SA16006

Identifying an Organization's Culture, Management Style with a Personality Connection

Dale Krueger
Missouri Western State University

Abstract: This research was based on a survey of professional men and women. The survey requested the recipients take a short organizational culture-managerial assessment that has organizational and managerial implications and a four category personality assessment. The variables that were statistically evaluated using analysis of variance included the cultural assessment, the four personality categories, stress, and gender. Various other demographic variables were requested to provide a more in depth and supportive framework. These demographic variables were occupational titles, industry identification, educational level, income level, years of experience, average hours worked per week, marital status including the number of children.

Culture, Management, Style, Personality, Connection

INRODUCTION

The influence and importance of a firm's culture has increased over the years (Case, 1996). What has developed has been the recognition there are connections between a firm's culture, and values, and employee personalities (Robbins, 2005). Therefore, the main purpose of this research was to attempt to quantitatively measure a firm's culture and management by using an specially designed assessment. Then identify the connection between a professional employee's personality and the firm's culture and management style that measures variations in gender and stress..

For identifying personality behavior patterns a personality assessment called DISC was utilized in this study to measure four distinct personality traits and patterns that each person has in different degrees. The DISC has four distinct categories delineated as D=Dominant, I= Influential, S=Steady-Relationship and C= Compliant (Mohler, 1981). The personality assessment consisted of twenty-five four word groups that were in two columns. This required the respondent to select one word from the first and succeeding word groups that was most like them. This was column one. From the second column the person had to choose the word which was least like them. The first column's highest score identified the person's main personality characteristics, and the second highest score represented a secondary category of personality characteristics of the person's total personality. By using Mohler's personality assessment or other similar assessments supervisors and colleagues can pin point and predict personal behavior patterns as well as behavior patterns associated with career placement and organizational improvement. For example, a person that scores high on the dominant category may have secondary personality characteristics associated with the compliant category, which indicates that person more than likely makes quick decisions, but the conflict comes from the fact that person is also highly structured, impatient, detailed and a perfectionist. A low dominate score coupled with the relationship category places a great deal on human relationships, but that person can also be somewhat impatient with others and yet a good listener.

For the present research a survey was sent to 630 professionals, who were members of the Kansas City Woman's Professional Organization and St. Joseph, Missouri Chamber of Commerce. Ninety four percent had college degrees. The survey required the respondents to complete the cultural and the personality assessment, answer the questions on gender, rank their stress level from one to ten and also, provide demographic information to insure research consistency. From 630 surveys that were sent 120 professional men and women responded for a 19.2 response percentage. The normal mail survey response rate varies between five and ten percent (Alreck and Settle, 1985).

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature is split into two parts. The first part addresses pertinent organizational culture research. The second part reviews personality trait research and its impact on an organization.

For corporate culture the foundation for understanding different types of company cultures began with a sociological approach (Becker, 1982), and then centered on certain characteristics that were present in different degrees within each organization (O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell, 1991). This research focused on flexible organizations that emphasized growth, assertiveness, innovation, risk taking, effectiveness, using a team approach and a relationship orientation. Other cultural research centered on two dimensions sociability and solidarity (Goffer and Jones, 1998). The sociability aspect embraces friendliness, which means relating and caring for others. Solidarity measures task orientation. These two dimensions can be ranked high or low, and these two dimensions break down into four distinct culture types: a networking culture, a fragmented culture, a mercenary culture, and a communal culture.

A high networking corporate culture views employees as family which promotes sharing of information whereas in contrast a low networking culture can lead to poor employee performance. The fragmented culture is low on sociability and solidarity, and produces concern for self and leads to no organizational commitment. Mercenary cultures are low on sociability and high on solidarity. Goals and objectives become very important and winning regardless of the effect on others becomes secondary to any form of sociability. The communal culture ranks sociability high and solidarity low. For high sociability friendship, performance and belonging are emphasized. On the other hand, solidarity emphasizes a strong, if not ruthless, focus on goal achievement.

Corporate values determine how a company culture develops. For example, organizational employee selection and evaluation processes evolve over time, but usually emanate from the initial organizational leadership. This organizational leadership emanates from the organization's leader's values. Normally, this leadership permeates the organization producing an organizational philosophy that develops and embraces a system of informal and formal patterns of behavior, which delineates what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior within the organization. These behavioral patterns influence individual behavior and helps determine the organizational direction (Deal and Kennedy, 1983). At the same time these assumptions, rules, and standards provide behavioral limits for individuals within the organization (O'Reilly and Chatman, 1996).). For the more traditional organizations the earlier research explored a values oriented approach to understanding different cultures (Cameron and Quinn (2006). Their research was based on a competing values approach that identified four organizational types: clan (family oriented culture, adhocracy (dynamic, creative, and entrepreneurial) market (productivity results) and hierarchy. This hierarchical category paid attention to procedures and processes to minimize risk and promote organizational stability. However, recent research emphasized developing an innovative culture (Cable, 2010) that created a climate of creativity (Hawkins, 2010).

For example, in the last twenty years the growth of the technology sector has fostered innovative corporate cultures that have a framework based on a comprehensive, integrative, clear, current, and generic approach to innovation (Powers, 2014). The latter term generic means the terminology and concepts provide a clear understanding about how the values of the organization support innovation.

SA16006

By turning to the personality research articles the personality literature begins with different types of personalities, and the impact personalities have on employees and the firm... One of the first articles on personality was the description of a Type A personality (Freidman and Rosenman, 1974). Later research measured the impact personality had on selecting a career (Kendrick and Funder, 1988). A few years later a longitudinal study reported stability and consistency of personality predispositions over time with trust and optimism present within the company culture (House, Howard, and Walker, 1991). This career oriented research focused on a person's genetic personality predispositions that supported personality stability and consistency for each person and guided individuals to select occupations and cultural situations consistent with their genetic predisposition. By 1994 the twin studies further reinforced genetic predisposition research and organizational behavior (Arvey, and Bouchard, (1994)

During the same time period as the genetic personality research was reported how personality research measured gender differences, how personality assessment variables influenced team cultures, and how personality types matched up with a number of job categories. The research on gender reported gender personality differences existed between males and females (Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, and Abraham, 1989; Loehlin, and Nichols, 1976). Years later the big five personality assessment research expanded and emphasized the personality variables of conscientiousness and agreeableness (Digman, 1997). Seven years later by using the Big Five personality assessment a connection between personality and team oriented cultures was added to the literature (Judge and Cable, 1997), where a highly extrovert personalities worked well in an aggressive team oriented cultures, and those individuals that were high on agreeableness gravitated to strong standardized supportive organizational cultures. In the same year as Judge and Cable's article, Holland matched six occupational classifications with six personality types (Holland, 1997).

After Holland's contribution to the personality research the measurement of personalities between and across various National Cultures supported the stability and consistency of personality trait theory (Costa and Terranciano, 2001), and in 2007 the research continued to support personality traits as reliable predictors of behavior (Roberts, Kuncel, Shiner, Caspi, and Goldberg, 2007).

Despite the substantial personality research critics of personality trait theory take the position that personality traits do not have the reliability or validity necessary to consistently predict human behavior. However, the literature has continued to expand toward using personality assessments as a basis to further improve our understanding of human behavior (Hogan, 2005; Schmitt, 2004). For example, the personality trait of dominant listed in this study corresponds to the Type A personality, and the research suggests the Type A aggressive personality is perceived by others as leaders and change agents (Bateman and Crant, 1993). Seven years later these two authors further reinforced the fact that the Type A personality is proactive (Crant and Bateman, 2000). Furthermore, in entrepreneurial endeavors using the four Mohler descriptive personality categories it was found that female entrepreneurs were extrovert and exhibited dominant personality characteristics (Krueger, 2000).

The use of personality assessments for employee selection and career development has become more acceptable, and definitely has possible implications to improve the organization's selection process and improve the employee career development. For example, the research already had moved toward evaluating the impact personality had on the interview process (Cook, Vance, and Spector, 2000), and human resource research helped to solidify the fact that personality matters by stating "let's move on" (Barrick and Mount, 2005) to support the use of personality assessments. Other similar research focused on the personal organizational fit and on personality criteria for hiring employees (Arthur, Bell, Villado, and Doverspike, 2006).

As the connection between personalities, and a firm's management style and organizational culture began to filter into corporate America, many businesses began to use personality assessments to improve their corporate culture. For example, Horizon Bank required all of its employees take a mandatory personality assessment (Woolsey and Reinertson, 2014). The personality assessment improved each employee's knowledge of the different types of personalities in the employee's family, their understanding of other employees, and provided a basis for analyzing the firm's customers. After the assessment, what transpired was more employee interaction and communication which in turn boosted employee teamwork.

THE ASSESSMENTS: CULTURAL-MANAGERIAL AND PERSONALITY

For the present cultural assessment a Likert scale from one to four was utilized that required individuals to rank the organization's culture and management style with one the lowest score and four is the highest four. This meant the survey respondents had to make a either favorable or unfavorable choice on each of the following twenty five management-cultural dimensions, and the four numerical choices eliminated a neutral or average choice.

Objectives Vague	1 2 3 4	Objectives Clear
Goal Setting by a Few	1 2 3 4	Goals set by persons involved
Employee Motivation Low	1 2 3 4	Employee Motivation High
Personal Goals Suppressed	1 2 3 4	Personal-Organizational Goals Integrated
Guarded Communication	1 2 3 4	Open Informal Communication
Pertinent Feelings Withheld	1 2 3 4	Open Feelings
Conflict-Repressed-Ignored	1 2 3 4	Conflict Handled Constructively
Low Mutual Support	1 2 3 4	High Mutual Support
Low Personal Responsibility	1 2 3 4	High Personal Responsibility
Low Trust Level	1 2 3 4	High Trust Level
Concern for Production	1 2 3 4	Concern for Employees
Decision-Making by a few	1 2 3 4	Decision-Making by those affected
Inflexible Procedures	1 2 3 4	Flexible Procedures
Organizational Evaluation by a Few	1 2 3 4	Organizational Evaluation by Employees
Low Performance Standards	1 2 3 4	High Performance Standards
Few Rewards	1 2 3 4	Numerous Rewards
Power Oriented Supervision	1 2 3 4	Problem Solving Emphasized
Many Rules and Controls	1 2 3 4	Few Rules and Controls
Structure Imposed	1 2 3 4	Structure Jointly Determined
Work Functions Delegated	1 2 3 4	Work Functions Jointly Determined
High Conformity	1 2 3 4	Low Conformity
Organizational Climate Tight	1 2 3 4	Supportive Organizational Climate
Centralized Leadership	1 2 3 4	Shared Leadership
Competitive Relationships	1 2 3 4	Collaborative Relationships
Low Interpersonal Skills	1 2 3 4	High Interpersonal Skills

By using the twenty five different dimensions management has the opportunity to evaluate each dimension separately, by department, by the different organization levels, and by what all employees think of the total organization. By using this cultural management assessment listed below firms have a basis for improving a firm's culture and possibly improving the firm's management policies, management styles, and strategies**.**

In addition to the cultural management assessment the survey included the four DISC descriptive personality relationships: C for Compliant, D for Dominant, I for Influential, and S for Steady Relationship.

DOMINANT
Overtly aggressive
Hard Driving and results oriented
Assertive and creative
Risk Taker
Competitive
Goal oriented
Direct and judgmental

INFLUENTIAL
Verbally Aggressive
Enthusiastic-can motivate others
Approachable & people oriented
Optimistic and likes recognition
Wants to lead
 Avoids details by socializing
Tendency toward disorganization

STEADY RELATIONSHIP	COMPLIANT
Organized and systematic	Factual and technically competent
Friendly and helpful	Reliable, accurate, systematic
Good listener and patient	Sensitive and detailed
Avoids risks	Likes routines and procedures
Conceals emotions	not a risk taker
Passive Aggressive	Defensively aggressive
Predictable and dependent	Thorough and well prepared

RESEARCH   DESIGN

The survey included the cultural-managerial assessment, the four different personality categories, gender determination, and a stress assessment that ranked the respondents stress level as high (ten) or low (one), as well as demographic information on each respondent to reinforce the similarities of the respondents. The demographic variables were occupational title, industry identification, educational level, income level, years of experience, average hours worked per week, marital status and the number of children. This demographic background information helped explain and place this study into a research context.

First, the cultural-management assessment was statistically compared to overall personality score and then each one of four personality categories was statistically compared. Second, the gender variable permitted a comparison between men and women. Third, the stress assessment was statistically compared to the cultural-management assessment. If the total stress level of the respondents was statistically significant, the cultural-management assessment answers would interfere with the accuracy of the cultural assessment, and result in fundamental attribution error. Fourth, analysis of variance was the statistical technique utilized with the culture-management as the dependent variable, and the personality assessment, gender and stress variables were the independent variables.

From the 120 responses 62 women professionals and 58 men responded to the survey.   Ten industry categories with nine different occupational titles other than supervisor or manager were represented. The responses for years of experience ranged from 3.4 to 13.9. Ninety-three percent of the men and women had bachelor degrees or more.   The hours worked per week averaged 48 to 50 for both men and women. Income levels started at $30,000 with a range slightly over $60,000. The men's income levels were slightly higher than the women at each income level, but marital status (single, divorced, widowed and number of children) was the same for men and women.

HYPOTHESES

H1: There is no relationship between the employee cultural management assessment ranking and results for the total of all four personality categories.

H2: There is a difference between the cultural management assessment and the total of all four personality categories.

Identifying an Organization's Culture

H3:   There is no relationship between the cultural management assessment and the four individual personality categories of the personality assessment.

H4:   There is a relationship between the cultural management assessment and the individual personality categories.

H5:   There is no relationship between gender and the cultural management assessment.

H6:   There is a relationship between gender and the cultural management assessment.

H7:   There is no relationship between gender and the four personality categories.

H8:   There is a relationship between gender and the four personality categories.

H9:   There is no relationship between stress and the cultural management assessment.

H10: There is a relationship between stress and the cultural management assessment.

STATISTICAL RESULTS

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: BETWEEN – SUBJECT VARIABLES

	Value Label	N
Gender 1	Male	59
2	Female	55
DISC 1	Dominant	19
2	Influential	54
3	Steady-Relationship	17
4	Compliant	24

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS
Dependent Variable: Management-Cultural Dimensions

GENDER DISC	Mean	Std Deviation	N
Male D	2.61	.557	9
I	2.62	.605	28
S	2.15	.464	9
C	2.80	.457	13
Total	2.59	.572	59
Female D	2.82	.643	10
I	2.54	.581	26
S	2.87	.517	8
C	2.26	.497	11
Total	2.26	.591	55
D	2.72	.597	19
I	2.58	.589	54
S	2.48	.601	17
C	2.58	.541	24
Total	2.59	.579	114

Identifying an Organization's Culture

TESTS BETWEEN SUBJECTS

Dependent Variable: Management-Cultural Dimensions: Independent: Total Personality Score

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Corrected Model	4.76a	7	.681	2.18	.042
Intercept	620.3	620.3	620.3	1986.4	.00
Gender	.143	1	.143	.458	.50
DISC	.514	3	.171	.549	.65
Error	33.1	106			
Total	800.4	114			
Corrected Total	37.87	113			

R Squared = .126 (adjusted R Square = .068)

GRAND MEAN

Dependent Variable: Management-Cultural assessment and Independent variable: gender with a 95% Confidence Interval

Gender	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Male	2.345	.081	2.385	2.71
Female	2.62	.083	2.49	2.79

Dependent Variable Cultural Assessment and the four personality categories

DISC	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
D	2.72	.128	2.46	2.97
I	2.58	.076	2.43	2.73
S	2.51	.136	2.24	2.78
C	2.53	.114	2.30	2.80

Dependent Variable Gender* DISC (Four Personality Variables)

Dependent Variable: Management and Cultural Dime

Gender DISC	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Male D	2.61	.186	2.24	2.98
I	2.62	.106	2.41	2.83
S	2.15	.186	1.78	2.52
C	2.80	.155	2.49	3.11

ONEWAY

ANOVA: Management and Cultural: Dominant category no significant differences

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	.210	1	.210	.576.	.458
Within Groups	6.20	17	.365		
Total	6.42	18			

ANOVA: Personality and Cultural: Influential category no significant differences

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	.080	1	.080	.226	.637
Within Groups	18.32	52	.352		
Total	18.40	53			

ANOVA: Personality Cultural: Females Steady –Relationship Category

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	2.185	1	2.185	9.12	.009
Within Groups	3.60	15	2.40		
Total	5.78	16			

Dependent Variable: Personality-Cultural: Males Compliant Category

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups Within Groups Total	1,726 4,980 6,706	1 22 23	1,726 .226	7,623	.011

SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL RESULTS

The dependent variable was the management cultural variable and the independent variable was the numerical total for all four personality types (DISC). The statistical relationship between the cultural management assessment and the total personality instrument was significant $F (7, 106) + 2.18, p<0.05$ the H2 hypothesis. However, there was no significant difference between males (Mean = 2.59, SD=0.57) and females on the relationship between gender and the cultural assessment H5 (Mean = 2.59, SD=0.59), but there were there significant differences among the different personality categories of the DISC and gender. The results between gender and DISC revealed significant statistical differences H4 $F (3,106) + 4.48, p<.05$ with females having significantly higher management cultural scores for the personality category "S", $F (1,15) = 9.12, p<0.05$, and males having higher management cultural scores for the personality category "C" $F(1,22) = 7.62, p<.005$. The independent variable stress, which required the respondents to rank their stress on a scale from one to ten, did not have any significant impact on any of the variables, H9. The stress variable affects stress in the social setting, the work setting and the variable time in the work place. Since the stress variable was not significant, the research results were not distorted and unreliable. .

IMPLICATIONS

This study's quantitative results of business professional personalities and their perception of their organizational management-culture provides supportive documentation that the type of personality an employee possesses is associated either favorably or unfavorably with the employee's respective organizational culture.

To provide a framework for the statistical results of this study the men and women were placed into categories based on education, occupation, titles, average hours worked, marital status, children, and income level. Forty-six percent of the women professionals had graduate degrees and forty-six percent bachelor degrees. Three women had two year associate degrees and two high school degrees. Similarly, the men professionals had fifty-two percent with graduate degrees, forty-three percent with bachelor degrees. Only two respondents had associate degrees. Between men and women the occupational titles were almost the same from vice-presidents, and directors down to managers for a total of forty seven for women and forty for men. Other professionals included three women attorneys, four men attorneys, four women accountants, five men accountants, two women salespersons, four men salespersons, two each for the consultants, and one person of each gender from the following: psychologist, social scientist, and network engineer. The average hours worked per week for women and men had only a two hour difference or less between men and women. On marital status (married, single, divorced or widowed) there was no variation between divorced males and females. Also, number of children did not vary between men and women. However, income levels indicated 13 more men earned more than $60,000 compared to the women. For the $40,000-$49,000 income category there were eighteen women and three men. In the $30,000-$39,000 category there were two women and two

men. Despite the income differences between men and women the statistical results showed no significant difference between males and females on the total management-cultural variable (See Descriptive Statistics: Mean = 2.59, SD = 0.57, females Mean 2.59, SD 0.59) nor were significant individual differences for the total personality assessment (DISC). However, the S personality category for females and C personality category for men in relation to the management-culture variable was significant.

The other demographic variables showed only numerical differences. Women in the S personality assessment category had the most years of service 13.9 compared to the D category of 6.4. The I category was 3.4 and the C category was 9.8. The C category for men had the most years of service with 7.9, the D category 6.7, I category 4.7, and the S category 7.5. Although years of experience as a demographic variable per se doesn't have a specific impact on explaining why there are differences between men and women, but in the context of the personality assessment the years of experience does have a research context. The research indicates the Type A or dominant type personalities are more aggressive, impatient and proactive, which means these personalities create opportunities to better themselves despite the possible constraints present within each organizational culture, when compared to the S and C types that are more apt to fall into the Type B personality category (Seibert, Kraimer, and Crant, 2001),.   For the D (Dominant) and I (Influential) personality categories the average years of experience for females was 4.85 and for males 5.7 compared to the S (Relationship) and C (Compliant) where the average years of service was 12.4 for females and 7.7 for males, which indicates the S and C personality types have a propensity to remain in their positions longer than the D and I personalities.

The recession of 2007-08 articles on organizational change and development emphasized leadership and organizational culture as pivotal variables in determining the process of change for organizations (Latta, 2009). To emphasize the need for career development programs an article in the Wall Street Journal indicated that the economy was growing stronger and companies had a shortage of qualified mangers (Light, 2010). The article points out the need for a basic career development program that incorporated leadership training in order to enhance the placement of the right person into the right position. This fit in turn affected organizational commitment, employee knowledge sharing, organizational efficacy and organizational effectiveness (Saleem, Adnan, Ambreen, 2011). Also, by initiating, and developing a human resource framework on top of a career development program an organization has the ability to assess their overall professional development program, which improves an organizations return on investment over time (Haskins and Shaffer, 2011)..

CONCLUSION

The organizational assessment presented in this study enables organizations to analyze the impact of the organization's culture initially and overtime. Another use of personality assessments pertains to the influence the assessment may have on the type of managerial style of the supervisors. For professional men and women the present research connects an employee's personality to an organization's management style and culture both on a group and individual basis. Although organizational cultures can vary considerably from very stable traditional cultures to very adaptable cultures, the degree of change in the external environment can also determine a firm's stability and ability to change direction.

Based on the statistical results of this study organizational cultural assessments and personality assessments should be considered as an integral part of an organizations career development program. This type of organizational development enables employees and organizations with a basis for understanding the organization's culture and the ability to understand each other. By having organizations evaluate and place individuals into organizational positions based on their personality, interests, skills, education, experience, attitudes, and values employee commitment and teamwork should increase. In summary, using the DISC assessment a D individual is very direct and would work well in positions that require quick decisions. The influential (I) individual would work well in communication positions because they have a tendency to be very verbal and somewhat aggressive. When the organization needs to build employee relationships and commitment, the S type of individual would be the best choice. Finally, where the position exhibits a measure of detailed structural consistency with set rules and procedures, the C personality should be the preferred choice...

In the future this study encourages a longitudinal research study that measures an organization's progress using various individual career development techniques in conjunction with this studies organizational cultural-managerial assessment.

REFERENCES

Alreck, P.L. and Settle, R. B. (1985). *The survey research handbook*, 45, Richard D. Irwin: Homewood, Illinois.

Arvey, R., Bouchard, T., Segal, N., and Abraham, L., (1989). Job satisfaction: environmental and the genetic component, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74 (2) 187-192.

Arvey, R. D., and Bouchard, T. J. Jr., (1994). Genetics, twins and organizational behavior, 16 47-83.

Arthur, W. Jr., Bell, S.T., Villado, A. J., and Doverspike, D., (2006). The use of person-organization fit in employment decision-making: An assessment of criterion-related validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (4) 786-801;

Barrick, M.R. and Mount, M.K., (2005). Yes, personality matters: Moving on to more important matters, *Human Performance* 18 (4) 359-372.

Bateman, T. S. and Crant, J.M., (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, March, 103-118.

Becker, H. S. (1982). A sociological View, *Yale Review, Summer, 513-27.*

Cable, J., (2010). Building an innovative culture, *Industry Week,* March 32-37.

Cameron, K., and Quin, R., (2006). Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework. *The Jossey-Bass Business & Management Series,* 1-242, San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & sons, Inc.

Cook, K. W., Vance, C. A. and Spector, E., (2000). The relation of candidate personality with selection-Interview Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 867-885.

Costa, P.T. Jr.,and Terraciano, A., (2001). Cross cultural differences in personality traits, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81 (2), 322-331.

Crant, J.M. and Bateman, T.S. (2000). Charismatic Leadership viewed from above: the impact of proactive personality, *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management,* 21 (1) 63-75.

Deal, T.E. and Kennedy, A. A., (1983). Culture: a new look through old lenses, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* November 1983, 501.

Digman, J.M., (1997). Higher factors of the big five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psycholoogy,* 73 (6) 1246-1256.

Friedman, M. and Rosenman, R. H., (1974). *Type A Behavior and Your Heart*, New York: Alfred A Knopf. 84.

Goffee, R., and Jones, G., (1998). *The character of the corporation,* New Harper Business, 21 and 132-133.

Haskins, M. E., and Shaffer, G., (2011). Assessing professional development program impact. *Strategic HR Review,* 10 (1) 15-20.

Hawkins, M., (2010), Create a climate of creativity. *Training,* January, 12.

Hogan, R., (2005). In defense of personality measurement: new wine for old whiners. *Human Performance* 18, no. 4, 331-341.

Holland, J.L., (1997). Making vocational choices: a theory of personality and work environments, *Psychological Assessment Resources.* Odessa, Fl.

House, R., Howard, A., and Walker, G., (1991). The prediction of managerial success: A competitive test of the person-situation debate. *Academy of Management: best Paper Proceedings, 215.*

Judge, T. A. and Cable, D. M., (1994). Applicant personality, organizational culture, and organizational attraction, *Personnel Psychology,* Summer 1997, 359-94.

Kendrick, D. and Funder, D., (1988). Profiting from controversy: lessons from the personality-situation debate, *American Psychologist, 43: 23-33*.

Krueger, D., (2000). Characteristics of the female entrepreneur. *Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship*, 12, 87-94.

Latta, G., (2009). The impact of organizational culture on leading change, *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies,* Vol. 16, 1, August 19-37.

Light, J. (2010). Leadship training gains urgency amid stronger economy, *Wall Street Journal,* August 23.

Loehlin, J., and Nichols, R., (1976). *Heredity, environment and personality: a study of 850 twins*, Austin: University of Texas.

Mohler, J., (1981). *Personal Concept*, Jack Mohler Associates, Garwood, New Jersey.

Powers, E., (2014). Innovating our thinking about management: a new model, *Advanced Management Journal,* Vol. 79, (1) 40-48.

O'Reilly III, C.A., Chapman, J. and Caldwell, D.E., (1991). People and organizational culture: a profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit, *Academy of Management Journal,* September, 487-516.

O'Reilly, C., and Chatman, J., (1996). *Culture as social control,* Research in Organizational Behavior, 18, 157-201.

Robbins, S., (2005). *Organizational Behavior,* Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River New Jersey, 594.

Roberts, G. W., Kuncel, N. R., Shiner, R., Caspi, A., and Goldberg, L. R., (2007). The power of personality, *Perspectives on Psychological Science 2*, (4) 313-344.

Saleem. W.A., Adnan, G., and Anbreen, M., (2011). Person organization fit commitment and knowledge sharing attitude-an analytical study. *Informational Management & Business Review,* 3 (2) 110-116..

Schmitt, N., (2004). Beyond the big five model: increases in understanding and practical utility." *Human Performance* 17, (3), 347-357.

Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. I., and Crant, J.M., (1999). Proactive personality and career success, *Journal of applied Psychology. 84 (3) 416-427.*

Woolsey, T. and Reinertson, R., (2014). Personality takes center stage in horizon's culture, *ESOP Report, June, 3-3*