A SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH ON LEADERS' BIG FIVE PERSONALITY IN THE PAST TWENTY YEARS

[1]TANG HONG BO, [2]LI JIA HUI

Graduate Institute of Technological Vocation Education, National Taipei University of Technology, Xiamen University of Technology, Headmaster's office.2 Departments of Educational Operating and Management, National Taipei University of Education

E-mail: 596392901@qq.com, 229141170@qq.com

Abstract— Big Five Personality is one of the important tools for detecting leader personality differences and identifying leadership behavior or effectiveness. Relevant research in the past 20 years had been popular. From the content dimension, it could be roughly divided into three main stages, the personality trait theory based on functionalist psychology, the personality trait association theory based on situational theory and the trait theory revival period based on statistical analysis. From the perspective of research methods, using network big data and media interviews to get the leader's personality data had innovative value in recent years. From the research trend, more and more researchers paid attention to the adjustment variables of the Big Five Personality's influence on leadership behavior and leadership performance, such as leadership power level, environmental factors, work autonomy, and interpersonal communication.

Keywords—Big Five Personality, Leaders, Research Summary

I. INTRODUCTION

According to Raymond Cattell et al., personality usually refers to the characteristics of people's behavioral patterns and ways of thinking, and personality traits refer to the all attributes and traits of a person different from others. Different theoretical factions had multiple classification methods for personality traits. For example, Carl Jung had divided personality into four categories: intentional, thinking, emotional, and sensory. Hans J. Eysenck proposed a three-factor personality model (extroversion, neuroticism, psychopathic); Raymond Cartel proposed "16 personality factor tests"; Tony Alessandra and Michael JO Conor proposed personality traits quadrilateral: command, socialists, coordinators, thinkers; John Holland proposed the hexagonal model in 1997. Since the 1980s, many contemporary personality psychologists believed that personality had five basic dimensions, called the five elements of personality, five personality traits, or the "big five" personality traits - extroversion, pleasantness, openness, responsibility and neuroticism [1]. The first letters of these five factors were linked together, named OCEAN, which referred to the ocean of personality. Although the academic community had not yet reached an agreement on the exact meaning of each dimension, it had a high overall recognition of its classification methods and research values.

Big Five was first proposed by Tappes and had evolved since the end of the 19th century. It began with the study of DW Fiske and was later developed by Norman, Smith, Goldberg, etc., especially the American psychologists Costa and McCrae. After the NEO Personality Scale, it was widely used as a personality test tool by the Personality Qualitative Faction. Big five personalities could influence individual performance, organizational citizenship behavior, career interest and other outcome variables. It was widely recognized for its high stability and was regarded as one of the most powerful tools for studying personality differences. It was also under modern management mode. One of the important reference factors for talent selection, employee effectiveness and leadership efficiency.

II. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DIFFERENT TYPES OF LEADERSHIP AND BIG FIVE PERSONALITY

A. Participatory Leadership and Big Five personality

Benoliel, P., & Somech, A. (2014) found that extroversion, amenity, responsibility and neurotic personality were conducted through a follow-up study of 153 employees and their managers. Dimensions played a leading role in participatory leadership and employee performance and psychological stress. Whether the openness trait could ease the psychological pressure of employees had not been verified. The study pointed out that the personality factors of leadership must be included when considering the impact of participatory leadership on employee performance. Leaders influenced the mental health and performance of employee [2].

B. The relationship between transformational leadership and Big Five Personality

Deinert, A., Homan, A. C., Boer, D., Voelpel, S. C., & Gutermann, D. (2015) found that the five personality traits are directly related to the transformational leadership dimension and the overall measurement of

leadership. For example, incentive motivation was related to all personality traits, but it had a direct impact on employees with experienced openness and pleasant personality, and was not highly relevant to other traits. The author proposed to separate the dimensions of the transformational leadership grid to gain a deeper understanding of the nature and causes of leadership behavior [3]. Lim B C, Ployhart R E. (2003) conducted a study of 276 military personnel in the Singapore Air Force. The results showed that neuroticism was significantly negatively correlated with transformational leadership, and neuroticism was a negative predictor of transformational leadership. Extroversion was the only trait that predicts the typical performance and the best performance of a transformational leader [4]. Bono J E, Judge T A. (2004) showed that the Big Five personality model can explain the 12% variation in the charisma of the leader, the 5% variation in intelligence, and the 6% variation in the individualized care. Extroversion could positively predict transformational leadership. Extroversion and the four dimensions of transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspiring motivation, intellectual stimulation, and personalized care) were significantly positively correlated [5]. Jiang Wei (2010) summarized the related concepts of Big Five personalities and transformational leadership and their relationship. There was a significant positive correlation between extroversion and transformational leadership; accountability had nothing to do with transformational leadership. The relationship between neuroticism, openness and amenity and transformational leadership was inconsistent in empirical research and meta-analysis [6]. The relationship between the Big Five personality model and the transformational leadership had reached inconsistent conclusions in the samples of different nature. For example, transformational leadership traits embodied by business leaders and military leaders were not exactly the same. It was not appropriate to treat transformational leadership as a trait theory.

C. Enterprise Leadership and Big Five Personality Research

Antoncic, B., Bratkovic Kregar, T., Singh, G., & DeNoble, AF (2015) Verified the relationship of five personalities and entrepreneurship by face-to-face structured interviews with 546 Slovenia people and multiple regression analysis of data [7]. Meng Hui, Li Yongxin (2004) investigated the psychological factors that determined entrepreneurial decision-making and trued intentions by comparing the differences between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs in the five major personality factors [8]. Castro, S. L. (2002) conducted a study of the personality traits of 210 managers in 72 companies and their relevance to leadership effectiveness. The results showed that the personality traits of managers had an important impact on their leadership effectiveness. The reliability, construct validity, aggregate validity and discriminant validity of the five-factor personality questionnaire compiled had reached the requirements of psychometrics [9]. Chen Hao (2015) used the Big Five personality model to test the personality of the leader and conducted research on 202 Chinese business leaders. The conclusion was that the exorcism and conscientiousness of business leaders were significantly and positively related to corporate growth; the five majorities of leaders had different influences on their PAEI leadership behavior (executive, administrative, innovation, integration); at different stages of corporate life corporate growth had different requirements for the personalities and behavior of business leaders [10].

III. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BIG FIVE PERSONALITIES AND LEADERSHIP GENERATION, LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AND LEADERSHIP PERFORMANCE

Vergauwe, J., Wille, B., Hofmans, J., Kaiser, R. B., & De Fruyt, F. (2018)The NEO personality five-factor scale was used to measure the status of leadership traits in personality glamour [11]. Focused on the relationship between leadership charisma and leadership effectiveness. The study found that leadership fascination was a double-edged sword for leadership effectiveness: there was an inverted U-shaped relationship between leadership traits and leadership effectiveness, indicating that middle-level personality glamour leaders were better than low-level or high-level glamour. Leaders' glamour was too low, which meant lack of strategic decision-making ability. Leaders with weak leadership were inefficient. Leaders were too attractive and tended to say more and do less. Because of their poor performance, they lacked practical operational management. Actions led to lower leadership efficiency. The article proposed the process and conditions for the transformation of leadership charm into leadership effectiveness. Chan, KY, Uy, MA, Chernyshenko, OS, Ho, MHR, & Sam, YL (2015)troughed analysis of 396 and 272 groups of college students, personality traits and entrepreneurship, professional and leadership motivation there was a close correlation between them. The five personality traits of low-risk evasion and proactive personalities were highly correlated with entrepreneurship and leadership motivation; high-risk aversion was associated with more specialized occupations. Whether initiative personality and low-risk aversion increased entrepreneurial and leadership motivation, which depended on the five indicator scales and sampling differences [12].

Day, DV, Fleenor, JW, Atwater, LE, Sturm, RE, & McKee, RA Researched the theory and evidence of the development of outstanding leaders and effective leadership behavior published in the Leadership Quarterly for nearly 25 years. Among them, the Big Five personality factor had significant predictability for military leaders and business leaders [13]. Zhang Yuliang (2014) pointed out that Lussier and Achua combined the previous 73 research results, found that the highest correlation coefficient between the Big Five personality and leadership was extroverted, and followed by responsibility and openness. People with strong extroversion, responsibility and openness were more suitable for leadership work. The author believed that high-efficiency leaders could be cultivated; the cultivation of the day after tomorrow was inseparable from the influence of environmental factors, and one of the limitations of the Big Five personality theory was that the influence of environmental factors on personality traits was not considered [14].

On the basis of the Big Five personality model, Chen Lei (2012) summarized the foreign researchers' understanding of leadership traits and abilities in recent years, and analyzed the relationship between the factors of the Big Five personality traits and leadership effectiveness. Leadership theory early researchers believed that leadership traits were inherent and difficult to change. The Big Five personality factor had a significant predictive effect on leadership effectiveness. It was considered important to recruit leaders with high extroversion, strong sense of responsibility, and low neuroticism [15]. Lam, W., Lee, C., Taylor, M. S., & Zhao, H. H. (2018). Research suggested that proactive personality promoted new leadership identity and changed action implementation. The article examined the role of proactive personality in leadership changed adaptation through four surveys and multi-factor regression analysis of 155 hotel employees and 51 new leaders. The study found that when the new leader and the subordinates and the team's initiative were consistent, and the difference between the initiative of the former leader and the new leader was obvious, the subordinate employees and the team could enhance the identity of the new leader and also It was easy to demonstrate behavioral engagement and attention to the new leader's change agenda [16].

Wang Min, Cheng Yuan (2013) reviewed the related research in recent years, and analyzed the influence of Big Five personality on the generation, leadership style, moral behavior and performance of leaders. In the organization, the personality characteristics and individual behavior of leaders it would have a crucial impact on the company's strategy, decision-making, performance, etc. [17]. The theory of implicit leadership argued that people often hold some stereotypes or expectations for leaders, such as self-confidence and communication, and if they met this expectation, individuals with certain personalities were likely to become leaders. This showed that the generation of the leader would be affected by its personality. The effectiveness of leadership behavior showed a strong heritability, and this heritability was undoubtedly related to the heredity of individual differences.

D. Relationship between responsibility and leadership

According to Judge, & Bono (2000), responsible leaders helped foster a fair and open work environment, and subordinates reported higher moral leadership behavior. Responsible individuals might be more likely to be promoted or selected, and entrepreneurs' score on responsibility was significantly higher than managers' [18]. Zhao, & Seibert (2006) argued that responsible leaders often adhered to establish norms or procedures and clearly defined role expectations and responsibilities for employees, and was therefore more likely to be trading leaders who were clear to reward and punishment rather than to be a transformation or charismatic leader [19]. Aronson, Reilly, & Lynn (2006) found that leadership's sense of responsibility was more effective in a stable environment because high-responsible leaders could take advantage of their mission-oriented advantages; at the same time, they could also have a negative impact, that was, while efficient would set too high standards, harsh subordinates and so on. In the way of decision-making, it might stick to the rules, did not know the flexibility, and prefer to centralize the decision-making [20].

E. The relationship between extroversion and leadership

Extroverts showed optimism about the future, the organization, and the “arbitrariness” of their character, made them easy to be seen as “leadership style” and easier to be selected as a leader [21]. From the perspective of leadership, extroverts were more inclined to adopt a transformational leadership style. The reason was that extroverts were more willing to communicate with subordinates and gave more personalized incentives [22]. In terms of leader performance, there was no extroversion between entrepreneurial success and leadership effectiveness. Significantly, they had the potential to build social networks that benefit the organization and promote teamwork (Aronson, Reilly, & Lynn, 2006), but because extroverts liked to be the center of attention, they tended to overestimate their abilities, possibly would ignore the praise and attention to employees [23].

F. Relationship between pleasantness and leadership

Individuals with higher affinity were more likely to cooperate with people than to compete, and were more

likely to gain the trust of others. Because the relatives were generally modest, they were less likely to be perceived as leaders [24]. In terms of leadership style, affinity leaders were more inclined to adopt transformational leadership behavior, which meant giving more guidance and incentive to employees, which were more likely to be seen as charismatic role model. The higher the affinity of the leader, the easier it was to treat employees fairly and to listen to the opinions of others [25]. Affinity had a weak relationship with entrepreneurial success and leadership effectiveness. Affinity had both advantages and disadvantages for leader performance. An approachable individual could establish a harmonious relationship between superiors and subordinates. However, they often value interpersonal relationships too much and may tolerate subordinates' bad behaviors; performance evaluation was more relaxed, which was not conducive to the development of employees. Usually avoiding conflicts might lead to poor decision quality [26].

G. Relationship between neuroticism and leadership

Neuroticism had no significant relationship with leadership evaluation, and some researchers believed that there was a negative correlation between neuroticism and leadership [27]. In terms of leadership performance, although emotional stability had no significant relationship with entrepreneurial success, the study found that the lower the neurotic level of the leader, the higher the performance, and the leader could better deal with stress and anxiety, conducive to promoting a fair atmosphere within the organization. Neuroticism also had positive implications for tissue. For example, leaders expressed their feelings of anger, had an incentive effect on employees, and indirectly promoted organizational performance. Neuroticism was an evolutionary personality [28]. The purpose of negative emotions was to prevent potential danger. It confirmed the views of Chinese culture in sorrow, death, and sorrow.

H. The relationship between openness and leadership

Zhao & Seibert (2006) found that entrepreneurs' experience was significantly more open than managers, suggesting that open-minded individuals were happy to embrace change, challenged risks, and had stronger entrepreneurial motivation [29]. From the perspective of leadership, openness of experience was positively related to transformation leadership. Open leaders had a rich imagination and dare to challenge tradition. In the style of decision-making, it might be more willing to listen to criticism and different opinions, more accept innovation, and had greater decision-making flexibility. Because open entrepreneurs tended to change their strategic direction, openness was negatively correlated with entrepreneurial success [30].

IV. BIG FIVE PERSONALITY AND DARKNESS, EXTREME LEADERSHIP, AND ABUSIVE MANAGEMENT

Li Kefu (2017) research believed that the emergence of leadership behavior came from the influence of individual comprehensive personality traits. The existing research paid more attention to the bright side of the "big five personality", but there was no theoretical proof for the generation of negative leadership behavior. In the process of exploring the limitations of the "Big Five" pattern, personality psychologists proposed a new personality trait - dark personality, also known as "dark personality three-in-one", mainly represented by Machiavellianism, narcissism and Three traits of mental illness: Machiavellianism excels in manipulation and conspiracy calculations in psychology and behavior; self-love and self-righteousness manifested in narcissism; mental morbidity showed behavioral stimuli and lack of responsibility Set any moral bottom line and standards of conduct. The typical manifestation of the dark personality of leading cadres often showed a remarkable self-righteous attitude in guiding the subordinates. In the process of getting along with the subordinates, they showed a cold and ruthless psychology, showed different characteristics in the behavioral manner, and the behavior process. It exhibited significant aggressiveness and poor self-control ability.

I. Big Five Personality and Darkness, Extreme Leadership

Because the final formatting of your paper is limited in sca Kaiser, RB, LeBreton, JM, & Hogan, J. (2015) found that the average score closed to the dark personality traits was associated with the optimal leadership behavior level after analyzing 320 US and European managers and managers, it was High scores and low scores were associated with extremely ineffective leader behavior. The authors suggest that the role of the dark side in leadership should be considered in future research, and moderately dark personality contributes to leadership. Verification of the ancient Chinese language: people can't be inseparable, and they had no deep feelings; people couldn’t be incomprehensible, and they were not infuriating [31]. Klotz, A. C., & Neubaum, D. O. (2016) studied the dark side of entrepreneurial personality traits based on organizational behavioral perspectives. Based on Miller's observation of entrepreneurial personality defects, five survey methods for observing entrepreneurial personality were proposed. Researchers believed that different personality traits lead to different organizational behaviors, and there was an interaction between key

personality traits and specified situations and emotional variables. The authors suggested that follow-up research focused on the mutual infection of positive and negative personality between entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial team members, and how to overcome the impact of negative personality on the team [32].

J. Big Five Personality and Abusive Management

Tang Guiyao, Wu Xiangfan, Wu Weiku, Li Pengcheng (2016) abusive supervision was a negative leadership behavior that had received much attention in recent years. It referred to subordinate supervisors who were perceived by subordinates to continue to express speech or non-verbal Hostile behavior, but did not include physical contact [33]. Based on the trait-inducing theory, the author explored the impact of managerial personality traits and psychological contract violations on the implementation of abusive management. Using 213 questionnaires as samples, empirical tests were conducted by multiple linear regression analysis. The results showed that the affinity of managers had a significant negative effect on the management of abusive management, while neuroticism had a significant positive effect on the management of abusive management. Contract violations had a significant positive impact on abusive management; psychological contracted violations not only regulate the negative link between managerial affinity and abusive management, but also regulated the positive relationship between neuroticism and abusive management.

CONCLUSIONS

From the literature review on the Leader's Big Five personalities in the past 20 years, we could see the evolutionary trends. The author believed that from the research, it could be roughly divided into three main stages:

Early research mainly focused on the difference between leader and non-leader traits. Leader traits originated in American functionalist psychology in the early 20th century. The early traits of the genre focused on the differences in personality traits between efficient leaders and inefficient leaders. The second phase focused on the relationship between different types of leadership and different personality traits. The reason was that since the rise of sensationalism in the 1950s, the theory of leadership traits had been questioned by many parties. The researchers found that the relationship between personality traits and leadership effectiveness was not consistent under different situations. In the past, personality traits did not pay much attention to the influence of external environment on traits. The research in this period paid more attention to the influence of personality traits on leadership and effectiveness in different environments. The third stage could be called the revival stage of personality traits. Since the 1980s, with the development of psychology and statistics, the genre had been re-emphasized by the academic community and the industry. All circles had begun to use a more comprehensive perspective to study the qualities that leaders should possess. The content mainly related to the relationship between the Big Five personality and the generation of different types of leadership, leadership behavior, and leadership performance. In the past ten years, attention had been paid to the association and characterization of personality traits with shady, extreme leadership, and abusive management.

From the research method, compared with ordinary employees or intermediate managers, the personality data of leaders was often difficult to grasp by researchers. Most of the previous studies used structural, semi-structured interviews or questionnaires to conduct multiple regression analysis on relevant data. Recently, some researchers had used the archival data, especially through the Internet and smart terminals to conduct big data retrieval, or through the information published by media interviews to speculate on personality, and some researchers had outlined the leader's growth trajectory through various channels. Tracking and analyzing the personality changes in different stages of life, the innovation of these research methods was worth learning.

From the research trend, some factors of Big Five personalities had a very direct impact on leadership behavior and leadership performance, such as extroversion and sense of responsibility. However, the influence of some dimensions was complex and variable, such as affinity and neuroticism. In order to achieve a better interpretation, some researchers had begun to study the regulatory variables, such as leadership power levels, environmental impact, work autonomy, and interpersonal relationships. According to the existing research results, more factors in the contingency theory should be tested to find out whether there was a regulatory effect on the leader's personality traits, leadership behavior and performance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank Professor Chin-Yen Lin，Graduate Institute of Technological Vocational Education, National Taipei University of Technology. This work was supported in part by a grant from Major Education and Teaching Reform Project of Undergraduate Universities in Fujian Province "Study on Management Mechanism of Sino-foreign Cooperation in Running Schools" (Project No. FBJG20170311).

REFERENCES

[1] Kendra Cherry. The Big Five Personality Traits. Cite from https://www.verywellmind.com/the-big-five-personality-dimensions-2795422 2018-03-27.

[2] Benoliel, P., & Somech, A.. The health and performance effects of participative leadership: Exploring the moderating role of the Big Five personality dimensions. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, vol. 23,no.2, pp. 277-294,15 January,2014.

[3] Deinert, A., Homan, A. C., Boer, D., Voelpel, S. C., & Gutermann, D. Transformational leadership sub-dimensions and their link to leaders' personality and performance. The Leadership Quarterly, vol.26,no 6, pp.1095-1120. 2015.

[4] Lim B C , Ployhart R E. Transformational Leadership; Relation to the Five Factor Model and Team Performance in typical and Maximum Contexts.45th Annual Conference of the International Military Testing Association. Pensacola. pp. 631, 2003.

[5] Bono J E, Judge T A. Personality and Transformational and Transactional Leadership; A Meta — Analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, vol.89,no.5,pp.901-910. 2004.

[6] Jiang Chuang. A Review of the Transformational Leadership and Big Five Personality. Economic vertical and horizontal·vol.6,pp.122-125,2010.

[7] Antoncic, B., Bratkovic Kregar, T., Singh, G., & DeNoble, A. F.The big five personality–entrepreneurship relationship: Evidence from Slovenia. Journal of Small Business Management, vol.53, no.3, pp. 819-841,2015.

[8] Meng Hui, Li Yongxin. Correlation between Big Five Personality Traits and Leadership Effectiveness. Psychological Science, vol.27, no.3, pp.611-614,2004.

[9] Castro, S. L. Date analytic methods for the analysis of multilevel questions: A comparison of intra class correlation coefficients, rwg, hierarchical Linear modeling, within-and-between-analysis, and random group resampling. The Leadership Quarterly, vol.13, pp.69-93,2002.

[10] Chen Lu. Research on the Impact of Five Leaders on Business Growth, Zhejiang University Master's Thesis, April, 2015.

[11] Vergauwe, J., Wille, B., Hofmans, J., Kaiser, R. B., & De Fruyt, F. The double-edged sword of leader charisma: Understanding the curvilinear relationship between charismatic personality and leader effectiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, vol.114, no.1, pp. 110-130,2018.

[12] Chan, K. Y., Uy, M. A., Chernyshenko, O. S., Ho, M. H. R., & Sam, Y. L. Personality and entrepreneurial, professional and leadership motivations. Personality and individual differences, vol.77, pp. 161-166, 2015.

[13] Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. The Leadership Quarterly, vol.25, no.1, pp. 63-82. 2014.

[14] Zhang Yuliang. The Way to Develop Effective Leadership From the Big Five Personality Theory. Leadership Science, vol.6, pp. 34-35,2014.

[15] Chen Lei. Analyzing the Relevance of Leadership Effectiveness and Big Five Personality Traits, Entrepreneur World, vol.2, pp.8-9, 2012.

[16] Lam, W., Lee, C., Taylor, M. S., & Zhao, H. H. Does proactive personality matter in leadership transitions? Effects of proactive personality on new leader identification and responses to new leaders and their change agendas. Academy of Management Journal, vol. 61,no.1, pp. 245-263,2018.

[17] Wang Min, Cheng Yuan. Research Status and Prospects of Leaders' Big Five Personality. Management Modernization, vol.4, pp. 48-50, 2013.

[18] [22][25][30] Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. Journal of applied psychology, vol.85, vol.5, pp. 751-765,2000.

[19] Zhao, H., & Seibert, S. E. The Big Five personality dimensions and entrepreneurial status: A meta-analytical review. Journal of applied psychology, vol.91,no.2, pp. 259, 2006.

[20] [23]Aronson, Z. H., Reilly, R. R., & Lynn, G. S. The impact of leader personality on new product development teamwork and performance: The moderating role of uncertainty. Journal of Engineering and Technology Management, vol.23, no.3, pp.221-247, 2006.

[21] [26][27]Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: a qualitative and quantitative review. Journal of applied psychology, vol.87, no.4, pp.765-780, 2002.

[24] McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. Journal of personality and social psychology, vol.52, no.1, pp. 81, 1987.

[28]. Mayer, D., Nishii, L., Schneider, B., & Goldstein, H. The precursors and products of justice climates: Group leader antecedents and employee attitudinal consequences. Personnel Psychology, vol.60, no.4, pp. 929-963, 2007.

[29] Zhao, H., & Seibert, S. E. The Big Five personality dimensions and entrepreneurial status: A meta-analytical review. Journal of applied psychology, vol. 91, no.2, pp. 259, 2006.

[30] LiKefu. Leaders' cadres' dark personality, negative consequences and prevention leadership strategy, vol.8, pp.52-54, 2017.

[31. Kaiser, R. B., LeBreton, J. M., & Hogan, J. The dark side of personality and extreme leader behavior. Applied Psychology, vol.64, no.1,pp. 55-92, 2015.

32] Klotz, A. C., & Neubaum, D. O. Research on the dark side of personality traits in entrepreneurship: observations from an organizational behavior perspective. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,vol.40, no.1, pp. 7-17,2016.

[33].Tang Guiyao, Wu Xiangfan, Wu Weiku, Li Pengcheng, The Influence of Manager's Big Five Personality and Psychological Contract Violation on Abusive Management: An Empirical Analysis Based on the Theory of Stimulating Characteristics. Psychological Science, vol.39, no.2, pp. 454-460,2016..

★★★