

VU Research Portal

Specificity in Personality Measurement

de Vries, A.

2012

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

de Vries, A. (2012). *Specificity in Personality Measurement*. [PhD-Thesis - Research and graduation internal, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam]. VU University.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl



Chapter 1

Specificity in Personality Measurement:
An Introduction

Would you steal a million dollars, if it was certain you would never get caught?

Are you worrying about little things?

Are you usually the one who makes the first move in social situations?

Do you want to help others as much as possible?

Do you clean your office or home frequently?

Do you like people with unconventional views?

Your answers to these questions will reveal something about your personality: those characteristics and traits that make you the way you are. Numerous studies have demonstrated that someone's personality affects his or her performance at school and at work. Consequently, in selection situations personality tests are used to measure personal characteristics in order to predict future performance.

This use of personality tests raises questions concerning characteristics that may positively or negatively influence the predictive validity of such instruments. One characteristic that may positively influence the predictive validity is the *specificity* of personality measurements. Some scholars relate specificity to *trait* specificity, that is, using narrow traits rather than the traditional broad personality traits (e.g., Ashton, 1998). Other scholars imply another type of specificity, namely *contextual* specificity: the specificity of the situational context to which respondents refer when filling out a personality inventory, such as the home, school, or work context (e.g., Butter & Born, in press; Lievens, De Corte, & Schollaert, 2008). Yet, another type of specificity is *referent* specificity, which refers to the specification of the comparison other in self-reported personality (e.g., Heine, Lehman, Peng, & Greenholtz, 2002). Therefore, this dissertation investigates the relevance of trait, contextual, and referent specificity in the prediction of important *academic and work outcomes*. In addition, as the past decades have seen significant increases in the numbers of ethnic minorities in Western societies, this dissertation also focuses on another important issue in personality assessment, namely *ethnicity* effects. Specificity in personality measurements may shed new light on this. For instance, in the case of trait specificity, previous studies have shown that the summation of facet scores to obtain a broad trait wrongly masked substantial ethnic group variation in facet scores (e.g., Van Iddekinge, Taylor, & Eidson, 2005).

In the following paragraphs, the literature will be reviewed regarding (1) existing personality frameworks (2), personality as predictor of academic outcomes, (3) personality as predictor of work outcomes, (4) trait specificity, (5) contextual specificity, and (6) referent specificity. If relevant, the issue of ethnicity is discussed after each part. The introduction concludes with an overview of the chapters.

Personality models

The most widely used framework for personality research is the Big Five model (or Five-Factor Model; FFM). This model is based on psycholexical studies analyzing personality-relevant terms used by people to describe themselves and others. The Big Five model consists of five higher order personality factors: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience (e.g., Costa & McCrae, 1992; Goldberg, 1990). In recent years, analyses based on the same psycholexical studies, which previously revealed the Big Five dimensions, have shown that personality characteristics may be better described in six (rather than five) dimensions (Ashton et al., 2004; Ashton & Lee, 2007; Lee & Ashton, 2008). This has led to the new six-dimensional HEXACO model, which consists of Honesty-Humility (H), Emotionality (E), Extraversion (X), Agreeableness (A), Conscientiousness (C), and Openness to Experience (O). The most important change in the HEXACO model with respect to the Big Five Model is the added dimension of Honesty-Humility, which is defined by honesty, sincerity, fairness, modesty, and lack of greed (Lee & Ashton, 2004). Of the remaining HEXACO dimensions, three are similar to Big Five dimensions: Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience. Agreeableness and Emotionality, the other two HEXACO dimensions, diverge somewhat from their Big Five counterparts (Neuroticism and Agreeableness). The HEXACO dimension Agreeableness includes traits related to irritability and temper. In the Big Five model, these are listed under Emotional (In)stability. Similarly, several traits associated with sentimentality and sensitivity are allocated to Agreeableness in the Big Five model, whereas they are associated with Emotionality in the HEXACO model.

Based on the HEXACO model, two questionnaires have been constructed to measure the six dimensions: the HEXACO Personality Inventory Revised (HEXACO-PI-R; Ashton & Lee, 2007; De Vries, Ashton, & Lee, 2009; Lee & Ashton, 2006, 2008) and the Multicultural Personality Test - Big Six (De Vries, De Vries, & Born, 2011; NOA, 2009). Prior research indicated strong convergent relations for the MPT-BS factor scales with the corresponding personality scales from the HEXACO-PI-R (De Vries et al., 2011; NOA, 2009). Moreover, earlier research has also shown adequate psychometric properties of the HEXACO-PI-R. With regard to the construct validity, several studies have produced evidence that the HEXACO dimensions correlate with similar theorized constructs (Ashton, Lee, De Vries, Perugini, Gnisci, & Sergi, 2006; Ashton, Lee, Marcus, & De Vries, 2007; Szarota, Ashton, & Lee, 2007). With regard to the predictive validity, research has shown that the HEXACO model, and especially Honesty-Humility, is able to explain incremental variance in the prediction of important criteria over and above Big Five measures (Lee, Ogunfowora, & Ashton, 2005). Due to the dimension of Honesty-Humility, the HEXACO model has been found to better predict anti-social behaviors directed at organizations (Lee, Ashton, & Shin, 2005), workplace delinquency (Lee, Ashton, & De Vries, 2005), unethical business decisions (Ashton & Lee, 2008), and more general antisocial behaviors such as Machiavellianism (Ashton, Lee, & Son, 2000; Lee & Ashton, 2005), Psychopathy

(Ashton et al., 2000; De Vries, Lee, & Ashton, 2008; Lee & Ashton, 2005), Narcissism (Lee & Ashton, 2005), Egoism (De Vries, De Vries, De Hoogh, & Feij, 2009), and Social Adroitness (Ashton & Lee, 2008; Ashton et al., 2000) than the Big Five model. All in all, the six-dimensional personality model, and especially the dimension Honesty–Humility, seems to predict variance associated with important outcomes above and beyond the variance predicted by Big Five measures.

Personality in academic contexts

In educational contexts, previous studies have frequently focused on identifying predictors of study success. A number of studies have indicated that personality factors explain variance in academic performance over and above the variance explained by cognitive ability (Conard, 2006; Furnham & Mosen, 2009; Goff & Ackerman, 1992; Nofle & Robins, 2007; Poropat, 2009). Cognitive ability indicates how someone *can* perform (so-called maximal performance); hence the added value of personality in predicting academic performance may be its focus on how someone actually *will* perform (so-called typical performance; Furnham & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2004; Goff & Ackerman, 1992; O'Connor & Paunonen, 2007).

Previous research has shown that Conscientiousness is the strongest Big Five predictor of academic performance (e.g., Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003a, 2003b; Conard, 2006; Kappe & Van der Flier, 2010; Nofle & Robins, 2007; Richardson & Abraham, 2009). This has been confirmed by a recent meta-analysis showing that Conscientiousness is consistently and positively correlated with academic performance (O'Connor & Paunonen, 2007). Consequently, personality traits such as self-discipline, punctuality, and perseverance may be important for academic success. Furthermore, the other personality dimensions are found to be either unrelated or inconsistently related to academic performance. However, no field studies have yet focused on a possible association between academic performance and the newly identified personality trait Honesty–Humility. This dissertation aims to fill this gap by investigating whether being honest and humble leads to higher levels of academic performance.

Until now, studies have mostly used grade point average (GPA) as an academic criterion. Yet, this dissertation also includes another academic criterion, namely counterproductive academic behavior (CAB). Examples of CABs are cheating, substance abuse, and plagiarism. The Big Five dimension Conscientiousness appears to be one of the best (negative) predictor of counterproductive behavior at school (Marcus, Lee, & Ashton, 2007). This may be due to the fact that conscientious students are organized, hard working, precise, and persistent. These personality traits would make counterproductive behavior unnecessary. Within the HEXACO model, Honesty–Humility seems to be most important for predicting counterproductive behaviors at work and at school (Ashton & Lee, 2008; Lee, Ashton, & De Vries, 2005; Lee, Ashton, & Shin, 2005; Marcus et al., 2007).

High scores on Honesty-Humility may indicate an unwillingness to take advantage of others, which may consequently result in avoiding CABs.

To sum up, with respect to personality as predictor of academic outcomes, the following research questions may be formulated:

Research question 1:

- a) Are Conscientiousness and Honesty-Humility positively related to academic performance?
- b) Are Conscientiousness and Honesty-Humility negatively related to counterproductive academic behavior?

Ethnic majority and minority students. The past decades have seen an increasing ethnic diversity in Western societies (Severiens & Wolff, 2009). In The Netherlands, the number of first year non-Western ethnic minority students in higher education, for instance, has more than doubled, reaching a total figure of almost 93,000 students from 2000 to 2010 according to Statistics Netherlands (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek; CBS). This is especially relevant because several studies have shown that students from ethnic minority backgrounds are generally less successful academically than ethnic majority students in terms of study progress, grade point average, and dropout rates (Jennissen & Oudhof, 2007; Meeuwisse, Severiens, & Born, 2010; Roth & Bobko, 2000). In the light of the fact that personality can contribute to the prediction of academic outcomes, this dissertation strives to answer the following research question:

Research question 2: Are the relations between personality and academic performance similar among ethnic majority and minority students?

Personality in work contexts

In organizational contexts, previous research has largely focused on personality as a predictor of (1) job performance, (2) organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and (3) counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000).

Job performance is commonly understood to refer to task performance, which is part of the formal job description and may be described as fulfilling specific tasks of the job's requirements (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). The Big Five dimension Conscientiousness has consistently been shown to be the most valid and stable predictor of job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Salgado, 1997; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991). This means that, regardless of the occupation, conscientious employees tend to perform better than less conscientious colleagues. While the other Big Five dimensions have also been shown to be related to job performance, their influence varies with different types of occupations. In a recent study, Johnson, Rowatt, and Petrini

(2011) were the first to show a significant and positive relation between job performance and the added sixth personality dimension (Honesty-Humility). Yet, their results were based on a sample consisting of employees working exclusively in a care-giving occupation. One specific aim of this dissertation therefore is to examine whether Honesty-Humility explains variance in job performance among other occupational groups as well.

Whilst job performance refers to obligatory behavior related to the job's requirements (Campbell, 1990), OCBs include behaviors that, while not part of an employee's formal job description, are nevertheless beneficial to an organization (Organ, 1988). Some examples of OCBs are: performing extra duties without complaint, staying late to help a coworker, using time efficiently, taking the time to welcome new employees, and representing the organization in a positive manner (Turnipseed & Rassuli, 2005). Several previous studies have analyzed the role of personality in the display of OCBs. These studies concluded that one personality dimension in particular has a strong and positive relationship with OCB: Conscientiousness (e.g., Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001; Ilies, Fulmer, Spitzmuller, & Johnson, 2009; Lapierre & Hackett, 2007; Miller, Griffin, & Hart, 1999; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Interestingly, Motowidlo, Borman, and Schmitt (1997) argue that Agreeableness and Extraversion also predict OCB. Although the empirical findings for these dimensions are less pronounced than those for Conscientiousness, researchers have indeed found significant correlations between Agreeableness and Extraversion on the one hand and OCB on the other (Ilies et al., 2009; McManus & Kelly, 1999; Miller et al., 1999; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). One issue that to our knowledge has not been studied is the potential relation between OCB and the personality dimension Honesty-Humility. Hence the present dissertation also examines whether Honesty-Humility positively affects displays of OCBs.

The potential utility of personality dimensions has also been demonstrated in the prediction of CWB, which pertains to the intentional or unintentional actions harmful to an organization or members of an organization (Sackett & DeVore, 2001; Spector, 1997). This includes behaviors such as theft, misuse of information, misuse of time and resources, unsafe work behavior, absenteeism, poor quality of work, alcohol and drug abuse, and inappropriate verbal and physical actions (Gruys & Sackett, 2003). Conscientiousness has been found to be the strongest (negative) predictor of CWB (Fallon, Avis, Kudisch, Gornet, & Frost, 2000; Salgado, 2002). In addition, the HEXACO personality model, particularly Honesty-Humility, has been shown to explain important variance in counterproductive work behaviors as well. Honesty-Humility has for instance been found to negatively predict anti-social behaviors directed at organizations (Lee, Ashton, & Shin, 2005) and workplace delinquency (Lee, Ashton, & De Vries, 2005).

Based on these previous studies concerning personality as predictor of work outcomes, this dissertation will address the following research questions:

Research question 3:

- a) Are Conscientiousness and Honesty-Humility positively related to job performance?
- b) Are Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Extraversion, and Honesty-Humility positively related to organizational citizenship behavior?
- c) Are Conscientiousness and Honesty-Humility negatively related to counterproductive work behavior?

Dutch majority and Turkish-Dutch minority employees. Turkish-Dutch immigrants form the largest ethnic minority group in The Netherlands, constituting 2.3% of the total population according to the CBS. These Turkish-Dutch people contribute to the Dutch economy in a wide variety of jobs. The studies mentioned above revealed that personality measurements may be used to provide significant information for the prediction of a wide range of work-related outcomes. An interesting question that has not been examined yet, is whether personality predicts work outcomes to the same degree among Dutch majority and Turkish-Dutch minority employees. De Meijer, Born, Terlouw, and Van der Molen (2008) have shown that different selection methods yield different predictive validity coefficients among ethnic minority and majority trainees. Their cognitive ability test appeared to be a stronger predictor of training success for ethnic minorities than for ethnic majorities. The selection interview, on the other hand, was a stronger predictor for ethnic majorities than for minorities. To further examine these issues, this dissertation will address the following research question:

Research question 4: Are the relations between personality and work outcomes similar among Dutch majority and Turkish-Dutch minority employees?

The following discusses the relevance of trait specificity, contextual specificity, and referent specificity in the prediction of academic and work outcomes.

Trait specificity

As previous studies have indicated, the validity of personality in the prediction of academic and work outcomes improves with the analyses of narrow facet traits instead of broad factor traits. Personality models are typically hierarchically arranged by means of different description levels. The lowest level consists of narrow, specific personality aspects. Moving upwards in the hierarchy, these separate aspects are combined and merge into broader personality factors such as the Big Five or HEXACO dimensions (e.g., Goldberg, 1990). Empirical researchers are therefore confronted with a methodological decision, namely to examine the criteria's relation either to the broad personality traits or to the narrow facets. This question of using either the broad, heterogeneous personality

factors or more narrow, homogenous personality facets, is widely known as the *bandwidth-fidelity dilemma* (Cronbach & Gleser, 1965; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1996).

In favor of using the broad dimensions, researchers have argued that most work outcomes, such as job performance, are themselves multi-faceted concepts and similarly complex predictors are required to maximize predictive validity (Schmidt & Kaplan, 1971; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1996). Following this line of argument, broad dimensions are to be preferred as predictors of performance criteria, because narrower traits are usually assessed with fewer items, resulting in lower reliabilities of these scales. This in turn will limit the size of the correlations found and consequently will underestimate the relation between personality and work outcomes (e.g., Ones & Viswesvaran, 1996). Furthermore, examining the broad dimensions as opposed to the narrow facets allows a wide-angle lens and consequently a better understanding of the 'big picture'. In other words, investigating broad factors in relation to work outcomes could lead to a better understanding of behavior within organizations (Hanisch, Hulin, & Roznowski, 1998).

From the opposite point of view, other scholars have advocated the use of narrow facets. The broad personality factors might be less useful for predicting criteria due to the heterogeneity of the underlying facets. For instance, several facets may display strong correlations with a criterion whereas others perhaps are barely or not at all related. This would reduce the predictive validity of the entire factor (O'Neill & Allen, 2011). It has been argued that a narrow facet scale consists of psychometrically matching items, and therefore one facet may individually add unique contribution to the prediction of behavior (Paunonen, Rothstein, & Jackson, 1999). Finally, some researchers believe that personality factors are too broad to be useful in describing personality, implying a loss of detailed information. In contrast, the use of narrow facets may reveal deeper insights into an individual's personality, and consequently, provide more understanding of the relations between personality and work behaviors (e.g., Tett, Steele, & Beauregard, 2003).

The main evidence thus far seems to underscore the position of narrow bandwidth advocates, since several studies have shown that the individual facets of the broad personality factors are better predictors of all kinds of criteria than the broad factors themselves (e.g., Ashton, 1998; Paunonen & Ashton, 2001b; Paunonen, Haddock, Forsterling, & Keinonen, 2003). Christiansen and Robie (2011) emphasized the importance of studies concentrating on narrow personality traits, arguing that: "For example, since 2003, there have been more than 200 studies published in the *Journal of Applied Psychology* and *Personnel Psychology* that used the FFM, and only 10 (< 5%) have considered more narrow traits in any way; very few used scales that even provide scoring instructions at the facet level" (p. 183). Hence one of the purposes of this dissertation is to examine whether the use of narrow traits improves the prediction of academic and work outcomes. The following research question will be examined:

Research question 5: Are narrow traits more strongly related to academic and work criteria than the broad factors themselves?

Ethnic score differences. While previous studies have found that cognitive ability tests are among the best predictors of job performance, they also produce considerable differences between majority and minority group members. In contrast, smaller ethnic score differences have been reported on personality tests (Hough, Oswald, & Ployhart, 2001; Ployhart & Holtz, 2008; Roth, Bobko, McFarland, & Buster, 2008). Assuming that the use of broad traits masks higher levels of predictive validity of the narrow traits, it may also conceal higher levels of ethnic score differences. To our knowledge, studies focusing explicitly on ethnic score differences on narrow personality facets are few and far between. Van Iddekinge et al. (2005) found that the merging of facet scores into the broad trait of Integrity concealed significant ethnic group variation in facet scores. Similarly, Foldes, Duehr, and Ones (2008) found that analyses on the facet level showed moderate group differences, whereas the use of broad personality factors to compare groups appeared to mask these differences. Based on these studies, it may be that existing differences between ethnic groups on narrow facet traits are concealed by the use of the broad factor traits. At present, our knowledge of possible ethnic score differences on the narrow personality traits is rather limited, in particular since ethnic score differences on personality scales have been studied mainly in organizational settings. This dissertation therefore investigates ethnic score differences in an educational *as well as* an organizational setting. To this purpose, the following research question has been formulated:

Research question 6: Do narrow facet traits show larger ethnic score differences than the respective broad factor traits?

In line with Research question 2 and 4, this dissertation also investigates whether the relations between the personality *facets* and outcomes are similar among ethnic majorities and minorities.

Contextual specificity

A second way to improve the predictive validity of personality measures, besides focusing on narrow personality traits, is adding a specific context or ‘frame-of-reference’ to each personality item. The frame-of-reference effect is rooted in the *theory of conditional dispositions* (Wright & Mischel, 1987), arguing that “individuals may behave consistently and predictably within *similar* situations, but do not necessarily behave consistently across *different* situations” (Bing, Whanger, Davison, & VanHook, 2004, p. 150-151). In a traditional (i.e., non-contextualized) personality inventory, respondents may think of a work situation when responding to one item and of a home situation when responding to

the next item. While people do not necessarily behave similarly in different situations, this may result in *within-person inconsistency* when giving answers to personality items (Lievens et al., 2008). Confirming this line of thought, Lievens et al. (2008) showed that adding a context, for example by means of the tag “at work” to each item, improved respondents’ consistency when filling out a personality test, thereby reducing within-person inconsistency and yielding higher reliabilities and predictive validities. In addition, the higher reliabilities and predictive validities may also be the result of reduced *between-person variability* as a consequence of adding a frame-of-reference (e.g., Bing et al., 2004; Schmit, Ryan, Stierwalt, & Powell, 1995). Lacking a fixed frame-of-reference, different test participants will complete one and the same scale from different perspectives. Some respondents, for instance, may think of a home situation whereas others will imagine a work situation. Adding a frame-of-reference to personality items thus also helps to prevent irrelevant score differences between respondents.

Previous empirical studies focusing on the frame-of-reference effect confirm the positive effects of providing a specific context in personality tests. In educational settings, adding the tag “at school” to Conscientiousness items has been shown to increase the prediction of GPA (Bing et al., 2004; Lievens et al., 2008). Moreover, Conscientiousness items with an irrelevant “at work” tag showed lower predictive validities in the prediction of GPA (Lievens et al., 2008). With respect to the prediction of work criteria, the frame-of-reference effect has not been extensively studied. Therefore, this dissertation aims to improve the prediction of three important *work* criteria, namely job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and counterproductive work behavior, by adding a relevant context to the personality items. In order to do so, the following research questions will be addressed:

Research question 7:

- a) Do work-specific personality scales have stronger relations with job performance, OCB, and CWB than non-contextualized and (conceptually irrelevant) home-specific personality scales?
- b) Do home-specific personality scales have weaker relations with job performance, OCB, and CWB than their corresponding non-contextualized personality scales?

Please note that the empirical studies in this dissertation do not pay attention to ethnicity effects with regard to contextual specificity. However, in the general discussion (see Chapter 8), there are some suggestions provided for future research concerning this issue.

Referent specificity

The issue of specificity may also be approached from a third angle, namely with respect to the so-called comparison other issue, which refers to the reference-group effect (RGE;

Peng, Nisbett, & Wong, 1997; Heine et al., 2002). This RGE occurs when responses to self-report items are based on respondents' scores relative to a comparison group rather than on their absolute level of a construct (Credé, Bashshur, & Niehorster, 2010). RGE generally reflects the fact that respondents within a certain group are more likely to use people from their own group as comparison others than people from another group. This notion is rooted in the *social comparison theory*, which holds that similar rather than dissimilar others are preferred as referents of social comparison (Festinger, 1954).

In the case of cross-cultural personality comparisons, however, when all people compare themselves with similar others, i.e., people from the own cultural group, true personality differences between cultural or ethnic groups may be concealed. Ordinal or (quasi-)interval scales, such as Likert scales, which are typically used for cross-cultural and cross-ethnic personality comparisons, may be especially susceptible to the RGE (Heine et al., 2002). People with a Chinese background for instance, are more likely to compare themselves with the norm of the Chinese cultural group, which is always located around the middle of the scale. People with an American background, on the other hand, may compare themselves with the norm of *their* cultural group, which again is located around the middle of the scale (Peng et al., 1997). As a consequence, true personality differences between cultural or ethnic groups may be masked.

Ethnic reference groups. Credé et al. (2010) were recently the first to examine the RGE in self-reported personality measures, using different age, gender, and relative (such as family, friends, and people in general) reference groups. Yet no studies have been conducted to test the RGE in personality judgments with different *ethnic* reference groups. Moreover, it is yet unknown what, if any, effects are to be expected among ethnic groups living in the same country. To address these issues, the following research question has been formulated:

Research question 8: To what extent are members of an ethnic minority group influenced by perceptions of comparison others when filling out a personality test?

Overview of the Chapters

This dissertation consists of six empirical chapters elaborating on the recent discussion with respect to specificity in personality measurement. Each chapter may be read independently from the others chapters, although some chapters overlap in terms of theoretical backgrounds, samples, and methods used.

Chapter 2 focuses on *trait specificity in an academic setting*. The purpose of the study described in this chapter was (a) to investigate the relations between Conscientiousness and Honesty-Humility on the one hand and two academic criteria, that is, grade point average and counterproductive academic behavior, on the other (Research

question 1) and (b) to compare the validity of the narrow traits of Conscientiousness and Honesty-Humility to the validity of the broad traits in the prediction of both academic criteria (Research question 5).¹ To examine these issues, two studies were conducted, using different personality questionnaires and different samples.

Chapter 3 focuses on *ethnicity* in particular. The data used in the study described in this chapter form part of the second study described in Chapter 2. We now used a separate ethnic majority and ethnic minority sample, the latter consisting of non-Western ethnic minorities with a Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese, or Antillean background, which are the four largest ethnic minority groups residing in The Netherlands. This chapter provides an answer to the question whether the relations between Conscientiousness and Honesty-Humility on the one hand and academic performance on the other are similar among ethnic majority and ethnic minority students (Research question 2). Further, ethnic score differences on personality scales were investigated by focusing on the narrow personality traits (Research question 6).

Chapter 4 explores *trait specificity in a work setting*. The purpose of this chapter was to provide more insight in the relations between the six personality dimensions on the one hand and three major work outcomes, that is, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and counterproductive work behavior on the other (Research question 3). In addition and in line with Chapter 2, we examined whether the narrow facets were capable of explaining more criterion variance in the work outcomes than the broad personality factors themselves (Research question 5). This chapter reports the results from two studies using different personality questionnaires and different samples.

Chapter 5 focuses on a comparison between *Dutch and Turkish-Dutch* employees with regard to personality in relation to job performance, OCB, and CWB. The Dutch majority data used in this chapter form part of the second study described in Chapter 4. We enlarged these data with ethnic minority data consisting of employees from a Turkish-Dutch minority background. The first purpose was to investigate whether the validity coefficients of several personality traits in the prediction of job performance, OCB, and CWB were approximately equal for the Dutch and the Turkish-Dutch workers (Research question 4). The second purpose was to examine ethnic score differences on personality factor- and facet scales among Dutch majority and Turkish-Dutch minority employees (Research question 6).

Chapter 6 combines *contextual and trait specificity in a work setting*. The study described in this chapter explores relations of Conscientiousness and Honesty-Humility with job performance, OCB, and CWB. We focused on contextual specificity by adding situational contexts (i.e., a home and work context) to non-contextualized personality items and investigated whether work-specific personality scales had stronger relations

¹ Please note that the order of the eight research questions introduced in this chapter does not exactly correspond with the sequence in which the research questions are investigated.

with the work criteria than the non-contextualized and (conceptually irrelevant) home-specific personality scales. Further, we examined whether the home-specific personality scales had weaker relations with job performance, OCB, and CWB than their corresponding non-contextualized personality scales (Research question 7). Finally, we explored the predictive validity of the narrow traits and compared this with that of the traditional broad traits (Research question 5).

Chapter 7 examines *the reference-group effect* among Turkish-Dutch minority members. We investigated whether (1) personality differences between Turkish-Dutch minorities and Dutch majorities were masked when Turkish-Dutch compared themselves with people from their own ethnic group (in-group comparison) and (2) whether personality differences between Turkish-Dutch minorities and Dutch majorities came forward when Turkish-Dutch compared themselves with a Dutch majority out-group (Research question 8).

Chapter 8 presents a summary and general discussion regarding the six empirical studies. We (1) summarize the methodology and main findings of the empirical studies, (2) discuss our results' theoretical implications and contribution to previous research, (3) discuss several potential weaknesses of our empirical studies, (4) provide a number of suggestions for further research, and (5) shed light on various practical implications of the empirical studies.