profiles of personality characteristics will be differentially associated with}
\text{tenure.} \]

Specifically:

\[ H3a: \text{Individuals clustered into profiles high in personality characteristics consistent}
\text{with the values in the firm are more likely to demonstrate longer organizational tenure}
\text{relative to the other profiles.} \]

In contrast:

\[ H3a: \text{Individuals clustered into profiles high in personality characteristics inconsistent}
\text{with the values in the firm are more likely to demonstrate longer organizational tenure}
\text{relative to the other profiles.} \]

Finally, organizations will likely be interested in exploring whether profiles created based
on personality characteristics are predictive of turnover. Though there may be a number of
reasons leading to turnover that could lead to voluntary or involuntary reasons to leave, these
data were not available for this study. In an effort to understand emerging trends in turnover
results as predicted by personality profiles:

\[ H4: \text{The profiles of personality characteristics will be differentially associated with the}
\text{likelihood of turnover.} \]
In line with the other hypotheses (H2a, H3a) that predicted a better outcome for a profile that embodies organizational values, and worse outcomes for a profile that does not align well with the values, needs and mission of the firm (H2b, H3b):

H4a: *Individuals clustered into profiles high in personality characteristics consistent with the values in the firm are less likely to turnover relative to the other profiles.*

H4b: *Individuals clustered into profiles high in personality characteristics inconsistent with the values in the firm are more likely to turnover relative to the other profiles.*

By using three important work outcomes, the idea that profile matching may be best suited for predicting some results better than others may offer recommendations for its use, particularly in complex hiring situations. Unveiling the desirable qualities of profile matching, given its popularity with practitioners, would begin to close the gap between science and practice in the personnel selection area. The result of sharing these findings is that practitioners can feel more confident employing these methods in a legally defensible way. A profiling method can be used to simplify the richness of the original data while still representing the complex nature of the interactions. Boiling the information down into separate profiles can help to organize the information into a snapshot for practitioners, though the individual personality characteristics are still being measured and can be utilized for other employee-focused activities, including onboarding, identifying training and development needs, advice for supervisors to assist in the management of new hires, and highlighting differences in the way each individual may approach their work relative to others in the organization.

These hypotheses were tested following the proposed methodology above using a personality measure called the Personality Pattern Inventory (for more detail, see *Measures* in the next chapter). With more than 19 years of uninterrupted use in the firm, it would be a lost
opportunity to use a newer tool from a longitudinal standpoint, despite its limited prevalence in the IO literature in contrast to its use in education and transactional analysis realm of clinical psychology. The PPI is used to highlight specific characteristics as being more dominant than others for each individual, though all domains are captured to varying degrees. As an initial first step to identify personality profiles presenting in the general population, as well as those represented in the target organization, this specific measure was used to differentiate which characteristics group together.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

Participants

Archival data of applicants who were assessed for employment prior to 2015 at a professional services firm were used to test the initial hypothesis \(N=5,674\). Though not all these individuals were successful at achieving gainful employment, using the full range of data collected more accurately captured clusters that could exist in the population of individuals who seek employment in this industry. Only individuals with data on both measures of interest were included for analysis.

All additional hypotheses were explored using the data of full-time hires, including client-facing professionals and administrative staff, at the firm over 19 years. Recent hires were excluded from the sample given the inability to assess organizational tenure or measures of performance. Thus, only those who joined the firm before June 2014 and who have been with the firm a minimum of six months were included in the sample. Of these, 2068 employees were included for analyses based on available information on the number of months with the firm and active versus separated status. Given missing data over time, job performance information was only available for 1068 employees. All cases retained in the study also met the criteria of completing both components of the assessment test battery (see Materials section). Individual results were kept confidential and only used in an aggregate.

Although a focus on professional services might constrain generalizability, it also offers distinct theoretical advantages. First, the majority of hiring studies focus on low-wage or low-skill labor markets. Such analyses are very important, but inequality is driven by privilege as well as disadvantage. To fully understand how employers contribute to economic stratification, it is also necessary to understand entry to highly paid and prestigious job tracks. Analyzing access
to professional jobs is particularly important given that the top 10 percent of income earners has disproportionately driven economic inequality in the United States in recent decades (Saez, 2008). Since hiring practices are usually labor-market specific (Bills, 2003), they may differ between groups, yet both deserve empirical attention.

Second, professional service firms are a fertile ground for analyzing value-based similarities in hiring. Many individuals have been hired through referrals historically. Even entry-level professional positions typically require a prestigious university credential, and these employers solicit the majority of applications directly through university career centers rather than through informal networks. Applicant pools are thus pre-screened, minimizing many traditional structural and status differences between applicants. Studying this labor market thus provides unique opportunities to analyze cultural similarities between job applicants and evaluators in the absence of stark differences in applicants' human or social capital.

Third, professional services employers are a particularly fruitful case for examining cultural similarities in hiring. Cultural qualities tend to be more salient in settings where differences in quality are minimized (Lamont, 2009) and among elites (Lamont, 1992). Thus, even if focusing on professional services employers is less generalizable, it allows for analysis of culture under the microscope. Although a focus on such organizations may magnify the relative importance of cultural similarities in hiring, it can also reveal important insights about the role of shared values in hiring at a level of granularity that may be inaccessible in other settings.

**Measures**

**Wonderlic Personnel Test (WPT).** The Wonderlic Personnel Test is a timed 12-minute, 50-item test of "problem-solving ability" (Wonderlic, 1983) that is widely used as a screening device in business and industry (Murphy, 1984). As cited by McKelvie (1989), some consider it
a test of general intelligence (Davou & McKelvie, 1984) given that items are based on the original Otis Test of Mental Ability (Wonderlic, 1983), scores correlate fairly well (.56 to .80) with aptitude G (General Learning Ability) of the General Aptitude Test Battery (Wonderlic, 1983), and very highly with the WAIS Full Scale IQ (.93; Dodrill, 1981).

In use for over 75 years, with 200 million administrations to date, the Wonderlic mental ability tests are among the most widely used and respected aptitude tests for personnel selection. Over 50,000 organizations use the WPT as a predictor of job performance. These aptitude tests measure a candidate’s ability to learn, adapt, solve problems and understand instructions. By matching candidates with jobs that are consistent with their abilities, practitioners can make choices to improve retention and reduce turnover, decrease training time, improve employee satisfaction and engagement, and increase productivity. This tool is available in nine different languages and includes 50 items of increasingly difficult questions. The type of questions asked ranges from analogies, analysis of geometric figures, arithmetic, direction following, disarranged sentences, judgment, logic, proverb matching, similarities, and word definitions. Additionally, timed and untimed scores can be obtained when the pencil and paper methodology is used. An example item is: “When a rope is selling for 20 cents per 2 feet, how many feet can you buy for 30 dollars?”

In the original manual (1973) the reported test-retest reliability was .82 to .94 with the second testing immediately following the first, a split-half reliability of .88 to .94, and alternate-forms reliability of .87 to .99. These results are similar to those reported in the manual, where the odd-even split-half reliability coefficients values (.88, .94; Wonderlic, 1983). In one validity study, Dodrill (1981) found the correlation between WAIS and Wonderlic IQs was .93.
**Personality Pattern Inventory (PPI).** The PPI (Kahler, 1982, 1996) was created to provide information regarding individual choices from which specific communication, interaction, and motivational preferences could be interpreted. It suggests that each person is made up of a combination of six personality types: Thinker, Persister, Harmonizer, Promoter, Rebel, and Imaginer (summary in Appendix B). Each type represents differing natural strengths, psychological needs, perceptions, and behaviors that affect the manner in which one communicates with others and interacts with the world in which one lives (Gilbert, 2004; Kahler, 2001).

The original inventory (Kahler, 1982) had 22 items and was shown to be valid (Kahler, n.d.). The inventory was revised (Kahler, 1996) into a more robust form in 1996. A total of 42 items were used to reveal patterns (example items shown in Appendix C). For candidates assessed since 1996, the revised form was used. The inventory considers patterns of responses to determine an individual’s Base personality (highest score out of six possibilities) and one’s Phase personality (current motivation). The interpretation of the results allows for the determination of the confidence of Base and Phase determinations, with nearly all higher than 70%. Nineteen of the 42 items relate to Base, and the remainder relates to Phase determinations (Ampaw, Gilbert, & Donlan, 2012).

In a validity study by Ampaw and colleagues (2012), the confidence level for valid Base results was 76% (41,649 cases) and 72% for the Phase results (54,233 participants who fell into this range). Cronbach’s alpha ranged from 0.66 – 0.85 for Base and 0.73 – 0.81 for Phase. Since 0.70 is the expected target for Base, the two personality types that did not meet this expectation might be re-examined for wording as placement in the inventory, going forward.
The PPI has been administered to more than 700,000 men and women in the United States as of October 2007. Additionally, it is offered in 11 languages, and it is most popular in France (Kahler, 2008). As of 2008, nine dissertations have been completed on the model with doctorates awarded. The PPI has been used in counseling and business, though it is most widely used in education. In one famous business example, the PPI was used to select astronauts and payload specialists for NASA from 1992-1996 based on its accuracy in predicting individual distress sequences and assessing compatibility (Kahler, 2008).

Kahler (1981) developed this model of personality profiling, identification, and predictive behavior analysis, and named it the Process Communication Model (PCM). It uses six perceptual frames as building blocks for a comprehensive model of communication and human interaction, which leverages transactional analysis and psychoanalysis (Kahler, 2001). Each personality type has differing psychological needs, perceptions, and behaviors that affect the manner in which one communicates with others and interacts with the world in which one lives (Gilbert, 2004; Kahler, 2001).

According to Kahler (2006), "Though one Personality Type dominates your identity, each of the six types occupies a space in your mental, emotional, and social structure. The spaces [in our personality structure] that house each type are not equal, however, and some are more accessible than others (pg. 157).” The aspects of one's personality vary in strength and influence (Kahler, 2001).

Though the PPI is not a derivative measure of the Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality, there is a great deal of overlap between them from a face validity standpoint from the author’s point of view. Specifically, the PPI measures six different personality types that, on
the surface, combine different FFM facets to create the types. For a summary of each of the six PPI types, see Appendix B.

As described in detail in the literature review (Chapter 2, pg. 37), the Thinker type is expected to align well with several facets of Conscientious: order, achievement-seeking, deliberation, and competence. Additionally, it overlaps with the Openness facet, ideas, and to a lesser extent, the Neuroticism facet of anxiety. Thus, many of its defining characteristics are predictors of performance (Barrick et al., 2001).

Similarly, the PPI type labeled Persister is also grounded largely in the FFM dimension of Conscientious (see pg. 38). It is described by the remaining facets of Conscientious: dutifulness and self-discipline, as well as achievement-seeking; as with the Thinker type, there is theoretical evidence for a higher score relating to job performance (Barrick et al., 2001). In addition, it appears related to the Extraversion facet of assertiveness, the Agreeableness facet of compliance and altruism, the Openness facet of values, and the reverse coded Agreeableness facet of trust.

The Harmonizer type is heavily embedded with Agreeableness and Extraversion facets (see pg. 39). For Agreeableness, the facets of trust, altruism, tender-mindedness, modesty, and reverse coded straightforwardness. For Extraversion, the facets of warmth and reverse coded assertiveness are likely evident. The Openness facet of feelings and reverse-coded hostility in Neuroticism also comprise this type.

The PPI type labeled Promoter is grounded in Extraversion, and to a lesser extent, Openness (see pg. 40). Within Extraversion, the activity, gregariousness, and excitement-seeking facets are evident; within Openness, actions. The Promoter type is unlikely to demonstrate much Conscientiousness or Neuroticism.
Similarly, the Rebel type is largely based in Extraversion and low Neuroticism (see pg. 40). The facets of positive emotions and warmth in Extraversion, the impulsiveness facet in Neuroticism, and the aesthetics, actions, and feelings facets in Openness relate best to the Rebel type.

Finally, the Imaginer PPI type is most closely associated with facets of Openness, low Neuroticism, and low Extraversion (see pg. 41). Specifically, within Openness, the facets of fantasy and reverse-coded actions will define this type. Imaginers tend to be low on Neuroticism, so they score lower on the facets of anxiety, vulnerability, and hostility. They are also known to be less Extraverted, as measured by lower scores on the facets of excitement seeking, gregariousness, assertiveness, and activity. They also tend to be more modest (facet of Agreeableness).

**Performance.** Performance was measured using employees’ annual manager performance appraisal rating. Annual performance review data were averaged over their time with the firm. All individuals completed at least 1 review cycle (with the firm a minimum of 6 months) in which individual job performance was discussed and assessed by leadership within their group.

**Tenure.** Tenure with the organization was measured by number of months within the firm for all individuals who were active or separated from the firm.

**Turnover.** Similar to organizational tenure, much can be understood by the number of individuals with any given profile and their likelihood of turnover. Given that many individuals are still employed, the sample was cut several ways to test this hypothesis. First, the variable was dichotomized to show those that are currently employed against those that have separated. For
the purpose of this study, only whether or not a person is currently with the firm were considered, as missing data presents issues for assessing voluntary versus involuntary turnover.

**Data Analysis**

Organizational data was collected for all candidates applying for employment within this organization for over 19 years. Latent profile analysis (LPA), one type of finite mixture modeling, was preferred to test a person-centered approach, given that it was used to reveal underlying patterns within the personality data available. Essentially, it grouped similar individuals into categories and was useful given that the available data included heterogeneous groups of people. LPA also offered benefits not found in other person-centered techniques, such as k-means or hierarchical cluster analysis. Specifically, LPA utilized a model-based analytic strategy rather than based on ad hoc distance which provided more comprehensive information about the utility and selection of different cluster solutions. Further, LPAs provided information concerning the accuracy of different cluster solutions in the form of entropy values. While latent class analysis (LCA) is often used for categorical variables, LPA uses continuous variable measures. As continuous variables were used to form latent subgroups, the LPA were quantified the underlying patterns of homogeneity across the individual characteristics of the employees.

The underlying assumption of LPA is that the relationship among continuous indicators can be explained by a categorical latent variable. Models were run using Mplus 6.0 software (Statistical Innovation, Belmont, MA) with the goal of identifying two to seven unique classes, or profiles. More than seven would threaten parsimony, since LPA was used to describe the associations between observed variables using the smallest number of necessary categories. The fit of multiple models were assessed to identify the optimal number of profiles. The optimal class solutions were evaluated on a combination of statistical fit indices, including Akaike information
criterion (AIC; Akaike, 1987) and Bayesian information criterion (BIC; Schwarz, 1978). For these indices, lower values will indicate better model fit (Vermunt & Magidson, 2002). Two likelihood-ratio based tests, the Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood-ratio test (LMR; Lo, Mendell, & Rubin, 2001) and the Bootstrap likelihood-ratio test (BLRT; McLachlan & Peel, 2000), were also used. For both, a non-significant value indicated that a model was not a significantly better fit to the data than the previous model with one fewer class. Class enumeration was also based on entropy values (accuracy) and analytic utility (via smallest class size). Solutions that provided higher entropy values were favored, though other indices were also considered in determining the number of classes. As noted above, the initial analyses were conducted with MPLUS v. 6.0 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2007) with secondary analyses performed with SPSS v. 23.0.

Of note, the conceptual fit of the final model was critical and was examined by using visual representations of the individual differences indicators to assess their interpretability and practical implications. Final class solutions were theoretically interpretable. Once the profiles were demonstrated (H1), hypothesis 2 was tested using Pearson’s chi-square test to evaluate how likely it is that any observed difference between the sets arose by chance. The expectation would be that differences in profile success being hired into the firm will vary, as described by hypotheses H2a and H2b.

After deriving latent profiles, a series of analyses of covariances (ANCOVAs) were run to compare differences among the profiles on several work-related outcomes, controlling for differences in mental ability. These ANCOVAs was used to test hypothesis 2 (profiles linked with job performance) and hypothesis 3 (profiles linked with job tenure), complete with Tukey’s range test used as a priori follow-up tests for all specific analyses comprising H2a, H2b, H3a, and H3b. Results of all the ANOVAs were statistically significant at the \( p < .05 \) level. It is
expected that the clusters significantly differed on a variety of outcomes including initial hire success, job performance, and tenure with the firm. Finally, a logistic regression was used to test H4, likelihood of turnover once hired into the firm.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Missing data was analyzed, and normality and multivariate outliers were checked. There was no missing data concerning primary independent variables (PPI), job candidate status, and months with the firm. Of the active candidates, \( n = 1028 \) (49.7\%) were missing data on their performance review. Table 1 presents means and standard deviations for those who had complete data and missing data for their performance review. Individuals with missing data were with the firm for significantly more months than those with complete data. Additionally, those with missing data scored slightly lower on several personality types, including the Thinker, Promoter, and Imaginer, and slightly higher on the Persister type compared to those with performance data. Table 2 displays this missing data pattern by year of assessment. Participants assessed between 2006 to 2010 appeared to have a higher likelihood of having missing performance rating and those assessed from 2011 to 2014 appeared to have a lower likelihood of having missing data on performance ratings. For this firm, 2011 marked an increase in record-keeping behaviors which may have contributed to these differences. Data was also inspected for distributional assumptions of normative and outliers. Months with the firm was positively skewed and leptokurtic; thus, it was log transformed. The pattern of significant findings did not differ when transformed variables were used. As a consequence, all results for models with untransformed variables are presented for ease of interpretation.

T-tests were used to evaluate whether there were gender differences in average months with the firm and job performance. Months with the firm were similar for males (\( M = 58.34, SD = 43.33 \)) and females (\( M = 55.56, SD = 43.94; t(2344) = 1.40, p > .05 \)). The same was true of job performance (males: \( M = 3.76, SD = .76 \); females: \( M = 3.74, SD = .75; t(1680) = .22, p > .05 \)). Additionally, chi-square analyses indicate that there were no gender differences by candidate
versus hired status ($\chi^2 = .06, p = .80$) or separated versus active status ($\chi^2 = .18, p = .67$). Differences in the results by racial identity or age were not available, given incomplete records.

Table 3 displays the descriptive statistics and Table 4 displays the bivariate correlations for all study variables. Approximately half of participants were once candidates that were subsequently hired at the firm. Of these participants, approximately half are currently employed at the firm while the other half has since separated for a variety of reasons (employment termination, self-selecting out, etc.). Of those who have ever worked at the firm, the average length of employment was 57.55 months. Bivariate correlations indicate mental ability was correlated with higher Thinker scores, higher Promoter scores, lower Harmonizer scores, and lower Imaginer scores. Higher raw scores on the mental ability measure were also correlated with a greater likelihood of being an active employee (versus separated), lower likelihood of remaining a candidate, and longer tenure in the firm. In general, the personality characteristics were moderately correlated with one another, though Persister was not significantly correlated with Promoter, Rebel, or Imaginer. Higher Persister values were correlated with a greater likelihood of being active, a greater likelihood of being hired, a greater likelihood of being separated (compared to active), and longer tenure with the firm. In general, higher values on Harmonizer, Promoter, Rebel, and Imaginer were correlated with a lower likelihood of being active and a lower likelihood of being hired. Higher values on these personality types were also correlated with a lower likelihood of being separated, shorter tenure with the firm, and lower job performance. Higher scores on Thinker were correlated with longer tenure with the firm.

**Hypothesis 1**: Candidates who apply for employment will demonstrate meaningful profiles based on the personality characteristics representative of individuals interested in working in professional services. LPA was used to test whether personality characteristics
comprise meaningful profiles among candidates interested in working in professional services. Class enumeration was based on theory, analytic utility, and model fit from solutions that specified two to six profiles. The BIC, AIC, entropy, LMR, and the BLMR values were used to evaluate model fit. Low BIC and AIC values, and high LMR and BLMR values indicate better model fit to the data (Nylund, Asparouhov, & Muthén, 2007). A significant $p$ value for the LMR and BLMR indicated that the current class solution provided a better model fit than a solution with one fewer class. Entropy levels over .70 were considered acceptable (Nylund, et al., 2007), with higher values indicating greater accuracy. The smallest class size for each solution was used to evaluate the analytic utility.

Table 5 presents model fit indices for the solutions estimating two to six classes. All cluster solutions provided acceptable entropy levels. Additionally, classes two through five provided a significantly better fit to the data than the class before them, and the six class solution did not provide a significantly better fit compared to the five-class solution (as indicated by the LMR). Overall, the six-class solution provided the best fit to the data as evaluated by the AIC and BIC values. However, the difference in AIC and BIC was comparatively large when progressing from a four-class to a five-class solution, yet substantially smaller when progressing from a five-class to a six-class solution. This indicates that adding a fifth class provided a greater improvement to model fit relative to adding a sixth class. Additionally, entropy (accuracy) was highest in the five-class solution compared to other solutions, and the smallest class size represented 5% ($n = 269$) of the sample. Together, these indices suggest that a five-class solution provides the best overall fit to the data.

Importantly, the five class model also provided a solution consistent with theory and hypotheses. Table 6 and Figure 1 present the cluster size and means for each personality
characteristic by cluster solution. The five cluster solution was interpreted as comprising: (a) a Persister/Harmonizer group ($N = 657; 11.5\%$), characterized by higher scores on Persister and Harmonizer relative to other characteristics; (b) a Persister/Thinker group ($N = 1202; 21.2\%$), characterized by higher scores on Thinker and Persister relative to all other characteristics, with notably lower scores on Rebel and Imaginer; (c) a Thinker group ($N = 3127; 55.1\%$), characterized by higher scores on Thinker and relatively low scores on all other characteristics; (d) a Low Thinker/High Harmonizer group ($N = 269; 4.7\%$), characterized by low scores on Thinker, higher scores on Harmonizer, and moderate scores on Persister; (e) and an All High group ($N = 419; 7.3\%$), characterized by high scores on all personality characteristics. Though the number of profiles and specificity of the profile descriptions were not anticipated a priori beyond awareness of an ideal profile (Persister/Thinker) and less ideal (All High) profiles, theory would suggest that the characteristics most closely related to conscientiousness, and emotional stability, and to a lesser extent extraversion and agreeableness, would emerge as the traits that are most job-relevant and predictive of outcomes in a workplace setting. These characteristics are evident in the Thinker, Persister/Harmonizer, and Low Thinker/High Harmonizer profiles, respectively.

$H1a$ and $H1b$. Individuals clustered into profiles high in personality characteristics consistent with the value in the firm [i.e., members of the Persister/Thinker profile] will be more likely to be hired. Individuals clustered into profiles high in personality characteristics inconsistent with the value [i.e., members of the all high profile] in the firm will be less likely to be hired. A $2 \times 5$ chi-square analysis was used to examine whether cluster membership varied by hired status. Table 7 displays the observed frequencies, expected frequencies, and standardized residuals for active versus candidate status by cluster membership. The overall chi-square
statistic was significant $\chi^2 (4) = 74.36, p < .001$. Further, significant standardized residuals ($z > 1.96$) indicate that those in the *Persister/Thinker* profile were significantly more likely to be active and significantly less like likely to be candidates. Additionally, those in the *All High* profile were less likely to be active and more likely to be a candidate.

Preliminary analyses indicated that mental ability was correlated with a greater tendency to be hired compared to retaining candidate status ($r = .12$). Thus, follow-up analyses were conducted to ensure that links among profile and active status were not accounted for by mental ability (see Table 8). A logistic regression was estimated in which active versus candidate (candidate = 0, active = 1) status were specified as the dependent variable. Profile membership was dummy coded, and membership in the *Persister/Harmonizer*, *Persister/Thinker*, *Low Thinker/High Harmonizer*, and *All High* profiles were entered as separate independent variables. Since the *Thinker* profile was the largest group (representing over 50% of cases) and was relatively equally represented across hired versus not hired status, this profile was used as a referent and not include in the model to avoid singularity. The overall model accounted for 3% ($Cox \text{ and } Snell R^2 = .03$) of the variance. Table 9 presents unstandardized estimates, standard errors, and odds ratios. For each unit increase in mental ability scores there was a 4% greater likelihood of being hired. Participants classified in the *Persister/Thinker* profile had a 37% greater likelihood of being hired compared to those not in the *Persister/Thinker* profile. Further, those in the *All High* profile were 53% less likely to be hired compared to those not in the *All High* profile. Together, these findings indicate that the firm’s hiring practices favor those in the *Persister/Thinker* profile and disfavored those in the *All High* profile, even after accounting for mental ability.
**Hypothesis 2:** The profiles of personality characteristics will be differentially associated with indicators of job performance valued by the organization. An ANVOCA was estimated to examine whether job performance differed by profile membership among those who were hired after accounting for mental ability. Mean scores on the average annual rating of job performance was specified as the primary dependent variable. Profile membership was specified as a fixed factor and mental ability was specified as a covariate. Figure 2 presents the means and standard errors and Table 10 displays the means and standard deviations for job performance by profile. Table 1 also displays the frequency of each profile for those hired by the firm and that have complete data on job performance (see page 54). The overall model was not significant $F(4, 1034) = .29, p = .87, \eta^2 = .001$. Post-hoc analyses with Bonferroni correction indicate that there were no significant differences among profiles on job performance.

**Hypothesis 3:** The profiles of personality characteristics will be differentially associated with tenure. An additional ANVOCA was estimated to examine whether months with the firm differed by profile membership among those who were hired after accounting for mental ability. Months with the firm was specified as the primary dependent variable. Profile membership was specified as a fixed factor and mental ability was specified as a covariate. Figure 3 presents the means and standard errors and Table 11 displays the means and standard deviations for months with the firm by profile. Table 1 also displays the frequency of each profile for those hired by the firm. The overall model was significant $F(4, 2340) = 31.41, p < .001, \eta^2 = .051$. Post-hoc analyses with Bonferroni correction indicated that those in the *All High* profile had significantly lower months with the firm compared to all other profiles. Those in the *Persister/Thinker* profile had significantly more months with the firm compared to those in the *Persistent/Harmonizer*
profile and the *Thinker* profile. Those in the *Low Thinker/High Harmonizer* profile also had more months with the firm compared to those in the *Thinker* profile.

**Hypothesis 4:** *The profiles of personality characteristics will be differentially associated with the likelihood of turnover.* A logistic regression was estimated in which turnover status (no turnover = 0, turnover = 1) was specified as the dependent variable. Profile membership was dummy coded, and membership in the *Persister/Harmonizer, Persister/Thinker, Low Thinker/High Harmonizer,* and *All High* profiles were entered as separate independent variables. Membership in the *Thinker* profile was used as a referent to avoid singularity. The overall model accounted for 1% (Cox and Snell $R^2 = .01$) of the variance. Participants classified in the *All High* profile had a 40% lower likelihood of leaving the compared to those not in the *All High* profile (see Table 12).

**Additional Analyses**

To more comprehensively elucidate findings from the proposed analyses, a series of supplemental analyses were performed. Some of these analyses involve testing whether profile membership varied by time of assessment and gender. Unfortunately, similar comparisons could not be conducted by racial category, as this information was largely incomplete in the available data. Sensitivity analyses were also performed to determine whether excluding participants who completed assessments after June of 2014 altered the pattern of significant findings. Lastly, to demonstrate the added utility of LPA and person-centered approaches, variable-centered analyses were performed and results from both solutions were compared.

**Profile Membership by Year.** To investigate whether the results of H4 are the result of candidate and hiring trends in the data, frequencies and proportions by profile and by year were conducted. Table 13 presents the frequency of profile membership for those assessed by time of
assessment and Figure 4 presents the proportion of class membership by time of assessment. For many profiles, the proportion of class membership shows similar pattern across measurement year. Notably, membership into the *All High* group appears to deviate from this pattern. Compared to other profiles, a lower proportion of members in the *All High* group were assessed prior to 2011 and a higher proportion was assessed from 2013 to 2016, indicating a potential bias in assessment trends.

Similar plots were created among those hired by the firm. Table 14 presents the frequency of profile membership by time of assessment and Figure 5 presents the proportion of profile membership by time of assessment for those hired by the firm. In general, trends in actual hiring were similar to those of the screening. Notably, it appears as though hiring for the *All High* varied by time of assessment, with a greater proportion of the *All High* cluster being hired from 2011 to 2014.

**Gender and Profile Membership.** A $5 \times 2$ chi-square was also used to test whether gender differed by profile membership. Table 15 presents the observed values, expected values, and the standardized residuals. Men were less likely to be in the *Persister/Harmonizer* profile and women were more likely to be in the *Persister/Harmonizer* profile. Men were more likely to be in the *Thinker* profile and women were less likely to be in the *Thinker* profile. Women were less likely to be in the *All High* profile. While there were no gender differences in any outcome, all models were reanalyzed controlling for gender to ensure findings were not due to overlap among gender and personality profiles. The pattern of significant findings did not change in any model when gender was included as a covariate.

**Inclusion of Data after June 2014.** For analyses involving job performance, tenure, and turnover, participants were included if they had joined the organization by the end of June 2014.
and had been working with the organization for a minimum of six months to ensure they met the criteria for an annual job performance review. This cut-off was selected because performance data was only available for these individuals at the time of initial data analyses. Since that time, performance data became available for an additional 614 participants. Thus, while reported results for models predicting job performance, tenure, and turnover were conducted on the sample that met this \textit{a priori} inclusion criteria, these models were reanalyzed using all available data. The pattern of significant findings was identical and the magnitude of effects was comparable when including these additional cases.

Unfortunately, not every employee who had ever been hired was included due to any historical data collection limitations and missing data for confidential reasons (e.g., senior executives). To examine any patterns that might exist, frequencies were generated for individuals who are active and those that have separated from the firm by data collection year. As shown in Table 16, the pattern in the data indicates that early years are relatively equal in terms of active versus separated, then there is a period of a few years were more individuals have separated from the firm, and in recent years, more assessed and remained active. This data also reflects that collection practices have improved over time given higher numbers in both categories during recent years.

**Using a Variable-Centered Approach.** To provide further evidence of the utility and unique contribution of the person-centered approach, models were reanalyzed using variable-centered methods. The purpose of this additional analysis was to serve as a comparison of analytic approaches and contrast the potential inferences that could be gleaned from either technique. Analyses follow a similar sequence to those presented earlier. A conceptual
comparison highlighting similarities and differences from this study are presented in detail in the Discussion.

**Predicting Hired Status.** A logistic regression was specified to test whether specific personality characteristics were associated with being hired at the organization. Hired status (0 = not hired, 1 = hired) was entered as the dependent variable. Scores for Thinker, Persister, Harmonizer, Promoter, Rebel, and Imaginer were entered as primary independent variables and mental ability was entered as a covariate. Table 17 displays the unstandardized estimates, standard errors, and model statistics, and odds ratios. The overall model accounted for 4% of the variance (Cox and Snell $R^2 = .04$). After controlling for mental ability, greater scores on Persister, Harmonizer, and Rebel were associated with a higher likelihood of being hired, while higher scores on Promoter and Imaginer were associated with a lower likelihood of being hired. For a one unit of increase in Persister, Harmonizer, and Rebel scores, there was a 1% increase in the likelihood of being hired. For a one unit increase in Promoter and Imaginer scores, there was a 2% lower likelihood of being hired. The magnitude of effects should be taken in light of the large range of personality characteristic scales (0 to 100).

Additionally, bivariate correlations indicated the Rebel score negatively correlated with hired status ($r = -.09, p < .001$) and positively correlated with Promoter and Imaginer. Because a change in the direction of this effect in the regression model could indicate a suppression effect (Darlington, 1968) due to the inclusion of mental ability, an additional model was estimated excluding this construct. Findings from this model indicated that Rebel was positively associated with months with the firm, suggesting that suppression was not due to mental ability.

**Predicting Job Performance.** A multiple regression was specified to test whether specific personality characteristics were associated job performance among those hired into the
organization. Mean scores for job performance was entered as the dependent variable. Scores for Thinker, Persister, Harmonizer, Promoter, Rebel, and Imaginer were entered as primary independent variables and mental ability was entered as a covariate. Table 18 displays the standardized estimates, unstandardized estimates, and standard errors. The overall model was not significant ($F[7, 1032] = 1.20, p = .30$, Adj. $R^2 = .001$). After controlling for mental ability, there were no personality characteristics that significantly predicted job performance among those hired within the organization.

**Predicting Tenure.** An additional regression tested whether specific personality characteristics were associated with tenure within the firm. Tenure, as measure by months with the firm, was specified as the dependent variable. Scores for Thinker, Persister, Harmonizer, Promoter, Rebel, and Imaginer were entered as primary independent variables and mental ability was entered as a covariate. Table 19 displays the standardized estimates, unstandardized estimates, and standard errors. The overall model was significant ($F[7, 2060] = 160.80, p < .001$, Adj. $R^2 = .35$). After controlling for mental ability, greater scores on Thinker, Harmonizer, Promoter, and Imaginer were associated with fewer months with the firm, and greater scores on Persister and Rebel were associated with more months with the firm. Bivariate correlations indicated the Rebel negatively correlated with months with the firm ($r = -.15, p < .001$) and positively correlated with Promoter and Imaginer. The change in the direction of this effect in the regression model may indicate a suppression effect (Darlington, 1968).

**Predicting Turnover.** A logistic regression was specified to test correlates of turnover within the organization. Turnover status (0 = no turnover/active, 1 = turnover/separated) was entered as the dependent variable. Scores for Thinker, Persister, Harmonizer, Promoter, Rebel, and Imaginer were entered as primary independent variables and mental ability was entered as a
covariate. Table 20 displays the unstandardized estimates, standard errors, model statistics, and odds ratios. The overall model accounted for 3% of the variance ($R^2 = .03$). After controlling for mental ability, Imaginer was associated with a lower likelihood of turnover at the organization. For each unit increase on Imaginer scores there was a 1% lower likelihood of separating from the firm.
CHAPTE R 5: DISCUSSION

The findings emphasize the value of continued study of personality in progressive ways. In recent years, the call for more integrative considerations has become clear; yet, as a field, methodological issues deter many from exploring alternative ways to examine the richness of personality for its use in selection and its bottom-line importance for predicting organizational outcomes. Additionally, this research contributes meaningfully to a discussion around the complementary features of variable- and person-centered approaches for selection with personality characteristics.

From this sample, clear patterns did emerge using the person-centered approach, which allowed differentiation of five different profiles within the pool of candidates who applied for a role in this professional services firm. The results were strongly supported by empirical fit statistics, as accuracy for this model was found to be extremely high. Not only are the findings empirically stable and instill much confidence in the interpretation of the results, but the five profiles identified also make conceptual sense.

Two profiles were anticipated a priori based on expected alignment with company values and the nature of the work performed. Consistent with hypothesis 1a, an ideal profile (Persister/Thinker) did emerge based on consistency with values. This profile reflected individuals who might describe themselves as reliable, organized, persistent, committed, and observant; to some extent resourceful, action-oriented, likeable, compassionate, and understanding; and to a lesser extent creative, spontaneous, imaginative, and passive. These traits are favored in the firm, given the complexity of the work, tight deadlines under which to perform, and importance of building trust and rapport with clients under challenging circumstances. Though the Big Five personality characteristics have not been widely studied to
examine the expected profiles that could emerge, these results are in line with the Big Five characteristics generally tied to workplace outcomes. In line with the findings of Barrick and colleagues’ (2001) investigation of 15 prior meta-analytic studies, the construct of Conscientiousness was highly represented in the *Persister/Thinker* profile, as were moderate elements of Emotional stability. These results are reflected in more recent articles, as well, like one on important attributes companies seek (Sackett & Whalmsley, 2014). This is also aligned with Dunn and others’ (1995) research that showed some personality characteristics offer incremental validity above and beyond general mental ability when predicting job performance. While each of the profiles offers a unique blend of different qualities, not all characteristics were expected to be as valuable in this environment given the nature of the work.

Also consistent with hypotheses, these undervalued qualities are not well represented within the candidate pipeline, given that the *All High* profile consisted of individuals that embody a wide range of different qualities. That is, these individuals embody both desirable characteristics and those less favorable in roughly the same magnitude. As a result of this diverse set of traits coming into play, it is more challenging to determine which characteristics will come through most predominantly at any given point. This could lead these individuals to invest time in activities and behaviors that are not aligned as well to the mission of the firm, at best. In the worst case scenario, these characteristics could lead to potentially derailing behaviors. Thus, hypothesis 1b was only partially supported, since individuals in this group were not lacking the characteristics greatly esteemed by the firm. For this group, each of the traits greatly resonated with the candidate, suggesting that the individual can potentially behave in different ways across situations and connect with a wide range of different people. Though these different facets of an individual’s personality could be useful at times, if the situation typically requires individuals to
maximize specific parts of their personality over others, these additional facets of personality are likely to create “noise” that could be maladaptive for the individual in that environment. While some individuals can access the various facets of their personality to meet the various demands and challenges presented to them across situations, others may just struggle to cope with demands and fail to handle them effectively. Rather than being more adaptive, they might be less predictable in their behavior.

The profiles of Persister/Harmonizer and Thinker are also consistent with theory, albeit more loosely, given that they emphasize the characteristics that align most closely with the Big Five characteristic of conscientiousness. Specifically, the Persister/Harmonizer profile likely comprises individuals that demonstrate empathy and compassion for client needs, and the individuals will fully devote themselves to the mission. The Thinker profile favors a more pragmatic approach, emphasizing the importance of hitting deadlines, thinking through problems to find logical conclusion, and executing in a timely manner when the goal is well established. Because the Thinker characteristics reflect a high degree of rational and analytical thinking, efficiency is of value with individuals with high magnitudes of Thinker in their personalities (Kahler, 2001).

The Low Thinker/High Harmonizer profile is the least represented in the sample of the five profiles identified. That makes sense given the limited connection to the literature and the values of the firm, as well as the inclusion of administrative professionals in the analyses. Referring back to the Big Five taxonomy, this type is likely to reflect individuals who are agreeable, relatable, and willing to do whatever it takes to earn the accolades of clients and colleagues. The empathy, warmth, and care these individuals bring will make them strong team players, and their work ethic might be matched by few. Like the other profiles described above,
this profile is intrinsically motivated and eager to prove oneself, even though the “goal” might be defined differently. Thus, for certain jobs within the firm, these traits might be particularly desirable. A person in the *Low Thinker/High Harmonizer* profile might feel a sense of accomplishment knowing they were appreciated for being who they are and *how* they delivered the work, not just what they delivered or how quickly they delivered.

Taken as a whole, these individuals embody slightly different qualities in combination that add a richness that speaks to their style, performance, and delivery. These clusters demonstrate the complexity and multi-faceted nature of personality and make sense given the nature of the work. The latent groups are clustered in ways that suggest there is value in capturing the richness of the intricate interactions that may not have been identified through traditional variable-centered methods. Logically, individuals who apply to the firm are likely to have similar characteristics to some extent. Using the labels described by the personality measure, the three types most commonly selected for in the firm include Thinker, Persister, and Harmonizer. The model would suggest that these three types are more engaged and active in identifying goals and they are more intrinsically motivated than the other three types. Thus, it is not surprising that individuals drawn to this professional services firm exemplify these qualities to a greater extent than the other types. Since about half of all candidates who are successfully hired were recruited as employee referrals, it is also expected that these traits – and combinations of traits – result from the lack of independence in the sample. Additionally, since the assessment process is not used for screening, individuals who are believed to be lower in such traits may be dismissed from the recruiting process before they have been invited to be assessed.

These findings also provide support for hypothesis 1, which predicted that some profiles are more likely to get hired into the firm than others. Specifically, the *Persister/Thinker* profile
with characteristics most closely aligned with company values and the nature of the work was hired significantly more frequently into the firm than the other profiles. Conversely, the profile that represents individuals with higher scores on traits undervalued within the organization was not selected as frequently. To some extent, these findings call attention to a potential bias in the firm about which characteristics are predictive of success relative to others. This bias is likely to perpetuate over time when all parties in a recruiting process reinforce the need for such qualities using different methods (e.g., technical interviews, case studies, personality assessments). This might also reflect the fear of the unknown in making selection decisions.

Such profiles were also used to predict outcomes that are of interest to the firm, including job performance, tenure with the firm, and turnover. The second set of hypotheses explored whether different profiles achieved statistically higher annual performance ratings than others. None of the profiles differentially predicted job performance, lacking support for hypotheses 2a and 2b. However, several of the profiles identified for candidates were not selected as frequently into the firm, which greatly reduced the number of cases representing a few profiles.

While conducting a second LPA using only those hired into the firm might have provided a different set of interesting results, this approach would not be consistent with the study goals. For the purpose of this study, limited understanding of profiles in the general population could be found in the literature. Using the complete sample of those assessed to create profiles allowed for a more accurate representation of what is found in the population than narrowing the sample into just those hired. The lack of support for this hypothesis could also be the result of known limitations of using subjective annual performance review ratings as a measure of job performance. Though variability in ratings is often primed in such discussions there is range restriction for this outcome variable that suggests most employees receive a rating between 3 and
4 on a 5 point scale. To more accurately test this hypothesis, other dependent variables could be considered to enhance the predictive power of the profiles.

Despite the lack of evidence for predicting job performance from this sample, organizations have a vested interest in selecting individuals with a greater likelihood of being retained over time. Findings indicate that several profiles could statistically predict tenure within the firm better than others. Hypothesis 3a predicted that the Persister/Thinker profile would have higher retention over time than the other profiles. Though this was supported by the data, the results actually indicated that three of the five profiles were statistically equivalent in terms of organizational tenure: Persister/Thinker, Persister/Harmonizer, and Low Thinker/High Harmonizer. By contrast, the All High profile and Thinker profile had shorter tenure with the firm. Though one might argue that this may be driven by the positive Persister traits if considering a variable-centered approach, the mean Persister score for individuals in the All High profile is higher than nearly all of the other groups (nearly 80 on a scale of 100). Thus, this suggests it is not exclusively Persister personality traits that predict tenure. Rather, the unique interactions of these personality traits blending together have potential to offer greater insight to predict tenure. Additionally, sensitivity around differences is likely to be exaggerated in a firm that is relatively small in size and highly thorough and selective when hiring new talent.

The Thinker profile might have shorter average tenure for a few reasons. Because this profile is dominated by logical, rational thinking and lacking in many other traits and characteristics, decisions are likely made by considering alternatives very analytically. For example, people comprising this profile might be more inclined to take another job offer to do the same type of work because it “makes sense” from a financial, geographical, or career-focused reason. One might argue that individuals in the Thinker group are likely to demonstrate greater
continuance commitment to their organization, with lower affective or normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Continuance commitment pertains to a logical approach to commitment; a person would make a decision to stay or leave based on perceived gains and losses. Affective commitment deals with emotional attachment to the organization and people, and normative commitment is evident when one feels a strong sense of obligation or duty to stay, despite any dissatisfaction with one’s situation. Additionally, because this profile has limited representation of some of the other characteristics, individuals who identify with this profile may not be as emotionally tied to people or company values as the other profiles. They may be less likely to feel a sense of purpose looking at the big picture, or feel obligated to stay to maintain strong relationships. Finally, *Thinkers* require structure and control over their schedules, but operating under tight deadlines on lean teams may consistently challenge individuals with this profile to act more quickly than they prefer on limited information, which has potential to increase frustration or distress.

Turnover, defined by active versus separated status, was the final organizational outcome examined. The results indicate that hypothesis 4 was not supported, in that those in the fifth profile, the *All High* profile, were significantly less likely to separate from the firm. These results were not expected. Upon further analysis described at the start of the next section, the *All High* profile was reflected to a greater extent in those assessed (Figure 4) and those selected (Figure 5) into the firm more in recent years. As a result, it is unclear how well this profile will fare over time. Additionally, individuals could have separated voluntarily on good terms, or involuntarily. This information would be of greater use to the organization and would likely offer more insight into organizational fit.
Comparing Variable-Centered and Person-Centered Approaches

One goal of the study was to demonstrate the complementary features of the person- and variable-centered approaches in understanding personality, given the bias in the literature toward a variable-centered approach in I/O. Because this is rarely done and still requires exploration in the field, this person-centered approach to create profiles is recommended as a complement to variable-centered approaches when predicting against a series of outcomes.

Using both approaches makes theoretical sense, given the dynamic interaction of various personality characteristics that comprise an individual. Because of how the variables are aggregated and organized, person-centered approaches offer rich information about how various traits come together and are represented in a sample. In other words, the person-centered approach can offer insight into which types and levels of characteristics naturally exist within different subgroups of people, which is something that cannot be obtained with a variable-centered approach. The information gleaned from a person-centered approach tends to be more naturalistic and conceptually consistent with how the personalities are present within individuals.

Both methods are valuable and offer different perspectives for understanding behavior (e.g., Bergman & Magnusson, 1997). Traits are often considered in isolation in the field to aid in determining effect sizes and an overall predictive impact. As a result, using both analytic methods in a single study can enhance one’s understanding of the phenomenon. Each method offers unique information, though neither method could be celebrated as being the best-in-class choice. Both use aggregate data that identify broad patterns to represent a wide range of different manifestations of various traits. Regardless of whether the profile is the point of focus or the personality characteristic itself, there limitations still exist when using either method that should be considered when applying theory to practice.
Specifically, the variable-centered approach considers the unit of analysis to be individual traits, with the intention on understanding how an individual trait predicts the overall outcome. However, it assumes all individuals in the sample are the same for the purpose of comparing the traits, though the result may not apply to any person when considered at the individual level. Person-centered approaches consider the individual to be the unit of analysis and aggregate a number of characteristics into a profile to compare similarities and differences among individuals. This method better accounts for similarities in patterns across different people, though the weight placed on specific traits is not as clear for predictive purposes, and few people perfectly match any of the identified profiles.

Similarities and differences were evident across the results of the variable- (regression) and person-centered (profiling) methods. In terms of decision to hire, the profiling method reflects greater success for the *Persister/Thinker* profile and a negative relationship with successful hiring outcomes for the *All High* profile. These qualities seem to align with the business needs and values of the organization well, and the combinations of qualities captured in these profiles make conceptual sense. Regression analyses also show that Promoter and Imaginer are negatively correlated with hiring success.

However, the Rebel qualities, which center on creativity, spontaneity, and enthusiasm, were not expected to be positively related to the hiring decision. This example illustrates how the blend of characteristics that emerge for the person-centered approach might interact in such a way that they were not as likely to be selected. Yet, considering Rebel qualities in isolation using a variable-centered regression suggests that these qualities might be desired and valued more-so than the other qualities that comprise the *All High* profile from the other method. These
conflicting results could be a potential limitation of using both methods simultaneously, as it can make the person-centered results difficult to interpret at times.

For the analyses on job performance, the person-centered approach indicated no significant results. The regression analyses also did not show any statistically significant results. Job performance was not predicted by personality using either approach.

With respect to tenure from a profiling perspective, the Persister/Thinker, Low Thinker/High Harmonizer, and Persister/Harmonizer profiles reflected higher tenure than the All High profile. This trend was also consistent with the regression analyses, as the common factor highlighted in the profiles predicting longer tenure is the Persister characteristics. Though Persister is also high in the All High profile, all of the other qualities in this profile are likely diluting the influence of Persister on the overall result. This demonstrates the importance of considering how the traits operate in tandem, rather than individually. By contrast, the variable-centered analyses suggest that Promoters and Imaginers have the shortest tenure. Yet Rebel type predicts longer tenure with the firm.

Finally, the turnover analysis from a person-centered approach suggests that the All High profile are more likely to be retained in the firm. The multiple regression showed only one significant relationship: the Imaginer type was significantly less likely to turnover. Few individuals have high Imaginer scores, which could impact the effect of these results. Recognizing that turnover could be regrettable (voluntary) or non-regrettable (involuntary) separation might also confound these results. Whereas several of the types are more proactive in goal-setting and initiating change, others, including Imaginer, are much more passive, require prompting to move into action, and passive in decision-making. With more data to categorize one’s reason for leaving the firm, turnover could be better understood.
In total, these similarities and discrepancies, particularly around the Rebel characteristics, offer great insight into the dynamic of such a trait in conjunction with others, as well as individually. At a minimum, it highlights the value of looking at the data from various angles before arriving at definitive interpretations.

**General Discussion**

This study offers a broad understanding of the clusters of candidates interested in working for this company. It also sheds light on which profiles met with the most success when considering a few different variables of interest: hiring decision, performance, organizational tenure, and turnover. These outcomes were chosen on the basis of their value in the given organization. Still, this profiling method is highly customizable in that a number of other organizational outcomes could be examined that more closely align with the outcomes valued by other organizations. It is important to consider the environment that an individual will be placed in, as well as the success factors the person will be measured against.

While profiling can be incredibly useful in identifying individuals with similar characteristics that seem to fare better within the unique context of a given organization, complementary attributes also offer benefits to a company, and this desire for balance is well worth consideration. Researchers including Powell (1999) have highlighted the advantages and limitations of hiring for P-O fit with respect to diversity, recognizing that cohesiveness and diversity each have potential to make organizations stronger or limit the ongoing success of businesses. Specifically, organizations that are successful are clear on what they stand for in terms of their values and mission. On the other hand, intelligent candidates who are also good at impression management may fake their way into organizations, and selecting for fit may limit the demographic composition of the firm (Powell, 1999). With respect to the diversity argument,
individuals who are hired into organizations with dissimilar backgrounds, values, and styles can aid in creativity and adaptability in light of rapidly changing demands on organizations. Diversity also allows companies to respond to global challenges with increased insight and sensitivity. Yet, this comes at a cost; teams comprised of individuals that lack similar values, motives, and traits are more likely to become dysfunctional and volatile. There is also reason to suspect that any imbalance on a team that leads to one group becoming a majority could lead to more “groupthink.” Thus, organizational fit can be highly valuable to an organization’s success, though there are trade-offs to consider in homogeneous environments (Powell, 1999).

Given the support shown for several of these hypotheses, additional research in person-centered approaches within organizational psychology should continue. While the personality tools may differ from one company to the next, linking each assessment with the company culture, mission, and values could enhance the utility of such measures. By identifying such profiles in one’s candidate pool and determining which profiles fit their unique style and needs, different organizations could more narrowly identify what works for the particular industry, sector, and business to potentially increase profitability, efficiency, and company effectiveness.

This is likely to be especially valuable for companies engaged in high stakes hiring for roles that require a great deal of autonomy and client engagement. In these roles, especially, how you perform your work is expected to have a far greater impact for repeat business, being staffed on new engagements. Beyond this, the organization is also concerned about turnover and training costs, so identifying candidates with potential to progress in and loyal to the firm for the long-term is important.
Limitations

The first limitation is that the bivariate results presented in this study are still correlational and do not imply causation. Though the data is longitudinal in nature, a number of outcomes could have impacted by outside factors, rather than just a direct influence of personality characteristics. Though general mental ability was controlled in this study, this represents just one known factor with potential to skew the results.

The second pertains to the limited research on profiling available. When very little research has been conducted examining personality in such ways outside of clinical studies, any study conducted in this area will always be somewhat exploratory in nature from a theoretical standpoint. That being said, it is often used in practice, which should make the topic worthy of exploration. The call for such progress is clear, and the field appears ripe for the investigation.

For this study, all existent data available was used in the initial analyses to more accurately represent clusters that could exist in the general population. However, Schneider’s ASA model (1987) proposes that individuals who are likely to be a good fit for an organization’s environment are often attracted to the organization and more inclined to apply. Attraction, then, limits the variability that likely exists in the applicant data set, creating range restriction during profile generation. In this sample, nearly all profiles reflected a moderate-to-high Thinker score, as these traits are preferred for the nature of the work that is performed in a professional services firm. These characteristics may not be as predominant in the general population, limiting the generalizability of the results.

Because the full sample of candidates and employees used to generate the initial profiles (H1) is all inclusive for those applying for employment within the organization, this group is comprised of many prospective consultants, as well as administrative support staff across a wide
array of functions. Just as a job analysis is highly encouraged to understand the specific characteristics and qualities desired for individual roles, different profiles might be better represented by some groups than others. The same theory may hold true of hiring certain profiles for different leadership levels within the firm, since behaviors and outcomes are likely to be weighted differently based on how much responsibility each person holds.

As with any archival data source, some limitations in the available data are to be expected. Record keeping has likely become stronger over time, as an interest in analytical evaluation and prediction efforts has become a priority in recent years. Even though these assessments have been conducted within the firm since 1981, records of such data for the purpose of this study began in 1997, and were much fewer in count until 2006. Though the data is still longitudinal in nature, it is skewed in that more complete data is available in recent years. Additionally, demographic information was not consistently available, nor was separation status (regrettable vs. non-regrettable). This information could have more directly addressed research questions around turnover than using active and separated data, particularly given historical events like the economic crisis, which could have resulted in a greater number of regrettable separations around 2009-2010. The uncertainty of the times, lack of work in some areas of expertise, and necessary streamlining of the business to ensure the organization would survive might have played a role for some. Though patterns were investigated to see how separations and active hires changed over time over the course of the last 19 years, the lack of data for existing employees may not have been consistently contained in one database over time, which may have affected the results.

Though job performance was not well predicted by this approach, well-documented methodological issues exist in capturing performance data, and this organization was no
exception. Such issues could include biases or comparisons made by managers when assigning ratings, changes in how ratings were distributed, and political, administrative, or compensation conflicts. Though this outcome was not well predicted using the profiling method, it is difficult to determine how much of this is due to measurement errors in the outcome variable.

That being said, the profiles hired into the firm in recent years appear to be much more diverse with respect to the characteristics represented, yet most of the outcomes of interest for this study are examined from a longitudinal perspective (i.e., job performance, tenure, turnover). This is likely to reflect the evolving nature of businesses and business needs, though it makes interpretation of longitudinal data difficult. For these outcomes, it may be that the “jury is still out.” This could account for some discrepancies noted across the outcomes between the person- and variable-centered approaches. To validate these initial results, a replication study should be conducted every three to five years to determine if the identified profiles still exist and predict outcomes.

With respect to the measures, the Personality Pattern Inventory used to capture personality characteristics and generate profiles is not well known in the US. It is used predominantly in Europe and has a stronger reputation in the fields of education and transcriptional analysis within clinical psychology relative to industrial/organizational psychology. Scale scores are provided by a vendor, so item level data was also unavailable to determine internal reliability or an assessment of psychometric properties. Despite this limitation, previous studies with access to such information have reported sound reliability statistics (see Methods section). For the purpose of this study, the measure itself is but a proxy for identifying profiles, and the ability to examine organizational outcomes longitudinally also offers support for its use.
This method for profiling is likely to have limited utility within organizations that have recently implemented personality measures. One advantage of this study was the ability to examine longitudinal trends in the data. Without several years of personality data and outcomes, these patterns are far less stable and much more difficult to establish reliably. Another limitation of this study is that tenure with the firm can only be fully investigated once an employee has left the firm. Thus, individuals who were only assessed in recent years have not yet had a chance to demonstrate their shorter or longer tenure with the firm. This would be expected to have reduced the effect size of the tenure findings to some extent.

Though not a limitation of the study, per se, some readers may have read this work looking for a more prescriptive evaluation of person- and variable-centered methods than could be concluded. Since these methods both offer unique advantages, using them in tandem allows a researcher to gain multiple perspectives to understand the underlying phenomenon. Just as the multi-trait, multi-method matrix collects information from a variety of angles to determine construct validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959), using these methods in triangulation offers a deeper understanding of the relationships that exist between personality and work-relevant outcomes.

**Future Research**

The current study offers a promising, new perspective when interpreting personality data, and logically encourages further research opportunities to enhance application. First, additional research could be conducted to replicate this method using other personality measures to more clearly assess the viability of its use with other tools. Further exploration is also warranted to determine if demographic information (age, ethnicity, etc.) might aid in predicting outcomes using profiles. Though the information on such variables was limited for the current study,
assessing profile membership based on demographic categorization could also aid in ensuring companies are not engaging in any discriminatory practices that could lead to legal issues.

Future research could also explore how different types of assessment information (e.g., general mental ability, work sample or simulation ratings, scored behavioral interviews) can be used in combination to inform decisions. Though general mental ability was controlled for in this study to eliminate any distraction away from the personality profiles, additional studies could investigate whether it is appropriate as a compensatory factor or in combination with the other information.

It is possible, if not likely, that different profiles could emerge based on seniority and experience, given the differences in task complexity, decision-making responsibility, and leadership as one progresses in their career. Future research could identify and differentiate such profiles by leadership level (e.g., executive, junior consulting staff) against outcomes highly indicative of success specific to that level. Though company values do not change or vary by position held within the firm, job-specific characteristics might take greater precedence for some roles or job families than others. As an example, billable hours contributed annually may be a fair outcome for some; for others, annual revenue sourced or sold may be more appropriate.

To this point, even within very similar roles, employee status (permanent company employee vs. temporary contractor) could be instrumental in understanding which qualities are necessary for long-term relationships against those more project-based and short-term. Having this flexibility to examine different profiles by level or status speaks to the flexibility of the model, as latent profiles can be generated for subpopulations to predict different outcomes if the sample size offers enough power for the analyses.
Additional exploration could also be done to study which candidates are attracted to companies and which profiles are more frequently selected during times of highly impactful organizational or historical change. These events, including a national or global recession, merger or acquisition, or change in leadership and subsequent priorities within the firm could generate shocks to the system that are worthy of exploring over time. Using the economic crisis as an example, it would stand to reason that such changes might cause a company to become more cautious and rigid in hiring decisions for a period of time following the event. However, once the economy becomes more stable, profiles once favored by the organization might no longer be held with such high regard.

In the current study, all personality characteristics were present in every profile to varying extents. However, other personality researchers like Hogan and colleagues (2010) have considered syndromes, or clusters of behavioral predispositions that are organized by schemas (e.g., Horney, 1950), as a form of profiling for practice. Using this framework, certain magnitudes of specific characteristics are critical in profile, or syndrome, identification, whereas others have no impact on the conclusion and magnitude does not matter. Comparing such approaches empirically would further the literature and interpretative value of profiling in practice.

Conclusions

In summary, a few key conclusions can be drawn from the current study. At a high level, latent profiles created using a person-centered approach appear promising for future research and application, as they capture the richness of data and the complex interactions between personality traits. In a similar vein, such profiles offer unique information above and beyond what can be
determined by variable-centered approaches alone (e.g., multiple regression analyses), and may be complementary or offer predictive utility differently across situations.

This person-centered approach also relies heavily on person-organization fit to aid in selection decisions. Mapping organizational values, missions, and styles to individuals and vice versa is useful in understanding retention and attrition concerns, particularly for roles that are complex and costly for the organization to replace. Still, this poses future opportunities to understand why individuals with profiles that do not seem to fit might not be more likely to leave the firm.

Taken as a whole, the use of profiling for selection purposes has been a focus in recent years, but it continues to lack thorough, empirical study. With more work in this area, linkages between valued work outcomes and multivariate combinations of characteristics could be identified in a more holistic way using a person’s fit with the organization as an underlying driver. By focusing on the interplay between characteristics in unique patterns within the individual using person-centered methodology, researchers can enhance the collective understanding of known relationships between personality traits and outcomes.
Table 1

**Means, Standard Deviations, and Test Statistics for Personality Characteristics, Months with the Firm, and Mental Ability Comparing those with Complete versus Missing Data on Job Performance.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Complete Job Perf Data</th>
<th></th>
<th>Missing Job Perf Data</th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinker</td>
<td>89.78</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>88.22</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>2.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister</td>
<td>76.46</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>79.14</td>
<td>20.39</td>
<td>-2.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonizer</td>
<td>55.26</td>
<td>25.41</td>
<td>56.19</td>
<td>25.31</td>
<td>-.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter</td>
<td>42.40</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>38.83</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>3.93***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel</td>
<td>37.11</td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td>35.65</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginer</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td>5.76***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (months)</td>
<td>54.43</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>74.58</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>-11.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Ability</td>
<td>30.49</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>30.51</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05.
Table 2.

*Missing Data Frequencies for Job Performance by Data Collection Year.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Complete Job Perf Data</th>
<th>Missing Job Perf Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

Descriptive Statistics for Key Study Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Sample Range</th>
<th>M (N)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covariates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Ability</td>
<td>5674</td>
<td>1-50</td>
<td>6-49</td>
<td>29.31</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinker</td>
<td>5674</td>
<td>1-100</td>
<td>15-100</td>
<td>89.35</td>
<td>16.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister</td>
<td>5674</td>
<td>1-100</td>
<td>5-100</td>
<td>73.32</td>
<td>22.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonizer</td>
<td>5674</td>
<td>1-100</td>
<td>4-100</td>
<td>59.63</td>
<td>25.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter</td>
<td>5674</td>
<td>1-100</td>
<td>2-100</td>
<td>48.67</td>
<td>23.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel</td>
<td>5674</td>
<td>1-100</td>
<td>2-100</td>
<td>39.45</td>
<td>21.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginer</td>
<td>5674</td>
<td>1-100</td>
<td>2-100</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary DVs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>5674</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1190)</td>
<td>(21.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>5674</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1155)</td>
<td>(20.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>5674</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3328)</td>
<td>(58.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (in months)</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>1-384</td>
<td>1-216</td>
<td>57.55</td>
<td>43.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Performance Rating</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.42</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td><strong>0.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.03</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05.
### Table 5. Model Fit Indices for Latent Profile Class Enumeration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Profiles</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>BLRT</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>LMR</th>
<th>BIC</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>$\Delta$BIC</th>
<th>$\Delta$AIC</th>
<th>Entropy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Smallest Class</td>
<td>299577.77</td>
<td>299451.54</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>3379.55</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>563.85</td>
<td>561.21</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>575.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>296891.85</td>
<td>296801.73</td>
<td>2649.81</td>
<td>2620.49</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>1867.91</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>868.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>295031.32</td>
<td>294916.95</td>
<td>1884.78</td>
<td>1867.91</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>1867.91</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>868.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>293347.61</td>
<td>293208.97</td>
<td>1707.98</td>
<td>1693.97</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>1693.97</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>868.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>292960.02</td>
<td>292647.76</td>
<td>561.21</td>
<td>575.21</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>575.21</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>868.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bold indicates selected profile. BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion. AIC = Akaike Information Criterion. LMR = Lo-Mendell-Rubin log likelihood ratio. BLRT = Boot-strapped likelihood-ratio test.

Model Fit Indices for Latent Profile Class Enumeration.

Table 5.
Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Persistor/Harmonizer (N=269, 4.7%)</th>
<th>Persistor/Thinker (N=1202, 21.2%)</th>
<th>Thinker (N=3127, 55.1%)</th>
<th>Low Thinker/Harmonizer (N=657, 11.5%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginer</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>99.01</td>
<td>99.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>73.96</td>
<td>80.71</td>
<td>80.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter</td>
<td>73.96</td>
<td>82.76</td>
<td>78.93</td>
<td>78.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonizer</td>
<td>47.69</td>
<td>62.98</td>
<td>65.07</td>
<td>65.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>73.96</td>
<td>80.71</td>
<td>80.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistor/Harmonizer</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>99.01</td>
<td>99.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginator</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>99.01</td>
<td>99.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>73.96</td>
<td>80.71</td>
<td>80.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter</td>
<td>73.96</td>
<td>82.76</td>
<td>78.93</td>
<td>78.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonizer</td>
<td>47.69</td>
<td>62.98</td>
<td>65.07</td>
<td>65.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>73.96</td>
<td>80.71</td>
<td>80.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistor/Harmonizer</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>99.01</td>
<td>99.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginator</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>99.01</td>
<td>99.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>73.96</td>
<td>80.71</td>
<td>80.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter</td>
<td>73.96</td>
<td>82.76</td>
<td>78.93</td>
<td>78.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonizer</td>
<td>47.69</td>
<td>62.98</td>
<td>65.07</td>
<td>65.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>73.96</td>
<td>80.71</td>
<td>80.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistor/Harmonizer</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>99.01</td>
<td>99.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginator</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>99.01</td>
<td>99.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>73.96</td>
<td>80.71</td>
<td>80.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter</td>
<td>73.96</td>
<td>82.76</td>
<td>78.93</td>
<td>78.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores for each personality characteristic by profile using the Five Cluster Latent Profile Analysis.
Table 7. Chi Square Analysis for Profile Membership by Hired Status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Type</th>
<th>Active Candidate</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Standardized Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persist/Performer</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persist/Thinker</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinker</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Thinker/High Performer</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All High</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persist/Thinker</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Thinker/High Performer</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All High</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Significant difference signified by standardized residual variances exceeding 1.96.
Table 8. Means and Standard Deviations of Mental Ability for Each Profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mental Ability</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persister/Harmonizer (N=224)</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.39</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister/Thinker (N=533)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.18</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinker (N=1151)</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.51</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Thinker/Harmonizer (N=88)</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.09&lt;sup&gt;abc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All High (N=72)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.18&lt;sup&gt;ae&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Thinker/High Thinker (N=533)</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.39</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister/Harmonizer (N=224)</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.39</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Values with the same subscript are significantly different from one another. F(4,2063) = 11.82, p < .001, η² = .022.
Table 9.

Logistic Regression Predicting Hiring Status Controlling for Mental Ability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Ability</td>
<td>.04***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>73.76</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister/Harmonizer</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister/Thinker</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Thinker/High Harmonizer</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All High</td>
<td>-.75***</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>38.95</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *Thinker* profile used as reference group; ***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05.
Table 10. Means and Standard Deviations for Job Performance for Each Profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmonizer</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Thinker/High</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistor/Thinker</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistor/High Harmonizer</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All High</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Job Performance Rating:

- Harmonizer: 3.94 (N=37)
- Low Thinker/High: 3.81 (N=600)
- Persistor/Thinker: 3.85 (N=248)
- Persistor/High Harmonizer: 3.81 (N=108)
- All High: 3.88 (N=47)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Tenure (Months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persister/Harmonizer (N=224)</td>
<td>67.51</td>
<td>39.21</td>
<td>75.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister/Thinker (N=533)</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>59.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinker (N=1151)</td>
<td>40.54</td>
<td>34.45</td>
<td>34.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Thinker/Harmonizer (N=88)</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>36.26</td>
<td>34.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All High (N=72)</td>
<td>67.51</td>
<td>39.21</td>
<td>59.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Values with the same subscript are significantly different from one another.
Table 12.

*Logistic Regression Predicting Turnover Status among those Hired Controlling for Mental Ability.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover Status</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Ability</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister/Harmonizer</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister/Thinker</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Thinker/High Harmonizer</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All High</td>
<td>-.52*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *p = .04. N = 2,068. Thinker profile used as reference group.
Table 13.

*Frequency of Profile Membership for those Assessed by Time of Assessment.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Persister/Harmonizer</th>
<th>Persister/Thinker</th>
<th>Thinker</th>
<th>Low Thinker/High Harmonizer</th>
<th>All High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14.

*Frequency of Profile Membership for those Hired by Time of Assessment.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Persister/ Harmonizer</th>
<th>Persister/ Thinker</th>
<th>Thinker</th>
<th>Low Thinker/High Harmonizer</th>
<th>All High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15.

*Chi Square for Profiles Membership by Gender.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Standardized</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Standardized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister/Harmonizer</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister/Thinker</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>-.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinker</td>
<td>2368</td>
<td>2244</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Thinker/High Harmonizer</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All High</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Significant difference signified by standardized residual variances exceeding 1.96.
Table 16.

*Frequency of Active versus Separated Status by Year.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Separated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17.

Logistic Regression Predicting Hired Status Using Variable Centered Approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Ability</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>64.20</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinker</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister</td>
<td>.01***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>75.88</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonizer</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter</td>
<td>-.02***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>238.81</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel</td>
<td>.01***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginer</td>
<td>-.02***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>64.90</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05.
Table 18.

*Multiple Regression Predicting Job Performance Using Variable Centered Approach.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinker</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonizer</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginer</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19.

*Multiple Regression Predicting Tenure (Months) Using Variable Centered Approach.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenure (months)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>LLCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Ability</td>
<td>.02***</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinker</td>
<td>-.06***</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonizer</td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter</td>
<td>-.37***</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginer</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ***\( p < .001 \), **\( p < .01 \), *\( p < .05 \).
Table 20.

Logistic Regression Predicting Turnover Using Variable Centered Approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Ability</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinker</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persister</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonizer</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginer</td>
<td>-.009**</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05. Loglikelihood value = 2836.40, Cox and Snell $R^2 = .007$. Turnover coding: 0 = no turnover (active status); 1 = turnover (separated status).
Figure 1. Means for Personality Characteristics by Profile Membership.
Figure 2. Average Job Performance for Profiles among those Hired.

Note: Analyses controlled for mental ability.
Figure 3. Average Months with the Firm for Profiles among Those Hired.

Note: Analyses controlled for mental ability.
Figure 4. Proportion of Cluster Membership by Time of Assessment for those Assessed.
Figure 5. Proportion of Cluster Membership by Time of Assessment for those Hired.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Strengths</th>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Action Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thinker</strong></td>
<td>Logical, responsible and organized</td>
<td>Attention to detail, Solitude</td>
<td>Thinks logically, Takes in facts and ideas and synthesizes them</td>
<td>Works well with things, Intrinsically motivated into action, Ability to be introspective, Ability to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persister</strong></td>
<td>Dedicated, observant, conscientious</td>
<td>Action oriented</td>
<td>Judges first, evaluates people</td>
<td>Ability to be firm and direct, Ability to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harmonizer</strong></td>
<td>Compassionate, creative, playful</td>
<td>Ability to enjoy the present</td>
<td>Creates harmony, compassion, and giving</td>
<td>Ability to be nurturant, Ability to play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rebel</strong></td>
<td>Spontaneous, imaginative, and artful</td>
<td>Ability to enjoy the present</td>
<td>Ability to give opinions, ( \text{Reacts to people/things with likes and dislikes.} )</td>
<td>Ability to be imaginative, Ability to be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Promoter**       | Adaptable, persuasive, and charming | Action oriented | Action oriented | Ability to be charming, Ability to be persuasive, and Adaptable, Ability to be |***What should I...*** \( \text{Decides first; evaluates people and things by "deciding about" them.} \) | Acceptance/Appreciation, Nurturance/Comfort, Recognition of work, Admiration & respect, Alignment with values, Clear goals, Recognition of achievement, Recognition of work, Attention to detail, Solitude, Pleasant environment, Relationships, Intuition/Emotion  

*Personality Pattern Inventory Overview*

APPENDIX A
APPENDIX B

Example Items from the Personality Pattern Inventory (PPI)

• The most valuable parts of my personality are those that…
  o give and take information and organize it.
  o have high ideals, morals, and expectations.
  o show sensitivity and respond to the feelings of others.
  o find clever ways of taking care of myself.
  o have flexibility, creativity, and a joy for life.
  o I let few people look into.

• My strengths are my abilities to…
  o receive and process information to solve problems.
  o stick with my beliefs, even under pressure.
  o nurture and care about others.
  o adapt, survive, and make things happen.
  o play, have fun and be creative.
  o do tasks that others might find boring.

• Often I…
  o am driven to excel and achieve.
  o have high expectations for other people.
  o try to please almost everyone.
  o expect others to look out for themselves.
  o try but it's really hard sometimes.
  o experience myself in a shell-like world.

• When things go badly, I…
  o push others away verbally.
  o dig in and hold firm with my beliefs.
  o feel unloved or rejected.
  o look out for number one.
  o feel hurt, and then vengeful.
  o go off by myself and seem not to feel much.
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Profile matching refers to personnel selection based on candidate similarity to a predetermined pattern. Although previous investigations support the use of personality data through univariate, linear-based selection methodologies, there is a paucity of research supporting the use of profile matching in a selection context, and very limited selection research has utilized a person-centered approach. Still, this support is necessary, given that a recent study estimated that the majority of consultative vendor organizations utilize some form of profile matching using personality patterns (Kulas, 2013). After generating profiles from the candidate pool, findings from the current study suggest that profiles have potential to offer predictive power beyond that of general mental ability for one organizational outcome, tenure. The results predicting job performance by profile were not supported. The current study further investigates the feasibility of profile generation based on an organization’s values and mission, to be used to assess fit for the purpose of selection. The use of person- and variable-centered approaches in understanding phenomenon is encouraged. Implications and future research are discussed.
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