

R3_FS-483482_10_3000-2026-03-25-G3kbS.docx

 Shri Vile Parle Kelavani Mandal

Document Details

Submission ID

trn:oid::9832:134122446

Submission Date

Apr 3, 2026, 9:48 PM GMT+5:30

Download Date

Apr 3, 2026, 9:51 PM GMT+5:30

File Name

R3_FS-483482_10_3000-2026-03-25-G3kbS.docx

File Size

42.0 KB

18 Pages

4,195 Words

26,918 Characters



24% detected as AI

The percentage indicates the combined amount of likely AI-generated text as well as likely AI-generated text that was also likely AI-paraphrased.

Caution: Review required.

It is essential to understand the limitations of AI detection before making decisions about a student's work. We encourage you to learn more about Turnitin's AI detection capabilities before using the tool.

Detection Groups

-  **10 AI-generated only 24%**
Likely AI-generated text from a large-language model.
-  **0 AI-generated text that was AI-paraphrased 0%**
Likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

Disclaimer

Our AI writing assessment is designed to help educators identify text that might be prepared by a generative AI tool. Our AI writing assessment may not always be accurate (i.e., our AI models may produce either false positive results or false negative results), so it should not be used as the sole basis for adverse actions against a student. It takes further scrutiny and human judgment in conjunction with an organization's application of its specific academic policies to determine whether any academic misconduct has occurred.

Frequently Asked Questions

How should I interpret Turnitin's AI writing percentage and false positives?

The percentage shown in the AI writing report is the amount of qualifying text within the submission that Turnitin's AI writing detection model determines was either likely AI-generated text from a large-language model or likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI paraphrase tool or word spinner.

False positives (incorrectly flagging human-written text as AI-generated) are a possibility in AI models.

AI detection scores under 20%, which we do not surface in new reports, have a higher likelihood of false positives. To reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation, no score or highlights are attributed and are indicated with an asterisk in the report (*%).

The AI writing percentage should not be the sole basis to determine whether misconduct has occurred. The reviewer/instructor should use the percentage as a means to start a formative conversation with their student and/or use it to examine the submitted assignment in accordance with their school's policies.

What does 'qualifying text' mean?

Our model only processes qualifying text in the form of long-form writing. Long-form writing means individual sentences contained in paragraphs that make up a longer piece of written work, such as an essay, a dissertation, or an article, etc. Qualifying text that has been determined to be likely AI-generated will be highlighted in cyan in the submission, and likely AI-generated and then likely AI-paraphrased will be highlighted purple.

Non-qualifying text, such as bullet points, annotated bibliographies, etc., will not be processed and can create disparity between the submission highlights and the percentage shown.



Ilya CW2 ADT

Name of Student

[Name of the Institution]

Ilya CW2 ADT

Introduction

Personality assessment tools have become ubiquitous in the organisational setting, with the urgency of team development work in particular (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022). Two fundamentally different approaches dominate the modern practice: type-based categorical methods and trait-based dimensional methods (Kang et al., 2023). Understanding the difference between these frameworks and the underlying theory is critical. It also has practical implications for developing teams within organisations aiming for effective, ethical, and scientifically-driven personnel strategies (Peters et al., 2024).

Comparing Type and Trait Assessment Approach

Type-based assessment tools work from a categorical perspective, that is to say, that personality consists of discrete, non-overlapping psychological types (Furnham, 2022). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and digital version of the same, 16 Personality (6 Personality factors (16PF), are a good example of this type (Erford et al., 2025). These instruments sort individuals according to the dichotomous dimensions of preferences (Extraversion vs. Introversion, Sensing vs. Intuition, Thinking vs. Feeling, Judging vs. Perceiving). There are 16 possible personality classification (ENTJ, ISFP) (Kordsmeyer et al., 2024). Each type has a positively-framed profile description that is supposed to make the profile more psychological and engaging.

In contrast, trait-based assessment works bottom up from a dimensional framework, and personality is viewed as a continuum of variation along underlying spectra (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022). The Five-Factor Model or Big Five (operationalised using instruments which

are designed to measure Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism/Emotional Stability) measures individuals across a range of scales instead of putting people in boxes (Eshete et al., 2025). This sort of dimensional approach recognizes that the vast majority of people lie at intermediate points across traits, with extremes being quite rare psychologically (Zhu et al., 2025). The theoretical distinction has enormous implications. Furnham, (2022) believes that type categorisation is fundamentally distorting the structure of personality; empirical research consistently shows that personality functions as continua, rather than being discrete clusters. Categorical type assignment means that continuous personality information is squeezed into artificial bins, making meaningful individual differences difficult to see and stifles nuance within type categories (supported by Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022).

Reliability and Measurement Consistency

One important distinction that stands between types and trait approaches would arise in the consistency of measurement (Francis and Village, 2022). Type tools show quite alarming instability when some individuals take retests (Satow, 2026). Francis and Village (2022) report that 40 - 50 per cent of respondents receive different type classifications on retesting within weeks, of this critically undermining the validity of type-based interventions. This volatility makes type-based self-knowledge, interpersonal judgements of team compatibility, and role allocations decisions in a shaky way (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022).

Erford et al. (2025) collated 25 years of MBTI research from 193 studies. They confirmed acceptable internal consistency (0.845-0.921) but highlighted test-retest reliability as a persistent weakness. For organisations that use type tools when people are making consequential decisions, this is disqualifying because people belonging to one type may be reclassified differently weeks later, invalidating any approach to team building based on type stability (Chen

et al., 2022). Trait instruments, on the other hand, have an increased degree of measurement stability (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022). Big Five assessments have been shown to possess internal consistency coefficients between 0.78 and 0.92 and much higher test-retest reliability over periods of measurement, and therefore lend organisational decision-makers confidence in the persistence of measured personality characteristics (Kordsmeyer et al., 2024; Soto and John, 2022).

Predictive Validity and Organisational Outcomes

Type-based tools demonstrate low predictive validity for occupational outcomes. Erford et al. (2025) found that MBTI type categories poorly predict job performance, leadership effectiveness, and team functioning. Zarate-Torres and Correa (2023) studied 529 students to examine relationships between MBTI types and leadership behaviours. Only 7 of 20 hypothesised relationships were statistically significant, resulting in a 65% failure rate. This pattern is consistent across occupational settings. Overall, type classifications provide little accuracy in predicting success in specific roles, leadership potential, or team functioning (Furnham, 2022).

Trait-based approaches, conversely, have good predictive validity (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022; Kordsmeyer et al., 2024). Conscientiousness has been shown to predict job performance across various occupations with sample sizes of .26 to .71 with significantly larger samples (.53+) for cognitively demanding and professional and managerial occupations (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022). Longitudinal job performance consistency and team stability are predicted by emotional stability (Kordsmeyer et al., 2024). Agreeableness is related to people collaborating well and working as a team. Extraversion has good predictive validity ($r = .40+$) in interpersonally demanding occupations like sales and leadership and zero to minimal prediction

in analytically oriented, technical functions. This role-specificity makes possible sophisticated occupational matching, which is unavailable through type approaches (Conley and Brown, 2023).

Response Bias and Measurement Integrity

Type tools are prone to intentional response distortion and social desirability bias, especially problematic in selection circumstances where applicants have incentives to tell lies about themselves (Furnham, 2022). Individuals can open type descriptions over the Internet, choose preferred type designations, and selectively respond to assessment items in order to receive desired classifications (Erford et al., 2025). This is a vulnerability to deliberate fraud, often at the expense of validity, and especially when high-stakes organisational decisions are involved. Big Five instruments include validity scales that are designed to identify faking and response distortion that give organisational protection against intentional misrepresentation which type tools do not (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022; Soto and John, 2022).

Critical Evaluation of Type vs Trait Approaches

Both of these features of type/trait measurements pose a paradox for the practitioners (Furnham, 2022). Type tools are more accessible and are conversation-friendly, but do not have a scientific level or organisational feasibility (Erford et al., 2025). On the other hand, trait tools are sufficiently predictive and scientifically sound, but may be too difficult to interpret unless interpreted by a specialist (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022). Organisation-wise, this paradox implies that the tools can be chosen based on purpose. Type instruments may come in handy when dealing with low-stakes team brainstorming or when getting acquainted with the concepts of personality (Furnham, 2022). Trait tests like the Big Five prove much more useful when it comes

to strategic decision-making, including role distribution, leadership building, people management, and team building (Furnham, 2022).

Evaluation: The Dominance of the Traits Approach

The comparative analysis makes trait-based dimensional assessment scientifically better for organisational decision-making (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022; Kordsmeyer et al., 2024). Type tools, whilst being psychologically interesting and facilitating conversation, are based upon false categorical premises that are contradicted by personality science (Furnham, 2022). Their 40-50 per cent test-retest inadequacy, poor predictive validity (65 per cent failure rate in the prediction of leadership), and the distorted nature in which they are subject to render them unfit for making consequential decisions on such matters in an organisation (hiring, promotion, allocation of roles) (Erford et al., 2025; Francis and Village, 2022). Approaches based on traits are scientifically superior over various indices: A high internal consistency (0.78-0.92), high predictive validity with occupational relationships well-documented, facilitate continuous measurement to show nuance of the individual, and provide cross-cultural validation that proves the aviation of a reactionary nature (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022; Soto and John, 2022). These are the characteristics that allow for sophisticated occupational matching, role-specific prediction, and measurable improvements in performance. Accordingly, organisations deploying type tools must limit their application to low-stakes conversational devices explicitly framed as having low scientific validity (Kordsmeyer et al., 2024). Consequential organisational decisions need to be based on trait-based assessment coupled with tests of ability, structured interviews, and work samples.

The Big Five Model in Organisational Team Development

The Five-Factor Model is the result of evolutionary convergence from a number of research traditions (Soto and John, 2022). Personality lexical analyses of different languages, factor analytical studies, and investigations of cross-cultural validity converge independently on five core dimensions, giving scientific robustness beyond what is extraordinary (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022). Unlike type categorisations, which are theoretically arbitrary, the Big Five has resulted from empirical convergence, which does give some credence to the universality of its application (Soto and John, 2022). The cross-cultural validity of the model provides for the generalisability of the model. Comparative factor structures have been found and reproduced in numerous populations, languages, and cultures, giving evidence for the Big Five being a stable dimensional structure that cuts across cultural boundaries (Kordsmeyer et al., 2024). This cross-cultural replication, which is lacking in typification's, establishes the Big Five as a scientifically defensible personality construct for use across various organisational situations.

Conscientiousness and Job Performance

Conscientiousness is the one that shows the best and most stable predictive validity across all work situations and organisational contexts (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022; Kordsmeyer et al., 2024). The trait, operationalised as individual differences in organisation, discipline, aiming at goals, and being dependable correlate substantially and consistently with job performance in all occupations studied (Soto and John, 2022). Effect sizes vary in relation to the complexity of the job and cognitive requirements low complexity jobs and routine tasks have smaller correlations ($r = .26 - .40$), while cognitively challenging professional and managerial jobs that require planning, coordination and quality control have much larger effects ($r = .53 - .71$) (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022). This pattern of complexity reflects the particular relevance and salience of conscientiousness in detail-oriented, organisationally demanding and planning-

intensive jobs where systematic task management and attention to specifications and adherence to procedures are directly involved in the determination of occupational success. This role-specific predictive validity allows organizational advantage and complex occupational matching that cannot be achieved using categorical-type approaches.

While conscientiousness has an excellent predictive validity in numerous occupations (Dimitriou & Galanakis, 2022; Kordsmeyer et al., 2024; Soto & John, 2022), it is worth noting that it has certain limitations and context-dependency. For instance, in very creative positions or jobs that require the rapid flexibility to adapt, very high conscientiousness may limit flexibility and innovative problem-solving. Rigid following of procedures may, in some instances, limit efficiency or the performance of creative tasks (Dimitriou & Galanakis, 2022). Additionally, the predictive strength of conscientiousness may also differ in other cultures; behaviours that display a high level of conscientiousness in a particular organisational culture may not draw equal comparisons in another (Kordsmeyer et al., 2024). Therefore, although conscientiousness is a useful trait to predict performance, it can be risky when it leads to an over-reliance on this measure to the exclusion of considering job-specific demands and cultural factors; it can cause an inappropriate role assignment or the failure to take advantage of other complementary traits.

Emotional Stability and Team Functioning

The aspect of Emotional Stability is the opposite of Neuroticism and exhibits specific importance to team development and psychological security. Longitudinal research (Adam Luke, 2025; Kordsmeyer et al., 2024) establishes that persons who score at the higher end of the Emotional Stability dimension are able to maintain a stable and unvarying pattern of job performance over longer periods of time, are able to cope with significant stress-induced performance vagaries, and are able to contribute to the interpersonally stable team environments

that are conducive to the effectiveness of team efforts (Furnham, 2022). Emotionally stable team members have stronger conflict management skills, greater stress resistance, and higher levels of psychological well-being in a team context, which is significantly less susceptible to interfering emotional highs and lows as well as inter-team tension. The relationship between separate Emotional Stability and team outcomes is a two-way street, in terms of how it contributes to the team's psychological safety, and the psychological safety of the team creates consistency of performance for all team members (Furnham, 2022). Organisations in building teams with complementary Emotional Stability profiles, including adequate emotional regulation capability and access to stress management resources, have an opportunity to implement specific stress management and emotional regulation interventions with measurable improvement in enhanced group functioning, psychological safety, and sustainable team performance (Shwartz-Asher et al., 2025). This trait-based team building allows organisational leverage to manage the high-pressure environments not available through using the type approaches, especially in positions that require emotional management under adversity or extended periods of interpersonal intensity.

Agreeableness and Collaboration

Agreeableness, operationalised as individual differences in cooperation, compassion, and interpersonal warmth, shows impressive applicability in team performance and working together (Shwartz-Asher et al., 2025). There are meta fixative syntheses called Agreeableness which set up collaborative work results, counter-productive work behaviour, nutshell, prediction of interpersonal affairs, and overall workplace performance (Shwartz-Asher et al., 2025). Strategically composed teams with members of different Agreeableness profiles are more successful than homogeneous teams (Furnham, 2022). Members with high agreeableness aid the cohesion, conflict-reduction, and collaboration in solving problems. Moderate-to-high

agreeability members play vital roles of critical thinking, constructive discord, and cognitive diversification. This complementary profile composition using trait-based team assembly results in the creation of superior conflict management systems and quantifiable performance advantages over personality-homogeneous teams.

Extraversion and Role-Specific Performance

Extraversion shows the role-contingent predictive validity, which reveals the sophistication of behaviour-contingent matching between traits and occupations (Conley and Brown, 2023). Sales, leadership, customer-facing functions, and public-facing service work (the subjects of interpersonal demand) are among the environments in which the predictive validity of meta-analytical synthesis ($r = +.40$) can be established by high scores (Conley and Brown, 2023). Extraversion is significantly related to the emerging leadership effectiveness ($r = .31+$). Extraversion has zero to minimal predictive validity in the analytically angled, technical, and solo functions (Kordsmeyer et al., 2024). This role-specificity which is completely absent from typifying by categories of type allows for a precise occupational matching. People with a high Extraversion are systematically jobbed into customer-facing, sales, and leadership roles where interpersonal orientation is a substantial predictor of performance, whilst more analytically-inclined people work in technical and strategic functions for which interpersonal dynamism is a poor predictor of performance.

Openness to Experience and Innovation

Openness to Experience has commonly been mentioned in the context of innovation and active job crafting (Mirasol, 2025; Laguia et al., 2024). However, it is very context-specific in its predictive validity. In a highly structured or routine environment, a high level of openness may not mean that a high level of openness can be translated into a high level of performance for such

an organization. People may create ideas or suggestions that are theoretically of value but unreasonable for the practical operational constraints of an organization (Laguia et al., 2024). Conversely, some people low on openness may instead be very good at dealing in repetitive or process-driven forms of work despite not being interested in novelty-seeking behaviors. This brings to the fore the idea of trait effectiveness, which is contingent upon job demands, organisational culture, and composition of team members (Mirasol, 2025). Moreover, by concentrating on openness as the primary drive for innovativeness, we might be neglecting other forms of interacting traits, such as conscientiousness or agreeableness, which can modulate acting innovatively as effective in practice (Laguia et al., 2024). Hence, while openness is a good predictor, when using it, it should be done in a nuanced way that considers the wider context of the team and organisation.

Team Composition and Organisational Strategy

The big five strategic application goes beyond applying to individual role alignment to the analysis of team composition as a whole (Kordsmeyer et al., 2024). By studying trait distributions within the team, organisations can determine whether they have strengths, gaps, and risks of conflicts (Furnham, 2022). For example, a team with a high degree of conscientiousness and low openness may be good at carrying out an activity precisely, but poor at innovation, or a team with a high degree of openness and low conscientiousness - good at coming up with ideas but bad at implementing them effectively. This evidence-based approach helps organisations to build balanced and complementary teams, using a combination of different personality profiles to optimise problem-solving, decision-making, and adaptive capacity (Furnham, 2022). In contrast, type-based approaches only give a very broad categorisation of what people are like and are

limited in terms of being able to capture the subtleties of how traits interact within a team, so they have limited utility for more complex organisational problems.

Ethical and Legal Considerations in Personality Assessment

Ethical and legal issues are important when using personality measures in organisations (Hunt, 2021; Furnham, 2022). Gender and ethnicity-related response patterns could be the result of social conditioning and not really genuine differences in personality (Furnham, 2022). Women tend to score higher for Neuroticism because of socialisation effects, and patterns of ethnic response bias possibly result in diverse cultures. Organisations must take an active interest in monitoring for such patterns in order to avoid bias and ensure fairness (Kordsmeyer et al., 2024). Additionally, response distortion or intentional faking is a threat to the validity of an assessment. 20-30% of candidates will exaggerate characteristics such as conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022). While Big Five instruments incorporate validity scales to check for these distortions, such mechanisms are not perfect and further call for personality assessments to be combined with structured interviewing, ability tests, and work sample assessments to make rounded decisions about organisations.

Data Protection, Fairness and Diversity

It is critical to comply with data protection regulations, including UK GDPR, due to the fact that personal information means special category data. Organisations must seek informed consent, communicate the purposes of the assessment, enable persons to have access to their personal information, and use the information for only the purposes for which it was granted (Hunt, 2021). Additionally, stereotype threat can impact one's performance, especially if you are connected to women or an underrepresented minority, in hierarchical or quantitative occupations (Hunt, 2021). Organisations should put in place assessment environments that are

psychologically safe, with a focus on development, a variety of assessor teams, and clear up how personality testing has limitations. Such measures reduce the amount of situational anxiety and allow more valid measures of true personality to be obtained.

Practical Application and Organisational Use

From a pragmatic point of view, organisations looking for effective, ethical, and scientifically sound team development should place more emphasis on the Big Five rather than type-based assessment for any consequential decisions (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022; Kordsmeyer et al., 2024). Type-based tools showed high unreliability (40-50% test-retest inconsistency) and low predictive validity, especially in leadership decisions (failure rate about 65%), which is unsuitable for hiring decisions, promotion decisions, and role allocation decisions (Erford et al., 2025). Type assessments can be considered low-stakes assessments for conversation or self-reflection, but cannot be used to inform evidence-based organisational decisions. In contrast, the Big Five delivers quantitative, reliable, and empirically-proven data for role matching, team formation, and leadership development (Soto and John, 2022).

Strategic Team Development Using the Big Five

Strategic use of the Big Five enables organisations to make the best use of complementary team composition (Kordsmeyer et al., 2024). Teams with the combination of high-conscientiousness implementers, emotionally stable regulators, high-agreeableness collaborators, and high-openness innovators turn out to be better performing than homogeneous teams (Mirasol, 2025). This approach helps not only in enhancing task completion and innovation, but it also helps strengthen team-cohesion, conflict management, and adaptability (Zell and Lesick, 2022). In a leadership context, Big Five assessments help us gain insights into a leader's personality profile, which is actionable and can help them to focus on specific

development programmes, communication improvements, and matching of leadership styles with team needs (Mirasol, 2025). By contrast, type-based assessments are not able to provide nuanced information for leadership development or precise assignment of roles.

Integrated Assessment Approach

Implementing Big Five assessments has to be done according to strict ethical and legal protocols (Hunt, 2021). Organisations have to ensure fairness between demographic groups, be fair in terms of GDPR, be explicit about informed consent, and communicate about the limitations of assessments. Big Five data should be used to guide the establishment of teams and given jobs, and as a basis for specific developmental efforts rather than as an exclusive measure for hiring, promotion, or dismissal decisions (Hunt, 2021). Combining personality assessment with other validated measures of organisational behaviour forms a multi-faceted and evidence-based approach to human resource management that will reduce bias and increase the overall quality of decisions.

Long-Term Organisational Development

Apart from performance optimisation, Big Five assessments aid long-term organisational development (Dimitriou and Galanakis, 2022). They help HR professionals to identify potential leaders, develop succession planning, and create a professional development program focused on individual strengths. By knowing the distribution of traits in teams, organisations will be able to foresee points of conflict, collaborate more effectively, and act proactively through training or coaching (Mirasol, 2025). This predictive and preventative ability is especially useful in complex, high-stakes, or high-pressure settings, such as healthcare, emergency response, or R&D-intensive industries.

Limitations of Personality Assessment

Finally, there is evidence that personality accounts for 4 - 16% of the variance in performance, which does suggest it is important, but does so with awareness of its limitations. Organisations should thus follow the line of an integrated approach, which includes the combination of Big Five assessments, ability testing, structured interviews, and work samples to guide consequential decisions. This holistic approach maximises the use of evidence-based decision-making whilst ensuring protection from bias, stereotyping, or unfair treatment, in order to ensure organisational effectiveness as well as an employee's rights.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the Big Five Model provides organisations with a scientifically validated, reliable, and practical tool in team building, leadership development, and role allocation. Traceable characteristics such as conscientiousness, emotional stability, agreeableness, extraversion, and openness can be used strategically to match individual strengths with team and organisational needs. Ethical, legal, and fairness considerations, combined with complementary assessment tools, provide a means to ensure that they are used responsibly. By contrast, type-based assessments still remain limited in use to informal purposes with low-stakes assessment because of their poor reliability and predictive validity. The strategic use of Big Five in the organisational context is bringing tangible benefits in terms of team performance, leadership development, adaptability, and innovation, while organisations with Big Five can go beyond a surface assessment and maximise their human capital strategically.

Bibliography

- Adam, L., 2025. *How to PASS Any Psychometric Test (100% PASS RATE)*.
- Chen, X., He, J., Swanson, E., Cai, Z., Fan, X., 2022. Big Five Personality Traits and Second Language Learning: a Meta-analysis of 40 Years' Research. *Educ. Psychol. Rev.* 34, 851–887. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09641-6>
- Conley, C.M., Brown, S.L., 2023. The role of gender expectations, stereotypes, and self-identification in rating psychopathy using the Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality (CAPP). *Personal. Individ. Differ.* 205, 112089. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2023.112089>
- Dimitriou, E., Galanakis, M., 2022. Organizational Psychology Re-Invented—The Big Five Personality Traits Model as a Reliable Behavior Framework in the Workplace. *Psychology* 13, 798–804. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2022.135053>
- Erford, B.T., Zhang, X., Sweeting, E.L., Russo, M., Rashid, A., Sherman, M.F., Bradford, E.L., Wang, X., Gao, A., Huang, Xinlei, Liu, Z., Haskew, A., MacInerney, E., Moore, E., Thompson, D., Barboza, S., Huang, Xinran, Zhou, A., Xu, Y., Liu, Y., Xu, S., Chen, L., Yang, Xianya, Tong, M., Ding, J., Yang, Xinya, 2025. A 25-Year Review and Psychometric Synthesis of the Myers–Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) – Form M. *J. Couns. Dev.* 103, 403–417. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.70006>
- Eshete, S.K., Debela, K.L., Kebede, T.A., 2025. Personality and workplace employees' performance: systematic review. *J. Innov. Entrep.* 14, 131. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-025-00602-9>

- Francis, L.J., Village, A., 2022. The Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS): factor structure, internal consistency reliability, and concurrent validity with the MBTI. *Ment. Health Relig. Cult.* 25, 931–951. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2022.2041584>
- Furnham, A., 2022. The Big Five Facets and the MBTI: The Relationship between the 30 NEO-PI(R) Facets and the Four Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) Scores. *Psychology* 13, 1504–1516. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2022.1310095>
- Hunt, E., 2021. What personality are you? How the Myers-Briggs test took over the world. *The Guardian*.
- Kang, W., Guzman, K.L., Malvaso, A., 2023. Big Five personality traits in the workplace: Investigating personality differences between employees, supervisors, managers, and entrepreneurs. *Front. Psychol.* 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.976022>
- Kordsmeyer, T.L., Speer, A.B., Wilms, R., Kurz, R., 2024. Longitudinal Effects of Employees' Big Five Personality Traits on Internal Promotions Differentiated by Job Level in a Multinational Company. *J. Bus. Psychol.* 39, 1049–1065. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-023-09930-7>
- Laguía, A., Topa, G., Pocinho, R.F.D.S., Fernández Muñoz, J.J., 2024. Direct effect of personality traits and work engagement on job crafting: A structural model. *Personal. Individ. Differ.* 220, 112518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2023.112518>
- Mirasol, P., 2025. Big Five Personality Traits And Organizational Performance In Higher Education Institutions: The Mediating Role Of Job Commitment. *Int. J. Manag.* 16, 220–240. https://doi.org/10.34218/IJM_16_05_013
- Peters, H., Garbe, A., Breil, S.M., Oberst, S., Selch, S., Holzhausen, Y., 2024. Big five personality traits of medical students and workplace performance in the final clerkship

year using an EPA framework. *BMC Med. Educ.* 24, 453. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-05434-x>

Satow, L., 2026. Test description of B5T®: Big Five Personality Test.

Shwartz-Asher, D., Tziner, A., Kurlander, Y., Rabenu, E., Shertzer, Y., Ehrlich, S., Tobol, Y., 2025. Attitudes in Action: How Managers Perceive and Position Freelancers in the Modern Workplace. *J. Work Organ. Psychol.* 41, 103–110.

<https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2025a11>

Zell, E., Lesick, T.L., 2022. Big five personality traits and performance: A quantitative synthesis of 50+ meta-analyses. *J. Pers.* 90, 559–573. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12683>

Zhu, H., Jia, F., Zhang, Y., Wang, R., 2025. The Relationship Between the Big Five Personality Model and Innovation Behavior: A Three-Level Meta-Analysis. *Behav. Sci.* 15, 1143.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15091143>