Journal of Organizational Behavior

WILEY

Journal of Organizational Behavior

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

From Personality Traits to Personality Dynamics: New Approaches to Personality Research in Organizations

The Emergence of Similar Personalities in Similar Occupations

Claudia Rossetti | Torsten Biemann | Katja Dlouhy

Department of Management, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany

Correspondence: Claudia Rossetti (claudia.rossetti@uni-mannheim.de)

Received: 29 February 2024 | **Revised:** 30 January 2025 | **Accepted:** 11 February 2025

Funding: The authors received no specific funding for this work.

Keywords: homogeneity | occupation | personality | person–environment fit | similarity

ABSTRACT

Personality research suggests that individuals tend to develop more homogeneous—or similar—personalities within, rather than between, occupations due to attraction and selection, attrition, and socialization effects. We expand this perspective using a distance-based methodological approach that relates similarities between combinations of individuals' personality traits to similarities between their occupations. Leveraging German panel data tracing individuals' careers from 2005 to 2017, we test how attraction and selection, attrition, and socialization effects contribute to the emergence of similar personalities in similar occupations over time. Our results reveal that individuals with more similar Big Five personality traits join more similar occupations, whereas those with personalities less similar to those of other occupational incumbents are more likely to leave the occupation. Moreover, individuals staying in more similar occupations develop more similar personalities. These findings enhance our understanding of the intricate interplay between individuals' personalities and occupations, providing evidence that similar personality traits emerge not only within the same occupation but also between similar occupations over time.

1 | Introduction

Existing research recognizes reciprocal influences between individuals' personalities and their work environments, encompassing teams, jobs, occupations, and organizations (e.g., Denissen et al. 2014; Heyde et al. 2024; Nieß and Zacher 2015; Roberts 2006; Wille et al. 2012; Wille and De Fruyt 2014; Woods et al. 2013, 2019, 2020). The underlying idea is that individuals strive to reach an optimal fit between their personality traits and their work environments (Van Vianen 2018; Woods et al. 2020). On the one hand, individuals' personalities affect their career choices, as *attraction* and *selection*, as well as *attrition* effects, lead people to gravitate toward work environments whose requirements, including tasks and duties, match their traits (e.g., Holland 1997; Schneider 1987). On the other hand, work environments shape the personalities of their incumbents through *socialization* effects (Frese 1982), because their requirements foster the development of traits that are necessary for a harmonious person–environment (P–E) fit (Woods et al. 2019, 2020). These findings have led researchers to propose the "homogeneity hypothesis," suggesting that more similar personalities emerge over time within, rather than between, work environments (e.g., King et al. 2017; Oh et al. 2018; Satterwhite et al. 2009; Schneider et al. 1998).

Investigating this proposition is relevant because the composition of human resources in a work environment shapes workplace performance, contributing to the creation of competitive advantage (Ployhart et al. 2014). Occupations—that is, work environments including roles with similar tasks and duties that necessitate specific individual attributes, such as skills and traits, for effective performance (Dierdorff 2019; Dierdorff and Morgeson 2007)—reflect the division of labor in organizations

and constitute an important context of investigation. Not only does person–occupation fit typically precede other types of fit, such as person–job or person–organization fit (Bradley-Geist and Landis 2012), but also occupational affiliations are often more lasting than organizational ones, playing a pivotal role in shaping individuals' careers over time (Dierdorff 2019). Nonetheless, how personalities converge at the occupational level remains an underexplored topic (Anni et al. 2024). Further, although extant studies generally confirm that individuals' personality traits are more similar within than between occupations (e.g., Bradley-Geist and Landis 2012; King et al. 2017; Satterwhite et al. 2009; Schaubroeck et al. 1998; Sundstrom et al. 2016), their findings come with certain limitations.

First, by treating occupations as separate, independent work environments, often coded as dummy variables to predict differences in individuals' personality trait levels (e.g., Anni et al. 2024; King et al. 2017; Schaubroeck et al. 1998), prior research has supported the homogeneity hypothesis by showing that personalities are more similar within the same occupation rather than between different occupations. Yet, this approach overlooks the interconnected nature of occupations, with some being more similar than others due to shared requirements (Barrick and Mount 1991). In other words, not all individuals with similar personality traits are likely drawn to, and therefore shaped by, the same occupation; some may, instead, join and stay in similar ones. This raises the untested possibility that personality homogeneity may not be confined to single occupations but could also extend among them, becoming more pronounced as occupational similarity increases. Second, existing evidence suggesting that larger misfits between individuals' personalities and occupations are related to higher intentions to leave the occupation has been used to confirm attrition effects (Donohue 2006; Sitzmann et al. 2019). However, because intentions are merely a predictor of behavior (Mobley et al. 1979), the extent to which personality–occupation misfit truly contributes to personality homogeneity in occupations through actual attrition remains unclear.

Integrating this research, we investigate whether, over time, individuals with *similar personalities* work in *similar occupations* and how working in similar occupations influences personality similarity between individuals. We define individuals as having similar personalities when they share similar combinations of personality trait levels and occupations as similar when they involve similar tasks and duties. The highest degree of similarity occurs when individuals have identical trait levels and work in the same occupation. To answer our research question, we derive and test three hypotheses. First, testing attraction and selection effects, we study whether individuals with more similar personalities join more similar occupations. Second, testing attrition effects, we examine whether individuals with personalities less similar to those of others in the same occupation (i.e., occupational incumbents) tend to leave the occupation. Third, testing socialization effects, we investigate whether staying in more similar occupations contributes to developing more similar personalities. Overall, we explore how each effect contributes to the emergence of personality homogeneity across similar occupations over time.

In line with our longitudinal perspective, we retrieve data from 2005 to 2017 for the Big Five personality traits and occupations of a representative sample of working individuals from the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP; Goebel et al. 2019). In detail, we create subsamples of *joiners*, *stayers*, and *leavers* to test the unique contribution of each theorized effect. Using all available data, we replicate our analyses over four study periods—2005–2009, 2009–2013, 2013–2017, and 2005–2017. We further employ *multiple regressions on distance matrices* (MRMs; Lichstein 2007) to relate similarities between individuals' personalities to similarities between their occupations, accounting for the role of occupational similarity in our analyses.

We make key contributions to research on the interplay between individuals' personalities and occupations. Our work directly addresses researchers studying personality homogeneity at the occupational level (e.g., Bradley-Geist and Landis 2012; King et al. 2017; Satterwhite et al. 2009; Schaubroeck et al. 1998; Sundstrom et al. 2016). Extending this body of literature, we treat occupations as interconnected rather than independent work environments and examine whether similar personalities emerge among similar occupations. Our findings show that, over time, similar personality traits are created not only within the same work environment (i.e., when individuals hold identical occupations) but also span environments with more similar tasks and duties, driven by attraction and selection as well as socialization effects. Consequently, we broaden the scope of the homogeneity hypothesis, revealing that personality homogeneity extends beyond the boundaries of single occupations. Our results further position occupational similarity as a novel and relevant variable in research on the personality–workplace interplay. For example, our tests of socialization effects contribute to existing work on personality dynamics (e.g., Li et al. 2014, 2021; Woods et al. 2020; Wu et al. 2020) by demonstrating that continuous membership in different yet similar occupations can predict changes in individuals' traits, making them more similar as time progresses. Moreover, we show that individuals whose personalities are less similar to those of other occupational incumbents tend to leave the occupation over time. Although our tests in this instance relate individuals in the same occupation, capturing actual occupational changes integrates prior work that has linked individuals' personality misfits to their intentions to leave the work environment (Donohue 2006; Sitzmann et al. 2019), which may not always translate into actual attrition. Hence, we advance the understanding of the role of attrition toward the homogenization of individuals' personalities in occupations, confirming its previously theorized but untested contribution.

In general, instead of relying on cross-sectional data collected from incumbents within occupations — which captures only a snapshot of personality homogeneity at a single point in time and can make it difficult to determine whether the observed homogeneity is due to attraction and selection, attrition, or socialization effects (e.g., Bradley-Geist and Landis 2012; Satterwhite et al. 2009) — we use data over 12 years and test our hypotheses using different subsamples of workers. This approach enables us to demonstrate that, over time, each effect uniquely contributes to the emergence of homogeneity. Our results are robust, as evinced by their replication across all study periods considered. Similar replications across different time horizons, both shorter and longer, are extremely valuable. For instance, our findings can inform future meta-analyses that, similar to that of Bleidorn et al. (2022), aim to explore how time influences the relationships

between individuals' personalities and their work environments. At the same time, by using MRM (Lichstein 2007), a method from the spatial sciences, to relate similarities between personalities and occupations, we answer calls to identify novel approaches to the study of the interactions between personality and the workplace (Sosnowska et al. 2021).

Finally, our results hold several practical implications. For example, they can assist HR practitioners in understanding and predicting personality convergence across different yet similar occupations within their organizations, facilitating more effective human resource management, including recruitment and internal transfers. Additionally, they can support vocational counselors in guiding individuals through occupational changes by identifying transitions that minimize the costs of personality adaptation.

2 | Theory and Hypotheses

2.1 | The Interplay Between Personality and Work Environment

Personality is a disposition manifested through enduring patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors (Roberts, Robins, et al. 2003). Departing from the trait perspective that considered personality as solely shaped by genetic predispositions (McCrae et al. 2000), current research acknowledges reciprocal influences between individuals' personalities and their work environments, spanning team, job, occupational, and organizational levels (e.g., Anni et al. 2024; Li et al. 2014, 2019; Lodi-Smith and Roberts 2007; Roberts, Caspi, and Moffitt 2003; Specht 2017; Wille et al. 2019; Woods et al. 2013, 2019, 2020; Wrzus and Roberts 2017). These dynamics are shaped by individuals' ongoing search for an optimal fit, or compatibility, between their personality traits and their environments (Woods et al. 2019, 2020) aimed to reach positive workplace outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction and performance; Su et al. 2015).

First, *attraction* and *selection*, as well as *attrition* effects are pivotal[1] to explain how personality shapes an individual's membership in a work environment. The overarching concept of these "gravitational mechanisms" is that individuals tend to be attracted to and selected for teams, jobs, occupations, or organizations whose requirements best align with their personalities (e.g., Woods et al. 2019). When individuals find themselves in environments with poor fit, they seek to reach P–E fit through active adjustment (Dawis and Lofquist 1984). Although this search for compatibility may, at first, involve taking actions to actively manipulate existing careers (e.g., engaging in job crafting; Wrzesniewski and Dutton 2001), it often culminates in attrition, with individuals exiting the current work environment in favor of one that better suits their personality (e.g., Denissen et al. 2014). In summary, individuals' personalities shape their careers by prompting them to gravitate toward work environments that are more compatible with their personality traits (e.g., Judge et al. 1999; Woods et al. 2020).

Second, *socialization* effects can explain how a work environment contributes to developing an individual's personality. In this context, socialization describes "changes in the person which take place in and because of the work situation" (Frese 1982, 209–210).[2] In this case, the requirements of the work environment create structures that encourage constant changes in behaviors, thoughts, and feelings (Wille and De Fruyt 2014). Therefore, personality development is the comprehensive outcome of the continuous interactions between individuals and their work environments (e.g., Woods et al. 2019; Wrzus and Roberts 2017). When there is an initial fit between individuals' traits and their work environments, personality development follows a corresponsive principle (Roberts, Caspi, and Moffitt 2003); that is, the traits that cause gravitation toward an environment are activated and, thus, reinforced. When there is a misfit between individuals' traits and their work environment, personality develops in a non-corresponsive manner (Woods et al. 2020); that is, the environment rewards behaviors that are inconsistent with individuals' traits but that can improve P–E fit. The repetitive engagement in trait-inconsistent behaviors drives individuals to continuously adjust their personalities in response to their work requirements (Woods et al. 2019).

Overall, as individuals gravitate toward work environments whose requirements, including tasks and duties, optimally fit their personality traits, similarity (i.e., homogeneity) between personalities is expected to be greater within an environment rather than between environments and to further intensify over time due to socialization effects (e.g., King et al. 2017; Oh et al. 2018; Schaubroeck et al. 1998; Schneider et al. 1998).

Below, we review existing research on the interplay between individuals' personalities and their occupations, that is, the work environments of our interest. We define an occupation as a work environment including work roles with similar requirements (i.e., tasks and duties; International Labor Office 1990), which require specific individual attributes, such as skills and traits, to be performed effectively (Dierdorff 2019; Dierdorff and Morgeson 2007). For example, the occupation of "medical doctors" includes ophthalmologists, surgeons, and others whose tasks and duties (e.g., conducting medical examinations) call upon specific individual attributes and, thus, are characterized by a certain similarity.

Complementing existing research, we focus on the similarities between individuals and between occupations. We define individuals as having more similar personalities when they possess more similar combinations of personality trait levels and occupations as more similar when they entail more similar tasks and duties requiring specific skills (Dierdorff 2019; Dierdorff and Morgeson 2013). Identical combinations of traits or occupations represent the highest levels of similarity. Each occupation delineates a distinct work environment (Woods et al. 2019), given that occupations exhibit a certain internal similarity because they group work roles with similar requirements (International Labor Office 1990). However, we also recognize that some requirements are shared among occupations (Barrick and Mount 1991). In essence, building upon the previous example, we acknowledge a high similarity in the work roles of "medical doctors" (e.g., surgeons and ophthalmologists), yet we also anticipate that "medical doctors" may exhibit greater similarity in occupational requirements with "pharmacologists, pathologists, and related professionals" than with "gardeners, horticultural and nursery growers." Overall, we study the interplay between *similar*

personalities and *similar occupations* by hypothesizing how attraction and selection, attrition, and socialization effects contribute to their reciprocal relationships over time. This enables us to shed light on the emergence of personality homogeneity in similar occupations.

2.2 | The Interplay Between Similar Personalities and Similar Occupations

Initially, we focus on attraction and selection, and attrition effects and describe how personality shapes occupational choices. Next, we consider socialization effects and discuss how occupational choices, in turn, shape personality.

2.2.1 | Personality Shapes Occupational Choices

Various scholars have found evidence for *attraction* and *selection* effects that link single personality traits to occupations with compatible requirements (e.g., De Fruyt and Mervielde 1999; Denissen et al. 2014; Judge et al. 1999; Nieß and Zacher 2015; Wille et al. 2012; Woods et al. 2020; Woods and Hampson 2010). For example, higher levels of openness to experience in early life have been associated with working in social occupations (e.g., teaching) during adulthood (Judge et al. 1999), whereas conscientiousness has been related to occupations that require practical and hands-on work (e.g., being a construction worker; Woods and Hampson 2010). Recognizing that individuals simultaneously possess different traits that function as a coordinated system (Allport 1971; De Fruyt 2002), some scholars have started investigating how individuals' personality profiles relate to their occupations. For example, individuals high on extraversion but low on agreeableness tend to enter realistic occupations characterized by a sense of adventure (e.g., being a ski instructor) (Wiernik 2016) and leadership positions (Dilchert 2007). These findings provide evidence that individuals are drawn to and selected for occupations that are compatible with their personality traits (e.g., De Fruyt and Mervielde 1999; Wille et al. 2012; Wille and De Fruyt 2014; Woods et al. 2020). Personality is a critical factor in this process, as it influences individuals' skills, which, in turn, determine whether they are likely to effectively perform the tasks and duties of a given occupation (Campbell et al. 1993; Motowildo et al. 1997), thus contributing to a favorable P–E fit.

We build upon this research to relate similarities between individuals' personalities to similarities between their occupations. Extant work suggests that distinct personality traits are needed to fulfill the requirements of different occupations (Woods et al. 2019). Accordingly, membership in occupations can predict individuals' differences in personality trait levels, such that it is possible to differentiate occupations based on the traits of their incumbents (e.g., Anni et al. 2024; King et al. 2017). Extending this research, we expect that more similar traits will be required not only in the same occupation but also in more similar ones that entail similar tasks and duties (Dierdorff and Morgeson 2013). In line with this expectation, prior research has shown, for example, that extraversion can predict individual performance in managerial and sales occupations (which are similar in that they are people-oriented), but not in occupations like engineering and production work (where the capability to interact with people is less crucial; Barrick and Mount 1991). Based on these arguments, we anticipate that individuals with more similar patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors (i.e., overall personality traits) can effectively fulfill more similar tasks and duties. Consequently, we propose that, over time, individuals with more similar personalities will be attracted to and selected for more similar occupations. In sum, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 1. *Individuals with more similar personalities join more similar occupations.*

Scholars have also started investigating how personality relates to *attrition* at the occupational level. Prior research has provided initial evidence that individuals tend to transition toward occupations that better match their personality traits throughout their careers (Denissen et al. 2014; Nieß and Zacher 2015). For instance, highly extraverted individuals move to occupations where extraversion is more important for successful job performance (Denissen et al. 2014). Although this research has focused on individuals' attempts to transition to new occupations that align better with their traits, it remains unclear whether these transitions are preceded by exits from current occupations that represent a personality misfit. Indeed, although attraction and selection effects ideally guide individuals toward compatible occupations, some may still work in occupations that are not a natural fit for their personalities (Woods et al. 2020). Consequently, some occupational incumbents will possess personalities that are less similar to those who typically align with the occupation. These individuals likely face more challenges in performing the tasks and duties of the occupation because these require behaviors that are inconsistent with their traits (e.g., Woods et al. 2019). Furthermore, as individuals compare themselves with other occupational incumbents, lower similarity in their personality traits may suggest a misfit with the environment (Sitzmann et al. 2019). Hence, individuals with traits less similar to other occupational incumbents or less congruent with their occupations tend to report lower job satisfaction (Törnroos et al. 2019) and higher turnover intentions (Donohue 2006; Sitzmann et al. 2019), which are predictors of actual turnover behavior (Carless and Arnup 2011; Mobley et al. 1979). Overall, we expect that individuals with personalities that are less similar to those of other individuals in the same occupation will be more likely to leave the occupation over time. Finally, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 2. *Individuals with personalities less similar to those of other occupational incumbents are more likely to leave the occupation.*

2.2.2 | Occupational Choices Shape Personality

There is also evidence on *socialization* effects, confirming that occupations shape the personality of individuals (e.g., Denissen et al. 2014; Hirschi et al. 2021; Nieß and Zacher 2015; Wille et al. 2012; Wille and De Fruyt 2014; Woods et al. 2020). For example, individuals working in occupations that require high levels of openness and extraversion tend to experience a reinforcement of these traits over time (Denissen et al. 2014). Other scholars have found that openness, a trait generally preventing

the choice of conventional occupations (Holland 1997), can further diminish within these work environments (Wille and De Fruyt 2014). Although these findings represent corresponsive personality developments, evidence of non-corresponsive changes also exists; for example, staying in social occupations (which require interpersonal contact) has been associated with increases in agreeableness and decreases in neuroticism, even though these traits do not initially predict individuals' gravitation toward social environments (Woods et al. 2020).

These findings support the idea that staying in an occupation can alter one's personality over time to better fit the work environment (e.g., Wille et al. 2012). This occurs because consistently engaging in the behaviors required to perform the tasks and duties of an occupation can both reinforce individuals' traits that already fit the environment and adjust traits that do not fit[3] (Woods et al. 2020). We build on this research to relate similarities between individuals' occupations to similarities between their personalities. Adding to existing work, we recognize that certain occupations share some requirements (Barrick and Mount 1991), which leads to greater similarity between them. Accordingly, we anticipate that individuals' personalities will converge not only in the same occupation but also across occupations that are more alike. In other words, we suggest that personality development may show greater resemblance in more similar occupations because these require more similar behaviors to perform their tasks and duties. Overall, we expect individuals staying in more similar occupations to undergo comparable reinforcements and adjustments in traits, further diminishing initial dissimilarities between them and, thus, leading to convergence in their personalities over time. In sum, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 3. *Individuals staying in more similar occupations develop more similar personalities.*

3 | Method

3.1 | Sample

We derived our sample from the German SOEP, a representative annual survey that, since 1984, has been collecting information regarding the personal and professional lives of approximately 20 000 German individuals (Goebel et al. 2019). The classification of occupations in the SOEP relies on the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO; International Labor Office 1990), which changed from version ISCO-88 to ISCO-08 in 2017. Individuals' occupations were identified based on the annual ISCO codes associated with them. To have a consistent measure of occupations over time, we relied on the ISCO-88 coding system for our analyses. The Big Five personality traits were first measured in 2005, with additional measurements in 2009, 2013, and 2017. Reflecting our longitudinal approach, we used these measurements to delineate the start (t_0) and the end (t_1) of a study period. This resulted in four study periods—2005–2009, 2009–2013, 2013–2017, and 2005–2017 (covering the entire temporal horizon). In line with a multiverse analysis (Steegen et al. 2016), we used all available data and tested our hypotheses across all of them. This approach enabled us to test the robustness of our results.[4] As we are interested in individuals with an occupation, we excluded from our sample those without any employment spells in the years included in each study period considered.

We further formed three subsamples for each study period. A subsample of *joiners* who entered an occupation in a study period (e.g., 2005–2009) was required to test the attraction and selection effects of Hypothesis 1. This subsample comprises individuals who changed their occupation (i.e., left an occupation to join another one as evinced by a change in their ISCO-88 codes) and those who entered the workforce (i.e., joined an occupation, therefore receiving an ISCO-88 code after a period without employment) in a given study period, that is, by t_1. To investigate attrition effects in Hypothesis 2, we compared individuals in a subsample of *stayers*, who remained in their occupation throughout a study period (i.e., had the same occupation as indicated by the same ISCO-88 code, e.g., from 2005 to 2009), to those in a subsample of *leavers*, who left the occupation they had at the start of a given study period for another one by the end of the same period (i.e., whose ISCO-88 code at t_0 changed by t_1). Those who completely left the workforce, for example, due to retirement, were not included in the subsample of leavers because their exit may be justified by reasons beyond a poor P–E fit.[5] As we will describe in more detail below, we compared stayers with leavers who had the same initial, at t_0, occupation to test Hypothesis 2. The subsample of *stayers* was also used to test the socialization effects of Hypothesis 3. Finally, if, during a study period, individuals changed more than one occupation, only the first change was considered because individuals can appear in a subsample only once to avoid non-independence.

Sample sizes per study period and subsample are shown in Table 1. Summing all individuals across subsamples, we have 11 607 individuals for 2005–2009, 9503 individuals for 2009–2013, and 9942 individuals for 2013–2017. Data for 6150 individuals are available for the entire temporal horizon (i.e., from 2005 to 2017).[6]

3.2 | Measures

We hypothesize on similarities between individuals' personalities and occupations. This implies a shift in the unit of analysis from *individuals* to *similarities between individuals*. Instead of using values that capture the personality trait levels of each individual, we measured similarities by computing distance values between individuals' personality trait levels. We relate these values to similarities between individuals' occupations, which we operationalized by computing distance values between the four-digit ISCO-88 codes used to categorize them. *Smaller distance values* indicate a *higher similarity* between individuals' personalities and occupations. Next, we explain the relevance of a distance-based approach in our setting before describing our study measures.

3.2.1 | Reasons for Using a Distance-Based Approach

The analysis of distances between entities is prevalent in some scientific domains, particularly the geographical sciences (e.g., Anselin 2001), but is rarely found in organizational research.

TABLE 1 | Descriptive statistics across samples and study periods.

	Study period (t_0–t_1)							
	2005–2009		**2009–2013**		**2013–2017**		**2005–2017**	
Full sample size (stayers and joiners)	11 607		9503		9942		6150	
Subsample of stayers	6275		5478		5668		2366	
Subsample of joiners	5332		4025		4274		3784	
Subsample of leavers[a]	4424		3565		3755		3270	
Gender (% female at t_0)	50.5		49.3		47.8		48.9	
Mean age (years at t_0)	44.4		47.2		49.0		45.1	
Occupational distance (ISCO-88 code at t_0)								
0—Same occupation (unit group)	1.16%		1.19%		1.19%		1.17%	
1—Same minor group	0.81%		0.83%		0.88%		0.83%	
2—Same sub-major group	4.01%		4.22%		4.23%		4.17%	
3—Same major group	8.43%		9.10%		9.56%		9.10%	
4—Different major group	85.59%		84.66%		84.14%		84.73%	
	M	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***
Overall personality distance (at t_0)								
Full sample	23.43	6.72	23.85	6.66	23.26	6.58	23.39	6.61
Within the same occupation[b]	22.83	6.65	23.45	6.56	22.70	6.53	22.83	6.49
Distance in openness (at t_0)								
Full sample	5.22	2.67	5.33	2.65	5.18	2.62	5.18	2.64
Within the same occupation	5.11	2.62	5.21	2.61	5.02	2.57	5.05	2.59
Distance in conscientiousness (at t_0)								
Full sample	3.58	2.36	3.79	2.36	3.66	2.25	3.56	2.33
Within the same occupation	3.39	2.30	3.68	2.31	3.51	2.26	3.38	2.26
Distance in extraversion (at t_0)								
Full sample	4.81	2.56	4.89	2.59	4.74	2.57	4.82	2.56
Within the same occupation	4.71	2.52	4.82	2.55	4.65	2.54	4.73	2.51
Distance in agreeableness (at t_0)								
Full sample	4.37	2.33	4.45	2.33	4.33	2.29	4.37	2.32
Within the same occupation	4.26	2.31	4.39	2.32	4.26	2.29	4.28	2.32
Distance in neuroticism (at t_0)								
Full sample	5.46	2.71	5.39	2.70	5.34	2.70	5.46	2.71
Within the same occupation	5.37	2.69	5.35	2.68	5.26	2.67	5.39	2.69

Note: Descriptive statistics for gender, age, and occupational distance are reported for the full samples.
[a]Overlapping subsamples: All individuals in the subsample of leavers are also in the subsample of joiners, as leavers joined another occupation in a study period after leaving their initial occupation. Individuals who joined the workforce in a study period are in the subsample of joiners but not in the subsample of leavers.
[b]Within the same occupation indicates a fraction of the full sample (stayers and joiners) that includes only pairs of individuals who stay in or join the *same* occupation in a study period. The full sample also includes pairs of individuals who stay in or join *different* occupations.

In our study, a distance-based approach capturing similarities between personalities allows us to move from a purely variable-centered toward a more person-centered approach, aligning more closely with our theorizing. Moreover, it enables us to consider the similarity that exists between occupations, providing a more fine-grained perspective of how personality homogeneity emerges across them. Common research paradigms allow for analyses that, by considering occupations as strictly independent groups (e.g., "medical doctors," "pharmacologists, pathologists, and related professionals," and "gardeners, horticultural

and nursery growers" as equally independent occupations coded as dummies), ignore their similarities. Instead, by computing distance values between occupations, we can account for their interconnections.

At the same time, some work environments may not optimally fit individuals with extreme personality traits (e.g., Le et al. 2011). For example, occupation X might need moderate, but not extremely high or low, levels of extraversion to perform its tasks and duties. A test of one-directional hypotheses such as "higher (lower) levels of extraversion are associated with entry in occupation X" would fail to capture this scenario. In this case, individuals with moderate, rather than high or low, levels of extraversion would be the ones to optimally fit and, therefore, join and remain in this occupation. Furthermore, the personalities of individuals staying in this occupation would change to converge toward this optimal, moderate level of extraversion. Accordingly, those with above-average initial levels of extraversion would experience a decrease in the trait over time, whereas those with below-average initial levels of the trait would show an increase. Once again, testing one-directional hypotheses like "extraversion increases (decreases) as individuals stay in occupation X" would be inappropriate. This aligns with the idea in the P–E fit literature that individuals can achieve an optimal fit with their work environment at high, moderate, and low personality trait levels (Van Vianen 2018). In other words, the relationship between personality traits and occupations does not always follow a one-directional pattern. Often, an average trait level might represent the best fit. By capturing similarities between individuals' personalities and occupations, rather than focusing on values for each variable, a distance-based approach allows us to test hypotheses that do not imply similar one-directional trajectories. Below, we describe our distance-based measures.

3.2.2 | Personality Distance

Personality was measured in 2005, 2009, 2013, and 2017 with the German Short Big Five Inventory (BFI-S), which comprises 15 items regrouped into five subscales (Gerlitz and Schupp 2005). Each subscale (openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism) contains three items measured on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *does not apply to me at all* to 7 = *applies to me perfectly*. A sample item for extraversion is "I see myself as someone who is outgoing, sociable." Hahn et al. (2012) have shown that this inventory has acceptable levels of internal consistency, stability over time, and convergent validity when compared to the revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R). Similar items are commonly employed in longitudinal household panel surveys to capture individuals' personalities (e.g., Zhou et al. 2021). Moreover, the SOEP data have already been used to study interactions between personality traits and occupations (e.g., Denissen et al. 2014; Ghetta et al. 2020), but with conceptual and methodological approaches that differ from those of our study.

We measured *personality distance* as the sum of absolute differences between two individuals on the 15 BFI-S items. We used all available information and looked at distances between items instead of computing distance values after aggregating the items at the subscale level to better capture personality nuances (e.g., Stewart et al. 2022). Thus, for example, if an individual answered all items with the scale anchor 3 and another always chose the scale anchor 5, the distance value between their personalities amounts to $15*2=30$. The maximum distance per item was 6 when individuals chose opposing endpoints of the 7-point Likert scale; hence, overall personality distance values can range from 0 to 90, with lower values representing more similar personalities. Supporting Information S1 offers a sample computation of personality distances, whereas Table 1 displays mean personality distance values and standard deviations. All individuals are compared to all others in the same subsample (i.e., joiners, leavers, and stayers) per study period (e.g., 2005–2009). Thus, a subsample with N individuals has $N*(N-1)/2$ personality distances. This measure of overall personality distance between individuals is appropriate to test our hypotheses because we are interested in how personalities, in general, converge in occupations. However, we also computed distances for each single personality trait (e.g., openness; see Table 1 for mean distance values and standard deviations) and used these measures in supplemental analyses.

3.2.3 | Occupational Distance

We used the well-established ISCO-88 coding system to identify individuals' occupations in each year of a study period. Within ISCO-88, work roles are grouped into occupations based on the similarity of skills required to fulfill their tasks and duties (International Labor Office 1990). Therefore, occupations coded according to ISCO-88 include roles subject to similar demands (Pelfrene et al. 2001) and with similar characteristics (Choi et al. 2020). In the SOEP survey instrument, participants are asked to indicate their current occupation, to which the SOEP interviewers assign a corresponding ISCO-88 code. The ISCO-88 codes consist of up to four digits, with each additional digit representing a more granular definition of occupations. Specifically, the first digit of the four-digit code captures *major groups* such as "professionals" (Group 2). ISCO-88 comprises a total of 10 major groups. The other digits refine each major group, resulting in 390 different four-digit codes. The second digit adds information regarding the *sub-major groups*, whereas the third digit indicates the *minor group* for each occupation. For example, "medical doctors" (2221) and "pharmacologists, pathologists, and related professionals" (2212) are both within the sub-major group 22, "life science and health professionals." However, the occupations belong to different minor groups, that is, 222, "health professionals (except nursing)" in the first case, and 221, "life science professionals" in the second. Finally, the fourth digit indicates the *unit groups*, therefore defining an occupation as granularly as possible (e.g., "medical doctors" and "pharmacologists, pathologists, and related professionals").

We relied on the information provided by each four-digit ISCO-88 code to measure the *occupational distance* between individuals. Instead of testing our hypotheses for broad groups of occupations (e.g., combining "medical doctors" and "pharmacologists, pathologists, and related professionals" with other occupations under the broader major group of "professionals"), we computed occupational distance at the most granular level by comparing all four digits of the ISCO-88 codes. In line with prior research (King et al. 2017), we used the full details of the

occupational codes to identify even minor differences between occupations that might be overlooked when considering broader groups of occupations. Overall, if two individuals had the same four-digit code (i.e., both were in the same unit group and, thus, had the same occupation, e.g., *2221*), the occupational distance was lowest and received the value of 0. If they shared the same three-digit, two-digit, or one-digit code, therefore having an occupation in the same minor, sub-major, or major group, the distance was set to 1, 2, or 3, respectively. For example, the occupational distance between *222*1 ("medical doctors") and *221*2 ("pharmacologists, pathologists, and related professionals") was 2. When two individuals had occupations in different major groups (e.g., 2221 "medical doctors" and 6112 "gardeners, horticultural and nursery growers"), the occupational distance was 4. Thus, occupational distance can take a value between 0 and 4, and lower distance values between individuals indicate that they have more similar occupations. Table 1 reports percentages for each possible occupational distance between individuals in the full samples across study periods. Supporting Information S2 includes a sample computation of occupational distances. We computed distances between each pair of individuals in a given subsample.

3.2.4 | Control Variables

We included *age* and *gender* as control variables in our analyses because both have been shown to affect work-related mobility (Rubenstein et al. 2018) and personality (Feingold 1994; Soto et al. 2011). Age was measured in years at the start of a study period. In line with our distance-based approach, we computed age similarities between individuals and assigned a value of 1 when the gender of two individuals differed and 0 when they had the same gender. In both cases, lower values represent more similar individuals.

3.3 | Analytical Strategy

To test Hypotheses 1 and 3, we created personality and occupational distance matrices that included distance values between personalities and occupations for each pair of individuals in a given subsample. For example, as the subsample of stayers for the period 2005–2009 includes a total of 6275 individuals, we generated two 6275×6275 symmetric distance matrices with $6275^2 = 39\,375\,625$ cells. Cells included distance values between individuals' personalities in the personality distance matrix and distance values between their occupations in the occupational distance matrix. Supporting Information S1 and S2 include examples of such matrices. A specific type of statistical analysis is required because distance matrices, rather than the variables themselves, are the inputs that are related in the regression analyses. Distance values represent dyadic data points resulting from comparing each individual to all the others in the same subsample on a given dimension (e.g., personality and occupation). Accordingly, changes in one individual's values on a dimension affect all distances between this individual and the others in the subsample. MRMs have been introduced (Lichstein 2007) to account for this non-independence. Beta coefficient estimates in MRM are identical to those in OLS regressions, but significance tests use permutations. In detail, the rows and associated columns of the distance matrix that is used as the outcome are simultaneously permutated while keeping all explanatory distance matrices constant (Lichstein 2007). A sample illustration of the inputs of an MRM analysis is available in Supporting Information S3. A more detailed discussion of MRM goes beyond the scope of this study, and we refer interested readers to Lichstein (2007) or, for a discussion of MRM in careers research, to Biemann et al. (2020).

To test Hypothesis 2, we compared the personality distances of individuals from the subsamples of stayers and leavers at the start of a study period. We initially computed the mean personality distance at t_0 between all individuals in a group that included all those who stayed in an occupation throughout a study period. In this first group, the average distance value reflects the initial personality distances between pairs of stayers. Then, we calculated the mean personality distance at t_0 between all individuals in a group that comprised, at the same time, those who stayed in and those who left an occupation in the same period. In this second group, the average distance value reflects the initial personality distances between pairs of stayers and leavers (i.e., pairs that included one stayer and one leaver). From the personality distance matrix, we only selected cells that contained either the personality distance between two individuals who both stayed in the same occupation during a study period (for the first group comparing stayers) or the distance between individuals who initially shared the same occupation, one of whom stayed in the occupation whereas the other left by the end of the period (for the second group comparing stayers with leavers). These distances represent only a fraction of the full personality distance matrix because each individual is only compared to others in the same occupation (i.e., with the same four-digit ISCO-88 code) at the start of a study period. For example, in the 2005–2009 period, there were 6275 stayers and 4424 leavers in the sample. However, only 0.5% of the personality distances were distances between two individuals who stayed in the same occupation, and 0.6% of them were distances between a stayer and a leaver who were initially in the same occupation. Because we did not compare full distance matrices, we avoided the high non-independence of cases that required MRM analyses to test Hypotheses 1 and 3. Therefore, to test Hypothesis 2, we computed Welch two-sample *t*-tests that compared the mean personality distances at the start of each study period (t_0) between the first group (stayer–stayer) and the second group (stayer–leaver).

All analyses were executed in *R* (R Core Team 2022), using the *ecodist* package (Goslee and Urban 2007) for MRM analyses. We report below unstandardized regression coefficients.

4 | Results

4.1 | Descriptive Results

The descriptive results on mean personality distances at t_0 between individuals across samples and study periods (see Table 1) offer some interesting preliminary insights. In all periods, the mean personality distance among all pairs of individuals, including both pairs of individuals with the same occupation and pairs with different occupations, is larger than

the mean personality distance in a fraction of this full sample that includes only pairs of individuals working in the same occupation. For example, for the period 2005–2009, the mean personality distance in 2005 was 23.43 for all pairs of individuals but only 22.83 for the pairs of individuals within the same occupation. This suggests, as expected, that the personalities of individuals in the same work environment are more homogeneous. This pattern is also consistent when looking at the mean distances in single personality traits. Tables 2–4 report the results of our hypothesis tests.

4.2 | Hypothesis Tests

Hypothesis 1 proposed that individuals with more similar personalities join more similar occupations. This hypothesis is supported if lower personality distances between individuals at the start of a study period (t_0) are related to lower distances between the occupations they enter by t_1. This implies that initial (pre-occupational entry) personality distances and distances in the occupations individuals join should be positively and significantly related. Data from both t_0 and t_1 allow us to capture how initial personality distances affect the gravitational process toward occupations. We tested this hypothesis in the subsample of joiners. The results from our MRM analyses are shown in Table 2. The dependent variable is the distance between the occupations that individuals enter by t_1, which is regressed on overall personality, age, and gender distances at t_0. Hypothesis 1 is supported in all study periods. For example, in Model 1a for 2005–2009, the beta coefficient of overall personality distance at t_0 amounts to $b = 0.0015$ ($p = 0.001$). As noted above, significance tests in MRM analyses use permutations, and we ran 1000 permutations in our analyses. Thus, the lower limit for p values is 0.001. This occurs when no permutation generates a beta coefficient that is more extreme than in the original, non-permutated data. All coefficients for overall personality distances at t_0 are positive and significant (Models 1a, 1c, 1e, and 1g), indicating that greater initial similarity in personalities is related to greater similarity in the occupations that individuals join over time. This aligns with our first hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2 suggested that individuals with personalities that are less similar to those of other occupational incumbents are more likely to leave the occupation. To observe attrition behavior over time, we used the available data between the start and end of each study period. Specifically, this hypothesis is supported when the initial, at t_0, mean personality distance between pairs of individuals who both stayed in the same occupation during a study period (between t_0 and t_1) is smaller than the initial mean personality distance between pairs of stayers

TABLE 2 | Results from MRM analyses to predict occupational distance (Hypothesis 1).

	Dependent variable: Occupational distance							
	Study period (t_0–t_1)							
	2005–2009		**2009–2013**		**2013–2017**		**2005–2017**	
	Model 1a	**Model 1b**	**Model 1c**	**Model 1d**	**Model 1e**	**Model 1f**	**Model 1g**	**Model 1h**
Intercept	3.68	3.68	3.68	3.68	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67
Distances (at t_0) in								
Overall personality	0.0015 ($p = 0.001$)		0.0013 ($p = 0.001$)		0.0015 ($p = 0.001$)		0.0020 ($p = 0.001$)	
Openness		0.0022 ($p = 0.001$)		0.0028 ($p = 0.001$)		0.0027 ($p = 0.001$)		0.0026 ($p = 0.001$)
Conscientiousness		−0.0002 ($p = 0.723$)		−0.0007 ($p = 0.324$)		0.0005 ($p = 0.455$)		0.0001 ($p = 0.882$)
Extraversion		0.0019 ($p = 0.001$)		0.0005 ($p = 0.373$)		0.0005 ($p = 0.402$)		0.0024 ($p = 0.001$)
Agreeableness		0.0017 ($p = 0.001$)		0.0015 ($p = 0.015$)		0.0013 ($p = 0.041$)		0.0018 ($p = 0.006$)
Neuroticism		0.0016 ($p = 0.001$)		0.0017 ($p = 0.004$)		0.0024 ($p = 0.001$)		0.0024 ($p = 0.001$)
Gender	0.0705 ($p = 0.001$)	0.0703 ($p = 0.001$)	0.0627 ($p = 0.001$)	0.0625 ($p = 0.001$)	0.0656 ($p = 0.001$)	0.0655 ($p = 0.001$)	0.0675 ($p = 0.001$)	0.0674 ($p = 0.001$)
Age	0.0007 ($p = 0.001$)	0.0007 ($p = 0.001$)	0.0002 ($p = 0.223$)	0.0002 ($p = 0.131$)	0.0005 ($p = 0.001$)	0.0004 ($p = 0.001$)	0.0004 ($p = 0.009$)	0.0004 ($p = 0.005$)
R^2	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
N	5332		4025		4274		3784	

Note: The subsample of joiners was used for these analyses.

TABLE 3 | Comparisons of mean personality distances (Hypothesis 2).

	Study period (t_0–t_1)			
	2005–2009	**2009–2013**	**2013–2017**	**2005–2017**
Mean overall personality distance (at t_0)				
Between stayer and stayer	22.85	23.33	22.48	22.68
Between stayer and leaver	22.90	23.52	22.83	22.90
	$t=-3.93$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=-13.12$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=-25.38$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=-7.99$ ($p<0.001$)
Mean distance in openness (at t_0)				
Between stayer and stayer	5.12	5.20	4.98	5.03
Between stayer and leaver	5.13	5.23	5.04	5.06
	$t=-1.72$ ($p=0.085$)	$t=-6.31$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=-11.10$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=-1.98$ ($p=0.048$)
Mean distance in conscientiousness (at t_0)				
Between stayer and stayer	3.38	3.67	3.48	3.41
Between stayer and leaver	3.39	3.69	3.53	3.39
	$t=-2.30$ ($p=0.021$)	$t=-3.96$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=-12.20$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=1.84$ ($p=0.066$)
Mean distance in extraversion (at t_0)				
Between stayer and stayer	4.73	4.81	4.59	4.69
Between stayer and leaver	4.73	4.82	4.67	4.74
	$t=0.22$ ($p=0.826$)	$t=-1.56$ ($p=0.119$)	$t=-14.17$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=-5.00$ ($p<0.001$)
Mean distance in agreeableness (at t_0)				
Between stayer and stayer	4.22	4.34	4.21	4.21
Between stayer and leaver	4.28	4.41	4.29	4.29
	$t=-12.20$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=-14.89$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=-16.75$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=-7.54$ ($p<0.001$)
Mean distance in neuroticism (at t_0)				
Between stayer and stayer	5.40	5.32	5.22	5.34
Between stayer and leaver	5.38	5.37	5.29	5.43
	$t=4.13$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=-8.23$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=-13.38$ ($p<0.001$)	$t=-7.99$ ($p<0.001$)

Note: Degrees of freedom varied between 1 095 356 and 1 103 168 in 2005–2009, between 798 280 and 799 982 in 2009–2013, between 884 121 and 885 860 in 2013–2017, and between 153 625 and 162 420 in 2005–2017. Differences in degrees of freedom between study periods occurred because of varying sample sizes across periods (see Table 1); differences within study periods occurred because of missing values on single items.

and leavers (who had the same occupation at t_0, but where one stayed in the occupation whereas the other left it for another one by t_1). Table 3 shows the results across study periods of *t*-tests comparing the mean personality distances at t_0 between pairs of stayers and stayers and stayers and leavers. For example, for the period 2005–2009, the mean personality distance in 2005 was 22.85 for stayers and stayers and 22.90 for stayers and leavers. A Welch two-sample *t*-test indicates a significantly smaller mean for the stayer–stayer group than for the stayer–leaver group ($t=-3.93$, $p<0.001$). Overall, Hypothesis 2 is supported across study periods.

Hypothesis 3 proposed that individuals staying in more similar occupations develop more similar personalities. Thus, we focused on the subsample of stayers. This hypothesis is supported if lower distances in individuals' occupations at t_0[7] are related to lower personality distances at t_1, the dependent variable, while controlling for the initial (at t_0) personality distances between individuals. Similar to Hypothesis 1, occupational distances and personality distances should be positively and significantly related. Further, by including initial distances in personality, we control for reverse causality. The hypothesis is only supported if the personalities of individuals staying in more similar occupations are more similar at the end than at the start of a study period. Data from both t_0 and t_1 enable us to capture how personalities change over time. In the MRM analyses, age and gender distances at t_0 are also included as control variables. The results in Table 4 support Hypothesis 3, as the coefficients for the distances in occupation at t_0 are positive and significant across study periods in Models 3a, 3c, 3e, and 3g. For example, in Model 3a for 2005–2009, the beta coefficient of occupational distance amounts to $b=0.1133$ ($p=0.001$). As expected, individuals' personalities become more similar over time while they stay in more similar occupations.

TABLE 4 | Results from MRM analyses to predict personality distance (Hypothesis 3).

	Dependent variable: Overall personality distance at t_1							
	Study period (t_0–t_1)							
	2005–2009		2009–2013		2013–2017		2005–2017	
	Model 3a	Model 3b	Model 3c	Model 3d	Model 3e	Model 3f	Model 3g	Model 3h
Intercept	14.38	14.40	12.70	12.74	12.69	12.74	15.47	15.48
Distances (at t_0) in								
Overall personality	0.3744 ($p=0.001$)		0.4180 ($p=0.001$)		0.4344 ($p=0.001$)		0.3060 ($p=0.001$)	
Openness		0.3942 ($p=0.001$)		0.4347 ($p=0.001$)		0.4173 ($p=0.001$)		0.3004 ($p=0.001$)
Conscientiousness		0.3478 ($p=0.001$)		0.3975 ($p=0.001$)		0.3702 ($p=0.001$)		0.2612 ($p=0.001$)
Extraversion		0.4469 ($p=0.001$)		0.4793 ($p=0.001$)		0.5220 ($p=0.001$)		0.3890 ($p=0.001$)
Agreeableness		0.3323 ($p=0.001$)		0.3598 ($p=0.001$)		0.3696 ($p=0.001$)		0.2421 ($p=0.001$)
Neuroticism		0.3371 ($p=0.001$)		0.4003 ($p=0.001$)		0.4590 ($p=0.001$)		0.3144 ($p=0.001$)
Occupation[a]	0.1133 ($p=0.001$)	0.1136 ($p=0.001$)	0.1065 ($p=0.001$)	0.1074 ($p=0.001$)	0.0851 ($p=0.001$)	0.0861 ($p=0.001$)	0.0833 ($p=0.006$)	0.0835 ($p=0.004$)
Gender	0.2302 ($p=0.001$)	0.2342 ($p=0.001$)	0.2617 ($p=0.001$)	0.2648 ($p=0.001$)	0.2272 ($p=0.001$)	0.2263 ($p=0.001$)	0.2431 ($p=0.001$)	0.2476 ($p=0.001$)
Age	0.0041 ($p=0.115$)	0.0044 ($p=0.090$)	0.0045 ($p=0.107$)	0.0045 ($p=0.112$)	0.0032 ($p=0.249$)	0.0036 ($p=0.223$)	0.0023 ($p=0.664$)	0.0022 ($p=0.656$)
R^2	14.3%	14.4%	17.2%	17.3%	18.8%	19.0%	9.6%	9.7%
N	6275		5478		5668		2366	

Note: The subsample of stayers was used for these analyses.
[a]We use the terms *distances in occupation* and *occupational distance* interchangeably.

4.3 | Supplemental Analyses

In a first set of supplemental analyses, we split the distance in overall personality into its five dimensions (e.g., the distance in extraversion, the distance in conscientiousness) and repeated our analyses for distances in single personality traits. The results provide insights into how attraction and selection, attrition, and socialization effects unfold for similarities in each Big Five personality trait. Such dynamics remain otherwise ambiguous when looking at similarities between individuals' overall personalities captured by single distance values (Edwards 1993).

Consistent with Hypothesis 1, across study periods, nearly all single personality trait distances at t_0 positively and significantly predict the distances between the occupations that individuals join by t_1 (Models 1b, 1d, 1f, and 1h in Table 2). Exceptions are observed for the distances in conscientiousness and extraversion, where non-significant and mixed results are found, respectively. The results for Hypothesis 2 are less consistent when looking at distances at the trait level (see Table 3). For the entire temporal horizon from 2005 to 2017, mean personality trait distances at t_0, except for conscientiousness, remain smaller between stayers and stayers than between stayers and leavers. Overall, these results are in line with Hypothesis 2. However, across the shorter study periods, mean distances in single personality traits are not always significantly different from one another (i.e., openness in 2005–2009 and extraversion in 2005–2009 and 2009–2013). Furthermore, there are also instances in which an opposite trend emerges with larger distance values between stayers and stayers than between stayers and leavers (i.e., neuroticism in 2005–2009). Finally, in line with Hypothesis 3, individuals' occupational distances at t_0 remain a positive and significant predictor of future overall personality distances, even after controlling for initial distances in each personality trait. Moreover, as expected, all personality trait distances at t_0 positively and significantly predict distances in overall personality between individuals at t_1 (Models 3b, 3d, 3f, and 3h in Table 4).

To further disentangle for which distances in single personality traits socialization effects occur as hypothesized, we report in Supporting Information S4 the results of analyses for 2005–2017 where initial (at t_0) distances between individuals' occupations predict future (at t_1) distances in single personality traits, instead of distances in overall personality. In line with the findings for

distances in overall personality, continuous membership in similar occupations significantly reduces distances in all traits except for extraversion and agreeableness. Similar results are observed for the other study periods. These analyses are available upon request.

In a second set of supplemental analyses, we used different operationalizations of occupational distance to test the robustness of our results. In Supporting Information S5, we describe in detail these alternative specifications and report the findings for the 2005–2017 period. Overall, the results for both Hypotheses 1 and 3, which include occupational distance as a dependent or independent variable, remain robust. No substantial differences are observed for the results of the other study periods. These results are available upon request.

5 | Discussion

Our study investigated whether, over time, individuals with *similar personalities* work in *similar occupations* and how working in similar occupations shapes their personality similarity. By analyzing longitudinal, nationally representative data, we unveiled the contributions of attraction and selection, attrition, and socialization effects toward creating homogeneity in individuals' personalities in similar occupations. The process leading to homogeneity indeed seems to start with attraction and selection effects because individuals with more similar personalities join more similar occupations. It then continues through attrition and socialization dynamics. On the one hand, individuals with personalities that are less similar to other occupational incumbents tend to leave the occupation over time. On the other hand, personality similarities between individuals increase with continuous membership in more similar occupations. As with prior research studying interactions between individuals' personalities and their work environments (e.g., King et al. 2017; Li et al. 2021), the observed effect sizes in our study are small, which should be considered when deriving the implications of our results.

5.1 | Theoretical Implications

Our work extends prior research in several ways. First, we contribute to existing literature investigating the homogeneity of individuals' personalities in occupations (e.g., Bradley-Geist and Landis 2012; King et al. 2017; Ployhart et al. 2006; Satterwhite et al. 2009; Sundstrom et al. 2016). Although previous studies have generally confirmed that personalities tend to be more similar within the same occupation than between different ones, we provide evidence that trait homogeneity also emerges among increasingly similar occupations, driven by attraction and selection, as well as socialization effects. Theoretically, instead of considering occupations as separate, independent work contexts, we recognize that some are more related than others (Barrick and Mount 1991; Dierdorff and Morgeson 2013). Empirically, extant work has tested the personality homogeneity hypothesis by showing a sufficient lack of within-occupation variability in personalities compared to between-occupation variability, for example, based on information from intraclass correlation coefficients (e.g., King et al. 2017) or MANOVAs (e.g., Satterwhite et al. 2009), or by focusing on proof of limited within-occupation variability through the computation of average deviations in the personalities of incumbents in the same occupation (Bradley-Geist and Landis 2012). In contrast, our distance-based approach relates similarities between personalities and occupations, enabling us to investigate how personality traits distribute over time across occupations with varying levels of similarity. Overall, we confirm that more similar personalities develop in the same work environment (i.e., when individuals work in identical occupations, thus sharing the highest level of similarity). Yet, we also show that more similar traits can arise among distinct but increasingly similar work environments, broadening the scope of the personality homogeneity hypothesis. In the process, we establish occupational similarity as a key, though underexplored, variable able to influence the interplay between personality and work. For instance, although prior research has linked other contextual factors, such as job demands (Li et al. 2014), job complexity, or work autonomy (Tasselli et al. 2018), to personality changes, our findings reveal that individuals' personalities become more similar as they remain in more similar occupations, demonstrating that occupational similarity can also influence the development of personality traits over time.

Moreover, we provide empirical evidence supporting the hypothesized role of attrition in the creation of personality homogeneity in occupations. The core idea is that personality misfits between individuals and their work environments increase the likelihood of leaving over time (e.g., Roberts 2006). However, prior research has focused on demonstrating a positive relationship between concurrent measures of personality misfit and intentions to leave the occupation. In detail, Sitzmann et al. (2019) found that individuals with personalities less similar to those of others in the same occupation have lower tenure and higher turnover intentions. Similarly, Donohue (2006) revealed that those with lower congruence between their personalities and occupations report higher intentions to leave. Importantly, intentions predict but do not necessarily equate to actual behavior (Carless and Arnup 2011; Mobley et al. 1979). This distinction is especially relevant for occupational changes, which often involve greater costs compared to other career moves (e.g., Blau 2007), such as organizational transitions. This can potentially lead to inaction, even when individuals experience a misfit with their occupation. We resolve the existing mismatch between the theorized role of attrition and its empirical tests by using longitudinal data to identify subsamples of stayers and leavers who leave their initial occupations by the end of a study period. Extending extant research, our findings indeed demonstrate that individuals with greater initial personality distances from other occupational incumbents tend to leave the occupation over time, leading to increased homogeneity in the work environment due to attrition effects.

Overall, analyzing study periods covering up to 12 years, we go beyond previous studies that have observed the existence of personality homogeneity in occupations at a single point in time (e.g., Bradley-Geist and Landis 2012; Satterwhite et al. 2009). By focusing on the role of occupational similarity and testing different effects by relying on subsamples of joiners, leavers, and stayers, we also offer new insights compared to existing longitudinal studies. These studies have documented the

emergence of personality homogeneity over time by examining only a subset of its underlying forces (e.g., attraction and selection from 2007 to 2013 in King et al. 2017; attraction and selection as well as socialization from 2005 to 2009 in Denissen et al. 2014), neglecting attrition and overlooking the interconnections between occupations. Furthermore, instead of focusing on a single temporal horizon, we replicate our hypothesis tests across multiple study periods with different start and end points between 2005 and 2017. By subsetting our dataset to use all available data, we address calls for greater transparency in research aimed at increasing its reproducibility and replicability (e.g., Steegen et al. 2016). Our replications exclude that specific temporal conditions, such as the European debt crisis in the 2009–2013 period, drive the results. At the same time, we provide evidence that all effects consistently contribute to the emergence of personality homogeneity in similar occupations over shorter (i.e., 4 years) and longer (i.e., up to 12 years) horizons. These findings offer valuable insights for future meta-analyses, such as that of Bleidorn et al. (2022), which aim to enhance our understanding of how time influences personality dynamics in the workplace.

Second, we contribute to existing studies that, drawing on the concept of P–E fit (e.g., Edwards 2008; Van Vianen 2018), have tested attraction and selection, attrition, and socialization effects to examine the reciprocal influences between personalities and occupations, even though their primary objective was not to test the homogeneity hypothesis (e.g., De Fruyt and Mervielde 1999; Denissen et al. 2014; Hirschi et al. 2021; Judge et al. 1999; Woods and Hampson 2010). Specifically, we offer a new angle to this research by including hypotheses that relate the similarities between individuals' personalities to the similarities between their occupations instead of testing one-directional relationships (e.g., "staying in a conventional occupation increases conscientiousness over time"). In line with the P–E fit literature, our approach captures the idea that individuals are attracted to, are selected for, and stay in work environments that offer an optimal fit with their personalities and that personality developments occur to achieve this optimal fit (Van Vianen 2018). Thus, fit can be attained by individuals with low, moderate, or high levels of personality traits, as long as these align optimally with the requirements of their occupations (Wille and De Fruyt 2014).

Supporting extant research on attraction and selection effects, we observe that individuals with more similar personalities join more similar occupations. Yet, if prior studies could not always support empirically expected relationships between specific trait levels and occupations, such that, for example, higher extraversion could not significantly predict entry into enterprising occupations (Woods and Hampson 2010), the finding for our first hypothesis provides evidence of attraction and selection effects in a setting that enables the emergence of fit not only at extreme trait levels but also at moderate ones. Concerning attrition, the idea that an optimal fit leads to more positive outcomes for occupational incumbents, potentially reducing the likelihood that they leave the occupation, has been explored in prior research. Studies by Ghetta et al. (2020) and Törnroos et al. (2019) have proposed that lower distances between individuals' personalities and the average personality of others in the same occupation predict higher job satisfaction. However, only the latter study found support for the proposition. Comparing individuals' personality traits to the average traits of others in the same occupation may have overlooked valuable information regarding the variability of traits among all occupational incumbents, potentially contributing to the mixed results found. Our measure of personality distance closely resembles the one used by Sitzmann et al. (2019), as both capture the degree to which individuals' personality traits deviate from those of all other occupational incumbents. However, instead of computing distance values based on the differences in individuals' dichotomous scores for four personality traits, our measure of personality distance relies on continuous ratings of the Big Five traits that capture more nuanced differences in individuals' personalities. Furthermore, as highlighted before, we relate personality to actual occupational changes rather than intentions to change, ultimately addressing a different research question. The finding in line with Hypothesis 3 that individuals in more similar occupations develop more similar personalities over time contributes to our understanding of personality dynamics (e.g., Li et al. 2014, 2021; Wille et al. 2012; Woods et al. 2020; Wu et al. 2020). Our tests of socialization focus on changes in personality distances between t_0 and t_1 due to continuous membership in similar occupations. Yet, a reduction in the distance between the personalities of two (or more) individuals can only occur when, over time, their personality trait levels undergo within-person changes that make them more similar. Overall, our results confirm the existence of socialization effects in a context that does not assume that personality traits should homogeneously increase or decrease in response to occupational requirements. This assumption makes the frequent non-significant findings regarding theorized corresponsive and non-corresponsive changes in personality (e.g., Hirschi et al. 2021; Wille et al. 2012; Wille and De Fruyt 2014) hard to explain. By showing that individuals' overall personalities develop such that initial similarities increase as they stay in more similar occupations, we further capture personality developments even if distances in certain traits remain stable. In other words, as the gravitation mechanisms encourage individuals to pick "niches" that fit their personality (Nye and Roberts 2019), our approach recognizes that certain traits may not change if they are already at an optimal level given the occupational requirements (Wille and De Fruyt 2014).

Third, although the main findings for the distances in individuals' overall personality help us derive conclusions regarding the general homogenization of individuals' personalities in occupations, our supplemental analyses for the distances in each Big Five trait suggest that attraction and selection, attrition, and socialization effects do not unfold for all traits equally. Across the entire study period from 2005 to 2017 (see Table 2), individuals who are more similar in openness, agreeableness, extraversion, and neuroticism tend to join more similar occupations. However, similarities in conscientiousness do not serve as significant predictors in the context of attraction and selection dynamics. Similarly, in line with attrition effects, the results shown in Table 3 for the same period indicate that the mean distances in all traits except for conscientiousness are significantly smaller in the stayer–stayer group than in the stayer–leaver group. Examining more closely the results for attraction and selection, and attrition effects over the different study periods, similarities in extraversion and conscientiousness more frequently cannot significantly predict similarities between individuals' occupations and their likelihood of attrition.

Concerning conscientiousness and extraversion, prior research has related these traits with higher order motivational goals—respectively, status striving (i.e., obtaining power and dominance) and accomplishment striving (i.e., accomplishing tasks)—that are common across occupations regardless of their requirements and, hence, their similarity (Barrick et al. 2002, 2013). Thus, as we find, distances in these traits may not be the strongest factors explaining why individuals enter and stay in more similar occupations. Our work aligns with existing studies suggesting that conscientiousness is equally relevant for performance across occupations (e.g., Barrick and Mount 1991; Wilmot and Ones 2021). Further, it indicates that a similar role can be played by extraversion, despite this trait being traditionally considered more relevant in specific (e.g., sales), rather than across all, occupations (Barrick and Mount 1991).

In line with prior research on personality dynamics in the workplace (e.g., Wille and De Fruyt 2014; Woods et al. 2020), our study offers simultaneous evidence of corresponsive and non-corresponsive changes in some traits related to socialization. Expanding existing work, changes in our analyses capture whether traits become more similar rather than whether they move in a single direction, either increasing or decreasing, across individuals. As shown in Table 2 and Supporting Information S4 (see the results for the 2005–2017 period), similarities in openness and neuroticism not only guide individuals toward similar occupations but also develop further as individuals stay in these occupations in a corresponsive pattern. Further, although similarities in conscientiousness do not predict individuals' gravitation toward similar occupations, these similarities do develop in a non-corresponsive fashion as individuals remain in a similar work environment. The evidence that similarities in occupations do not lead to an increase in the similarities between individuals' extraversion and agreeableness indicates that, as suggested before, individuals' personalities may overall converge despite the similarities in some traits remaining unaffected by the continuous membership in similar work environments. A potential explanation for this finding is that some traits do not change after people join their occupations. For example, Wille and De Fruyt (2014) found evidence that extraversion does not develop in response to occupational characteristics, despite the trait initially guiding individuals toward specific occupations. Evidence regarding agreeableness is more mixed, with some studies finding that occupations can develop the trait (e.g., Wille and De Fruyt 2014; Woods et al. 2020), whereas others fail to provide similar evidence (Hirschi et al. 2021). As Hirschi et al. (2021) propose for extraversion, individuals may not feel the need to be more sociable once they obtain a job in an occupation. A similar argument may also be valid for agreeableness.

Finally, from a conceptual and methodological perspective, our research supports as warranted the calls from personality (Asendorpf 2015) and vocational researchers (Hofmans et al. 2020) to increase the use of person-centered perspectives to better capture differences in individuals' overall personalities. At the same time, MRMs (Lichstein 2007), which have been used in other disciplines, provide a useful approach to capture and relate similarities in individuals' combinations of personality traits and their occupations in management research. Therefore, we fulfill a demand for innovative methods that can allow for a better comprehension of the interplay between individuals' personalities and their work environments (Sosnowska et al. 2021).

5.2 | Practical Implications

As organizations can be seen as systems that include occupations of varying similarity (Dierdorff 2019), our research carries relevant implications for HR practitioners. By showing that individuals with more similar personalities join more similar occupations that, in turn, further enhance their initial personality similarities, our work suggests that organizations that include more similar occupations tend to have a workforce with more homogeneous personality traits. Further, the finding that individuals whose personalities differ more from those of others in the same occupation are more likely to leave that occupation could help organizations better assess factors contributing to attrition risk. Overall, our insights contribute to a broader understanding of the characteristics and expected development of human resources across the occupations within organizations. They can assist HR practitioners in making more informed hiring decisions and managing the workforce more effectively (e.g., when considering employee transfers among occupations). Moreover, the homogeneity in personality-based human capital resources within organizations affects their competitive advantage (Ployhart and Hale 2014), for example, by promoting labor productivity and corporate performance (Oh et al. 2015). Hence, understanding how personality converges in organizations remains crucial. By observing how the similarity between occupations leads to the emergence of more homogeneous combinations of traits, we offer managers a novel approach to understanding the roots of this convergence.

Our results also apply to vocational counseling. They indicate that, beyond assessing individual trait levels, evaluating similarities in combinations of personality traits among individuals can be useful when helping clients select sets of suitable occupations and avoid those with higher attrition risks. By indicating that those staying in similar occupations develop more similar personalities over time, our research may further encourage individuals to pursue occupations even if they do not meet the thresholds for some of the traits that are traditionally associated with them but, overall, possess relatively similar personalities compared to occupational incumbents. A greater similarity between personalities reduces the likelihood of changing occupations—a decision accompanied by substantial costs for individuals, such as the need for additional training in the new work role and the loss of professional relationships with peers in the same occupation (e.g., Blau 2007). Additionally, initial dissimilarities in traits tend to diminish over time as individuals stay in similar occupations. Nonetheless, should individuals still wish to change occupations, our research can guide them toward roles more similar to their previous ones, thereby reducing the costs associated with personality adaptation.

On the whole, although these remain valid implications, personality is only one of many factors influencing occupational outcomes. The significant, albeit modest, effect sizes observed in our analyses serve as a reminder to HR practitioners and vocational counselors of the importance of considering personality as a relevant factor alongside other elements, such as

organizational culture, individuals' skills, and career aspirations, when guiding decisions or designing interventions.

5.3 | Limitations and Avenues for Future Research

This study is not without limitations, some of which reveal promising avenues for future research. First, using different subsamples (i.e., joiners, stayers, and leavers) enhances our ability to test the drivers behind the interplay between similarities in personalities and occupations. Yet, our data do not enable us to empirically distinguish the attraction and selection mechanisms. There may be individuals who are attracted to a particular occupation but are not selected for it, which might have consequences such as increasing the likelihood of attrition from their "plan B" occupation. Further, it remains unclear which effect contributes the most to the homogenization of personalities in occupations. Future research might rely on datasets that systematically track the career journeys of the same individuals over time, with information on their personalities, applications for specific occupations, and outcomes of selection processes (e.g., Oh et al. 2018), to separate and investigate the contributions of these forces more precisely. Moreover, some individuals in our subsample of stayers who experience a misfit between their personality and occupation may choose to change the environment within their occupation, such as engaging in job crafting, instead of altering their personality. As individuals modify their work environments to enhance the fit with their personalities, these changes reduce rather than amplify the need for their personalities to adjust. Therefore, our estimates of the contribution of socialization effects toward personality homogeneity in occupations may be conservative. Nevertheless, exploring how changes within the occupation (e.g., tasks and work hours) influence the impact of socialization on the emergence of personality homogeneity in this work environment remains a fruitful avenue for further research.

Second, in line with prior research (Ghetta et al. 2020), we use the ISCO codes to identify occupations. Specifically, our measure of occupational distance relies on the differences in the four-digit ISCO-88 codes assigned to occupations that capture similarities in their tasks and duties, reflecting the skills required for their execution (International Labor Office 1990). Thanks to the ISCO codes, we can rely on a standard system used internationally to categorize occupations. However, work environments can also be differentiated based on other features, such as in terms of more psychological situation characteristics (Woods et al. 2019). For instance, the DIAMONDS framework offers a taxonomy of dimensions reflecting individuals' perceptions of situations, which can be related to their personality traits. For example, a situation perceived as high on the duty dimension may especially fit individuals high in conscientiousness (Rauthmann et al. 2014). As a natural extension of our work, future studies could use differences in psychological situation characteristics (e.g., differences in perceptions of duty) to capture similarities between occupations and relate them to similarities between individuals' personality traits. Further, our measure of occupational distance assigns values of 0, 1, 2, or 3 for occupations within the same unit, minor, sub-major, or major groups, respectively, and 4 for occupations in different major groups, assuming equal increases in distances. Because we lacked a strong theoretical basis for assigning unequal weights, we opted for a straightforward method that is easy to apply to other systems, such as the US Standard Occupational Classification (SOC). To address a reviewer's suggestion that occupational distances might increase nonlinearly—where distances between occupations with fewer shared ISCO-88 digits should carry more weight—we conducted supplemental analyses using alternative weights (0, 1, 3, 5, and 10; see Supporting Information S5). Although these analyses confirmed our original results, underscoring the robustness and adaptability of our approach, future researchers may build on our work by exploring different weighting schemes.

Third, similar to prior research in the field (e.g., Denissen et al. 2014; Hirschi et al. 2021; King et al. 2017), the effect sizes that we found are relatively small. Our novel approach makes it unfeasible to directly compare the magnitude of our effects and those of others. In general, different factors, such as socioeconomic opportunities, uncontrollable life events (Woods et al. 2020), or the use of various selection tools like cognitive ability tests and role-playing exercises, contribute to individuals' attraction to and selection for occupations alongside their personality. Additionally, as individuals gravitate toward "niches" that fit their personalities, stability rather than change in traits often prevails (e.g., Wille and De Fruyt 2014), justifying why personality developments due to occupational membership should not be overestimated. In our work, we find that even small deviations from the personality of other occupational incumbents are associated with attrition. The fact that attraction and selection, as well as socialization effects, operate as theorized limits the range of personality trait levels observed within each occupation. Simultaneously, other aspects of P–E fit likely play a more crucial role in occupational attrition, creating opportunities for future investigations. Our small effect sizes could also result from the fact that, in our main analyses, we relate similarities in a broad measure of personality (which includes the items for all of the Big Five traits) to a narrow measure of occupations (which relies on the four-digit ISCO-88 codes) (e.g., Judge and Kammeyer-Mueller 2012; Woods et al. 2019). The use of a broad personality measure enable us to test the emergence of homogeneity in individuals' personalities more generally and parsimoniously. However, by relating a narrow measure of occupations to a likewise narrow measure of personality (e.g., by remaining at the level of facets), other researchers could extend our findings by providing more nuanced insights regarding the interplay between similarities in personality facets and occupations. Overall, even small effects regarding the relationships between individuals' personalities and work environments are meaningful (Li et al. 2021). Personality remains an important predictor of workplace performance (Barrick and Mount 1991), and an optimal fit between personality traits and work environments contributes to job satisfaction (Törnroos et al. 2019). Therefore, even subtle shifts can have meaningful consequences on career success measures. Furthermore, cumulative effects can emerge over time, especially in the case of attrition and socialization effects, and even minor personality changes impact individuals' lives (Roberts et al. 2007). In spite of these considerations, and although our results are firmly grounded in theory and remain consistent across different time horizons, we nonetheless recognize that the significance of small effects in large samples should always be interpreted with some caution. Thus, while

the SOEP data provided access to a representative sample of the working population and a wide variety of occupations—key factors for reliably testing how personality homogeneity emerges at the occupational level (Anni et al. 2024; King et al. 2017), we encourage the replication of our results with datasets of varying sample sizes to further validate their generalizability.

Lastly, we believe that there are several other promising directions for future research. We constructed datasets from the SOEP for four study periods, offered alternative computations of our key variables, and replicated our hypothesis tests across variations of alternatively processed data. Thereby, we embraced the suggestion from new methodological approaches, such as multiverse analyses (Steegen et al. 2016), to perform tests that increase transparency and scrutinize the fragility of study findings. Consequently, we highlighted the robustness of our results for individuals' similarities in overall personalities while unveiling inconsistencies in some findings for similarities in single personality traits (e.g., for conscientiousness and extraversion). Overall, our thorough examination of a large, representative sample over several years makes it unlikely that non-significant findings are due to sample bias or inadequate statistical power. Therefore, although we theoretically discussed some of these discrepancies, we encourage future researchers to continue investigating how similarities between individuals' single traits relate to similarities between their occupations. Besides, our focus is on participants' main job. Nevertheless, there is the possibility that multiple jobholders (i.e., individuals working in two or more paid jobs; Campion et al. 2020) may work in different occupations whose requirements also affect personality development, such as when the requirements of occupations interact or when the second job compensates for a lack of P–E fit in the first one. For example, the similarity between the occupations of multiple jobholders may affect the extent to which socialization effects produce consistent personality changes. We encourage future researchers to test these possibilities. Finally, we used a distance-based approach to test our hypotheses. Other methods have been used in P–E fit research to study related research questions, most importantly spline regression (Edwards and Parry 2018) and response surface methodology (Edwards 2007). However, these methods tend to link the computed fit to an individual-level outcome, such as job satisfaction (e.g., Ghetta et al. 2020), rather than relating similarities between entities (i.e., individuals and occupations). Our approach is versatile and can be extended to capture similarities between other individual attributes (e.g., values and vocational interests) and work environments (e.g., jobs and organizations). In addition, similarities between personality traits other than the Big Five traits might be further employed to predict similarities between other types of career choices (e.g., being employed or self-employed), mobility (e.g., organizational turnover), and life outcomes (e.g., sleep quality and quantity, and volunteering).

Acknowledgments

We are very grateful for the helpful feedback received from Andreas Hirschi on earlier versions of the manuscript, as well as for the insightful and constructive comments from the editor and the anonymous reviewers. A prior, abridged version of this manuscript appeared in the 2024 Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings. Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are derived from the German SOEP. Researchers can apply for access to the SOEP data through the German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin). The code for our analyses is available in the Open Science Framework (OSF) repository at: https://osf.io/qzyrb/.

Endnotes

[1] Noteworthy models illustrating these effects include Holland's (1973, 1997) theory of vocational choice, Schneider's (1987) attraction–selection–attrition (ASA) theory, the subsequent attraction, selection, transformation, manipulation, and attrition (ASTMA) model of person–organization transactions (Roberts 2006), and the demands–affordances transactional (DATA) model (Woods et al. 2019).

[2] Socialization effects are described in different theories that explain personality development. Exemplary models include Holland's (1997) theory of vocational choice (where these effects are called "secondary effects"), Woods' theory of vocational and personality development (Woods et al. 2020), the theory of work adjustment (Dawis and Lofquist 1984), the ASTMA model (Roberts 2006), and the DATA model (Woods et al. 2019).

[3] As alternative options, individuals experiencing a misfit between their personality traits and occupations may leave the work environment or stay and modify it, for example, by engaging in job crafting. We account for the first alternative in our previous reasoning, leading to Hypothesis 2. In the limitations, we discuss the implications of the second alternative and its impact on our results.

[4] We also performed analyses for the periods 2005–2013 and 2009–2017. The study's results remain robust in these temporal horizons. The results of these additional analyses are available upon request.

[5] We further analyzed the attrition effect with an extended subsample of leavers, which included individuals leaving the workforce. The study's results remain robust in these supplemental analyses, which are available upon request.

[6] These sample sizes are computed by summing the sizes of the *stayer* and *joiner* subsamples for a given study period. This is due to the fact that all individuals in the *leaver* subsample (i.e., who left an initial occupation by the end of a study period) are already in the *joiner* subsample because they left an occupation to join another one.

[7] The subsample of stayers includes individuals staying in the same occupation throughout a study period. Consequently, individuals in this subsample have the same occupation at both t_0 and t_1.

References

Allport, G. W. 1971. *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation*. London: Constable.

Anni, K., U. Vainik, and R. Mõttus. 2024. "Personality Profiles of 263 Occupations." *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001249.

Anselin, L. 2001. "Spatial Effects in Econometric Practice in Environmental and Resource Economics." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 83, no. 3: 705–710. https://doi.org/10.1111/0002-9092.00194.

Asendorpf, J. B. 2015. "Person-Centered Approaches to Personality." In *APA Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology, Volume 4: Personality Processes and Individual Differences*, edited by M. Mikulincer, P. R. Shaver, M. L. Cooper, and R. J. Larsen, 403–424. American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/14343–018.

Barrick, M. R., and M. K. Mount. 1991. "The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis." *Personnel Psychology* 44, no. 1: 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744–6570.1991.tb00688.x.

Barrick, M. R., M. K. Mount, and N. Li. 2013. "The Theory of Purposeful Work Behavior: The Role of Personality, Higher-Order Goals, and Job Characteristics." *Academy of Management Review* 38, no. 1: 132–153. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2010.0479.

Barrick, M. R., G. L. Stewart, and M. Piotrowski. 2002. "Personality and Job Performance: Test of the Mediating Effects of Motivation Among Sales Representatives." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87, no. 1: 43–51. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021–9010.87.1.43.

Biemann, T., M. Mühlenbock, and K. Dlouhy. 2020. "Going the Distance in Vocational Behavior Research: Introducing Three Extensions for Optimal Matching Analysis Based on Distances Between Career Sequences." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 119: 103399. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103399.

Blau, G. 2007. "Does a Corresponding Set of Variables for Explaining Voluntary Organizational Turnover Transfer to Explaining Voluntary Occupational Turnover?" *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 70, no. 1: 135–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.07.007.

Bleidorn, W., T. Schwaba, A. Zheng, et al. 2022. "Personality Stability and Change: A Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Studies." *Psychological Bulletin* 148, no. 7–8: 588–619. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000365.

Bradley-Geist, J. C., and R. S. Landis. 2012. "Homogeneity of Personality in Occupations and Organizations: A Comparison of Alternative Statistical Tests." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 27, no. 2: 149–159. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9233-6.

Campbell, J. P., R. A. McCloy, S. H. Oppler, and C. E. Sager. 1993. "A Theory of Performance." In *Personnel Selection in Organizations*, edited by N. Schmitt and W. C. Borman, 35–70. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Campion, E. D., B. B. Caza, and S. E. Moss. 2020. "Multiple Jobholding: An Integrative Systematic Review and Future Research Agenda." *Journal of Management* 46, no. 1: 165–191. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319882756.

Carless, S. A., and J. L. Arnup. 2011. "A Longitudinal Study of the Determinants and Outcomes of Career Change." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 78, no. 1: 80–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.09.002.

Choi, S. B., J.-H. Yoon, and W. Lee. 2020. "The Modified International Standard Classification of Occupations Defined by the Clustering of Occupational Characteristics in the Korean Working Conditions Survey." *Industrial Health* 58, no. 2: 132–141. https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.2018–0169.

Dawis, R. V., and L. H. Lofquist. 1984. *A Psychological Theory of Work Adjustment: An Individual-Differences Model and Its Applications*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

De Fruyt, F. 2002. "A Person-Centered Approach to P–E Fit Questions Using a Multiple-Trait Model." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 60, no. 1: 73–90. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1816.

De Fruyt, F., and I. Mervielde. 1999. "RIASEC Types and Big Five Traits as Predictors of Employment Status and Nature of Employment." *Personnel Psychology* 52, no. 3: 701–727. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744–6570.1999.tb00177.x.

Denissen, J. J. A., H. Ulferts, O. Lüdtke, P. M. Muck, and D. Gerstorf. 2014. "Longitudinal Transactions Between Personality and Occupational Roles: A Large and Heterogeneous Study of Job Beginners, Stayers, and Changers." *Developmental Psychology* 50, no. 7: 1931–1942. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036994.

Dierdorff, E. C. 2019. "Toward Reviving an Occupation With Occupations." *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 6, no. 1: 397–419. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015019.

Dierdorff, E. C., and F. P. Morgeson. 2007. "Consensus in Work Role Requirements: The Influence of Discrete Occupational Context on Role Expectations." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92, no. 5: 1228–1241. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021–9010.92.5.1228.

Dierdorff, E. C., and F. P. Morgeson. 2013. "Getting What the Occupation Gives: Exploring Multilevel Links Between Work Design and Occupational Values." *Personnel Psychology* 66, no. 3: 687–721. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12023.

Dilchert, S. 2007. "Peaks and Valleys: Predicting Interests in Leadership and Managerial Positions From Personality Profiles." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 15, no. 3: 317–334. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468–2389.2007.00391.x.

Donohue, R. 2006. "Person-Environment Congruence in Relation to Career Change and Career Persistence." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 68, no. 3: 504–515. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.11.002.

Edwards, J. R. 1993. "Problems With the Use of Profile Similarity Indices in the Study of Congruence in Organizational Research." *Personnel Psychology* 46, no. 3: 641–665. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00889.x.

Edwards, J. R. 2007. "Polynomial Regression and Response Surface Methodology." In *Perspectives on Organizational Fit*, edited by C. Ostroff and T. A. Judge, 361–372. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Edwards, J. R. 2008. "4 Person–Environment Fit in Organizations: An Assessment of Theoretical Progress." *Academy of Management Annals* 2, no. 1: 167–230. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520802211503.

Edwards, J. R., and M. E. Parry. 2018. "On the Use of Spline Regression in the Study of Congruence in Organizational Research." *Organizational Research Methods* 21, no. 1: 68–110. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428117715067.

Feingold, A. 1994. "Gender Differences in Personality: A Meta-Analysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 116, no. 3: 429–456. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033–2909.116.3.429.

Frese, M. 1982. "Occupational Socialization and Psychological Development: An Underemphasized Research Perspective in Industrial Psychology." *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 55, no. 3: 209–224. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044–8325.1982.tb00095.x.

Gerlitz, J. Y., and J. Schupp. 2005. "Zur Erhebung der Big-Five-basierten persoenlichkeitsmerkmale im SOEP." *DIW Research Notes* 4: 1–36.

Ghetta, A., A. Hirschi, M. Wang, J. Rossier, and A. Herrmann. 2020. "Birds of a Feather Flock Together: How Congruence Between Worker and Occupational Personality Relates to Job Satisfaction Over Time." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 119: 103412. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103412.

Goebel, J., M. M. Grabka, S. Liebig, et al. 2019. "The German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP)." *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik* 239, no. 2: 345–360. https://doi.org/10.1515/jbnst-2018-0022.

Goslee, S. C., and D. L. Urban. 2007. "The Ecodist Package for Dissimilarity-Based Analysis of Ecological Data." *Journal of Statistical Software* 22, no. 7: 1–19. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v022.i07.

Hahn, E., J. Gottschling, and F. M. Spinath. 2012. "Short Measurements of Personality—Validity and Reliability of the GSOEP Big Five Inventory (BFI-S)." *Journal of Research in Personality* 46, no. 3: 355–359. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2012.03.008.

Heyde, F., B. Wille, J. Vergauwe, J. Hofmans, and F. De Fruyt. 2024. "Reciprocal Relationships Between Narcissism and Agentic Versus Communal Work Activities Across the First 6 Years of the Career." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 109, no. 5: 650–667. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001157.

Hirschi, A., C. S. Johnston, F. De Fruyt, A. Ghetta, and U. Orth. 2021. "Does Success Change People? Examining Objective Career Success as a Precursor for Personality Development." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 127: 103582. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2021.103582.

Hofmans, J., B. Wille, and B. Schreurs. 2020. "Person-Centered Methods in Vocational Research." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 118: 103398. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103398.

Holland, J. L. 1973. *Making Vocational Choices: A Theory of Careers*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Holland, J. L. 1997. *Making Vocational Choices: A Theory of Vocational Personalities and Work Environments, 3rd Ed*. Odessa: Psychological Assessment Resources.

International Labor Office. 1990. *International Standard Classification of Occupations: ISCO-88*. Geneva: International Labor Office.

Judge, T. A., C. A. Higgins, C. J. Thoresen, and M. R. Barrick. 1999. "The Big Five Personality Traits, General Mental Ability, and Career Success Across the Life Span." *Personnel Psychology* 52, no. 3: 621–652. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1999.tb00174.x.

Judge, T. A., and J. D. Kammeyer-Mueller. 2012. "General and Specific Measures in Organizational Behavior Research: Considerations, Examples, and Recommendations for Researchers." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 33, no. 2: 161–174. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.764.

King, D. D., C. J. Ott-Holland, A. M. Ryan, J. L. Huang, P. L. Wadlington, and F. Elizondo. 2017. "Personality Homogeneity in Organizations and Occupations: Considering Similarity Sources." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 32, no. 6: 641–653. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-016-9459-4.

Le, H., I.-S. Oh, S. B. Robbins, R. Ilies, E. Holland, and P. Westrick. 2011. "Too Much of a Good Thing: Curvilinear Relationships Between Personality Traits and Job Performance." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 96, no. 1: 113. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021016.

Li, W.-D., D. Fay, M. Frese, P. D. Harms, and X. Y. Gao. 2014. "Reciprocal Relationship Between Proactive Personality and Work Characteristics: A Latent Change Score Approach." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 99, no. 5: 948–965. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036169.

Li, W.-D., S. Li, D. Fay, and M. Frese. 2019. "Reciprocal Relationships Between Dispositional Optimism and Work Experiences: A Five-Wave Longitudinal Investigation." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 104, no. 12: 1471–1486. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000417.

Li, W.-D., S. Li, J. J. Feng, et al. 2021. "Can Becoming a Leader Change Your Personality? An Investigation With Two Longitudinal Studies From a Role-Based Perspective." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 106, no. 6: 882–901. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000808.

Lichstein, J. W. 2007. "Multiple Regression on Distance Matrices: A Multivariate Spatial Analysis Tool." *Plant Ecology* 188, no. 2: 117–131. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-006-9126-3.

Lodi-Smith, J., and B. W. Roberts. 2007. "Social Investment and Personality: A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship of Personality Traits to Investment in Work, Family, Religion, and Volunteerism." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 11, no. 1: 68–86. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868306294590.

McCrae, R. R., P. T. Costa, F. Ostendorf, et al. 2000. "Nature Over Nurture: Temperament, Personality, and Life Span Development." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 78, no. 1: 173–186. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022–3514.78.1.173.

Mobley, W. H., R. W. Griffeth, H. H. Hand, and B. M. Meglino. 1979. "Review and Conceptual Analysis of the Employee Turnover Process." *Psychological Bulletin* 86, no. 3: 493–522. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033–2909.86.3.493.

Motowildo, S. J., W. C. Borman, and M. J. Schmit. 1997. "A Theory of Individual Differences in Task and Contextual Performance." *Human Performance* 10, no. 2: 71–83. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_1.

Nieß, C., and H. Zacher. 2015. "Openness to Experience as a Predictor and Outcome of Upward Job Changes Into Managerial and Professional Positions." *PLoS ONE* 10, no. 6: e0131115. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0131115.

Nye, C. D., and B. W. Roberts. 2019. "A Neo-Socioanalytic Model of Personality Development." In *Work Across the Lifespan*, edited by B. B. Baltes, C. W. Rudolph, and H. Zacher, 47–79. London: Academic Press.

Oh, I., J. H. Han, B. Holtz, Y. J. Kim, and S. Kim. 2018. "Do Birds of a Feather Flock, Fly, and Continue to Fly Together? The Differential and Cumulative Effects of Attraction, Selection, and Attrition on Personality-Based Within-Organization Homogeneity and Between-Organization Heterogeneity Progression Over Time." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 39, no. 10: 1347–1366. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2304.

Oh, I.-S., S. Kim, and C. H. Van Iddekinge. 2015. "Taking It to Another Level: Do Personality-Based Human Capital Resources Matter to Firm Performance?" *Journal of Applied Psychology* 100, no. 3: 935–947. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039052.

Pelfrene, E., P. Vlerick, R. P. Mak, P. De Smet, M. Kornitzer, and G. De Backer. 2001. "Scale Reliability and Validity of the Karasek 'Job Demand-Control-Support' Model in the Belstress Study." *Work & Stress* 15, no. 4: 297–313. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370110086399.

Ployhart, R. E., and D. Hale. 2014. "The Fascinating Psychological Microfoundations of Strategy and Competitive Advantage." *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 1, no. 1: 145–172. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413–091312.

Ployhart, R. E., A. J. Nyberg, G. Reilly, and M. A. Maltarich. 2014. "Human Capital Is Dead; Long Live Human Capital Resources!" *Journal of Management* 40, no. 2: 371–398. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313512152.

Ployhart, R. E., J. A. Weekley, and K. Baughman. 2006. "The Structure and Function of Human Capital Emergence: A Multilevel Examination of the Attraction-Selection-Attrition Model." *Academy of Management Journal* 49, no. 4: 661–677. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.22083023.

R Core Team. 2022. "A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing." R Foundation for Statistical Computing. https://www.R-project.org/.

Rauthmann, J. F., D. Gallardo-Pujol, E. M. Guillaume, et al. 2014. "The Situational Eight DIAMONDS: A Taxonomy of Major Dimensions of Situation Characteristics." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 107, no. 4: 677–718. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037250.

Roberts, B. W. 2006. "Personality Development and Organizational Behavior." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 27: 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(06)27001-1.

Roberts, B. W., A. Caspi, and T. E. Moffitt. 2003. "Work Experiences and Personality Development in Young Adulthood." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 84, no. 3: 582–593. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022–3514.84.3.582.

Roberts, B. W., N. R. Kuncel, R. Shiner, A. Caspi, and L. R. Goldberg. 2007. "The Power of Personality: The Comparative Validity of Personality Traits, Socioeconomic Status, and Cognitive Ability for Predicting Important Life Outcomes." *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 2: 313–345. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00047.x.

Roberts, B. W., R. W. Robins, K. H. Trzesniewski, and A. Caspi. 2003. "Personality Trait Development in Adulthood." In *Handbook of the Life Course*, edited by J. T. Mortimer and M. J. Shanahan, 579–595. New York: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-306-48247-2_26.

Rubenstein, A. L., M. B. Eberly, T. W. Lee, and T. R. Mitchell. 2018. "Surveying the Forest: A Meta-Analysis, Moderator Investigation, and Future-Oriented Discussion of the Antecedents of Voluntary Employee Turnover." *Personnel Psychology* 71, no. 1: 23–65. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12226.

Satterwhite, R. C., J. W. Fleenor, P. W. Braddy, J. Feldman, and L. Hoopes. 2009. "A Case for Homogeneity of Personality at the Occupational Level." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 17, no. 2: 154–164. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468–2389.2009.00459.x.

Schaubroeck, J., D. C. Ganster, and J. R. Jones. 1998. "Organization and Occupation Influences in the Attraction–Selection–Attrition Process." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 83, no. 6: 869–891. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021–9010.83.6.869.

Schneider, B. 1987. "The People Make the Place." *Personnel Psychology* 40, no. 3: 437–453. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00609.x.

Schneider, B., D. B. Smith, S. Taylor, and J. Fleenor. 1998. "Personality and Organizations: A Test of the Homogeneity of Personality Hypothesis." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 83, no. 3: 462–470. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021–9010.83.3.462.

Sitzmann, T., R. E. Ployhart, and Y. Kim. 2019. "A Process Model Linking Occupational Strength to Attitudes and Behaviors: The Explanatory Role of Occupational Personality Heterogeneity." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 104, no. 2: 247–269. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000352.

Sosnowska, J., J. Hofmans, J. Rauthmann, and B. Wille. 2021. "Personality Is Dynamic and It Matters: The Role of Personality Dynamics in Applied Contexts." *European Journal of Personality* 35, no. 4: 418–420. https://doi.org/10.1177/08902070211022491.

Soto, C. J., O. P. John, S. D. Gosling, and J. Potter. 2011. "Age Differences in Personality Traits From 10 to 65: Big Five Domains and Facets in a Large Cross-Sectional Sample." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 100, no. 2: 330–348. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021717.

Specht, J. 2017. *Personality Development Across the Lifespan*. Cambridge: Academic Press.

Steegen, S., F. Tuerlinckx, A. Gelman, and W. Vanpaemel. 2016. "Increasing Transparency Through a Multiverse Analysis." *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 11, no. 5: 702–712. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616658637.

Stewart, R. D., R. Mõttus, A. Seeboth, C. J. Soto, and W. Johnson. 2022. "The Finer Details? The Predictability of Life Outcomes From Big Five Domains, Facets, and Nuances." *Journal of Personality* 90, no. 2: 167–182. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12660.

Su, R., C. Murdock, and J. Rounds. 2015. "Person-Environment Fit." In *APA Handbook of Career Intervention, Volume 1: Foundations*, edited by P. J. Hartung, M. L. Savickas, and W. B. Walsh, 81–98. American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/14438–005.

Sundstrom, E. D., J. W. Lounsbury, L. W. Gibson, and J. L. Huang. 2016. "Personality Traits and Career Satisfaction in Training and Development Occupations: Toward a Distinctive T&D Personality Profile." *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 27, no. 1: 13–40. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21223.

Tasselli, S., M. Kilduff, and B. Landis. 2018. "Personality Change: Implications for Organizational Behavior." *Academy of Management Annals* 12, no. 2: 467–493. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0008.

Törnroos, M., M. Jokela, and C. Hakulinen. 2019. "The Relationship Between Personality and Job Satisfaction Across Occupations." *Personality and Individual Differences* 145: 82–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.03.027.

Van Vianen, A. E. M. 2018. "Person–Environment Fit: A Review of Its Basic Tenets." *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 5, no. 1: 75–101. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104702.

Wiernik, B. M. 2016. "Intraindividual Personality Profiles Associated With Realistic Interests." *Journal of Career Assessment* 24, no. 3: 460–480. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072715599378.

Wille, B., W. Beyers, and F. De Fruyt. 2012. "A Transactional Approach to Person-Environment Fit: Reciprocal Relations Between Personality Development and Career Role Growth Across Young to Middle Adulthood." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 81, no. 3: 307–321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.06.004.

Wille, B., and F. De Fruyt. 2014. "Vocations as a Source of Identity: Reciprocal Relations Between Big Five Personality Traits and RIASEC Characteristics Over 15 Years." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 99, no. 2: 262–281. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034917.

Wille, B., J. Hofmans, F. Lievens, M. D. Back, and F. De Fruyt. 2019. "Climbing the Corporate Ladder and Within-Person Changes in Narcissism: Reciprocal Relationships Over Two Decades." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 115: 103341. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103341.

Wilmot, M. P., and D. S. Ones. 2021. "Occupational Characteristics Moderate Personality–Performance Relations in Major Occupational Groups." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 131: 103655. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2021.103655.

Woods, S. A., G. W. Edmonds, S. E. Hampson, and F. Lievens. 2020. "How Our Work Influences Who We Are: Testing a Theory of Vocational and Personality Development Over Fifty Years." *Journal of Research in Personality* 85: 103930. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2020.103930.

Woods, S. A., and S. E. Hampson. 2010. "Predicting Adult Occupational Environments From Gender and Childhood Personality Traits." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 95, no. 6: 1045–1057. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020600.

Woods, S. A., F. Lievens, F. De Fruyt, and B. Wille. 2013. "Personality Across Working Life: The Longitudinal and Reciprocal Influences of Personality on Work." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 34, no. S1: S7–S25. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1863.

Woods, S. A., B. Wille, C. Wu, F. Lievens, and F. De Fruyt. 2019. "The Influence of Work on Personality Trait Development: The Demands-Affordances TrAnsactional (DATA) Model, an Integrative Review, and Research Agenda." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 110: 258–271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.11.010.

Wrzesniewski, A., and J. E. Dutton. 2001. "Crafting a Job: Revisioning Employees as Active Crafters of Their Work." *Academy of Management Review* 26, no. 2: 179–201. https://doi.org/10.2307/259118.

Wrzus, C., and B. W. Roberts. 2017. "Processes of Personality Development in Adulthood: The TESSERA Framework." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 21, no. 3: 253–277. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868316652279.

Wu, C.-H., Y. Wang, S. K. Parker, and M. A. Griffin. 2020. "Effects of Chronic Job Insecurity on Big Five Personality Change." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 105, no. 11: 1308–1326. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000488.

Zhou, Y., C. Wu, M. Zou, and M. Williams. 2021. "When Is the Grass Greener on the Other Side? A Longitudinal Study of the Joint Effect of Occupational Mobility and Personality on the Honeymoon-Hangover Experience During Job Change." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 42, no. 4: 551–566. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2491.

Supporting Information

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section.