Personalities of Preferred Managers and Subordinates

Stephanie Whelan

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the Master degree of Psychology (Organisational & Human Factors)

Written for the Journal of Managerial Psychology

School of Psychology

University of Adelaide

November 2018

Literature Review word count: 5 125

Research Project word count: 8 489

DECLARATION

This report contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any University, and, to the best of my knowledge, this report contains no materials previously published except where due reference is made.

I give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the School to restrict access for a period of time.

Stephanie Whelan

November, 2018

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Literature Review

Introduction

Predicting job performance is a key area of interest in the field of Organisational Psychology. As such, much research has focused on identifying employee personality traits that are predictive of job performance across various job criteria and occupational groups (e.g. Barrick & Mount, 1991; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Salgado, 1997). However, prior to the 1990s, researchers largely agreed that personality was a poor predictor of job performance (e.g. Guion & Gottier, 1965), and Guion and Gottier (1965, p. 159) even concluded in their influential review that, 'taken as a whole, there is no generalisable evidence that personality measures can be recommended as good or practical tools for employee selection'. This view remained unchallenged until the early 1990s when meta-analyses utilised the 'Big Five' framework to provide evidence that specific personality constructs predict job-related criteria (e.g. Barrick & Mount, 1991; Barrick, Mount & Judge, 2001; Salgado, 1997; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991). Barrick and Mount (1991) later suggested that the absence of a relationship between personality and job performance in the earlier studies may have been be due to there being no suitable taxonomy at the time by which personality traits could be categorised.

Personality traits are described as relatively stable patterns of thoughts, emotions, and behaviour that endure over time and describe individuals' behaviour in various situations (Costa & McCrae, 1989). Over recent decades, most research linking personality with organisational outcomes has utilised the Five Factor Model of personality (FFM; Costa and McRae, 1992), also referred to as the 'Big Five' personality dimensions (Goldberg, 1990), as an organising framework. The FFM is comprised of five broad personality traits: Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability (also referred to as its opposite, Neuroticism) and Openness; each of which is comprised of six narrower facets. See table 1 for a description of the factors and facets of the FFM. As with any model, it has faced

criticism; for example, Block (1995) suggested that the model is comprised of too few factors, while Eysenck (1992) argued for fewer. Despite the criticisms, there is largely consensus that the FFM encompasses the key domains of personality and that it is a useful taxonomy by which personality traits can be investigated (Goldberg, 1990).

Table 1

Big Five Dimensions and Facets

	Big Five Dimensions	Facets (and correlated trait adjective)
E.	Extraversion (versus Introversion)	Gregariousness (sociable)
		Assertiveness (forceful)
		Activity (energetic)
		Excitement seeking (adventurous)
		Positive Emotions (enthusiastic)
		Warmth (outgoing)
A.	Agreeableness (versus Antagonism)	Trust (forgiving)
		Straightforwardness (not demanding)
		Altruism (warm)
		Compliance (not stubborn)
		Modesty (not show off)
		Tender-mindedness (sympathetic)
C.	Conscientiousness (versus Lack of direction)	Competence (efficient)
		Order (organised)
		Dutifulness (not careless)
		Achievement striving (thorough)
		Self-discipline (not lazy)
		Deliberation (not impulsive)
N.	Neuroticism (versus Emotional Stability)	Anxiety (tense)
		Angry Hostility (irritable)
		Depression (not contented)
		Self-Consciousness (shy)
		Impulsiveness (moody)
		Vulnerability (not self-confident)
O.	Openness (versus Closedness to experience)	Ideas (curious)
		Fantasy (imaginative)
		Aesthetics (artistic)
		Actions (wide interests)
		Feelings (excitable)
		Values (unconventional)

Note: These traits from the Adjective Check List (listed in brackets next to each facet)

correlated with self-rated scores on that facet (Costa & McCrae, 1992, p. 49)

Job performance is defined as the extent to which an individual assists an organisation to achieve its goals (Campbell, 1983). Initially considered to be a unidimensional construct, job performance has been expanded to reflect a multidimensional construct and has been further divided into two high level components: task performance and contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993) and, importantly, personality traits have been found to differentially correlate with the two dimensions of performance (Bergner, Neubauer & Kreuzthaler, 2010). Motowidlo, Borman and Schmit (1997) have defined task performance as the activities that contribute to an organisation's core output, consisting of activities that allow the organisation to function effectively and efficiently; an example of this is the act of controlling processes and supervising staff (Motowidlo, Borman & Schmit, 1997). Contextual performance, a construct related to Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCBs) or prosocial behaviour (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986) includes the behaviours that benefit organisation by contributing to the broader psychological and social context in which the work is performed (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Examples of contextual performance behaviours are cooperating with and assisting others in the organisation (Motowidlo, Borman & Schmit, 1997). Another non-task related behaviour, and one which is distinct from, not on a continuum with OCB (Dalal, 2005), is Counterproductive work behaviour (CWB), which is defined as negative behaviours that may potentially harm the organisation (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002).

Relationships between the Big Five Personality Factors and Job Performance

Meta-analyses have demonstrated that within the FFM, Conscientiousness and Emotional Stability are consistent predictors of job performance across all jobs, and the relevance of the other factors is dependent on job type or criteria (e.g. Salgado, 1997). Barrick and Mount (2005) suggested that these two traits may be viewed as measures of trait-

oriented work motivation, such that they affect performance through their associated motivational mechanisms.

Conscientiousness reflects self-control and traits such as planning and achieving tasks. Individuals who score highly on Conscientiousness are determined, reliable and purposeful in their behaviour, while those who are less conscientious are more relaxed in working toward their goals (Costa & McRae, 1992). In their influential meta-analysis, Barrick and Mount (1991) investigated the validity of each of the five factors across five occupational groups, and for three types of job performance (job proficiency, training proficiency and personnel data), and results showed that Conscientiousness was predictive of performance in all occupational groups studied and for each of the three types of job performance. Other meta-analyses have established Conscientiousness as a consistent predictor of performance; however, correlations have been low (e.g. Barrick, Mount & Judge., 2001; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Salgado, 1997; Tett et al., 1991). Barrick, et al. (2001) concluded that it would be difficult to imagine a job where positive outcomes are associated with being careless, impulsive and low achievement-striving. Moreover, Conscientiousness has also been positively associated with Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB; e.g. Chiaburu, Oh , Berry, Li and Gardner, 2011; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Iles, Fulmer, Spizmuller, & Johnson, 2009), teamwork (Hough, 1992), and negatively associated with Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB; Hough et al., 1990).

Despite the positive relationships between Conscientiousness and performance, conscientious individuals may be stubborn and difficult to deal with (Witt, Burke, Barrick & Mount, 2002), and similarly, leaders who possess high levels of Conscientiousness may be unreasonably critical of their subordinates' work (Hogan & Hogan, 2001) and supervise them too closely (House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991).

Emotional Stability reflects the extent to which individuals are calm under pressure. As such, individuals who score highly on Emotional Stability are typically even-tempered, and less susceptible to experiencing negative emotions, while those who score low (neurotic) tend to experience negative feelings and emotional volatility, (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Being well-adjusted, calm, and low in anxiety is positively associated with performance (Hough et al., 1990; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Salgado, 1997; Tett et al., 1991). Less emotionally stable (neurotic) individuals have been found to be more vulnerable to work stressors (Conard & Matthews, 2008) which has been found to be associated with work withdrawal behaviours (Schneider, 2004), and Neuroticism has been positively associated with interpersonal and organisational deviance behaviours (Berry, Ones & Sackett, 2007).

Extraversion reflects an interpersonal dimension which is characterised by being outgoing, talkative and assertive. Individuals who score highly on Extraversion tend to enjoy socialising with others, while those who score low are more reserved (Costa and McCrae, 1992). Accordingly, meta-analyses have shown Extraversion to predict performance in jobs that require interpersonal interaction, such as sales or management jobs (Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Mount, Barrick & Stewart, 1998; Salgado, 1997), and OCB (e.g. Chiaburu et al., 2011; Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Individuals who score highly on Agreeableness are sympathetic, helpful and altruistic in their nature, and are likely to be perceived as trusting and trustworthy. On the other hand, low scorers are likely to be sceptical and antagonistic (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Associations have been found between Agreeableness and teamwork (Hough, 1992; Mount, Barrick & Stewart, 1998) and training performance (Salgado, 1997). However, despite Agreeableness being an interpersonal trait, in their meta-analysis, Barrick and Mount (1991) found it was not predictive of performance even when the job involved significant social interaction. Due to their cooperative nature (Costa & McCrae, 1992), agreeable individuals are likely to make an

effort to get along with others at work (Barrick, Stewart and Piotrowski, 2002), and engage in

OCB (e.g. Chiaburu et al., 2011; Ilies, Fulmer, Spitzmuller & Johnson, 2009).

Individuals who score highly on Openness to Experience are intellectually curious,

and interested in new ideas, while those who score lower tend to be more conservative in

their outlook (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Openness is the least understood of the Big Five

factors (Judge & Bono, 2010), but meta-analyses have shown that Openness predicts training

proficiency (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Barrick et al., 2001; Salgado, 1997). Open individuals

may have more positive attitudes towards training (Barrick & Mount, 1991) and accordingly,

may benefit more from training (Hough et al., 1990). Moreover, Chiaburu, et al. (2011)

found that Openness significantly predicts OCB.

Leadership, Management and Personality

It is important to define and differentiate between management and leadership. There

have been numerous attempts to do so in the literature, and there appears to be confusion

between the two terms as authors tend to use the terms interchangeably. Some authors argue

leadership is simply one aspect of management, that is primarily concerned with the long-

term future of the organisation (e.g. Hay & Hodgkinson, 2006). Notably, in their influential

Handbook of Leadership, Bass and Stogdill (1990) defined leadership as "the principal

dynamic force that motivates and coordinates the organization in the accomplishment of its

objectives" and Daft (2003) has defined management as "the attainment of organisational

goals in an effective and efficient manner through planning, organising, leading and

controlling organisational resources". Despite different perspectives, management and

leadership roles share many parallels as "most managers show some leadership skills, while

most leaders find themselves managing at times" (Karpin, 1995, p. 1210). From this point

forward, leadership will refer to more strategic functions, while management will be used to refer to organising and implementing.

Research has shown that dimensions of the FFM are related to aspects of leadership (e.g. Judge & Bono, 2000; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhart, 2002) and managerial success (e.g. Bergner et al., 2010).   Using the FFM as an organising framework, Judge et al. (2002) conducted a key meta-analysis to establish the validity of Big Five personality traits for predicting leadership emergence (being perceived as leader like by others; Hogan et al, 1994) and leader effectiveness (the effectiveness of the leader in influencing their unit to achieve their objectives; Stogdill, 1950) across business, government/military and education settings, and Judge and Bono (2000) associated the Big Five personality traits with transformational leadership behaviour (motivational and inspirational leadership; Bass & Avolio, 1994)

Extraversion has emerged as predictor of transformational leadership (Judge & Bono, 2000), and was found to be the most important trait in leadership performance overall, relating more strongly to leader emergence than to leadership effectiveness (Judge et al., 2002). Similarly, Extraversion was found to predict managerial performance (e.g. Barrick et al., 2001; Judge et al., 2002). Bergner et al. (2010) suggested that it is probable that individuals who are dominant and outgoing are at the fore in group situations, and those who are ambitious, and dominant are likely to accomplish their managerial goals.

More strongly associated with leader emergence than leadership effectiveness, Conscientiousness displayed the second-strongest correlations with leadership across the criteria and settings (Judge et al., 2002), and managerial performance across task performance, job satisfaction and promotion rate (Bergner et al., 2010). Specific task-oriented behaviours of conscientious individuals may lead to their emergence as leaders (Judge et al., 2002) and their likelihood of being promoted and job-satisfied (Bergner et al.,

2010). However, Conscientiousness was not related to transformational leadership (Judge &

Bono, 2000) and this may be due to individuals who are highly achievement striving, a facet

of Conscientiousness, being less effective at delegation, a key managerial competency, and as

such, may supervise their subordinates too closely (House et al., 1991).

Judge and Bono (2000) found Agreeableness to be the strongest predictor of

transformational leadership, and this finding was explained in terms of the social nature of

Agreeableness aligning with the social context in which leadership occurs. In the study by

Bergner et al. (2010), Agreeableness was correlated with contextual performance and

additionally, in their study of personality and job performance in a pharmaceutical company,

Rothmann and Coetzer (2003) found Agreeableness was significantly positively associated

with management performance. However, in the meta-analysis by Judge et al., (2002),

Agreeableness was only related to leadership effectiveness within student samples. As such,

the authors suggested that due to agreeable individuals' acquiescent nature, it is not surprising

that they are less likely to emerge as leaders who may need to make tough or unpopular

decisions (Judge et al., 2002)

Openness to Experience has been associated with transformational leadership (Judge

& Bono, 2000), managerial contextual performance (Bergner et al., 2010), and leadership

within business settings (Judge et al., 2002).

Judge et al. (2002) found negative relationships between Neuroticism and leadership

across business, government and student settings. Similarly, Rothmann and Coetzer (2003)

found Neuroticism negatively related to managerial performance in a pharmaceutical setting,

with the authors suggesting that managers who score highly on Neuroticism may not cope

well with stress and be less able to control their emotions. However, despite hypothesising a

negative relationship, Judge et al. (2002) found that Neuroticism was not related to transformational leadership behaviour.

The Managerial Role

Many authors have contributed to our understanding of the managerial role. One of the most well-known is Fayol (1949), who proposed that the managerial role centred around planning, commanding, organising, leading and controlling resources. Katz (1974) proposed that managers need to be skilled in three broad areas to be effective managers: technical skills, human skills and conceptual skills. Technical skills involve a proficiency in applying specialised knowledge; human skills involve effectively working with others, and conceptual skills involve the ability to understand how the functions of the organisation depend on each other, and how the organisation functions as part of a wider system and accordingly, the ability to make decisions accordingly.

Importantly, another role in the workplace is the subordinate role, which is defined by Yukl (2002, p. 8) as 'someone whose primary work activities for a group or organisation are directed to and evaluated by the focal leader'. Work is increasingly being organised in a manner that requires workers, or subordinates, to think for themselves; while one manager may adopt more of a supervisory role and spend much of their time controlling and planning work for their staff, another manager may spend most of their time coaching staff (Stevens, Guthrie, Ash & Coate, 2002).

Leader-Member Exchange Theory

The personality of one member of the manager-subordinate relationship affects the other. In fact, a dyad, such as the manager-subordinate one, despite consisting of only two members, may be the most fundamental type of group because differences in one member are likely to have a larger impact on the other member than they would in a larger group (Bernerth et al., 2008). One theory that can provide unique insight into the manager subordinate relationship is Leader Member Exchange Theory (LMX; Graen & Scandura, 1987). LMX proposes that over time leaders develop differential working relationships with each of their subordinates based on exchanges, or interactions, which can range from low to high quality (Graen, 2003). High-quality LMX is characterised by trust, reciprocal respect and loyalty (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Diensch & Linden, 1986) while low-quality LMX is based solely on formal obligations such as the employment contract (Bauer & Green, 1996). LMX theory is underpinned by social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and the theory of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960); and as such, when subordinates perceive high quality relationships with their supervisor, and vice versa, they are likely to feel compelled to reciprocate the positive actions (Kamdar & Dyne, 2007).

Interpersonal Compatibility - Similarity and Complementarity

The dominant approach to interpersonal compatibility is the similarity-attraction model (Byrne, 1971). This model proposes that individuals are attracted to individuals to whom they are similar on dimensions such as personality, attitude and other demographic characteristics. Within manager-subordinate relationships, similarity has been found to have a positive effect on tangible outcomes such as OCB (Lai, Lam & Chow, 2014), job

satisfaction (e.g. Turban & Jones, 1988), performance ratings (e.g. Pulakos & Wekley, 1982) and LMX quality (e.g. Bauer & Green, 1996).

Some mechanisms by which interpersonal similarity may lead to these positive outcomes in the workplace is through similarity in task interpretation style (Bauer & Green, 1996), greater behavioural predictability (Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1991), increased trust (Turban & Jones, 1988), and through a common system of communication (Schein, 1985). Importantly, a distinction has been made between actual similarity and perceived similarity (Turban & Jones, 1988). Actual similarity refers to objectively measured similarity between both members of the dyad on attitudes, personality and demographic characteristics, while perceived similarity refers to one member of the dyad's perception of similarity in those characteristics (Turban & Jones, 1988).

Actual personality similarity, also referred to as 'relational personality' has received more attention in the literature than has perceived similarity. For example, Bernerth et al. (2008) investigated the effect of actual subordinate-supervisor personality differences on subordinate perceptions of LMX quality. Both supervisor and subordinate personality were measured with the NEO FFI (Costa & McCrae, 1992) and subordinates rated their perception of LMX quality. Actual similarity between supervisor and subordinate in Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Openness and Emotional Stability were positively associated with subordinate perception of LMX. However, contrary to their hypothesis, differences in Extraversion were not associated with perceptions of LMX. The perception of LMX quality was only examined from the subordinate's perspective, but it is managers or supervisors who typically make selection and promotion decisions, accordingly it would have been useful to investigate the supervisors' LMX perceptions.

Similarly, Bin Ahmad (2008) found that actual personality similarity between manager and subordinate was associated with subordinate job satisfaction and satisfaction with supervisor. However, to assess personality similarity, like other authors, Bin Ahmad (2008) calculated the absolute difference between the respondent and manager on each of the five secondary factors of the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), and the five difference scores were added to obtain a total absolute difference score. The limitation of this method is that is it impossible to determine how the dyad actually differs on each dimension. For example, if both members of the dyad score high on Conscientiousness or both score low, the absolute difference scores will be similar.

Acknowledging that Conscientiousness is a key factor associated with effective job performance (e.g. Barrick & Mount, 1991), Deluga (1998) found that supervisor subordinate similarity in Conscientiousness facilitates high quality LMX and productivity. When both members are similar in Conscientiousness, they both work with the same level of diligence towards their goals, understanding the relative importance of each other for achievement of their goals (Deluga, 1998). Thus, different levels of conscientiousness are likely to cause dissatisfaction between managers and subordinates.

Less research has been conducted on perceived personality similarity; however, there are studies that show its association with positive outcomes. For example, in a study of sales people and their supervisors, Strauss, Barrick, and Connerley (2001) examined the effect of both actual and perceived similarity in Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Emotional Stability on peer and supervisor performance ratings. Results showed that actual similarity in Emotional Stability only predicted peer performance ratings. However, supporting their hypothesis, perceived similarity in Agreeableness, Emotional Stability and Extraversion were associated with higher performance ratings across both peers and supervisor raters. To assess perceived personality, Strauss et al. (2001) asked supervisors and peers to indicate on a scale

the degree to which they view themselves as similar or dissimilar to the ratee on the

Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability and Extraversion by rating themselves on a scale of

'less, same, more'. Each time 'less' or 'more' was rated, the perceived difference score

would increase by one; the smaller the absolute difference, the more similar the rater

perceived themselves to the ratee. To obtain a more complete understanding of the degree of

perceived similarity from one member's perspective, it would be beneficial to have

participants provide self-ratings and ratings of their 'partner' on the same personality

inventory. This approach is a utilised in the romantic relationships research which will be

detailed later in this review (e.g. Figueredo, Sefcek & Jones, 2006).

Despite the benefits of interpersonal similarity, other studies show that dissimilarities

between individuals can lead to positive outcomes. Within the person-organisation fit (P-O

fit) literature, dissimilarity has typically been investigated in relation to complementarity

(Kristof, 1996) whereby characteristics of an individual, typically skills and ability, complete

the environment by adding the missing characteristics (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987).

Within the team composition research, there is evidence for complementary personalities

leading to positive outcomes. For example, a team comprised of some extraverted members

has been found to be beneficial, but too many or too few would be detrimental; if all

members of the group sought leadership positions, conflict would likely ensue (Barry &

Stewart, 1997; Neuman, Wagner, & Christiansen, 1999). Similarly, Leonard and Strauss

(1997) suggested that it is beneficial for individuals with different cognitive styles to work

together as it leads to creative decision making, while similarities in cognitive style may stifle

that creativity. Focusing on the dimension of 'control', which is characterised by dominance

and assertiveness and is similar to Extraversion in the FFM, Glomb and Welsh (2005) found

that when mangers were higher on control than subordinates, subordinates were more

satisfied with their manager.

Rating important characteristics in others

While considerable research has established the validity of dimensions of the FFM as predictors of job performance (e.g. Barrick & Mount, 1991), an issue of importance is to understand how managers are likely to value different personality characteristics in their subordinates and managers without having knowledge of the association between personality and performance established in the empirical research.

Implicit leadership theory (ILT) reflects the notion that individuals have unconscious views about the traits and skills that characterise leaders, and those that differentiate leaders from non-leaders (Lord, 1985). Some of these characteristics include charisma, dedication, verbal skills, sensitivity and intelligence (Offerman et al; 1994; Schyns & Schilling, 2011) and these characteristics can be categorised according to the FFM (Hogan, Curphy & Hogan, 1994).

Dunn, Mount, Barrick and Ones (1995) examined the relative importance managers place on general mental ability (GMA) and the five factors of personality when making selection decisions. Eighty-four managers rated 39 hypothetical job applicants who were described according to the Big Five personality factors and on GMA. Managers were divided into six groups whereby they evaluated applicant suitability, according to hirability and counterproductivity for one of six jobs representative of each of the six types in Holland's (1966, 1973) typology of occupational classification. As well as GMA, and in line with the meta-analytic results (e.g. Barrick & Mount, 1991) Conscientiousness were perceived as being most important across job types. The other factors were important in different job roles; specifically, Extraversion was perceived as being important in an Enterprising type job but not a Social type job. Likewise, Openness was perceived as being important in both Artistic and Investigative type jobs.

Sartori, Costantini, Ceschi, and Scalco (2017), investigated employees' perceptions of the importance of personality factors within the Five Factor model, on job performance. One hundred workers were divided into the five occupational groups that were represented in the two meta-analyses conducted by Barrick and Mount (1991) and Barrick et al. (2001). The workers were surveyed about which traits make the difference in job performance via three methods: a semi-structured interview; the rating of the relative importance of each of the Big Five personality factors for job performance, and the completion of the Big Five personality questionnaire. Results showed that overall, Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Emotional Stability were perceived to be most important in job performance while Agreeableness and Openness were perceived as least important. Importantly, ratings were affected by the method of rating; for example, when the Big Five characteristics were not explicitly named, as in the interview method, Emotional Stability did not emerge as important for job performance. However, when the Big Five was investigated by assessment of the importance of each factor, Emotional Stability was perceived as being second-most important. The effect of rater personality on these ratings was not explored, and the sample size is too small to generalise the results.

Studies have examined perceptions of important personality characteristics in individuals in different positions in the workplace (e.g. Dunn et al., 1995; Sartori et al., 2017), but, to date, there has been little work done in rating perceptions of specific important personality characteristics within the FFM, in others in the workplace, relative to the rater's own personality characteristics. One study that took steps towards this was Furnham (2002) whereby 149 managers completed the Five Factor personality inventory and subsequently rated 20 desirable characteristics, from a list composed by Kouzes and Posner (1988) in their ideal manager, colleague and subordinate. Results indicated that while they valued different characteristics in managers, colleagues and subordinates; participating managers perceived

honesty and competency as being important in all three positions. The most important

characteristics in managers included forward-looking, inspiring, intelligent and fair-minded,

and these characteristics were also in line with the findings of Kouzes and Posner (1988).

Being cooperative and possessing dependability and determination were rated as the most

important characteristics of subordinates. Personality characteristics of participants played

little role in the ratings, but it was argued by Furnham (2002) that further research is required

to confirm this. The question asked participants to rate an 'ideal' boss, colleague or

subordinate, but this may have been interpreted in terms of ideal for most workers, which

might not be associated with the rater's personality. Moreover, this study was limited by the

utilising a list of characteristics developed by Kouzes and Posner (1988); specifically, this list

did not make clear whether each characteristic was a personality, behaviour or value, and it is

important that the difference between types of characteristics are understood due to

implications for management training.

Workplace relationships, and the manager-subordinate relationship specifically, is one

of several types of relationship (Cottrell, Neuberg, & Li, 2007). Preferences for specific

characteristics in other individuals relative to the rater's own personality, have been

investigated within the romantic relationships literature. Within this research area,

preferences for others, relative to the rater's own personality, and similarity between the rater

and the preferred individual, are often assessed using within-subjects correlations between a

participant's self-rated scores on a personality inventory and their actual or ideal partner's

scores.

Using this methodology, Dijkstra and Barelds (2008) investigated the extent to which

single individuals desired romantic partners with similar rather than complementary

personality characteristics. Participants rated their own and their ideal partner's personality

on the same inventory and were subsequently asked to choose whether they find it more

important that a partner complements them or resembles them. Correlation analysis showed,

supporting the similarity-attraction hypothesis (Byrne, 1971), that participants desired a

partner who was similar to them on each of the five factors of personality.   However, when

explicitly asked whether they would prefer a similar or complementary partner, almost 90%

of participants specified that they would prefer a complementary partner. To explain this

contradictory finding, Dijkstra and Barelds (2008) suggested that when answering the explicit

question, participants may have focused on characteristics other than personality, such as

intelligence or religion; as such, the wording of this question is a key limitation.

Further support for individuals preferring similar others was provided by Figueredo et

al. (2006) who examined personality preferences, as measured by the NEO-Five Factor

Inventory (NEO-FFI) in students' ideal romantic partner. Correlations between self-ratings

and ideal partner ratings were substantial and significant, indicating that individuals want

partners who are similar to themselves on the five factors. Results also showed that as well

as seeking partners who were similar to themselves, participants also sought partners higher

in Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness, and lower in Neuroticism than

themselves.

The student-lecturer relationship perhaps more closely resembles a workplace

relationship. Furnham & Chamorro-Premuzic (2005) investigated the relationship between

student personality and intelligence and their personality preference of their lecturers. As

well as completing IQ tests, 136 students completed the NEO-PI-R and rated the desirability

of 30 characteristics on an 11-point scale designed by Furnham (2003). All characteristics

were coded onto the Big Five taxonomy. Overall, students preferred conscientious,

emotionally stable and open lecturers, and students who were less intelligent, less agreeable

and more introverted preferred agreeable lecturers. Importantly, the similarity effect (Byrne,

1971) was supported for Openness and Agreeableness. Despite the coding of characteristics

being conducted by experts and independent judges who were presented with a synopsis of the descriptors, the study would have been improved if participants rated facets of the Big Five traits or completed self-ratings and ideal partner ratings as in the romantic partner preferences (e.g. Figueredo et al., 2006).

Chamorro-Premuzic et al. (2008) replicated the study by Furnham and Chamorro-Premuzic (2005) with a larger and more representative sample, and used the NEO-FFI (Costa & McCrae, 1992) to enable facet-level investigation. Results showed that each of the Conscientiousness facets was rated positively while each of the Neuroticism facets was rated negatively. Overall, students preferred lecturers who were emotionally stable and conscientious, and excluding Neuroticism, they preferred lecturers with similar personalities to themselves. These results were supported by Kim and MacCann (2016) who found that overall, students' ideal lecturer was higher on all Big Five traits, apart from Openness, than the general population and higher than themselves. In line with the findings of Furnham and Chamorro-Premuzic (2005) and Chamorro-Premuzic et al. (2008), the similarity-attraction model (Byrne, 1971) was supported for Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness and Conscientiousness.

Individuals' preferences for romantic partners and students' preferences for lecturers are two of several types of relationships, and the results may generalise to other types of relationships, such as workplace relationships between managers and subordinates. As Furnham (2002) demonstrated, people value different characteristics in people they work for and people who work for them, and these preferences may be relative to the raters' own personality, in line with students' preferences for lecturers (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2008; Furnham & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2005; Kim &Maccann, 2016). Katz and Khan (1966) commented that "anyone who has worked under a number of different bosses has become a

student of such personality differences; anyone who has supervised a number of subordinates

has discovered how differently they respond to uniform tasks and supervisory behaviour" (p.

193). As such, it is important to foster personality awareness in managers, and accordingly

there is a need for research on personality characteristics within the FFM of personality, that

characterise managers' perceptions of good managers and subordinates overall and how their

personality affects their perceptions of those with whom they believe they would work best.

References

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1-26.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1993). Autonomy as a moderator of the relationship between the Big Five personality dimensions and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 111-118.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (2005). Yes, Personality Matters: Moving on to More Important Matters. *Human Performance, 18*(4), 359-372.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *Personality and Performance, 9*, 9-30.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Strauss, J. P. (2005). Self-monitoring as a moderator of the relationships between personality traits and performance. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 745-767.

Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., & Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and Job Performance: Test of the Mediating Effects of Motivation Among Sales Representatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 43-51. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.87.1.43

Barry, B., & Stewart, G. L. (1997). Composition, Process, and Performance in Self-Managed Groups: The Role of Personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(1), 62-78. doi:0021-9010/97

Bass, B. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bauer, T., & Green, S. (1996). Development of leader-member exchange: A longitudinal test. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(6), 1538-1567.

Bergner, S., Neubauer, A., & Kreuzthaler, A. (2010). Broad and narrow personality traits for predicting managerial success. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 19*(2), 177-199. doi:10.1080/13594320902819728

Bernerth, J. B., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., Giles, W. F., & Walker, H. J. (2008). The influence of personality differences between subordinates and supervisors on perceptions of LMX an empirical investigation. *Group & Organization Management, 33*(2), 216-240. doi:10.1177/1059601106293858

Berry, C. M., Ones, D. M., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2). doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410

Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley.

Block, J. (1995). A contrarian view of the five-factor approach to personality description. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 187-215.

Borman, W., & Motowidlo, S. (1993). *Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance* (N. Schmitt & W. Borman Eds.). New York: Jossey-Bass.

Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review, 11*, 710-725.

Buss, D. (1994). *The evolution of desire: Strategies of human mating*. New York: Basic Books.

Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.

Byrne, D., Griffitt, W., & Stefaniak, D. (1967). Attraction and similarity of personality characteristics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*, 82-90.

Campbell, J. (1983). *Some possible implications of "modeling" for the conceptualization of measurement*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Furnham, A., Christopher, A., Garwood, J., & Martin, G. (2007). Birds of a feather: Students' preferences for lecturers' personalities as predicted by their own personality and learning approaches. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44*. doi:10.10.1016/j.paid.2007.10.032

Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I., Berry, C. M., Li, N., & Gardner, R. G. (2011). The Five-Factor Model of Personality Traits and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(6), 1140-1166. doi:10.1037/a0024004

Conard, M. A., & Matthews, R. A. (2008). Modeling the stress process: Personality eclipses dysfunctional cognitions and workload in predicting stress. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44*, 171-181. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2007.07.023

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1991). *NEO five-factor inventory: Form S*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five Factor Model (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, Florida: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

Daft, R. L. (2003). *Management* (6th ed.). London: Dryden.

Dalal, R. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(1241-1255). doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241

Deluga, R. J. (1998). Leader-Member Exchange Quality and Effectiveness Ratings. *Group & Organization Management, 23*(2), 189-216.

Diensch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A

   critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review, 11*, 618-634.

Dijkstra, P., & Barelds, D. (2008). Do People Know What They Want: A Similar or

   Complementary Partner? *Evolutionary Psychology, 6*(4), 595-602.

Douglas, C., Frink, D., & Ferris, G. (2004). Emotional intelligence as a moderator of the

   relationship between conscientiousness and performance. *Journal of Leadership and*

   Organizational Studies, 10(3), 2-13.

Dunn, W. S., Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Ones, D. S. (1995). Relative Importance of

   Personality and General Mental Ability in Managers' Judgments of Applicant

   Qualifications. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(4), 500-509.

Eysenck, H. (1992). Four ways five factors are not basic. *Personality and Individual*

   Differences, 13(6), 667-673. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(92)90237-J

Fayol, H. (1949). *General and Industrial Management. trans. C. Storrs*. London: Pitman.

Figueredo, A., Sefcek, J., & Jones, D. (2006). The ideal romantic partner personality.

   Personality and Individual Differences, 41, 431-441. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2006.02.004

Furnham, A. (2002). Rating a boss, a colleague and a subordinate. *Journal of Managerial*

   Psychology, 17(8), 655-671. doi:10.1108/02683940210450450475

Furnham, A. (2003). *What do you look for in a lecturer? Unpublished questionnaire*.

   University College. London, UK.

Furnham, A., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2005). Individual Differences in Students'

   Preferences for Lecturers' Personalities. *Journal of Individual Differences, 26*(4).

   doi:10.1027/1614-0001.26.4.176

Goldberg, L. (1990). An alternative 'description of personality': The big five factor structure.

   Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59(6), 1216 - 1229. doi:10.1037/0022-

   3514.59.6.1216

Gouldner, A. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review, 25*, 161-178.

Glomb, T. M., & Welsh, E. T. (2005). Can Opposites Attract? Personality Heterogeneity in Supervisor-Subordinate Dyads as a Predictor of Subordinate Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(4), 479-757. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.749

Graen, G. (2003). *LMX Leadership: The Series: Vol. 1, Dealing with Diversity, Information Age*. Greenwich, CT.

Graen, G., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*(219-247).

Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). *Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. Research in organizational behavior* (B. M. S. L. L. Cummings Ed.). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Guion, R. M., & Gottier, R. F. (1965). Validity of personality measures in personnel selection. *Personnel Psychology, 18*, 136-164.

Hay, A., & Hodgkinson, M. (2006). Rethinking leadership: A way forward for teaching leadership? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 27*(2), 144-158. doi:10.1108/01437730610646642

Hogan, R., Curphy, G., & Hogan, J. (1994). What We Know About Leadership. Effectiveness and Personality. *American Psychologist, 49*(6), 493-504.

Holland, J. L. (1966). *The psychology of vocational choice*. Waltham, MA: Blaisdell.

Holland, J. L. (1973). *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hough, L. M., Eaton, N. K., Dunnette, M. D., Kamp, J. D., & McCloy, A. A. (1990). Crieterion-related validities of personality constructs and the effects of response distortion on those validities. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(5), 581-595.

House, R., Spangler, W., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and Charisma in the U.S. Presidency: A Psychological Theory of Leader Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*(3), 364-396.

Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job perfomrance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 869-879.

Ilies, R., Fulmer, I. S., Spitzmuller, M., & Johnson, M. (2009). Personality and Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(4), 945-959. doi:10.1037/a0013329

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. (2000). Five-Factor Model of Personality and Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(5), 751-765. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.85.5.751

Judge, T. A., Bono, J., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. (2002). Personality and Leadership: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 765-780. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.765

Kamdar, D., & Dyne, L. (2007). The Joint Effects of Personality and Workplace Social Exchange Relationships in Predicting Task Performance and Citizenship Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(5), 1286-1298. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1286

Karpin, D. (1995). *Enterprising Nation: Renewing Australia's Managers to Meet the Challenges of the Asia-Pacific Century*. Retrieved from Australian Capital Territory:

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Katz, R. (1974). Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Review, 52*(5), 90.

Kim, L. E., & MacCann, C. (2016). What is students' ideal university instructor personality? An investigation of absolute and relative personality preferences. *Personality and Individual Differences, 102*, 190-203. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.068

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1988). *The Leadership Challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kristof, A. (1996). Person–organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*, 1-49.

Lai, J., Lam, S., & Chow, C. (2015). What good soldiers are made of: the role of personality similarity. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 30*(8), 1003-1018. doi:10.1108/JMP-05-2013-0132

Leonard, D., & Strauss, S. (1997). Putting your company's whole brain to work. *Harvard Business Review, 75*(4), 111-121.

Lord, R. G. (1985). *An information processing approach to social perceptions, leadership perceptions and behavioral measurement in organizations.* (I. M. Staw & I. I. Cummings Eds.). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Meglino, B., Ravlin, E., & Adkins, C. (1991). Value congruence and satisfaction with a leader: An examination of the role of interaction. *Human Relations, 44*(481-495).

Mintzberg, H. (2005). *Managers, not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and management development*. San Fransisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Morry, M. (2005). Relationship satisfaction as a predictor of similarity ratings: A test of the attraction–similarity hypothesis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*(4), 561-584. doi:10.1177/0265407505054524

Motowidlo, S., Borman, W., & Schmit, M. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance, 10*, 71-83. doi:10.1207/s15327043hup1002_1

Motowidlo, S., & Van Scotter, J. (1994). Evidence That Task Performance Should Be

Distinguised From Contextual Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(4),

475-480.

Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Stewart, G. L. (1998). Five-factor model of personality and

performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions. *Human Performance,

11*(2/3), 145-165.

Muchinsky, P. M., & Monaghan, C. J. (1987). What is person-environment congruence?

Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,

31*, 268-277.

Neumann, G., Wagner, S., & Christiansen, N. (1999). The relationship between workteam

personality composition and the job performance of teams. *Group & Organization

Managemen, 24*, 28-45. doi:10.1177/1059601199241003

Nichols, A. L., & Cottrell, C. A. (2014). What do people desire in their leaders? The role of

leadership level on trait desirability. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*, 711-729.

doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.04.001

Offermann, L. R., Kennedy, J. K., & Wirtz, P. W. (1994). Implicit Leadership Theories:

Content, Structure, And Generealizability. *Leadership Quarterly, 5*(1), 43-58.

Pulakos, E. D., & Wexley, K. N. (1983). The relationship among perceptual similarity, sex,

and performance ratings in manager-subordinate dyads. *Acadamy of Management

Journal, 26*(129-139).

Rothman, S., & Coetzer, E. (2003). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job

Performance. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 29*(1), 68-74.

doi:10.4102/sajip.v29i1.88

Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and

counterproductive performance to global ratings of job

performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 66-80.

doi:10.1037//0021-9010.87.1.66

Salgado, J. F. (1997). The Five Factor Model of Personality and Job Performance in the

European Community. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(1), 30-43.

Sartori, R., Costantini, A., Ceschi, A., & Scalco, A. (2017). Not only correlations: a different

approach for investigating the relationship between the Big Five personality traits and

job performance based on workers and employees' perception. *Qual Quant, 51*, 2507-

2519. doi:10.1007/s11135-016-0406-2

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, T. (2004). The role of neuroticism on psychological and physiological stress

responses. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*(6), 795-804.

doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2004.04.005

Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2011). Implicit Leadership Theories: think Leader, Think

Effective? *Journal of Management Inquiry, 20*(2), 141-150.

doi:10.1177/1056492610375989

Stevens, C. D., Guthrie, J. P., Ash, R. A., & Coate, C. J. (2002). Does personality predict

preferred managerial style? Evidence from New Zealand and the United States. *Asia

Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 40*(3), 322-344.

Stogdill, R. M. (1950). Leadership, membership and organization. *Psychological Bulletin, 47*,

1-14.

Strauss, J. P., Barrick, M. R., & Connerley, M. L. (2001). An investigation of personality

similarity effects (relational and perceived) on peer and supervisor ratings and the role

of familiarity and liking. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,

74*, 637-657.

Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality Measures as Predictors of Job

Performance: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 703-742.

Turban, D., & Jones, A. (1988). Supervisor-Subordinate Similarity: Types, Effects, and

Mechanisms. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*(2), 228-234.

Witt, L. A., Burke, L. A., Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (2002). The Interactive Effects of

Conscientiousness and Agreeableness on Job Performance. *Journal of Applied

Psychology, 87*(1), 164-169. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.87.1.164

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice

Hall.

Zalenzik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review,

55*(3), 67-78.

PERSONALITIES OF PREFERRED MANAGERS AND SUBORDINATES

Author details: Stephanie Whelan, University of Adelaide

Please note:

The Journal of Managerial Psychology adheres to Harvard style, not APA style.

Journal of Managerial Psychology

Manuscript requirements

Please prepare your manuscript before submission, using the following guidelines:

Format	Article files should be provided in Microsoft Word format. LaTex files can be used if an accompanying PDF document is provided. PDF as a sole file type is not accepted, a PDF must be accompanied by the source file. Acceptable figure file types are listed further below.
Article Length	Articles should be between 5000 and 7500 words in length. This includes all text including references and appendices. Please allow 280 words for each figure or table.
Article Title	A title of not more than eight words should be provided.
Author details	All contributing authors' names should be added to the ScholarOne submission, and their names arranged in the correct order for publication. • Correct email addresses should be supplied for each author in their separate author accounts • The full name of each author must be present in their author account in the exact format they should appear for publication, including or excluding any middle names or initials as required • The affiliation of each contributing author should be correct in their individual author account. The affiliation listed should be where they were based at the time that the research for the paper was conducted
Biographies and acknowledgements	Authors who wish to include these items should save them together in an MS Word file to be uploaded with the submission. If they are to be included, a brief professional biography of not more than 100 words should be supplied for each named author.
Research funding	Authors must declare all sources of external research funding in their article and a statement to this effect should appear in the Acknowledgements section. Authors should describe the role of the funder or financial sponsor in the entire research process, from study design to submission.
Structured Abstract	Authors must supply a structured abstract in their submission, set out under 4-7 sub-headings (see our "How to... write an abstract" guide for practical help and guidance): • Purpose (mandatory) • Design/methodology/approach (mandatory) • Findings (mandatory) • Research limitations/implications (if applicable) • Practical implications (if applicable) • Social implications (if applicable) • Originality/value (mandatory) Maximum is 250 words in total (including keywords and article classification, see below). Authors should avoid the use of personal pronouns within the structured

	abstract and body of the paper (e.g. "this paper investigates..." is correct, "I investigate..." is incorrect).
Keywords	Authors should provide appropriate and short keywords in the ScholarOne submission that encapsulate the principal topics of the paper (see the How to... ensure your article is highly downloaded guide for practical help and guidance on choosing search-engine friendly keywords). The maximum number of keywords is 12.
	Whilst Emerald will endeavour to use submitted keywords in the published version, all keywords are subject to approval by Emerald's in house editorial team and may be replaced by a matching term to ensure consistency.
Article Classification	Authors must categorize their paper as part of the submission process. The category which most closely describes their paper should be selected from the list below.
	Research paper. This category covers papers which report on any type of research undertaken by the author(s). The research may involve the construction or testing of a model or framework, action research, testing of data, market research or surveys, empirical, scientific or clinical research.
	Conceptual paper. These papers will not be based on research but will develop hypotheses. The papers are likely to be discursive and will cover philosophical discussions and comparative studies of others' work and thinking.
	Case study. Case studies describe actual interventions or experiences within organizations. They may well be subjective and will not generally report on research. A description of a legal case or a hypothetical case study used as a teaching exercise would also fit into this category.
Headings	Headings must be concise, with a clear indication of the distinction between the hierarchy of headings.
	The preferred format is for first level headings to be presented in bold format and subsequent sub-headings to be presented in medium italics.
Notes/Endnotes	Notes or Endnotes should be used only if absolutely necessary and must be identified in the text by consecutive numbers, enclosed in square brackets and listed at the end of the article.
Figures	All Figures (charts, diagrams, line drawings, web pages/screenshots, and photographic images) should be submitted in electronic form.
	All Figures should be of high quality, legible and numbered consecutively with arabic numerals. Graphics may be supplied in colour to facilitate their appearance on the online database.
	• Figures created in MS Word, MS PowerPoint, MS Excel, Illustrator should be supplied in their native formats. Electronic figures created in other applications should be copied from the origination software and pasted into a blank MS Word document or saved and imported into an MS Word document or alternatively create a .pdf file from the origination software. • Figures which cannot be supplied as above are acceptable in the standard image formats which are: .pdf, .ai, and .eps. If you are

unable to supply graphics in these formats then please ensure they are .tif, .jpeg, or .bmp at a resolution of at least 300dpi and at least 10cm wide.

- To prepare web pages/screenshots simultaneously press the "Alt" and "Print screen" keys on the keyboard, open a blank Microsoft Word document and simultaneously press "Ctrl" and "V" to paste the image. (Capture all the contents/windows on the computer screen to paste into MS Word, by simultaneously pressing "Ctrl" and "Print screen".)
- Photographic images should be submitted electronically and of high quality. They should be saved as .tif or .jpeg files at a resolution of at least 300dpi and at least 10cm wide. Digital camera settings should be set at the highest resolution/quality possible.

Tables	Tables should be typed and included in a separate file to the main body of the article. The position of each table should be clearly labelled in the body text of article with corresponding labels being clearly shown in the separate file. Ensure that any superscripts or asterisks are shown next to the relevant items and have corresponding explanations displayed as footnotes to the table, figure or plate.
References	References to other publications must be in **Harvard** style and carefully checked for completeness, accuracy and consistency. This is very important in an electronic environment because it enables your readers to exploit the Reference Linking facility on the database and link back to the works you have cited through CrossRef. You should cite publications in the text: (Adams, 2006) using the first named author's name or (Adams and Brown, 2006) citing both names of two, or (Adams *et al.*, 2006), when there are three or more authors. At the end of the paper a reference list in alphabetical order should be supplied:
For books	Surname, Initials (year), *Title of Book*, Publisher, Place of publication. e.g. Harrow, R. (2005), *No Place to Hide*, Simon & Schuster, New York, NY.
For book chapters	Surname, Initials (year), "Chapter title", Editor's Surname, Initials, *Title of Book*, Publisher, Place of publication, pages. e.g. Calabrese, F.A. (2005), "The early pathways: theory to practice – a continuum", in Stankosky, M. (Ed.), *Creating the Discipline of Knowledge Management*, Elsevier, New York, NY, pp. 15-20.
For journals	Surname, Initials (year), "Title of article", *Journal Name*, volume issue, pages. e.g. Capizzi, M.T. and Ferguson, R. (2005), "Loyalty trends for the twenty-first century", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 72-80.
For published conference proceedings	Surname, Initials (year of publication), "Title of paper", in Surname, Initials (Ed.), *Title of published proceeding which may include place and date(s) held*, Publisher, Place of publication, Page numbers. e.g. Jakkilinki, R., Georgievski, M. and Sharda, N. (2007), "Connecting destinations with an ontology-based e-tourism planner", in *Information and communication technologies in tourism 2007 proceedings of the*

	international conference in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 2007, Springer-Verlag, Vienna, pp. 12-32. yleeee
For unpublished conference proceedings	Surname, Initials (year), "Title of paper", paper presented at Name of Conference, date of conference, place of conference, available at: URL if freely available on the internet (accessed date). e.g. Aumueller, D. (2005), "Semantic authoring and retrieval within a wiki", paper presented at the European Semantic Web Conference (ESWC), 29 May-1 June, Heraklion, Crete, available at: http://dbs.uni-leipzig.de/file/aumueller05wiksar.pdf (accessed 20 February 2007).
For working papers	Surname, Initials (year), "Title of article", working paper [number if available], Institution or organization, Place of organization, date. e.g. Moizer, P. (2003), "How published academic research can inform policy decisions: the case of mandatory rotation of audit appointments", working paper, Leeds University Business School, University of Leeds, Leeds, 28 March.
For encyclopedia entries (with no author or editor)	*Title of Encyclopedia* (year) "Title of entry", volume, edition, Title of Encyclopedia, Publisher, Place of publication, pages. e.g. *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1926) "Psychology of culture contact", Vol. 1, 13th ed., Encyclopaedia Britannica, London and New York, NY, pp. 765-71. (For authored entries please refer to book chapter guidelines above)
For newspaper articles (authored)	Surname, Initials (year), "Article title", *Newspaper*, date, pages. e.g. Smith, A. (2008), "Money for old rope", *Daily News*, 21 January, pp. 1, 3-4.
For newspaper articles (non-authored)	*Newspaper* (year), "Article title", date, pages. e.g. *Daily News* (2008), "Small change", 2 February, p. 7.
For archival or other unpublished sources	Surname, Initials, (year), "Title of document", Unpublished Manuscript, collection name, inventory record, name of archive, location of archive. e.g. Litman, S. (1902), "Mechanism & Technique of Commerce", Unpublished Manuscript, Simon Litman Papers, Record series 9/5/29 Box 3, University of Illinois Archives, Urbana-Champaign, IL.
For electronic sources	If available online, the full URL should be supplied at the end of the reference, as well as a date that the resource was accessed. e.g. Castle, B. (2005), "Introduction to web services for remote portlets", available at: http://www-128.ibm.com/developerworks/library/ws-wsrp/ (accessed 12 November 2007). Standalone URLs, i.e. without an author or date, should be included either within parentheses within the main text, or preferably set as a note (roman numeral within square brackets within text followed by the full URL address at the end of the paper).

Abstract

Purpose: This study explored personality traits within the Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality, that characterise managers' perceptions of the personalities of their preferred managers and subordinates, and the extent to which managers' own personality influenced their perceptions of those with whom they believe they would work best.

Design/methodology/approach: Participating mangers (N=78) completed the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John *et al.,*1991; John *et al.,* 2008) for themselves, their preferred manager and their preferred subordinate. Participants also provided open-ended rankings of characteristics perceived to be important for their preferred managers and subordinates. Correlation analyses and t-tests were conducted, and all open-ended rankings were coded according to the factors and facets of the Five Factor Model of personality.

Findings: Participants preferred managers to be more open and extraverted and less neurotic than subordinates, while preferring subordinates to be more conscientious than managers. In addition to wanting them to be similar to themselves on each of the five factors, participants preferred managers and subordinates who were higher on the socially desirable five factor traits than themselves and lower in neuroticism.

Originality/value: The results of this study may be beneficial for developing managers' awareness of how their own and others' personalities affect their working relationships. Developing this awareness in management training courses may assist managers to develop more positive working relationships. The methodology utilised to assess personality preferences in this study is a new approach within this area of organisational research.

Keywords: Personality, Big Five, Similarity, Perceptions, Manager, Subordinate

Paper type: Research paper

Introduction

Positive working relationships between managers and subordinates are important for both

individuals and organisations (Dulebohn *et al*., 2012). One factor that is associated with both

organisational outcomes and interpersonal relationships within the workplace is personality

(Deluga, 1998). Katz and Khan (1966, p. 193) commented that 'anyone who has worked

under a number of different bosses has become a student of such personality differences;

anyone who has supervised a number of subordinates has discovered how differently they

respond to uniform tasks and supervisory behaviour'.

Recently, most of the research linking personality with organisational outcomes has utilised

the Five Factor Model of personality (FFM; Costa and McRae, 1992) as an organising

framework. The FFM is comprised of five broad personality traits: Openness,

Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability (also referred to as its

opposite, Neuroticism, and each of which is comprised of six narrower facets. Meta-analytic

research has established that within the FFM, Conscientiousness and Emotional Stability are

key predictors of performance across jobs (e.g. Salgado, 1997). Indeed, in relation to

Conscientiousness, Barrick, *et al.* (2001) suggested that it would be difficult to imagine a job

where positive outcomes are associated with being careless, impulsive and low achievement-

striving.

It has been proposed that Conscientiousness and Emotional stability may be regarded as

measures of personality-trait based work motivation, such that they affect performance

through their associated motivational mechanisms, and the relevance of the other factors is

dependent on job type or criteria (Barrick and Mount, 2005). For example, Extraversion has

been found to predict performance in jobs that require substantial interpersonal interaction,

such as those in sales or management (Hurtz and Donovan, 2000; Mount *et al.,* 1998;

Salgado, 1997) and Agreeableness has been associated with teamwork (Mount *et al.,*1998).

An issue of importance is to understand how managers may value different traits in people

they work for versus those who work for them. Within selection and performance appraisal

settings, managers are familiar with specifying the qualities they seek in candidates

(Furnham, 2002). For example, Dunn, *et al.,* (1995) found that in addition to General Mental

Ability (GMA), managers perceived Conscientiousness as most important in candidates

across job types, while other traits were perceived as important in different jobs depending on

their 'type' within Holland's (1966, 1973) Occupational Classification Typology. In line

with the meta-analytic studies (e.g. Barrick and Mount, 1991), Extraversion was perceived as

being important in enterprising jobs while Openness was perceived as being important in

both artistic and investigative type jobs.

Similarly, Sartori *et al.,* (2017), surveyed employees from five occupational groups (see

Barrick and Mount, 1991) on which Big Five traits are important for job performance via

three methods; a semi-structured interview, their rating of the relative importance of each of

the Big Five personality factors for job performance, and the completion of a Big Five

personality questionnaire. Results showed that overall, Conscientiousness, Extraversion and

Emotional Stability were perceived to be most important in job performance while

Agreeableness and Openness were perceived as least important. However, ratings were

affected by the method of rating; for example, when the Big Five characteristics were not

explicitly named, as in the interview method, Emotional Stability did not emerge as important

for job performance but when the Big Five was investigated by assessment of the importance

of each factor, Emotional Stability was perceived as being second-most important. The effect

of rater personality on these assessments was not explored.

Characteristics that represent effective or emergent leaders have been studied extensively

(e.g. Bass, 1990; Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991). Some of these characteristics include; drive

(achievement, ambition, energy) and self-confidence (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991).

Importantly, dimensions of the FFM are related to aspects of leadership (e.g. Judge and Bono,

2000; Judge *et al.,* 2002) and managerial success (e.g. Bergner *et al.,* 2010). For example,

Judge and Bono (2000) found Agreeableness to be the strongest predictor of transformational

leadership (motivational and inspirational leadership; Bass and Aviolo, 1994), and this

finding was explained in terms of the social nature of Agreeableness aligning with the social

context in which leadership occurs. Extraversion has been found to be the most important

trait of effective and emergent leadership (Judge *et al.,* 2002) and a predictor of performance

(e.g. Barrick *et al.,* 2001). Bergner *et al.,* (2010) suggested that it is probable that individuals

who are dominant and outgoing are at the fore in group situations, and those who are

ambitious and dominant are more likely to accomplish their managerial goals.

Conscientiousness displayed the second-strongest correlation with leadership across criteria

and settings (Judge *et al.,* 2002) with the authors suggesting that task-oriented behaviours of

conscientious individuals may lead to their emergence as leaders (Judge *et al.,* 2002).

Importantly, perceptions of important traits in leaders may be affected by raters' implicit

leadership theories (ILTs), which reflect the notion that individuals hold their own

unconscious views about the traits and abilities that characterise leaders (Lord, 1985); these include charisma, dedication and intelligence (Offerman *et al.,* 1994).

The manager-subordinate dyad, despite consisting of only two members, may be the most fundamental type of group because differences in one member are likely to have a larger impact on the other member than they would in a larger group (Bernerth *et al.,* 2008). While many leadership and management models and theories exist, unique insight into the manager subordinate relationship can be gained through Leader Member Exchange Theory (LMX; Graen and Scandura, 1987). LMX proposes that over time leaders develop differential working relationships with each of their subordinates, based on exchanges, which can range from low to high quality (Graen, 2003). High-quality LMX is characterised by trust, reciprocal respect and loyalty (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995; Diensch and Linden, 1986) while low-quality LMX is based solely on fulfilling formal obligations such as the employment contract (Bauer and Green, 1996). Notably, Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) suggested that productivity will be improved if managers develop high-quality relationships with each and all of their subordinates rather than just a few.

Accordingly, in addition to having overall preferences for traits in others, managers may also have relative preferences for personality traits in their own managers and subordinates based on their levels of the traits. Rater personality has been found to predict performance ratings (Harari *et al.,* 2015) preferences for both managerial (e.g. Stevens *et al.,* 2002) and leadership styles (e.g. Ehrhart and Klein, 2001). According to Byrne's (1971) similarity-attraction model, individuals are attracted to others to whom they are similar on dimensions such as personality, attitudes and demographic characteristics. Within workplace

relationships, interpersonal similarity has been found to positively affect tangible outcomes such as Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCBs; Lai *et al.,* 2014), job satisfaction (e.g. Turban and Jones, 1988), performance ratings (e.g. Pulakos and Wekley, 1982) and LMX quality (e.g. Bauer and Green, 1996; Bernerth *et al.,* 2008). Some mechanisms by which interpersonal similarity may lead to these positive outcomes in the workplace are through similarity in task interpretation style (Bauer and Green, 1996), greater behavioural predictability (Meglino *et al.,*1991), increased trust (Bauer and Green, 1996), and through a common system of communication (Schein, 1985).

Within the organisational context, studies of manager subordinate similarity have measured 'actual', or objectively measured similarity between both members of the dyad on attitudes, personality and demographic characteristics (Turban and Jones, 1988). For example, Bernerth *et al.,* (2008) found actual similarity between supervisor and subordinate in Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Openness and Emotional Stability were positively associated with subordinate perception of LMX. Likewise, similarity in positive affectivity, similar to Extraversion, has been positively associated with performance ratings and LMX quality (Bauer and Green, 1996).

Acknowledging that Conscientiousness is a key factor associated with effective job performance (e.g. Barrick and Mount, 1991), Deluga (1998) found that supervisor subordinate actual similarity in Conscientiousness facilitates high quality LMX and productivity. When both members are similar in conscientiousness, they both work with the same level of diligence towards their goals, understanding the relative importance of each other for achievement of their goals (Deluga, 1998). Thus, different levels of

conscientiousness are likely to cause dissatisfaction between managers and subordinates.

Other studies have also measured perceived similarity, or one member of the dyad's

perception of similarity in those characteristics (Turban and Jones, 1988). For example,

Strauss *et al.,*(2001) found in a study of sales people, that both peer and supervisor ratings of

perceived similarity in Agreeableness, Emotional Stability and Extraversion were associated

with higher performance ratings.

Despite the positive outcomes of interpersonal similarity, dissimilarities between individuals

can be beneficial. Within the person-organisation fit (P-O fit) perspective, interpersonal

dissimilarity has typically been investigated in relation to complementarity (Kristof, 1996)

whereby characteristics of an individual, typically skills and ability, complete the

organisational environment by adding the missing characteristics (Muchinsky and Monahan,

1987). For example, Leonard and Strauss (1997) suggested that it is beneficial for

individuals with different cognitive styles to work together as it leads to more creative

decision making, while similarities in cognitive style may stifle that creativity. Similarly, a

team comprised of some extraverted members has been found to be beneficial for team

performance, but too many or too few would be detrimental; for example, if all members of

the group sought leadership positions, conflict would likely occur (Barry and Stewart, 1997;

Neuman *et al.,* 1999). Glomb and Welsh (2005) investigated whether dissimilarity on the

dimension of 'control', similar to Extraversion facets of 'dominance' and 'assertiveness' on

the FFM, would predict positive outcomes; specifically, whether differences between

manager and subordinate (where the manager scored higher), would be related to higher

subordinate satisfaction with manager, subordinate organisational citizenship behaviour and

lower subordinate work withdrawal. Results showed that when managers were higher on

control than subordinates, subordinate satisfaction with their manager was higher. Moreover,

subordinate satisfaction with manager was low when managers were lower in control than subordinates.

While research has established associations between personality and performance (e.g. Barrick and Mount, 1991), positive outcomes from both interpersonal similarity (e.g. Bernerth *et al.,*2008) and dissimilarity (Glomb and Welsh, 2005), and preferences for both managerial (e.g. Stevens *et al.,* 2002) and leadership styles (e.g. Ehrhart and Klein, 2001), studies that relate individuals' own personality traits to those that they seek in their managers and subordinates are limited. Furnham (2002) took steps towards this in a study which motivated the current study. Managers (N=149) completed the NEO-FFI (Costa and McCrae, 1998) and subsequently rated 20 desirable characteristics in their ideal managers, subordinates and colleagues. Participants perceived honesty and competence as being important in all three positions, but the most important characteristics in managers included forward-looking, inspiring, intelligent and fair-minded; these findings were in line with those of Kouzes and Posner (1988). Being cooperative and possessing dependability and determination were rated as the most important characteristics of subordinates. Personality characteristics of participants were not strong predictors of ratings; specifically, results showed that less conscientious individuals valued a supportive manager, but it was argued by Furnham (2002) that further research is required to confirm this. Furnham (2002) asked participants to rate an 'ideal' boss, colleague or subordinate, but this may have been interpreted in terms of ideal for most workers, which might not be associated with the rater's personality. Additionally, the list of characteristics, which had been developed by Kouzes and Posner (1988), did not specify whether each characteristic was a personality, behaviour or value, and it is important that the difference between types of characteristics are understood due to implications for management training.

Workplace relationships, and the manager-subordinate relationship specifically, are one of

several types of relationship (Cottrell *et al.,* 2007). Other relationships include romantic

relationships, and preferences for personality traits in other people, based on the raters' own

personality, have been investigated within this context (e.g. Dijkstra and Barelds, 2008).

Within these studies, individuals' preferences for personality traits of their partner, relative to

the rater's own traits, are often assessed using within-subjects correlations between an

individual's self-rated scores on a personality inventory and their actual or ideal partner's

scores. This is an approach which is not typically used within organisational research but may

offer unique insights. Supporting the similarity-attraction model (Byrne, 1971), several

studies have shown that people desire partners who are similar to them on each factor within

the FFM (Dijkstra and Barelds, 2008; Figueredo *et al.,* 2006). In addition to seeking partners

who were similar to themselves, Figueredo *et al.,* (2006) found that participants also wanted

partners higher in Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness, and lower in

Neuroticism than themselves.

The lecturer-student relationship perhaps more closely resembles a workplace relationship,

and students' preferences for lecturers' personalities have been studied using the

methodology employed in the romantic relationships studies. Furnham and Chamorro-

Premuzic (2005) found that students preferred conscientious, emotionally stable and open

lecturers, and students who were less intelligent, less agreeable and more introverted

preferred agreeable lecturers. Importantly, the similarity-attraction model (Byrne, 1971) was

supported for Openness and Agreeableness. In a larger and more representative replication of

the study by Furnham and Chamorro-Premuzic (2005), Chamorro-Premuzic *et al.,* (2008)

found that students preferred lecturers who were emotionally stable and conscientious, and

excluding Neuroticism, they preferred lecturers with similar personalities to themselves.

These results were supported by Kim and MacCann (2016) who also found that students'

ideal lecturer was higher on all socially desirable FFM traits, apart from Openness, than both

themselves and the general population.

Preferences with respect to the personality of others may generalise to other interpersonal

relationships (Furnham and Chamorro-Premuzic, 2005). To the author's knowledge, to date,

no study has investigated specific personality characteristics within the FFM of personality

that characterise managers' perceptions of the traits they consider characterise a personally

preferred manager and subordinate for themselves and the extent to which their own

personalities affect their ratings. The little role rater personality played in ratings of important

characteristics in managers and subordinates found by Furnham (2002) requires further

investigation and, in particular, whether personality would affect ratings of a manager or

subordinate that the rater would personally prefer rather than generally good. While

exploring important characteristics and traits in leaders and employees other authors did not

examine the effect of rater personality on their ratings (e.g. Dunn *et al.,* 1995; Sartori *et al.,*

2017). Accordingly, the current exploratory study has two major aims; first, to extend

existing research by exploring only personality characteristics within the FFM of personality,

that characterise managers' perceptions of their personally preferred managers and

subordinates. The second aim is to explore the extent to which managers' own personalities

affect their ratings of the personalities of their preferred managers and subordinates; that is,

those with whom they believe they would work best.

Method

Research Participants

Participants consisted of 78 managers with ages ranging from 18 to 65 years and over (41% were aged between 35 and 44). There were 35 males and 43 females. Graduates of the Executive Education program at the University of Adelaide comprised 19.2% of the participants and the remainder were obtained through snowball sampling. Specifically, participants were able to share the survey with other individuals who met the criteria. At the time of completing the survey, 15.4% of all participants were employed in a junior management position, 59% in a middle management position, and 24% in a senior management position. Participants represented a range of industries which were coded according to the Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification (ANZSIC; ABS, 2006); 20.5% of participants were employed in professional occupations, 15.4% in the financial industry, 11.5% in the education industry, 10.3% in the health industry, 9% each in the retail industry and public sector, 7.7% in the agriculture industry, 5.1% in the administrative industry, 2.6% each in accommodation and other industries, and the remaining 6.5% were employed in the mining, manufacturing, electricity, wholesale and transport industries.

Measures

Participant Personality

The participants' self-reported personality was measured via the 44-item Big Five Inventory (BFI; John *et al.,*1991; John *et al.,* 2008). Sample items are: 'I see myself as someone who': 'is talkative' (Extraversion), 'tends to find fault with others' (Agreeableness), 'Does things

efficiently' (Conscientiousness), 'Gets nervous easily' (Neuroticism), and 'Likes to reflect, play with ideas' (Openness). Items were scored on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly). Total scores for each of the five domains were computed by averaging the item scores for each domain. The BFI was considered to be an appropriate measure of personality for the current study as it can be completed in approximately five minutes and it has good psychometric properties. Specifically, the validity of the BFI has been confirmed in relation to the NEO-FFI by John and Srivastava (1999), and it has been used in several studies to measure the broad Big Five personality traits (e.g. Ryan and Xenos, 2011). Agreeableness and Conscientiousness were measured with nine items ($\alpha = 0.77$ and $\alpha = 0.79$ respectively), Extraversion and Neuroticism were measured with eight items ($\alpha = 0.87$ and $\alpha = 0.83$ respectively), and Openness to Experience was measured with ten items ($\alpha = 0.79$).

Preferred Manager and Subordinate Personality

Participants' preferred managers' and subordinates' personality traits were measured via modified versions of the BFI where participants responded as they believe their preferred manager or subordinate would respond. For example, a sample item for their preferred manager was: 'I see the manager who would get the best out of me (in performance and job satisfaction) as someone who' and a sample item for their preferred subordinate was: 'I see the subordinate who I would get the best out of (in performance and job satisfaction) as someone who'. No other changes were made to the original inventory. Items were scored on the same five-point scale. Internal consistency reliabilities, which were satisfactory, ranging from .68 to .85 for preferred manager, and .70 to .87 for preferred subordinate, are reported in table 1.

Ranking of Important Personality characteristics in Managers and Subordinates

Participants were asked to provide their rankings of five important personality characteristics in managers and subordinates in order of importance. These questions allowed for rankings to be obtained without being prompted. They were given the following instructions: 'Assuming competence, in order for a manger to get the best out of me (in performance and job satisfaction), the most important personality characteristics of the manager would be: Please provide up to 5 personality characteristics in order of importance' and 'In order for me to get the most out of the subordinate whom I manage (in performance and job satisfaction), the most important personality characteristics of the subordinate would be (again, assuming competence). Please provide up to 5 personality characteristics in order of importance'. Rankings of personality characteristics perceived to be important in managers and subordinates are reported in tables 6 and 7.

Procedure

Past Executive Education students at the University of Adelaide and participants obtained through snowball sampling methods detailed previously were emailed an invitation and link to complete the online questionnaire which was hosted by third-party website SurveyMonkey.

Participants were required to be over 18 years of age, to have managed staff and to have been managed themselves. Informed consent was obtained for all participants; participants were informed that their participation was voluntary, that they could withdraw from the study at any time, and that their data was confidential with only group data being reported.

In total, 106 participants were obtained. After excluding 28 participants who did not complete the survey or did not meet the inclusion criteria, data were available for 78 participants. Participants were given the option to receive feedback on the BFI and to enter the draw to win one of two gift cards. The Human Research Ethics committee at the University of Adelaide approved the protocol.

Statistical Analysis

All statistical analyses were undertaken using SPSS Statistics version 25. To account for the violation of the assumption of normality, a bootstrapping procedure with 1000 iterations to generate bias corrected and accelerated (BCa) 95% confidence intervals were used for all statistical analyses (Wright *et al.,* 2011). All open-ended responses were coded according to the Big Five factors and facets utilising the adjective check list provided in the NEO-PI-R manual (Costa and McCrae,1991, p. 49) by the author and independently checked for consistency by a second rater with the few discrepancies resolved through discussion.

Results

Descriptive statistics and reliability

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics and internal consistency reliability for the participants' self-ratings of personality, their preferred manager, and their preferred subordinate.

(Insert Table 1 here)

Comparisons between self-ratings and preferred manager ratings

Paired samples t-tests with bootstrapping were conducted to determine whether participants' ratings of important personality traits in their preferred managers were significantly different to their own self-ratings on that trait. The results of the paired samples t-tests are shown in table 2. On average, participants preferred managers who were more Open, Conscientious, Extraverted and Agreeable than themselves, and less Neurotic than themselves. The largest effect sizes were for Neuroticism (d=1.41), Conscientiousness (d=.84) and Agreeableness (d=.82).

(Insert Table 2 here)

Comparisons between self-ratings and preferred subordinate ratings

Paired samples t-tests with bootstrapping were conducted to determine whether participants' ratings of important personality traits in their preferred subordinates were significantly different to their own self-ratings on that trait. The results of the paired samples t-tests are shown in table 3. On average, participants preferred subordinates who were more Conscientious, more Agreeable and less Neurotic than themselves. Results for Openness and Extraversion were not significant for preferred subordinates.

In sum, these results suggest that overall, participants prefer their managers to be more Open, Conscientious, Extraverted and Agreeable than themselves, while preferring their subordinates to be more Conscientious and Agreeable than themselves. Participants prefer both their subordinates and managers to be less neurotic than themselves.

(Insert Table 3 here)

Comparisons between preferred manager ratings and preferred subordinate ratings

Paired samples t-tests with bootstrapping were conducted to determine whether ratings for preferred managers were significantly different to ratings for preferred subordinates. The results of the paired samples t-tests are shown in table 4. On average, participants preferred managers to be more Open and Extraverted, and less Neurotic than subordinates. On the other hand, participants preferred subordinates to be more Conscientious than managers. Results for Agreeableness were not significant.

(Insert Table 4 here)

Participants' Personality Correlates of their preferred Managers and Subordinates' Personality Traits

Bivariate correlations were conducted to examine the relationship between participants' personality and their preferences for their managers' and subordinates' personalities. In studies of ideal partner preferences, to investigate similarity between self-ratings and ideal partner ratings, Liu *et al.,* (2018) followed the suggestion of Rogers *et al.,* (2018, p. 115) that 'simple between-person correlations are a straightforward approach to assess questions of correspondence for single attributes'. Pearson's *r* correlation coefficients and bias corrected and accelerated bootstrap 95% CIs are reported in brackets in table 5. There were several significant correlations between participants' personality and their preferred managers' personality. Specifically, participants' Openness scores were significantly and positively correlated with the openness scores of their preferred managers. Participants' Conscientiousness scores were significantly and positively correlated with the openness, conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness scores of their preferred managers. Participants' Extraversion scores were significantly and positively correlated with the extraversion scores of their preferred managers. Participants' Agreeableness scores were significantly and positively correlated with the conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness scores of their preferred managers, and significantly negatively correlated with

the neuroticism scores of their preferred managers. Participants' Neuroticism scores were significant positively correlated with the neuroticism scores of their preferred managers.

Regarding preferred subordinates, participants' Openness scores were significantly and positively correlated with the openness scores of their preferred subordinates. Participants' Conscientiousness scores were significantly and positively correlated with the conscientiousness and agreeableness scores of their preferred subordinates, and significantly negatively correlated with the neuroticism scores of their preferred subordinates. Participants' Extraversion scores were significantly positively correlated with the extraversion scores of their preferred subordinates. Participants' Agreeableness scores were significantly positively correlated with the conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness scores of their preferred subordinates, and significantly negatively correlated with the neuroticism scores of their preferred subordinates. Participants' Neuroticism scores were significantly negatively correlated with the extraversion scores of their preferred subordinates and significantly positively correlated with the neuroticism scores of their preferred subordinates.

In sum, these results suggest that managers prefer their managers and subordinates to be similar to themselves on all of the five personality traits except for neuroticism. For example, the more Open, the manager is, the more open they prefer both their managers and subordinates to be, and likewise for the other traits except neuroticism where, for example, the more conscientious they are, the less neurotic the prefer their managers and subordinates to be.

(Insert Table 5 here)

Open-Ended Rankings of Important Personality Traits in Managers and Subordinates

Tables 6 and 7 show the frequencies of choice for each of the Big Five factors and their position in terms of perceived importance in managers (table 6) and subordinates (table 7). Two factors are important to note in this analysis. Firstly, Neuroticism-related characteristics were analysed according to its inverse, Emotional stability, as participants ranked positive characteristics only. Secondly, 'Honesty' was coded under the Straightforwardness facet of Agreeableness. Ashton and Lee (2005) suggested that the Straightforwardness and Modesty facets of Agreeableness can together provide a close approximation to the Honesty-Humility domain of the HEXACO-PI. 'Straightforwardness' was chosen for the current study due to its stronger correlation with Honesty-Humility (r=.55 compared to r=.42 for Modesty).

Open-ended rankings of important personality traits in managers are shown in table 6. As shown in table 6, participants perceived Agreeableness as the most important trait in managers. Agreeableness was ranked in first position 39 times and in second position 29 times. Importantly, these rankings were driven by the facet of 'trust', which emerged 19 times as the most important trait and 9 times in second position. Conscientiousness emerged as the second most important trait in managers, and again these rankings were driven by the

facet of 'competence'. Extraversion was perceived to be the third most important factor in managers and rankings were driven by the facets of 'warmth' and 'assertiveness' which were mentioned 20 times each. Openness and Neuroticism (Emotional Stability) were perceived to be slightly less important in managers, being mentioned 26 and 13 times respectively. 'Leadership' emerged as important in managers 10 times but was excluded as it could not be accurately categorised according to the facets of the FFM.

(Insert Table 6 here)

As shown in table 7, participants perceived Conscientiousness as the most important trait in subordinates, being mentioned 125 times overall. The facet of 'dutifulness' was mentioned 43 times overall. Second-most important in subordinates was Agreeableness, and 'trust' was the most important facet. As with managers, Openness and Neuroticism (Emotional Stability) were perceived as of lower importance in subordinates.

In sum, these results suggest that, participants perceive Agreeableness as the most important trait in managers followed by Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Openness and Neuroticism (Emotional Stability). In subordinates, Conscientiousness was ranked as being most important followed by Agreeableness, then Extraversion, Openness and Neuroticism (Emotional Stability).

(Insert Table 7 here)

Discussion

The current study was motivated by a study by Furnham (2002) which investigated whether managers valued desirable characteristics differently in managers, colleagues and subordinates, and in which the list of characteristics utilised was developed by Kouzes and Posner (1988) and did not differentiate between personality, ability and value characteristics. By investigating only personality traits and utilising the widely accepted Five Factor Model of personality as an organising framework, the present study enabled direct comparisons to be made with prior studies linking personality to organisational outcomes (e.g. Barrick and Mount, 1991). The methodology utilised in the current study; specifically, having participants rate their personality and that of their preferred manager and subordinate on the same personality inventory is common in the romantic partner preference research (e.g. Dijkstra and Barelds, 2008), but is a novel approach within this area of organisational research.

Participants rated the traits in the same order of importance for both managers and subordinates; Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Openness, Extraversion, Neuroticism. In the open-ended questions, however, there were some differences in ranking order; specifically, participants ranked personality characteristics which were subsequently classified in terms of Agreeableness as the most important trait in their preferred managers followed by those classified as Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Openness and Neuroticism

(Emotional Stability). In their preferred subordinates, characteristics classified in terms of

Conscientiousness were still perceived as being most important followed by those classified

in terms of Agreeableness, then Extraversion, Openness and Neuroticism (Emotional

Stability).

In a study relating the Big Five personality factors to transformational leadership behaviour,

Agreeableness was the strongest predictor, and Judge and Bono (2000, p. 761) suggested that

'if subordinates were asked to evaluate the desired traits in a leader, it seems plausible that

Agreeableness might emerge as the most important trait'. The open-ended rankings in the

current study support this. Importantly, in the open-ended questions, the rankings for

Agreeableness were driven by being trusting and straightforward. Honesty was coded under

the facet of Straightforwardness and has been established as being perceived as important in

all positions, including managers (Furnham, 2002). As work is becoming increasingly team-

based (Aronson *et al.,* 2014), it is not surprising that the sympathetic and cooperative nature

of agreeable individuals (Costa and McCrae, 1992) is desired in both managers and

subordinates, considering that such individuals are likely to be motivated to get along with

others in their teams (Barrick *et al.,* 2002), and be engaged in organisational citizenship

behaviours (e.g. Chiaburu *et al.,* 2011).

While the order of participants' rankings of important traits in managers and subordinates

were largely comparable, the comparisons between the traits in preferred managers provided

more insight. Results indicate that participants prefer managers to be significantly more open

and extraverted and less neurotic than subordinates. The results for Openness align with those

of Furnham (2002) who found that forward looking and intelligent are among the most desired characteristics in managers, and these characteristics align with Openness.

Similarly, the finding that Extraversion is perceived as more important in preferred managers than subordinates aligns with meta-analytic studies demonstrating Extraversion to predict emergence into leadership positions (Judge et al., 2002) and performance in jobs that require substantial interpersonal interaction, including management jobs (Hurtz and Donovan, 2000; Mount *et al.,* 1998; Salgado, 1997). Considering the social context in which management occurs and acknowledging key managerial competencies such as networking and presenting, being outgoing and assertive is likely to be beneficial. Importantly, these findings may be also explained by participants' implicit leadership theories whereby they implicitly expect their leaders to display hallmarks of Extraversion, such as dominance and assertiveness (Lord *et al.,* 1984).

Neuroticism was the least desired trait in both managers and subordinates, which is not surprising, as being anxious and insecure is unlikely to be associated with performance in any job (Barrick *et al.,*2001). Participants preferring that managers are less neurotic than subordinates can be explained in relation to the finding of Hogan *et al.,* (1994) that neurotic individuals may not be likely to be perceived as leaders. Additionally, as neurotic individuals are likely to be easily irritated by others (McCrae and Costa, 1987), they may engage in hostile exchanges with their subordinates, thereby facilitating a poor relationship quality.

Participants preferred their subordinates to be significantly more conscientious than their managers. It is apparent that the diligent qualities of Conscientiousness appeal to managers who seek dedicated and hardworking subordinates. This finding aligns with extensive evidence that Conscientiousness is the strongest predictor of work performance (e.g. Barrick *et al.,* 1991). Another consideration for Conscientiousness being desired more in subordinates, is that for all its many benefits, managers who have high levels of the trait may be perceived as micromanagers, supervising those whom they manage too closely (House *et al.,*1991) and being unreasonably critical of their work (Hogan and Hogan, 2001).

The method by which participants rated or ranked perceptions of important personality characteristics in their preferred managers and subordinates affected their responses. Specifically, the order of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness changed according to the method of assessment for both preferred managers and preferred subordinates. The method of rating affecting responses is in line with findings by Sartori *et al.* (2017) who found that different traits were perceived as more or less important in job performance depending on the assessment method. It is interesting that characteristics related to Emotional Stability did not emerge more frequently in the open-ended questions; however, Barrick and Mount (1991) suggested as one explanation for their low rankings with respect to the trait, that if individuals are extremely neurotic, they may be unlikely to be in the workforce at all, so at least a moderate level of emotional stability is assumed.

Examining the relative preferences of participants for their preferred managers and subordinates, the strong correlations between participants' own personality and their preferred managers and subordinates strongly support the similarity-attraction model (Byrne,

1971), indicating that participants prefer both managers and subordinates with similar personalities to themselves. Specifically, participants' self-ratings on each of the five traits were significantly and positively correlated with their preferred manager and subordinates on all traits including level of neuroticism. These findings are aligned with previous studies on romantic partner preferences (e.g. Dijkstra and Barelds, 2008; Figueredo *et al.,* 2006; Liu *et al.,* 2018).

The lecturer student relationship more closely resembles that of managers and subordinates and the findings of the current study largely support those of students' preferences for the personality traits of lecturers (Chamorro-Premuzic *et al.,* 2008; Furnham and Chamorro-Premuzic, 2005; Kim and MacCann, 2016) which found that student self-ratings on the Big Five personality dimensions were significantly correlated with those of their preferred lecturers except for Neuroticism and Openness (Kim and MacCann, 2016).

Correlations between participant Neuroticism and both preferred manager and subordinate Neuroticism were significant, positive and substantial. Thus, people prefer to work with others who have a similar level of neuroticism to themselves, even though, intuitively, it might be expected that two emotionally stable individuals would work well together, but two similarly neurotic individuals would not. However, in agreement with the present results, Barrick *et al.* (1998) found that one neurotic team member can lower overall group cohesion, and likewise, Bernerth et al. (2008) found that differing levels of Emotional Stability between managers and subordinates inhibits the development of high quality LMX.

Participants preferring both managers and subordinates who are similar to themselves in Conscientiousness aligns with Deluga's finding that supervisor subordinate similarity in Conscientiousness facilitates productivity and high quality LMX , that is, when both members are similar in conscientiousness, they will both work with a similar level of diligence towards their goals, understanding the relative importance of each other for achievement of their goals (Deluga, 1998). If managers are conscientious and hold themselves to high standards, they are likely to expect the same level of diligence in others and are likely to become frustrated if their work partner does not meet comparable standards. Similarly, participants preferring managers and subordinates similar to themselves on Extraversion may be due to their similar levels of extraverted activity in communication. Likewise, participants prefer both managers and subordinates who are similar to themselves on Agreeableness. If one disagreeable member of a team can negatively affect team performance and cohesion (Barrick *et al.,* 1998), differences between a manager and their manager or subordinate in Agreeableness are likely to be more pronounced due to the nature of the relationship and the smaller group size. Similarly, for Openness it is plausible that open individuals prefer to be intellectually challenged by similarly open managers and subordinates.

In addition to preferring managers and subordinates who are similar to themselves in terms of personality, participants also preferred managers to be more open, conscientious, extraverted and agreeable, and less neurotic than themselves. Similarly, participants preferred subordinates to be more conscientious, more agreeable, and less neurotic than themselves. This pattern has been termed 'aspirational assortative preference' in the romantic partner preference studies (Liu *et al,* 2018) and has also emerged in students' preferences for

lecturers' personalities (Kim and MacCann, 2016). However, this finding warrants more research within organisational research, specifically utilising a personality inventory that enables facet-level investigation which can determine whether some facets of a trait correlate more highly than others, or whether the reason that a trait does not correlate highly is due to some of its facets correlating in opposite directions and thus cancelling out their effects.

The current study is not without limitations and these could be addressed in future research. Firstly, the most obvious limitation is the relatively small sample size of 78 participants; the results obtained may therefore not be generalisable. Another limitation is the use of the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John *et al.,* Kentle, 1991; John *et al.,* 2008). This measure was chosen due to time constraints necessitating a brief and applicable measure of the Big Five personality characteristics, as each participant was required to complete personality ratings on three different targets. However, a limitation of the BFI, and accordingly, the current study is that the BFI does not enable facet-level investigation. As discussed previously, the rankings of importance of the facet level characteristics in the open-ended questions related differently with participants' perceptions of a preferred manager or subordinate which indicates that it is plausible that some people seek different facets of each FFM factor. To address this limitation, a recommendation for future research would be to utilise a personality questionnaire such as the NEO-PI-R (Costa and McCrae, 1992) that enables facet-level investigation. However, this would significantly increase the length of the survey. Accordingly, this might require preferred managers and subordinates to be investigated in two separate studies.

Another limitation relates to the interpretation of the questions asked of participants. In this study, they were asked about the personalities of their personally preferred manager or subordinate as opposed to their 'ideal' or 'good' manager or subordinate which could be interpreted to mean ideal or good for most workers and thus may be less likely to correlate with the rater's personality. Further studies comparing these personal and impersonal types of questions would be needed to investigate this issue. It is also possible that in answering the question in this study: 'I see the manager/subordinate who would get the best out of me (in performance and job satisfaction) as someone who…..', participants may have focused on either performance or job satisfaction when responding, and accordingly, the traits required to satisfy one condition may not be required for the other. Future research could explore these two work aspects separately, since it is plausible that a manager might admit they were productive under particular manager but did not like their driving style of management, whereas they might also admit that they really enjoyed working with another manager but did not achieve much.

Despite there being differences in the rankings of important traits in managers and subordinates in the open-ended questions, ratings obtained from the personality inventories were generally very similar. This could be due to participants completing three identical personality inventories consecutively. To overcome this limitation, future research could follow the approach of Liu *et al.* (2018) and add a short filler questionnaire that is not related to the study, between each personality inventory so that participants do not see three almost identical questionnaires consecutively. As a result of this limitation, the results should be interpreted with caution until replicated using an approach like that of Liu *et al.* (2018).

The current study provides evidence that managers have specific preferences for broad personality traits in their managers and subordinates. Additionally, the results show that participants prefer managers and subordinates who are similar to, but higher on all (managers) or some (subordinates) of the socially desirable traits than themselves. However, with research indicating that diversity in the workplace can lead to positive outcomes such as increased innovation (Østergaard *et al.,* 2011), diversity initiatives are becoming a strategic business priority (Kalman & Frost, 2016). As such, throughout managers' careers, it is inevitable that they will be required to form productive working relationships with individuals who have dissimilar personalities to themselves. Accordingly, it is important to foster personality awareness in managers, particularly in management training courses, so that they are aware of how their own personality traits may affect their behaviour and preferences.

Developing managers' self-awareness not only enhances their performance but is also a key characteristic of effective leadership (Konger and Benjamin, 1999). These results could contribute to the development of personality awareness initiatives in the workplace firstly by providing managers with an understanding of their own personality traits and associated strengths and weaknesses. By acknowledging that the current results demonstrate that managers prefer to work with similar others, managers may learn to develop stronger working relationships with individuals who are dissimilar if they are aware of their relative strengths as well as weaknesses. For example, if a manager is extraverted and they become aware that one of their subordinates is introverted, this awareness may assist them to change their interaction style; for example, sending an email arranging a face to face meeting if that form of communication enables a more positive outcome to be achieved. The Myers Briggs

Type Indicator (MBTI; Myers and McCaulley, 1985) is commonly used to identify different strengths and weaknesses in different personalities to facilitate these types of interactions and interventions, especially for the purpose of team-building. However, considering the cautions against its use for various reasons, including its overly simplistic account of personality (e.g. Pittenger, 2005), a personality awareness program based on the FFM may be more appropriate to enable managers to develop a more nuanced understanding of their own, and others' personalities and their associated strengths and weaknesses.

In conclusion, the results of this study demonstrate that managers value personality traits slightly differently in their preferred managers and subordinates. While supporting the similarity-attraction model (Byrne, 1971) for all traits within the FFM, the results also show that managers prefer their managers to be higher in Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and lower in Neuroticism than themselves and their subordinates to be higher in both Conscientiousness and Agreeableness and lower in Neuroticism than themselves. The methodology utilised to assess personality preferences is a new approach within this area of organisational research, and replications of the study addressing the identified limitations are needed. These results may be beneficial, particularly in management training programs, for developing managers' awareness of their own personalities and its influence on their preferences for whom they believe they would work with best. Likewise, recognising the strengths and weaknesses associated with different personalities may assist them to develop more positive working relationships with managers and subordinates who may have similar or dissimilar personalities.

References

Aronson, Z.H., Dominick, P.G. & Wang, M. 2014, 'Exhibiting Leadership and Facilitation Behaviors in NPD Project-Based Work: Does Team Personal Style Composition Matter?', *Engineering Management Journal*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 25-35.

Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification (ANZSIC)(Revision 2.0) 2006, vol. 1292, Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Aronson, Z.H., Dominick, P.G. & Wang, M. 2014, 'Exhibiting Leadership and Facilitation Behaviors in NPD Project-Based Work: Does Team Personal Style Composition Matter?', *Engineering Management Journal*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 25-35.

Ashton, M.C. & Lee, K. 2005, 'Honesty-Humility, the Big Five, and the Five-Factor Model', *Journal of Personality*, vol. 73, no. 5, pp. 1321-1354.

Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. 1991, 'The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis', *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 44, pp. 1-26.

Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. 2005, 'Yes, Personality Matters: Moving on to More Important Matters', *Human Performance*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 359-372.

Barrick, M.R., Mount, M.K. & Judge, T.A. 2001, 'Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next?', *Personality and Performance*, vol. 9, pp. 9-30.

Barry, B. & Stewart, G.L. 1997, 'Composition, Process, and Performance in Self-Managed Groups: The Role of Personality', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 82, no. 1, pp. 62-78.

Barrick, M.R., Stewart, G.L., Neubert, M. & Mount, M. 1998, 'Relating Member Ability and Personality to Work-Team Processes and Team Effectiveness', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 83, no. 3, pp. 377-391.

Bass, B. 1990, *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*, 3rd edn, Free Press, New York.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. 1994, *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Bauer, T. & Green, S. 1996, 'Development of leader-member exchange: A longitudinal test', *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 1538-1567.

Bergner, S., Neubauer, A. & Kreuzthaler, A. 2010, 'Broad and narrow personality traits for predicting managerial success', *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 177-199.

Bernerth, J.B., Armenakis, A.A., Feild, H.S., Giles, W.F. & Walker, H.J. 2008, 'The influence of personality differences between subordinates and supervisors on perceptions of LMX an empirical investigation', *Group & Organization Management,* vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 216-240.

Byrne, D. 1971, *The attraction paradigm*, Academic Press, New York.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Furnham, A., Christopher, A., Garwood, J. & Martin, G. 2007, 'Birds of a feather: Students' preferences for lecturers' personalities as predicted by their own personality and learning approaches', *Personality and Individual Differences*, vol. 44.

Chiaburu, D.S., Oh, I., Berry, C.M., Li, N. & Gardner, R.G. 2011, 'The Five-Factor Model of Personality Traits and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Meta-Analysis', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 96, no. 6, pp. 1140-1166.

Costa, P.T. & McCrae, R.R. 1991, *NEO five-factor inventory: Form S*, Psychological Assessment Resources, Odessa, FL.

Costa, P.T. & McCrae, R.R. 1991, *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI_R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) Professional Manual*, Psychological Assessment Resources, Lutz, FL.

Costa, P.T. & McCrae, R.R. 1992, *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five Factor Model (NEO-FFI) professional manual*, Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc, Odessa, Florida.

Diensch, R.M. & Liden, R.C. 1986, 'Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development', *Acadamy of Management Review*, vol. 11, pp. 618-634.

Deluga, R.J. 1998, 'Leader-Member Exchange Quality and Effectiveness Ratings', *Group & Organization Management*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 189-216.

Dijkstra, P. & Barelds, D. 2008, 'Do People Know What They Want: A Similar or Complementary Partner?', *Evolutionary Psychology*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 595-602.

Dulebohn, J.H., Bommer, W.H., Liden, R.C., Brouer, R.L. & Ferris, G.R. 2012, 'A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents and Consequences of Leader-Member Exchange: Integrating the Past With an Eye Toward the Future', *Journal of Management*, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 1715-1759.

Dunn, W.S., Mount, M.K., Barrick, M.R. & Ones, D.S. 1995, 'Relative Importance of Personality and General Mental Ability in Managers' Judgments of Applicant Qualifications', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 80, no. 4, pp. 500-509.

Ehrhart, M.G. & Klein, K.J. 2001, 'Predicting followers' preferences for charismatic leadership: the influence of follower values and personality', *The Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 12, pp. 153-179.

Figueredo, A., Sefcek, J. & Jones, D. 2006, 'The ideal romantic partner personality', *Personality and Individual Differences*, vol. 41, pp. 431-441.

Furnham, A. 2002, 'Rating a boss, a colleague and a subordinate', *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 17, no. 8, pp. 655-671.

Furnham, A. 2003, 'What do you look for in a lecturer? Unpublished questionnaire', University College, London, UK.

Furnham, A. & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. 2005, 'Individual Differences in Students' Preferences for Lecturers' Personalities', *Journal of Individual Differences*, vol. 26, no. 4.

Glomb, T.M. & Welsh, E.T. 2005, 'Can Opposites Attract? Personality Heterogeneity in Supervisor-Subordinate Dyads as a Predictor of Subordinate Outcomes', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 90, no. 4, pp. 479-757.

Graen, G. 2003, *LMX Leadership: The Series: Vol. 1, Dealing with Diversity, Information Age*, Greenwich, CT.

Graen, G. & Uhl-Bien, M. 1995, 'Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective', *Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 6, no. 219-247.

Graen, G.B. & Scandura, T.A. 1987, *Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. Research in organizational behavior* JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.

Harari, M.B., Rudolph, C.W. & Laginess, A.J. 2014, 'Does rater personality matter? A meta-analysis of rater Big Five-performance rating relationships', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 88, pp. 387-414.

Hautala, T. 2005, 'The Effects of Subordinates' Personality on Appraisals of Transformational Leadership', *Journal of Leadership and Organzational Studies*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 84-89.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. & Hogan, J. 1994, 'What We Know About Leadership. Effectiveness and Personality', *American Psychologist*, vol. 49, no. 6, pp. 493-504.

Holland, J.L. 1966, *The psychology of vocational choice*, Blaisdell, Waltham, MA.

Holland, J.L. 1973, *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

House, R., Spangler, W. & Woycke, J. 1991, 'Personality and Charisma in the U.S. Presidency: A Psychological Theory of Leader Effectiveness', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 364-396.

Hurtz, G.M. & Donovan, J.J. 2000, 'Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 85, pp. 869-879.

John, O.P., Donahue, E.M. & Kentle, R.L. 1991, *The Big Five Inventory--Versions 4a and 54*, University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research, Berkeley, CA.

John, O.P., Naumann, L.P. & Soto, C.J. 2008, *Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues*, Handbook of personality: Theory and research Guilford Press, New York, NY.

Judge, T.A. & Bono, J. 2000, 'Five-Factor Model of Personality and Transformational Leadership', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 85, no. 5, pp. 751-765.

Judge, T.A., Bono, J., Ilies, R. & Gerhardt, M. 2002, 'Personality and Leadership: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 87, no. 4, pp. 765-780.

Kalman, D. & Frost, S. 2016, 'Working with difference: is it a business imperative', *Strategic HR Review*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 214-219.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. 1966, *The social psychology of organizations*, John Wiley & Sons Inc, New York.

Kim, L.E. & MacCann, C. 2016, 'What is students' ideal university instructor personality? An investigation of absolute and relative personality preferences', *Personality and Individual Differences*, vol. 102, pp. 190-203.

Konger, J.A. & Benjamin, B. 1999, *Building Leaders: How Successful Companies Develop the Next Generation*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. 1988, *The Leadership Challenge*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Kristof, A. 1996, 'Person–organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications', *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 49, pp. 1-49.

Lai, J., Lam, S. & Chow, C. 2015, 'What good soldiers are made of: the role of personality similarity', *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 1003-1018.

Leonard, D. & Strauss, S. 1997, 'Putting your company's whole brain to work', *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 75, no. 4, pp. 111-121.

Liu, J., Ludeke, S., Haubrich, J., Gondan-Rochon, M. & Zettler, I. 2018, 'Similar to and/or Better than Oneself? Singles' Ideal Partner Personality Descriptions', *European Journal of Personality*, vol. 32, no. 443-458.

Kirkpatrick, S.A. & Locke, E.A. 1991, 'Leadership: do traits matter?', *Academy of Management Executive*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 48-60.

Lord, R.G. 1985, *An information processing approach to social perceptions, leadership perceptions and behavioral measurement in organizations.* , Research in organizational behavior, vol 7, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.

McCrae, R.R. & Costa, P.T. 1987, 'Validation of the Five-Factor Model of Personality Across Instruments and Observers', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 81-90.

Myers, I.B. & McCaulley, M.H. 1985, *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator*, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.

Meglino, B., Ravlin, E. & Adkins, C. 1991, 'Value congruence and satisfaction with a leader: An examination of the role of interaction', *Human Relations*, vol. 44, no. 481-495.

Mount, M.K., Barrick, M.R. & Stewart, G.L. 1998, 'Five-factor model of personality and performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions', *Human Performance*, vol. 11, no. 2/3, pp. 145-165.

Muchinsky, P.M. & Monaghan, C.J. 1987, 'What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 31, pp. 268-277.

Neumann, G., Wagner, S. & Christiansen, N. 1999, 'The relationship between workteam personality composition and the job performance of teams', *Group & Organization Managemen*, vol. 24, pp. 28-45.

Offermann, L.R., Kennedy, J.K. & Wirtz, P.W. 1994, 'Implicit Leadership Theories: Content, Structure, And Generalizability', *Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 43-58.

Østergaard, C.R., Timmermans, B. & Kristinsson, K. 2011, 'Does a different view create something new? The effect of employee diversity on innovation', *Research Policy*, vol. 40, pp. 500-509.

Pittenger, D.J. 2005, 'Cautionary Comments Regarding the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator', *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 210-221.

Pulakos, E.D. & Wexley, K.N. 1983, 'The relationship among perceptual similarity, sex, and performance ratings in manager-subordinate dyads', *Acadamy of Management Journal*, vol. 26, no. 129-139.

Rogers, K.H., Wood, D. & Furr, M. 2018, 'Assessment of similarity and self-other agreement in dyadic relationships: A guide to best practices', *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, vol. 35, no. 112-134.

Rothman, S. & Coetzer, E. 2003, 'The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance', *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 68-74.

Ryan, T. & Xenos, S. 2011, 'Who uses Facebook? An investigation into the relationship between the Big Five, shyness, narcissism, loneliness, and Facebook usage', *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 27, pp. 1658–1664.

Salgado, J.F. 1997, 'The Five Factor Model of Personality and Job Performance in the European Community', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 82, no. 1, pp. 30-43.

Sartori, R., Costantini, A., Ceschi, A. & Scalco, A. 2017, 'Not only correlations: a different approach for investigating the relationship between the Big Five personality traits and job performance based on workers and employees' perception', *Qual Quant*, vol. 51, pp. 2507-2519.

Schein, E.H. 1985, *Organizational culture and leadership*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Stevens, C.D., Guthrie, J.P., Ash, R.A. & Coate, C.J. 2002, 'Does personality predict preferred managerial style? Evidence from New Zealand and the United States', *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 322-344.

Strauss, J.P., Barrick, M.R. & Connerley, M.L. 2001, 'An investigation of personality similarity effects (relational and perceived) on peer and supervisor ratings and the role of familiarity and liking', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 74, pp. 637-657.

Turban, D. & Jones, A. 1988, 'Supervisor-Subordinate Similarity: Types, Effects, and Mechanisms', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 73, no. 2, pp. 228-234.

Wright, D.B., London, K. & Field, A.P. 2011, 'Using bootstrap estimation and the plug-in principle for clinical psychology data', *Journal of Experimental Psychopathology*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 252-270.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Table 1

Table 1

Descriptive statistics and reliabilities for participants' self-reported personality, preferred manager personality, and preferred subordinate personality (N=78)

	Self-reported					Preferred Manager					Preferred Subordinate				
	Min	*Max*	*M*	*SD*	*α*	*Min*	*Max*	*M*	*SD*	*α*	*Min*	*Max*	*M*	*SD*	*α*
Openness	2.00	5.00	**3.65**	0.62	0.79	3.00	4.90	**3.83**	0.43	0.76	2.80	4.80	**3.67**	0.39	0.75
Conscientiousness	2.56	4.89	**4.08**	0.54	0.79	3.00	5.00	**4.50**	0.46	0.85	3.00	5.00	**4.58**	0.42	0.86
Extraversion	1.25	5.00	**3.52**	0.84	0.87	2.88	4.88	**3.82**	0.44	0.68	2.63	5.00	**3.56**	0.43	0.70
Agreeableness	2.44	5.00	**4.04**	0.56	0.77	3.00	5.00	**4.45**	0.44	0.76	3.00	5.00	**4.44**	0.47	0.87
Neuroticism	1.00	4.13	**2.43**	0.75	0.83	1.00	3.00	**1.56**	0.46	0.81	1.00	3.00	**1.83**	0.55	0.87

Appendix 2– Table 2

Table 2

Differences between self-ratings and preferred manager ratings on each of the Big Five factors (*N*=78)

Big Five Factor	Target	*M*	SE	M*d*	CI	*t (df)*	*d*
Openness	Self	3.65	.07	-.19	[-.31, -.07]	-2.70 (77)*	.33
	Preferred Manager	3.83	.05				
Conscientiousness	Self	4.08	.06	-.42	[-.52, -.32]	-8.14 (77)**	.84
	Preferred Manager	4.50	.05				
Extraversion	Self	3.52	.09	-.30	[-.46, -.14]	-3.80 (77)**	.46
	Preferred Manager	3.82	.05				
Agreeableness	Self	4.04	.06	-.40	[-.52, -.28]	-7.19 (77)**	.82
	Preferred Manager	4.45	.05				
Neuroticism	Self	2.43	.08	.88	[.71, 1.05]	11.18 (77)**	1.41
	Preferred Manager	1.56	.05				

M*d* (mean difference), CI (Bias corrected and accelerated 95% confidence intervals*), d* (Cohen's *d*)

*p <.05

**p<.001

Appendix 3 – Table 3

Table 3.
Differences between self-ratings and preferred subordinate ratings on each of the Big Five factors (*N*=78)

Big Five Factor	Target	*M*	SE	M*d*	CI	*t(df)*	*d*
Openness	Self	3.65	.07	-.02	[-.12, .08]	-.38 (77)	.06
	Preferred Subordinate	3.67	.04				
Conscientiousness	Self	4.08	.06	-.50	[-.61, -.40]	-9.71 (77)**	1.01
	Preferred Subordinate	4.58	.05				
Extraversion	Self	3.52	.09	-.04	[-.20, .10]	-.51 (77)	.07
	Preferred Subordinate	3.56	.05				
Agreeableness	Self	4.04	.06	-.40	[-.51, -.28]	-6.8 (77)**	.76
	Preferred Subordinate	4.44	.05				
Neuroticism	Self	2.43	.08	.61	[.42, .80]	6.74 (77)**	.91
	Preferred Subordinate	1.83	.06				

M*d* (mean difference), CI (Bias corrected and accelerated 95% confidence intervals*), d* (Cohen's *d*)
**p* <.05
***p*<.001

Appendix 4– Table 4

Table 4.

Differences between preferred manager ratings and preferred subordinate ratings on each of the Big Five factors (*N*=78)

Big Five Factor	Target	*M*	SE	M*d*	CI	*t(df)*	*d*
Openness	Preferred Manager	3.83	.05	.17	[.09, .24]	4.00 (77)**	.39
	Preferred Subordinate	3.67	.04				
Conscientiousness	Preferred Manager	4.50	.05	-.08	[-.14, -.02]	-2.59 (77)*	.16
	Preferred Subordinate	4.58	.05				
Extraversion	Preferred Manager	3.82	.05	.26	[.17, .36]	5.39 (77)**	.60
	Preferred Subordinate	3.56	.05				
Agreeableness	Preferred Manager	4.45	.05	.004	[-.06, .07]	.112 (77)	.008
	Preferred Subordinate	4.44	.05				
Neuroticism	Preferred Manager	1.56	.05	-.27	[-.36, -.18],	-5.86 (77)**	.53
	Preferred Subordinate	1.83	.06				

M*d* (mean difference), CI (Bias corrected and accelerated 95% confidence intervals*), d* (Cohen's *d*)

*p <.05

**p<.001

Appendix 5 – Table 5

Table 5.

Correlations between participants' personality and personalities of preferred managers and subordinates

		Participant Big Five Traits				
		O	C	E	A	N
Preferred Manager	O	.354** [124, 547]	.389** [186, 587]	.078 [- 213, .380]	.244 [.020, .440]	-.140 [- 345, .056]
	C	-.002 [-.260, .243]	.604** [.416, .742]	.203 [-.030, .438]	.365** [.114, .568]	-.196 [- 381, .005]
	E	.031 [-.246, .320]	.255* [.029, .465]	.539** [.305, .716]	.227* [.029, .429]	-.127 [- 356, .084]
	A	.114 [-.084, .328]	.296** [.022, 525]	.073 [- 147, .277]	.537** [.312, .725]	-.085 [- 282, 130]
	N	-.051 [-.269, .161]	-.479** [-.618, -.310]	-.154 [- 369, .078]	-.351** [-.554, -.130]	.424** [.210, .594]
Preferred Subordinate	O	.540** [334, .687]	.176 [-.070, .405]	-.020 [- 305, .274]	.183 [-.017, .379]	-.057 [- 288, 148]
	C	.094 [-.090, .265]	.586** [.418, .705]	.159 [-.075, .376]	.309** [.054, .542]	-.101 [- 313, 104]
	E	.055 [-.160, .262]	.188 [-.012, .356]	.505** [.340, .626]	.240* [.006, .456]	-.261* [-.477, -.022]
	A	.126 [-.052, .306]	.325** [.040, 558]	.105 [- 157, .335]	.515** [.279, .719]	-.076 [- 279, 133]
	N	-.101 [-.304, .095]	-.394** [- 575, -.183]	-.010 [- 263, .231]	-323** [-.511, .281]	.281* [.042, .494]

Note O = Openness, C = Conscientiousness, E = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, N = Neuroticism

Bias corrected and accelerated bootstrap 95% Confidence Intervals reported in square brackets

p <.05

**p* <.001

Appendix 6– Table 6

Table 6

Frequency and Ranking of factors and facets of the Big Five Personality Traits in Preferred Managers

	Position					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Openness	**1**	**8**	**5**	**8**	**4**	**26**
Fantasy	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aesthetics	-	-	-	1	1	2
Feelings	-	-	1	-	-	1
Actions	-	2	2	1	-	5
Ideas	1	6	2	6	3	18
Values	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conscientiousness	**17**	**16**	**20**	**15**	**15**	**83**
Competence	6	7	5	5	5	28
Order	5	3	4	3	2	17
Dutifulness	2	5	5	1	1	14
Achievement Striving	2	1	5	4	3	15
Self-Discipline	2	-	-	2	3	7
Deliberation	-	-	1	-	1	2
Extraversion	**10**	**14**	**19**	**14**	**14**	**71**
Warmth	4	1	4	5	6	20
Gregariousness	2	-	1	1	-	4
Assertiveness	1	4	9	3	3	20
Activity	1	5	2	2	2	12
Excitement-Seeking	-	-	-	1	-	1
Positive Emotions	2	4	3	2	3	14
Agreeableness	**39**	**29**	**20**	**27**	**19**	**134**
Trust	19	9	7	4	4	43
Straightforwardness	6	5	3	3	4	21
Altruism	6	5	2	7	2	22
Compliance	1	1	1	2	1	6
Modesty	-	-	1	-	2	3
Tender-Mindedness	7	9	6	11	6	39
Neuroticism	**3**	**1**	**6**	**-**	**3**	**13**
Anxiety	1	-	1	-	2	4
Angry Hostility	1	1	4	-	-	6
Depression	-	-	-	-	-	-
Self-Consciousness	-	-	-	-	-	-
Impulsiveness	1	-	1	-	1	3
Vulnerability	-	-	-	-	-	-

Appendix 7 – Table 7

Table 7
Frequency and Ranking of factors and facets of the Big Five Personality Traits in Preferred Subordinates

	Position					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Openness	**9**	**5**	**11**	**9**	**4**	**38**
Fantasy	-	-	1	1	-	2
Aesthetics	-	-	-	-	-	-
Feelings	-	-	-	-	-	-
Actions	-	-	2	1	1	4
Ideas	9	5	8	7	3	32
Values	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conscientiousness	**28**	**23**	**26**	**30**	**18**	**125**
Competence	5	6	4	8	7	30
Order	6	-	6	5	1	18
Dutifulness	8	8	10	12	5	43
Achievement Striving	7	8	4	2	5	26
Self-Discipline	2	1	2	2	-	7
Deliberation	-	-	-	1	-	1
Extraversion	**9**	**17**	**12**	**13**	**16**	**67**
Warmth	1	1	5	2	4	13
Gregariousness	-	2	-	-	1	3
Assertiveness	4	4	-	5	2	15
Activity	4	8	3	6	6	27
Excitement-Seeking	-	-	-	-	1	1
Positive Emotions	-	2	4	-	2	8
Agreeableness	**27**	**27**	**19**	**10**	**16**	**99**
Trust	9	8	5	3	3	28
Straightforwardness	9	7	2	3	1	22
Altruism	-	3	2	1	4	10
Compliance	5	4	3	1	6	19
Modesty	-	-	2	1	-	3
Tender-Mindedness	4	5	5	1	2	17
Neuroticism	**2**	**3**	**5**	**3**	**3**	**16**
Anxiety	-	1	2	1	3	7
Angry Hostility	2	-	3	1	-	6
Depression	-	-	-	-	-	-
Self-Consciousness	-	-	-	-	-	-
Impulsiveness	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vulnerability	-	2	-	1	-	3

Appendix 8 - Big Five Inventory

How I am in general

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who *likes to spend time with others*? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which **you agree or disagree with that statement.**

1	2	3	4	5
Disagree Strongly	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree strongly

I am someone who…

1. _____ Is talkative

2. _____ Tends to find fault with others

3. _____ Does a thorough job

4. _____ Is depressed, blue

5. _____ Is original, comes up with new ideas

6. _____ Is reserved

7. _____ Is helpful and unselfish with others

8. _____ Can be somewhat careless

9. _____ Is relaxed, handles stress well.

10. _____ Is curious about many different things

11. _____ Is full of energy

12. _____ Starts quarrels with others

13. _____ Is a reliable worker

14. _____ Can be tense

15. _____ Is ingenious, a deep thinker

16. _____ Generates a lot of enthusiasm

17. _____ Has a forgiving nature

18. _____ Tends to be disorganized

19. _____ Worries a lot

20. _____ Has an active imagination

21. _____ Tends to be quiet

22. _____ Is generally trusting

23. _____ Tends to be lazy

24. _____ Is emotionally stable, not easily upset

25. _____ Is inventive

26. _____ Has an assertive personality

27. _____ Can be cold and aloof

28. _____ Perseveres until the task is finished

29. _____ Can be moody

30. _____ Values artistic, aesthetic experiences

31. _____ Is sometimes shy, inhibited

32. _____ Is considerate and kind to almost everyone

33. _____ Does things efficiently

34. _____ Remains calm in tense situations

35. _____ Prefers work that is routine

36. _____ Is outgoing, sociable

37. _____ Is sometimes rude to others

38. _____ Makes plans and follows through with them

39. _____ Gets nervous easily

40. _____ Likes to reflect, play with ideas

41. _____ Has few artistic interests

42. _____ Likes to cooperate with others

43. _____ Is easily distracted

44. _____ Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature