Personality Psychology

Brent W. Roberts[ab] & Hee J. Yoon[a]
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign[a] & Hector Institute of Education and Sciences
and Psychology, University of Tübingen[b]

Brent W. Roberts, bwrobrts@illinois.edu; ORCID: 0000-0002-3244-1164
Hee J. Yoon, yoon14@illinois.edu; ORCID: 0000-0002-2105-7271

Corresponding Author: Brent W. Roberts, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign, 603 East Daniel St, Champaign, IL 61822

Citation: Roberts, B.W., & Yoon, H.J. (In press). Personality Psychology. Annual Review of
Psychology, 73. 10.1146/annurev-psych-020821-114927

Abstract

Personality psychology, which seeks to study individual differences in thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that persist over time and place, has experienced a renaissance in the last few decades. It has also not been reviewed as a field in the Annual Review since 2001 (Funder, 2001). In this chapter, we seek to provide an update, while also providing a meta-organizational structure to the field. In particular, personality psychology has a prescribed set of four responsibilities that it implicitly or explicitly tackles as a field: (a) describe what personality is—the units of analysis in the field; (b) document how it develops; (c) explain the processes of personality and why they affect functioning; and (d) provide a framework for understanding individuals and explaining their actions, feelings, and motivations. We review progress made over the last 20 years to address these four agendas and finish with a section highlighting future directions and ongoing challenges to the field.

Key words: Personality, personality development, personality traits, motivation, skills, narrative identity

INTRODUCTION

Why was President Donald Trump unwilling to apologize? Why, in contrast did someone like Chancellor Merkel of Germany continue to tell the truth even when the consequences damaged her standing? How did Frederick Douglass move from being a slave to a successful abolitionist and publisher and how did his experience shape him as an adult? Why are all of these people different from one another? These are some of the questions the science of personality psychology tries to answer.

Based on energy, activity, and productivity, the field of personality psychology has clearly had a renaissance since the last annual reviews covering the field (Funder 2001; Swann & Seyle, 2005). In 2001, the field was still experiencing the fallout from the person-situation debate[1], new debates had begun on whether and how personality and personality traits developed, and the field was still wrestling with the vestiges of the "Big Theories" that had dominated the field for decades. Since that time, the person-situation debate subsided, with most researchers concluding that the extreme positions of that time were unwarranted (Funder, 2008; Lucas & Donnellan, 2009). The riddle of personality development received a thorough treatment with an explosion of longitudinal studies (Denissen, 2014; Graham et al., 2020). And, for the most part, the grand theorists of the past, such as Freud, Jung, Adler, Rogers, Skinner and others were set aside for more pragmatic "models" that guided research programs but did not make sweeping or untestable assumptions about human nature. The move away from grand theories and toward the structure and development of personality resulted in a huge influx of research that continues to this day.

Given the prolific output in personality psychology over the last two decades, the task of organizing the research is challenging. According to one of the classic perspectives (e.g., Allport, 1937), personality has several jobs to do, including, 1) identifying the units of analysis of personality psychology, 2) describing how the components of personality develop and change, 3) excavating the mechanistic underpinnings of personality, and 4) using that information to not only understand populations but also individuals. We use these four broad tasks as organizers for this chapter. In each section, we review and synthesize recent personality research. We end with sections on basic research issues, including future directions, and institutional challenges faced by the field.

What are the Units of Analysis in Personality Science?

One of the primary goals of personality psychology is to describe the panoply of individual differences that characterize people. Historically, personality psychology has had a penchant to increase the number of constructs in its repertoire rather than decrease or integrate these constructs. There is also a default tendency to equate personality to the study of personality traits. Of course, personality traits are not everything, nor do they adequately capture the units of analysis commonly included under the broad umbrella of personality psychology. Looking across some of the salient models of personality, such as the Neo-Socioanalytic Model (Roberts & Nickel, 2020), Five Factor Model (McCrae & Costa, 2008), the Alternative Five (McAdams & Pals, 2006), or the Cybernetic Five (DeYoung, 2015), one can

---

[1] The person-situation debate surrounds the extent to which behavior is determined by characteristics of the individual vs. characteristics of the situation (Kenrick & Funder, 1988).

identify at least four distinct domains or units of analysis: personality traits, motives, skills/abilities, and narrative identity.

Personality traits. The first domain, personality traits, has been transformed the most over the last few decades because of the adoption of the Big Five Taxonomy (Goldberg, 1993). The Big Five Taxonomy organizes traits into the five broad domains of extraversion (e.g., assertive, gregarious, vs introverted), agreeableness (warm, kind, vs cruel), conscientiousness (industrious, responsible vs undependable), emotional stability (calm, serene vs anxious), and openness to experience (intellectual, creative vs closed-minded). The fact that the Big Five is a broad and inclusive taxonomy is an important feature that can be forgotten in the rush to quickly assess personality traits. That is to say, the Big Five are not discrete, independent dimensions, but more akin to a raucous family of partially overlapping and increasingly complex groups of specific facets (Condon & Mroczek, 2016).

The impact of the Big Five on the field of personality psychology cannot be underestimated. First, it has forced the field to be more disciplined in asking whether a newly described trait is really new or not. The most salient recent example being grit (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews, & Kelly, 2007), which was considered to be somewhat novel and unique when first introduced. Recent, research has clarified that grit is so strongly linked to conscientiousness that it should be considered as a facet of that trait domain rather than something new (Credé, Tynan, & Harms, 2017).

Second, the structure of the Big Five has helped to organize findings in such a way that has moved the field forward. For example, the understanding that personality traits do predict important life outcomes would not have been possible if not for the organizing structure of the Big Five (Roberts et al., 2007; Soto, 2019). Substantive relationships were only revealed once the originally unorganized range of measures were organized within the Big Five taxonomy. Finally, it has made the ability to link to other fields, such as clinical psychology, much more effective. For example, the content overlap of the Big Five and the new dimensional nosology of personality disorders found in the PID-5 and HITOP systems are strikingly high (Krueger & Markon, 2014).

This is not to say that work has stopped on the structure of personality traits or that there is consensus that the Big Five are necessary and sufficient (Mõttus et al., 2020). There remains a strong case for adding at least one more dimension to the Big Five, with several lines of research pointing to the importance of an honesty factor (Ashton & Lee, 2020; Thalmayer & Saucier, 2014). An honesty factor tends to show up more regularly and reliably in countries other than the US, which for various reasons has contributed a disproportionate amount of data on the structure of personality. Also, the validity of the honesty domain is distinct and incrementally useful above and beyond the remaining Big Five (Zettler, Thielmann, Hilbig, & Moshagen, 2020). There are also efforts to introduce other traits, such as those found in the Dark Triad (e.g., narcissism, psychopathy, & machiavellianism), though the distinctiveness of these three traits from the Big Six is less clear at the moment (Jonason, Kaufman, Webster, & Geher, 2013).

Motivation. The second domain of personality, motivation, focuses on what people desire, either consciously or unconsciously. The domain of motivation is less well organized than the personality trait domain largely because it lacks a consensual taxonomy or for that matter an accepted mode of assessment. The topics of motivation are arguably wider in range

than personality traits, covering achievement motivations (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996), life goals (Kasser, 2016), power motivations (Schultheiss, Worth, Torgas, Pang, Villacorta, & Welsh, 2005), life values (Schwartz, 1994), and vocational interests, such as Realistic and Enterprising interests (Nye, Su, Rounds, & Drasgow, 2012). The modalities of assessment in motivation research range from classic projective techniques such as the Thematic Apperception Test, to self-reported vocational interests, to idiographic cataloguing of every day aspirations. Conceptual and empirical attempts at identifying the core domains of motives have ranged from three (predictability, acceptance, & competence; Dweck, 2017), to four (prominence, inclusiveness, negativity-prevention, & tradition; Wilkowski et al., 2019) to seven (physiological, self-protection, affiliation, status, mate acquisition, mate retention, & parenting; Cook et al., 2021). Clearly, the diversity of organizational systems make it a challenge to achieve the clarity brought by the Big Five for personality traits.

   Skills/Abilities. The third domain of personality, which we will refer to as the skills domain, has traditionally been dominated by research on cognitive skills or, more aptly, cognitive abilities (Ritchie, Bates, & Deary, 2015). While research on cognitive abilities continues somewhat unabated, it has been largely carved off from personality psychology and housed in societies, such as the International Society for the Study of Individual Differences (ISSID), that focus their energies on the study of intelligence over other types of constructs (Revelle, Wilt, & Condon, 2011). Nonetheless, if one of the goals of personality psychology is to capture individual differences, broadly construed, it would be odd to omit skills, cognitive or otherwise. The most notable findings on cognitive functioning appear timeless. The three perennial issues that have dominated research on cognitive abilities are 1) whether its putative effects are attributable to background factors like socioeconomic status, 2) its relative importance for predicting various outcomes, and 3) whether and to what extent it causes bias against specific groups when used in selection systems. The empirical answers, which also appear timeless, are that cognitive ability and background factors, though related, are independent in their effects (Kuncel & Hezlet, 2010). That is to say, cognitive ability is not wholly imparted by family socio-economic status and is not simply an indicator of how affluent one's family may have been. Cognitive ability also predicts many outcomes that persons and society care about, such as occupational success and physical health (Kuncel, Hezlet, & Ones, 2004). And, finally though cognitive ability does not impart bias in the technical, psychometric sense[2] it most certainly leads to adverse impact when used for selection (Newman & Lyon, 2009).

   Probably the most notable development in the skills domain is the explosion of activity around "non-cognitive" skills. The term "non-cognitive" was generated by economists (Heckman et al., 2013) and is a term that is uniformly despised by personality psychologists. The emergent focus on non-cognitive skills also reflects a renewed interest from educational science on intra and interpersonal factors, described as socio-emotional skills, that contribute to better performance in school that are not the types of informational or fact-based material (e.g., math, writing) that have been the traditional focus of educational policy (National Research Council, 2012).

---

[2] That is to say, it tends to predict outcomes similarly for different groups.

There is currently no consensus taxonomy that organizes the constructs associated with socio-emotional skills (Abrahams et al., 2019; Duckworth & Yeager, 2015). Socio-emotional skills have suffered some of the definitional challenges of other domains, like motivation. Recently, we attempted to draw a clear distinction between personality traits and the social and emotional skills dominating the discussion of non-cognitive skills (Soto, Napolitano, & Roberts, 2020). Personality traits are typically defined as characteristic, and automatic, patterns of thinking, feeling, and behaving that are consistent over time and across relevant situations (Roberts, 2009). They therefore represent cognitive, affective and behavioral tendencies: what a particular person tends to do, averaged across situations (Fleeson & Jayawickreme, 2015). In contrast, skills are capacities: what a person is capable of doing, when the situation calls for it. Rather than reflecting a person's default pattern of behavior, social and emotional skills represent the tools available in their psychological toolbox, which they can selectively bring out or put away as needed. For example, a student who is usually shy and introverted (reflecting their traits), can act as a leader when needed (reflecting their skills).

We believe the distinction between traits and skills is an important one, especially for interventions designed to impart skills. There is an emerging move to investigate whether personality traits can be changed (Roberts et al., 2017), which is somewhat askew of the goals of most education and socialization efforts. The latter tend to focus on imparting skills. Training children to have the capacity for self-control--the skill--is a much different enterprise than training children to be self-controlled—the trait. The former respects the autonomy of the child while the latter strikes many as being authoritarian.

Narrative identity. The last major domain of personality is loosely referred to as Narrative Identity. The narrative content of a life reflects the experiences of the individual in their immediate environments, in their relationships, their community, and their society. Unlike the other content domains of personality narrative identity is much more concrete, time bound, qualitative, and grounded in individual experience. The content of narrative identity reflects the particularities of the person's experiences and their propensity to integrate those experiences into their personality and/or identity (McAdams, 2013). These are the stories of a person's life, with particular characters and actions that reflect the actual lived life rather than some extrapolation from that experience which is common in assessments of personality traits and motivations.

While historically, the actual content of people's lives has been the focus of some personality psychologists, either in the form of psychobiographies or life stories (McAdams, 2020), a more common approach to understanding narrative identity is to code features of the stories people tell about their lives, such as the emotional tone (Sengsavang, Pratt, Alisat, & Sadler, 2018), meaning (Pals, 2006), and its motivational content (Adler, 2012). Across these efforts, three broad domains of narrative identity variables have been identified: motivational and affective, autobiographical reasoning (e.g., meaning), and structural (Adler, Lodi-Smith, Phlippe, & Houle 2016; McLean et al., 2019). Researchers interested in employing narrative techniques are encouraged to review the recent primer on this methodology (Adler et al., 2017).

One of the longstanding issues faced by narrative researchers has been the question of utility. What does narrative or autobiographical information add beyond what other dimensions of personality already provide? Relatedly, a dominant theme in the field of

narrative identity has been the demonstration that narrative dimensions add incremental validity to traits and motives when predicting outcomes like personality development and well-being (Lodi-Smith, Geise, Roberts, & Robins, 2009). For example, narrative content can be used to predict trajectories of mental health in patients seeking therapy (Adler, Turner, Brookshier, Monahan, Walder-Biesanz, Harmeling, et al., 2015). Summarized in a recent meta-analysis, it is clear that despite the skepticism, narrative information can and does provide incremental information to the prediction of important outcomes like well-being above and beyond the Big Five (Adler et al., 2016).

At a minimum, then, personality psychology answers the "what" question with the idea that at least four construct domains are needed to adequately capture the broad question of the content of personality psychology: Traits, Motives, Skills/Abilities, and Narrative Identity. We could, of course, expand this list to include other individual difference domains (e.g. meta-perceptions, physical skills, identity), but these four seem to be a good compromise between parsimony and inclusiveness.

Attempts at integrating units of analysis

Although work on the domain of personality traits has benefited from an organizing taxonomy, it is fair to say that across traits, motives, skills/abilities, and narratives, that the number and type of dimensions studied has grown without an overarching organizational structure for the entire field. The field is vibrant, but unintegrated. There have been several attempts at creating overarching models that aspired to bring order to the panoply of constructs in personality psychology, but all have gone wanting for various reasons. Notably, the Five Factor Model[3] (McCrae & Costa, 2008) proposed that personality traits were immutable causes of all other types of constructs, including motives and narratives. The FFM proposed that motives and narratives were more context bound and therefore less basic to the individual than personality traits, referring to them as "characteristic adaptations." The more recent BEATs model (Dweck, 2017) reversed this ordering, placing goals at the core of personality dimensions and proposing that they were the causes of personality traits which were emergent from the interaction of goals with situations. In contrast to these models, both McAdams (McAdams & Pals, 2006) and Roberts (Roberts & Wood, 2006) acknowledged that these domains were distinct. McAdams argued that traits, motives, and narratives were manifest at different levels of analysis, with the latter two domains being more granular and context-specific than personality traits. Roberts went on to argue that personality also should include skills as an area of inquiry and that all of the units of analysis can be conceptualized from broad to narrow with no real reason to argue for a preferred level of analysis at this juncture. For example, motives can be broad (universal harmony) or narrow (be nicer to one's students), just as traits can be broad (extraversion) or narrow (propensity to crack jokes during committee meetings).

None of these, or other, models of personality currently dominate the field. In retrospect, there are both empirical and conceptual realities, which inhibited their adoption. On the empirical front, the modal magnitude of the correlations between the domains identified

---

[3] Five Factor Model (FFM) and Big Five taxonomy are not interchangeable. The FFM is an attempt at a complete cataloguing of human variation whereas the Big Five taxonomy is an organizational structure for trait terms.

above remain too low to either assume that traits cause goals or that goals cause traits, for example (e.g., average r = 11; Roberts & Robins, 2000). Moreover, variables from these domains tend to predict outcomes independently of one another (Stoll et al., 2017). So, the models which propose a strong hierarchical relation between these domains are challenged by the fact that the relations are small and the putative causal effects of the domains are independent.

The argument that these domains represent different levels of analysis, while historically an accurate description of the modal research in these domains, ignores the fact that all of these domains can be operationalized along a dimension from broad to narrow (Hooker & McAdams, 2003; Roberts, 2007). Narratives can be conceptualized at the level of the society and culture (McLean et al., 2019). Goals can be operationalized as daily concerns or broad values (Schwartz, 1994) and interests (Su et al., 2019). Skills can be conceptualized as overall competence or differentiated into more and more molecular manifestations that are increasingly specific to situations and contexts (Wirth et al., 2020). Thus, every domain of personality can be conceptualized and measured at multiple levels of breadth. Just because the field at various times in history has preferred broad (e.g., values) or narrow (e.g., strivings) conceptualizations of constructs does not mean that any one level should be preferred or prioritized.

A final reason for why these models may have failed to capture the imaginations of researchers is their descriptive nature. By staying close to the data, these models tend to be overly inclusive and therefore complex. The complexity of the models does not lend itself to informing hypotheses to test in subsequent research. Also, in contrast to the grand theories of personality of the past, none of these theories provides answers to more ultimate questions such as what factors motivate human behavior. In a nutshell, these theories have failed to answer simple questions, like why do we find the Big Five, or what are the core motivations that guide most human behavior?

At this juncture, we can identify at least four domains of inquiry for answering the "what" question of personality psychology (e.g., traits, motives, skills, & narratives), each providing fodder for an explosion of new research. We have yet to find an organizing model that satisfactorily explains why these four domains, what other domains might be added, and how to organize them.

Personality Development

Personality development is the sub area of personality psychology that has very much led the renaissance in personality science. Broadly speaking, research on continuity, change, and factors associated with change in personality has increased exponentially in the last two decades. This was the result of fortuitous timing. Just as personality psychology became more widely accepted, technology and science policy, especially in Europe and Oceania, converged to create numerous publicly available longitudinal data sets. The resulting explosion of research has rendered what once was novel--a report on the longitudinal continuity and change in personality--somewhat mundane. Fortunately, it has also resulted in a much better empirical edifice on which to draw initial inferences about personality development.

Of course, one reason for the emphasis on longitudinal studies in personality psychology is because consistency is definitional to the field (Fraley & Roberts, 2005). The most frequently

given definitions of personality or personality traits all include consistency as a defining feature. Thus, the motivation to examine longitudinal patterns of continuity and change in personality is high.

Given their primacy, longitudinal studies of personality traits abound and have been successfully summarized in numerous meta-analytic reports (e.g., Anusic & Schimmack, 2016; Ardelt, 2000; Bazana & Stelmack, 2004; Ferguson, 2010; Roberts & DelVecchio, 2000; Roberts, Walton, & Viechtbauer, 2006; Schuerger, Zarrella, & Hotz, 1989). Based on these reviews, we now know that personality traits demonstrate moderate to high rank-order consistency (i.e., correlations between .40 and .60) over reasonably long periods of time (i.e., 4 to 10 years), and the longer one tracks rank-order consistency, the lower consistency gets (e.g., Damian & Roberts, 2015), but that consistency seems to plateau above zero (Fraley & Roberts, 2005). Personality traits increase in rank-order consistency with age, peaking sometime after age 25, with some evidence for decreases in very old age (Lucas & Donnellan, 2011). In addition, rank-order consistency does not vary markedly across the Big Five traits, assessment method (i.e., self-reports, observer ratings, and projective tests), or gender.

Research on the consistency of motives, skills, and narratives has been less systematic, but nonetheless, still a target of dozens of studies. To the extent that vocational interests are exemplary constructs in the motivation domain, we know that they are actually more consistent than personality traits at a younger age (Low et al, 2005) and show similarly high levels of consistency over decades (Nye, Willie, Amory, & De Fruyt, 2020; Schultz, Connolly, Garrison, Leveille, & Jackson, 2017). Though less often studied, other motivational constructs, such as major life goals (Atherton et al., 2020) and values (Dobewall & Aavik, 2016; Vecchione et al., 2016) are as consistent as personality traits over comparable time intervals. Skills, at least in terms of the traditional measures of cognitive ability, appear to be more consistent than any other domain in personality (Deary, Whiteman, Starr, Whalley, & Fox, 2004; Tucker-Drob & Briley, 2014) with estimates of consistency exceeding .80 for samples older than 20. Admittedly, and oddly, there has yet to be a systematic review of the consistency of the skill domain. Finally, the narrative domain, despite being cast as qualitatively less stable than, for example, personality traits, has shown varied levels of consistency. In some cases, the consistency demonstrated by narrative dimensions was indistinguishable from personality traits (McAdams et al., 2006) while in other cases the levels of continuity were much lower (Dunlop et al., 2016).

Given the definitional nature of consistency to the field of personality, these results provide unequivocal evidence that across any way of conceptualizing personality we find enough continuity to support the core definitional assumption of the field. Some may mistakenly point to variability across moment-to-moment situations as challenging to the idea of personality, but this was never an assumption of personality psychology. No personality psychologist claimed that personality was defined by absolute cross-situational stability; that extraverted people would talk the same amount at a bar or at a funeral. And, when examined simultaneously, researchers find, of course, that we shift our behavior from moment to moment, but over time retain a strong, rank-order consistency in our behavior (Fleeson, 2001). Empirically, the levels of continuity in personality constructs are high enough to warrant the conclusion that personality exists and persists.

Personality development entails more than whether constructs are consistent. It also entails focusing on other types of continuity and change including whether there are normative gains or losses with age (Roberts, Wood, & Caspi, 2008). The prevailing perspective on personality traits is that childhood and adolescence hold little significance for systematic gains and losses, while the transition to young adulthood is the crucible of personality trait change (e.g., Borghuis, et al., 2017; Göllner et al., 2017; Mroczek & Spiro, 2003; Roberts, Walton, & Viechtbauer, 2006). Meta-analytic estimates of longitudinal mean-level change across the life course show significant change in all trait domains largely in young adulthood (Roberts et al., 2006). Social dominance, a subdomain of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability show increases steadily through midlife. More recent cross-sectional (Lucas & Donnellan, 2011) and longitudinal work has replicated this general pattern (Damian & Roberts, 2015; Oltmanns, Jackson, & Oltmanns, 2020; Vecchione, Alessandri, Barbaranelli, & Caprara, 2012).

Mean level changes in abilities, motives, and narratives not only exist, but the fact that they develop differently than personality traits highlights the fact that these domains are distinct. It is known that cognitive abilities track a different path developmentally than personality traits. Fluid abilities tend to peak early in the life course and then decline thereafter, while crystalized abilities tend to peak in midlife and then drop off (Schaie & Strother, 1968). We know far less about longitudinal changes in social and emotional skills. Measures of motivation, when assessed as the importance or salience of a goal show a very consistent pattern of no mean-level change or decreasing across the life course (Atherton, Grijalva, Roberts, & Robins, 2020; Stoll, Rieger, Nagengast, Trautwein, & Rounds, 2020). When measured as interests, the picture for motivation grows more complex, possibly as a result of having fewer long-term studies in adulthood. Those that do exist show heterogeneous patterns, with some interest domains, like Realistic and Investigative showing declines in young adulthood and increases later in life (Hoff, Briley, Wee, & Rounds, 2018). One of the few longitudinal studies of values found many increases in values such as universalism and conformity in young adulthood and plateauing thereafter (Schultz et al., 2017).

Less is known about changes in narrative constructs, but there are some aging and longitudinal studies. It is assumed that personal narratives emerge in adolescence (Bohn & Berntsen, 2013; Habermas & de Silveira, 2008) and become more coherent with age. Consistent with that position, an aging study of narrative content found that narrative coherence increased with age, especially from adolescence to young adulthood (Köber et al., 2015). Redemptive content in narratives appears to increase during college but remain unchanging in midlife (Dunlop et al., 2016).

Of course, not everyone changes in the same direction or to the same degree; some people change less than their peers, while others change more than their peers (e.g., De Fruyt et al., 2006). Moreover, some people show stability as defined by long-term trajectories that are flat (or near flat) in functional form (Mroczek, Graham, Turiano, & Oro-Lambo, 2021). Thus, a third way of examining personality development is to investigate individual differences in change (Mroczek, 2014; Roberts & Mroczek, 2008). There is robust evidence for the existence of individual-level change across the life course, even into old age (Graham et al., 2020; Schwaba & Bleidorn, 2018).

One reason to focus on individual differences in change in personality is that it asks a most interesting question: does life experience relate to or cause people to develop in idiosyncratic ways? Most of the research on life experiences linked to individual differences in change focus on experiences in relationships, work, and health. For example, achievement and work-related experiences have been linked to changes in personality traits across the life course. Children who increased their effort on homework show commensurate increases in conscientiousness (Göllner et al., 2017). Achieving more in work through attaining higher status was associated with increases in the social dominance facet of extraversion and sometimes conscientiousness-related traits (Le, Donnellan, Spilman, Garcia, & Conger, 2014; Roberts, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2003). Being more invested and committed to one's work is associated with increases in conscientiousness (Hudson, Roberts, & Lodi-Smith, 2012). People who are called upon to be leaders at work increase more in extraversion (Wille, Beyers, & De Fruyt, 2012). In addition, positive experiences in work are reliably associated with increases in emotional stability (Le et al., 2014; Scollon & Diener, 2006; van Aken et al., 2006).

Marital and family experiences are also associated with changes in personality traits. For example, forming serious partnerships is associated with decreases in neuroticism and increases in conscientiousness and self-esteem (Lehnart, Neyer, & Eccles, 2010). Similarly, men who get married or remarried in late middle age and old age tend to decrease in neuroticism over time (Mroczek & Spiro, 2003). Genetically-informed research supports the argument that marriage is a cause of personality trait change (Burt et al., 2010). Holding genetic confounds constant, getting married purportedly causes decreases in antisocial behavior, which is strongly associated with the domains of agreeableness and conscientiousness (Hopwood & Bleidorn, 2018).

Other relationship experiences are also associated with personality trait change. Individuals who experience satisfying and fulfilling relationships become more emotionally stable and conscientious (Lehnart & Neyer, 2006; Robins, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2002; Scollon & Diener, 2006). Negative relationship experiences, such as difficulties in one's sex life, are associated with increased neuroticism (Lüdtke et al., 2011). Receiving more support from family members during adolescence is associated with increases in agreeableness (Branje, van Lieshout, van Aken, & Haselager, 2004).

Negative life experiences in general, whether in aggregate or in particular, are also associated with increases in neuroticism (Laceulle, Nederhof, Karreman, Ormel, & van Aken, 2012; Lüdtke et al., 2011). Clinical issues are also associated with personality trait change or the lack of normative personality trait change. For example, continuing or increasing substance use and abuse is associated with a failure to increase in conscientiousness and decrease in emotional stability (Lee, Ellingson, & Sher, 2015). Similarly, changes in mental health and depression are associated with decreases in most of the Big Five, and emotional stability in particular (Chow & Roberts, 2014). Clearly, when people have negative experiences, especially ones that play out over time, personality changes.

On a more positive note, travel abroad is associated with positive personality trait change. In one study, Germans who traveled to another country were more likely to increase in agreeableness and openness, and decrease in neuroticism (Lüdtke et al., 2011). A second study of German "sojourners" (students who study abroad) found strikingly similar results. Sojourners grew more agreeable and open, and less neurotic the longer they stayed abroad (Zimmermann

& Neyer, 2013). These findings point to proactive measures people and institutions can take to foster positive developmental trends in students.

While a disproportionate amount of research has focused on individual differences in trait change, analogous research is increasing for motives, skills, and narratives. For example, individuals who achieved life tasks related to relationships and work, in turn, decreased more on goals related to family and work (Salmela-Aro, Aunola, & Nurmi, 2007). Greater fit between one's work environment and one's interest profile predicted changes in the corresponding interests (Nye, Willie, Amory, & De Fruyt, 2020), while losing one's job was associated with increases in enterprising interests (Schultz et al., 2017). The transition to parenthood was associated with changes in goals, unlike research on personality traits which show little or no change in relation to becoming a parent (van Scheppingen et al., 2016). In particular, new mothers increased their goals related to family and health and decreased their achievement-related aspirations (Salmela-Aro, Nurmi, Saisto, & Halmesmäki, 2000). Going through cancer treatment is differentially related to changes in life goals, such that cancer patients decrease on achievement and leisure aspirations, but remain unchanged on their health-related goals (Pinquart, Fröhlich, & Silbereisen, 2007). Of course, changes in goals are also associated with changes in personality traits (Hudson, Fraley, Chopik, & Briley, 2020). In particular, changes in economic goals were positively related to changes in extraversion and changes in family goals were associated with changes in agreeableness (Atherton et al., 2020).

There has been less work on changes in cognitive ability and other skills, but there is evidence that experience does relate to individual differences in change in these domains also. For example, a recent meta-analysis showed that participating in higher education was associated with increases in cognitive ability (Ritchie & Tucker-Drob, 2018). Of course, because of the importance of declines in cognitive functioning in old age, more research has focused on factors that mitigate these normative losses. For example, maintaining better physical functioning in old age is associated with less cognitive decline (Tabbarah, Crimmins, & Seemen, 2002). Also, in old age, decline in physical functioning, especially in areas like visual and auditory functioning, is related to faster declines in cognitive functioning (Valentijn et al., 2005). Similarly, susceptibility to mental health issues, such as schizophrenia, is associated with faster declines in cognitive ability with age (McIntosh et al., 2013).

In addition to the increase in longitudinal studies of personality traits, motives, and skills, there is now a healthy number of longitudinal studies examining individual differences in narrative content over time. In an examination of factors associated with changes in redemptive and contamination themes over time, it was found that changes in employment status were associated with decreases in redemptive content in narratives (Dunlop et al., 2016). In contrast, Köber et al., (2015) examined changes in narrative coherence and found little explained the increase. They found no relation between coherence and negative life experiences, confiding in others, or even an intervention intended to increase coherent thinking. While examining individual differences in narrative change is less common, the few studies to date would indicate that this aspect of personality is similar to traits, motives, and skills.

In sum, personality, whether conceptualized as traits, motives, skills, or narratives, is a developmental phenomenon. People show profound levels of continuity that are high enough to support the definitional nature of personality, while also showing maturational changes in all

domains, as well as individual differences in their personal trajectories and changes in response to life experiences. The combination of continuity and change existing side by side can be confusing to some, we suspect because the field has been dominated by theoretical models that pit continuity against change. However, we feel the clear message emerging from the voluminous longitudinal empirical database showing that personality is consistent, changing, apparently responsive to experience, and is a profoundly important foundation for understanding human nature. People are not rudderless ships battered by the winds of experience, nor are they cement jetties moving nowhere despite the ocean and the wind. Given the longstanding dominance of the extreme situationist and essentialist positions in all of psychology, one of the most important contributions of the last few decades of personality research is the longitudinal record showing that human nature is neither extreme.

Personality Process

The question of process is the question of why and how. Why and how does someone who is conscientious live longer than those who are less conscientious? Why and how do people who are less neurotic have more stable and satisfying relationships? Why and how do those who are power motivated end up in leadership positions more than others? And how do we leverage this sort of information to turn the gears of human nature toward productive ends?

The consideration of process goes to the question of how some concept or construct of human nature actually impacts a person or persons' lives and is therefore unambiguously an issue of causality. Of course, causality has been a challenging issue for personality psychology for two controversial reasons that appear to have been reconciled in the last two decades. First, for something to be considered causal it would have to be associated with outcomes that we care about at a magnitude that matters. Of course, historically, personality was maligned for empirical findings that were mistakenly thought to be smaller than most other areas of psychology (Mischel, 1968). The shared ethos was that personality traits and personality writ large lacked the levels of predictive validity that would make them matter[4].

The perspective that personality was not an important predictor of important outcomes began to change because of industrial psychology, which concluded in the 1990s that personality traits did matter for outcomes like job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991) and job satisfaction (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002). What followed were a series of studies, reviews, and meta-analyses that rendered a very clear picture. Personality traits and other personality constructs predicted many important life outcomes, such as work success, relationship outcomes, well-being, mental health, and physical health (Caspi, Roberts, & Shiner, 2005; Ozer & Benet-Martinez, 2006) and often did so at levels equal to "gold standard" predictors such as cognitive ability and socioeconomic status (Roberts et al., 2007). And, those predictive patterns tend to replicate at a far higher rate than many other findings in the psychological literature (Soto, 2019).

---

[4] Students of history will know that the "personality coefficient" was an r of .30. The argument that this was small resulted from the fact that personality psychologists habitually reported effect sizes, whereas many other areas of psychology, especially in the 1960s failed to report effect sizes at all. Personality psychology committed the sin of being too transparent. It is also the case that once the effects of these other areas were translated into the r metric, we found that most areas of psychology find effects smaller than an r of .3.

The second condition for something to be considered mechanistic is that it can be manipulated or changed. While it is still widely thought that personality is not changeable, recent research has roundly contradicted that notion. Summarized succinctly in a review of over 200 intervention studies, personality traits, but especially neuroticism, were found to be modifiable through clinical intervention with changes on average being half of a standard deviation over periods as short as 6 weeks (Roberts, Luo, Briley, Chow, Su, & Hill, 2017). Moreover, changes that resulted from therapy not only happened quickly but also remained in place well after patients left therapy. Subsequent research has shown that the other trait domains can also be changed through intervention even if the population or intervention is not clinical in nature (Stieger et al., 2021).

So, surprisingly, we sit at a time where understanding how traits affect the day-to-day processes and accomplishments of life is not only warranted, but holds much more causal import than ever. There have been two dominant approaches to thinking of how personality acts mechanistically. The first is to assume that traits, being broad, cause more narrow thoughts, feelings, and behaviors and that these thoughts, feelings, and behaviors mediate the relation between a trait, motive, or skill and some outcome of interest (Baumert et al, 2017). The second approach relies on longitudinal methods where the process plays out over time (Wrzus & Roberts, 2017). As the sheer amount of research that falls under these umbrellas is so large, we will provide a few recent examples of this mechanistically focused research for relationships, achievement, well-being, and health.

Focusing on relationships, questions of process have centered on personality features like social anxiety, extraversion, attachment, and relationship motives. These qualities appear to shape relationship outcomes right from the first encounter. For example, people who are more socially anxious tend to be less accurate about how they are perceived, which in turn contributes to being less liked at first encounter (Tissera, Gazzard Kerr, Carlson, & Human, 2020). Specifically, people high in neuroticism tend to elevate their relationship partners, perceiving them as more positive than they really are (Hannuschke et al., 2020). And, of course these processes play out over time with neuroticism being related to lower relationship satisfaction across different relationships (Robins et al., 2002), and thus to outcomes such as elevated rates of divorce (Solomon & Jackson, 2014).

Motivation also plays an important role in influencing satisfaction with romantic partners. Research on approach and avoidance motivation (tendencies to move toward rewards and away from punishments; Elliot & Church, 1997) has shown that individuals high in approach motivation were more likely to be satisfied with their relationships while individuals high in avoidance motivation are less satisfied with their relationships (Impett et al., 2010). High approach motivation is associated with more involvement in positive behaviors and events, such as special events, that could induce positive emotion and relationship outcomes. Avoidance motivation is problematic because it contributes to over reaction to negative events, which leads to lowered well-being (Elliot, Gable, & Mapes, 2006; Gable & Impett, 2012). Relationship orientation is another motivational factor that positively predicts relationship satisfaction because individuals high in relationship orientation tend to engage in behaviors that promote persistence and health of the relationship (Hofmann, Finkel, & Fitzsimons, 2015).

Analogous research has focused on achievement and how self-regulation affects outcomes like school and work performance. Self-regulatory factors like conscientiousness are

now widely accepted as predictors of school grades (Noftle & Robins, 2007; Poropat, 2009). Process-oriented research has shown that this arises because of classroom behaviors. More conscientious students set more effective achievement goals and use more tenacious study habits, among other behaviors, which lead to better grades (Corker et al., 2012). Similarly, in the workplace, research has shown that personality traits, such as conscientiousness, indirectly predict work performance by influencing more proximal antecedents, such as motivational factors (Campbell & Wiernik, 2015; Van Iddekinge, Ferris, & Heffner, 2009).

Research does not always support the assumption that narrow behaviors are the mechanism through which broader constructs affect achievement. For example, self-regulation behaviors manifest in the moment tend to be unassociated with positive outcomes like goal attainment (Milyavskaya & Inzlicht, 2017), in contrast to the uniformly positive outcomes associated with trait-level measures of self-control (Inzlicht et al, 2021). Moreover, self-control processes do not seem to account for some of the positive effects of global self-control (Hennecke, Czikmantori, & Brandstatter, 2019). These discrepant findings beg the question of whether simple, narrower versions of a global trait are measuring the same construct as the broad trait measure, or whether the processes that explain the outcomes at different levels of analysis may be distinct.

Another common process question is why certain personality dimensions are predictive of well-being and mental health. It has been known for quite some time that people who are extraverted also report being happier (Costa & McCrae, 1980). The process question was whether the relationship was an artifact that resulted from common method variance or whether it was due to what extraverted people did. Follow up research shows that extraversion leads to greater quantities of social interaction (Breil et al., 2019) and that these larger amounts of social interaction contribute to greater well-being (Sun et al., 2019). Of course, there are numerous other potential mechanisms, such as social cognitive factors like reward sensitivity (Blain, Sassenberg, Zhao, & DeYoung, 2019) as well as how people perceive situations (Horstmann, Rathmann, Sherman, & Ziegler, 2020).

Similar process questions have become the focus of research linking personality to health outcomes, including mortality. Personality is now a widely accepted aspect of many different health models in which factors like personality traits are often considered to be distal causes of more proximal process variables, such as health behaviors (Segerstrom, 2019). Linkages to health behaviors are now common (Turiano et al., 2012) and cumulative findings show that emotional stability and conscientiousness are the primary personality traits contributing to better physical health. In terms of mechanistic research, the majority of efforts to date have tested mediators such as health behaviors that are key elements of most health behavior models. For example, smoking behavior mediates the association between neuroticism and mortality (Mroczek et al., 2009) and better cognitive functioning in old age mediates the relation between conscientiousness and mortality (Hill et al., 2011). Interestingly, like the research on self-regulation, the typical mediating factors have not turned out to be as explanatory as expected when attempting to understand the relation between factors like conscientiousness and either morbidity or mortality (Segerstrom, 2019). For example, even when controlling for multiple factors like cardiovascular disease and health behaviors, conscientiousness retains a direct link to Alzheimer's disease (Wilson et al., 2007).

Of course, the ultimate mechanistic inferences arise when change in personality is linked to subsequent outcomes. A few examples of these studies come from clinical psychology and economics. In clinical psychology, for example, studies have shown that changes in emotional stability predict clinical outcomes such as better treatment progress (Nguyen et al., 2020) or decreased probability of relapse (Tang et al., 2009) better than changes in depression do. Large scale randomized control trials in economics have shown that interventions have long lasting effects on personality dimensions (e.g., Kosse et al., 2020) and that these changes predict long-term outcomes such as improved economic standing (Heckman et al., 2013). These applied studies provide the strongest evidence to date that personality traits can be true mechanisms for improving the lives of individuals.

In sum, mechanistic research on personality has accelerated along with the increased appreciation that personality predicts important outcomes and for the fact that personality is changeable and can be changed. While changing personality traits or other personality characteristics may be more involved than the ways we change narrow thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in lab experiments, it does have one distinct advantage. We already know that personality is related to important outcomes, therefore changing personality could result in benefits for individuals. Though slow to come and slow in execution, the move to a mechanistic understanding of personality is a sign of the increasing relevance and importance of personality in public policy circles (e.g., Bleidorn et al., 2020).

Understanding Individuals

The final primary task that personality psychology serves is to help us understand ourselves and others at an individual level. Since the originating writings of personality psychology, found in Allport and Murray, personality psychologists have practiced the art of interpreting the personalities of individuals through the lens of their preferred theoretical systems. The practice, codified with the term, "personology" (Barresi & Juckes, 1997) has typically served as a medium through which personality psychology helped the world understand influential people in society. Early efforts, like many in psychology, were trained upon people like Adolf Hitler (Adorno, Frenkel-Brenswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950) in an attempt to better understand who these leaders were and why they could so effectively perpetrate atrocities. The interpretation of these lives was taken up by many different psychologists reflecting the classic theoretical schools of personality psychology including Freudian, Jungian, Trait, Interpersonal, etc. And, of course, these types of interpretations were not limited to only the most famous people, as authors took it upon themselves to interpret the lives and personalities of other characters of history (e.g., Allport's Letters From Jenny; Anonymous, 1946).

While the practice of doing psychobiographies has never been a mainstream activity in personality psychology, it has continued at a steady pace over the decades until this day. In the most prominent recent examples of this practice, McAdams (2010; 2020) conducted personological analyses of two recent presidents, George W. Bush and Donald Trump. These analyses are illuminating for many reasons, but foremost for highlighting the point made above that personality psychology needs to include multiple domains in order to be a comprehensive science of human nature, and to provide a coherent understanding of an individual.

Using the multiple domains of personality is exemplified nicely in the analysis of George W. Bush (McAdams, 2010). As a youngster, Bush was gregarious and fun loving, with a remarkable skill for remembering people's names, making the disarming joke, and the ability to make people feel welcomed and accepted. When combined with his incuriousness (low openness), one could mistake him for a person with little leadership capacity. But, the intersection of his high extraversion and low openness, and his redemptive narrative of overcoming alcoholism, rendered him prepared to take action and be decisive in times of crisis, according to McAdams. And, of course, with the events of 9-11 occurring during his first year as president, he did everything of the sort to take control and assert his vision on the US and the world in the aftermath of the tragedy. His actions are best understood through his personality traits, his motives, and his life story and how they all combined to forge the actions he took as president.

With Trump, McAdams (2020) obviously focuses, in part, on narcissism. There appears to be strong consensus that Trump was a lodestar for narcissism (Lilienfeld, Miller, & Lynam, 2018). Preoccupation with power and success? Check. Belief that he is unique? Check. The need for excessive admiration? Check. Go through the standard criteria for narcissism and Trump checks them all. McAdams (2020) reminds us that this is a syndrome because it is not reducible to a simple trait profile. Narcissists do score high on extraversion and low on agreeableness (Paulhus & Williams, 2002), but that is not sufficient to classify someone as narcissistic. This trait profile has to be combined with an unyielding motivation to be the center of attention and to consistently promote the self over others. One could be outgoing and unkind but be entirely focused on other people, for example. Without the motive to focus on the self, personality traits are an insufficient explanation for why someone might be narcissistic, including President Trump.

McAdams also points out that Trump is more complex than even the compilation of attributes associated with narcissism. From a narrative perspective, Trump was an empty vessel according to McAdams, possessing no clear narrative on which to find purchase. There was no linear story about Trump's experiences, the lessons learned, the insights gained by overcoming failure. Rather, Trump was the "episodic man," combining his insatiable narcissism, with a seemingly continuous search for a battle he could win. Trump would even create battles when there are none to be found. And, each day, Trump did his best to win or be perceived as winning and then proclaiming his excellence and his achievements, even if fictitious. The imperative for Trump was himself and whether, at that moment, he was garnering the respect and adoration he believed he deserved for being great. The continuous self-focus combined with the lack of historical narrative, meant Trump did not accumulate experience and use it like most people do, rather he focused day-to-day on whether the spotlight was on him and whether the image revealed was a good one by his definition.

But, of course, the nature of Trump's personality may be less important than how he wielded his personality during his tenure as president. Trump showed what some might describe as the "power of personality" during his four years as the US leader. Most pundits predicted that Trump's propensity for grandiosity, mendacity, and love of attention would be moderated by the demands of the role that come with being president. That is, the role, the environment, the institution of being the US president, would force Trump to accommodate, to change. Eventually, the power of the situation would take hold.

Quite to the contrary, Trump appeared to yield no ground to the role of president. Instead, he made the role, the institution, and the people around to him bend to his will. If these people did not conform to his desires, they were simply jettisoned and demeaned. If a part of the institution did not fulfill his unquenchable thirst for validation, it was ignored. Trump entered his presidency obsessed with the optics of his inauguration and left the presidency obsessed with the optics of losing the election and lying about both in remarkably self-serving ways. In those cases, and all the cases between, he was singularly focused on whether he was seen in a positive light and who saw him that way. To those who saw him positively he lavished his praise and attention even if that undermined his political standing. For better or worse Trump has helped personality psychology, as he provided an unambiguous example of its existence, importance, and effect it can have on a society.

These personological interpretations of two recent presidents provide examples of how personality psychology can be used to better understand individual lives or the whole person. They also highlight the fact that factors like personality traits do not operate in isolation. To truly understand an individual necessitates a consideration of the entire constellation of individual attributes along with their social and historical context. It is impossible to explain an individual's behavior, whether they be the president or one's next door neighbor, without considering multiple elements of their personality and how these attributes are organized within the person.

Basic Research Issues

One of the typical recommendations we, and others, make at this stage is the idea that the field should improve itself in some ways, with the proforma recommendations to do a better job using multiple methods (Roberts, Harms, Smith, Wood, & Webb, 2006) and assessing "real" behavior (Baumeister, Vohs, & Funder, 2007). We will refrain from reiterating these points because we believe they oversimplify the situation. Ever since Fiske (of Campbell and Fiske, 1959) went off on his own to study multiple modalities, the field has known that employing multiple methods seldom brings clarity to any issue as the chasms between different methodological assessments of constructs is too wide and deep to bridge (Fiske, 1971). Likewise, "real behavior" is often studied by fields employing personality psychology constructs (e.g., industrial, health, and clinical psychology) even if those in the guild of personality do not do so enough.

Rather, we'd like to recommend that the field, instead, invest in understanding its core constructs. As a field, personality psychology needs to do the hard work of trying to understand the phenomena of personality psychology better. Using multiple methods and studying behavior (and thought, and emotion) all come naturally when better understanding is the goal. Moreover, using new and innovative techniques--smartphones, computers, and apps, (e.g., Bleidorn, Hopwood, Back, Dennisen, Hennecke, Jokela, et al, 2020) will naturally involve multiple methods, more in-the-moment assessments of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors, all of which could lead to improvements of our understanding of personality, personality development, and how it affects people's lives. In fact, we have even gone so far as to suggest we abandon the traditional personality assessment approaches for these more real-time methods, as our statistical models are more than adequate to estimate things like stable traits from the continuous stream of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors (Roberts, 2018).

It might be conspicuous that we have not focused on the biology or physiology of personality. We have chosen to ignore biological issues related to personality psychology for three reasons. First, in our opinion, biological factors are more often correlates, not causes of the phenotypes we study. Although it may be interesting to those motivated to investigate the neural correlates of narcissism, knowing which part of the brain lights up in an fMRI does us little good in understanding the effect of being accosted by a narcissistic supervisor. Second, everything we need to know about the construct of narcissism is contained in the phenotype. That your supervisor is narcissistic and whether they will change is what you need to know, not whether they have a certain biochemical marker of narcissism. If, as many assume, some unchanging biological factor causes a trait like narcissism to remain fixed, we should see that fixedness in the phenotype and can study it with impunity without ever conducting an fMRI scan or drawing our participants' blood. Moreover, according to evolutionary biologists, evolution does not act on the biological substrate, it acts on the phenotype (West-Eberhard, 2003). A phenotype, like extraversion or narcissism, can be ascertained without fancy or expensive equipment. And, in the ultimate irony, the biomarker for any phenotype is wholly dependent on the measure of that phenotype, which is typically left to the psychologist, not the biologist. Third, the emphasis on biology has come at the expense of our ability to understand the constructs of personality psychology and, in turn human nature. The majority of research conducted on the biological underpinnings of personality, whether using genetic polymorphisms or neuroimaging, has been conducted using remarkably uninformative designs (Button et al., 2013; Chabris, Hebert, Benjamin, Beauchamp, Cesarini et al, 2012). We have literally wasted millions and millions of dollars pursuing underpowered, uninformative research out of a misplaced wish to find a biological root to our phenotypes and have done so to the detriment of better investments in measuring and understanding the phenomenon of personality psychology. Even if a quarter of the funds dedicated to these biological "causes" of personality were invested instead on improving the assessment and understanding of the core constructs of the field there would likely have been innumerable advances for psychological science.

Finally, the discovery of personality psychologists by policy makers poses interesting choices and opportunities for the field of personality psychology (Kankaraš & Suarez-Alvarez, 2019). Historically, personality psychology has not focused on applied issues, being proudly iconoclastic and hostile to having some form of utility and beholden to the ideal of being a basic science. Despite our best efforts to remain a basic science, others have discovered its utility and are making a compelling case for applied research in personality science. In particular, clinical science and economics have come to understand that personality is robustly linked to important outcomes for self and society (Cuijpers et al., 2010). More importantly, especially from a policy standpoint, personality changes not only happen, but predict important life outcomes, such as job attainment and income (Hoff et al., 2021). Moreover, personality is changeable (Stieger et al., 2021), which leads to the conclusion that it is a viable target for intervention (Bleidorn et al., 2020). And, finally, while some have ethical reservations about the idea of changing personality (English & Carstensen, 2014), it is more often the case that when we seek to change ourselves or others, our goal is, at the very least, a personality-like change (Roberts, Hill, & Davis, 2017). We do not seek out therapists just to get back on our feet. We'd like to stay on our feet for good. We do not hope our supervisor's leadership training fails to

last beyond the retreat. Thus, the press toward policy relevance invites a new, albeit challenging research agenda focused on how to change personality, how to make the change last, and then whether the change itself results in consequences we want and avoids unforeseen side effects.

Of course, basic science is ideally done in the service of testing theories. Personality science gave up on grand theories, and maybe it is time the field revisits the question of grand theories. Psychology as a whole, and personality psychology in particular backed away from grand theories since the latter half of the 20th century. In terms of producing replicable robust science the move away from grand theories was seemingly a good one. The unintended consequence of this move appears to be a balkanization of psychology and personality psychology into minor subfields that focus on incommensurate issues and constructs. While the balkanization is good for the deep dives into particular issues, the net result is a dispersed field with little harmony in its efforts or conclusions. Of course, there is an inescapable fact--there is only one, true version of human nature, lurking behind all of our scientific efforts. In our current approach to science we act as if there are as many versions of human nature as there are research questions to ask. In contrast, if we could achieve a widely accepted grand theory of personality and thus human nature, many of the rifts in the field could be reconciled. While it might be naive to assume that this could be done, it is also a fact that in the absence of creating these grand theories, we will not realize the potential our science can provide.

Institutional Issues

In many ways, these are halcyon days for personality science. No longer shackled with the burdens of the person-situation debate, blessed with reams of data from ongoing longitudinal studies, and a deserved reputation for conducting more replicable science (Soto, 2019), one would expect the field to be on the rise, as is evidenced from this review. When coupled with the creation of the Association for Research in Personality, the robust and positive relation of that group with its European counterparts (e.g., The European Association for Personality Psychology), and the burgeoning appreciation for personality science by other fields, such as clinical, industrial, and health psychology as well as economics (Borghans et al., 2008) and political science (Mondak & Halperin, 2008), one would assume the field's future is bright.

However, some institutional issues remain potential barriers to the future health of the field. One of the conspicuous features of the personality renaissance is that it has happened more in Europe than in the United States. It is fair to ask why. The most salient difference is that personality psychology in Europe is not typically aligned with or housed with social psychology as it is in the United States. European personality psychologists are more often independent, and aligned, and grouped with fields like developmental, clinical, or quantitative psychology where the alliance is more mutualistic and appreciative (e.g., Rauthmann, 2020). These groups often use similar methods and share assumptions about human nature. A lot can be said for being housed with guilds that find your work intrinsically valuable and this appears to have benefited European personality psychology greatly.

In contrast, since the divisional structure of the American Psychological Association began, US-based social and personality psychologists have been housed together in one organization. This marriage of social and personality psychology reflects the idealistic vision

offered by early 20th century psychologists like Gordon Allport, who believed that a proper understanding of human behavior would entail both perspectives (Tracy, Robins, & Sherman, 2009). While the idea is noble, the execution has not lived up to that lofty vision.

One reason for the failure to live up to this ideal is the history of social and personality psychology in the United States. The person-situation debate that emerged in the 1970s was essentially a battle between a social psychology vision of human nature—that the locus of cause is in the situation—and a personality-based vision of human nature, that people brought significant, and entrenched individual differences to every situation. Functionally and structurally, the person-situation debate was "won" by the situationists in that the field turned more toward social psychology for several decades of the last half of the 20th century for simple, but profoundly important decisions such as whom to hire. Programs that used to house personality psychologists stopped doing so, and the numbers of positions and personality scientists declined in a commensurate fashion. Given the slow turnover of the academic system, these historical decisions reverberate for many generations such that personality psychology is quite the minority partner in the social and personality relationship even to this day.

This history is coupled to methodological value systems that are also, unfortunately and unnecessarily, seen as being in opposition to one another. As many social psychologists note, social psychology is unashamedly an experimental enterprise focused on the causes of behavior (Fiske, 2016). Aside from the provocative new intervention research on personality noted above, personality psychologists largely use observational methods to study phenomenon that cannot be manipulated. In the inimical words of Baumeister (2016), the result is a field that is notably stodgy and boring, at least in contrast to the exciting, risky experimental research traditionally offered up by social psychology.

The functional result of the historical fallout and value differences is that there are only three independent personality science Ph.D. programs in the United States and no personality psychologists at many of the most esteemed U.S. psychology programs (Lanning, 2017). In fact, a significant proportion of personality scientists don't hold the title "personality psychologist" in the job description they were hired for, being instead hired as methodologists or quantitative psychologists. So, despite the heartening revitalization shown in the field of personality psychology over the last two decades, the future of the field is less clear. In the U.S. we lack a healthy set of doctoral programs staffed and motivated to study personality psychology. There are few jobs for doctoral students and hiring decisions when they do occur in "social/personality" programs err in the direction of social psychology.

It is impossible not to see the irony and missed opportunity that have resulted from the US structural disparities of social and personality psychology while writing these words in the midst of a pandemic at the end of the Trump administration. In the middle of the 20th century social and personality psychologists went their separate ways to understand fascism and the appeal of authoritarian leaders. Instead of bringing the resulting insights together to form a comprehensive understanding of both leaders and their followers, the tendency was to use findings to uphold unintegrated arguments of the "power of the situation", or the prominence of personality. The Asch conformity studies and the Milgram experiments were used to show the power of the situation and even up until modern times are used to argue against personality interpretations of abhorrent behavior (Zimbardo, 2007). Conversely, fascinating

personological interpretations of Trump's personality tend not to integrate situational forces or effects.

Like the 20th century, the 21st century is faced with a rise in fascist and authoritarian leaders and values across the globe. It appears that social and personality psychologists do not have a ready answer that integrates their independent, and differing world views on the topic. Just as the Trump presidency was an undeniable example of the importance of personality, it was also an unequivocal clarion call for an integrated understanding of both personality and social forces. The reality is that the Trump presidency was one of the most incredibly powerful situations faced by U.S. citizens in history. And, the situation in this case was caused, in no uncertain terms, by Trump's personality. Moreover, the effect of Trump's personality was felt in almost bimodal ways depending on, of course, individual differences in traits, motives, skills, and narrative identity (e.g., Clayton et al, 2019; Garrison et al., 2018). Some were enthralled with his style, while others were distressed. Like the pandemic that followed, the Trump presidency showed in immediate and stark relief the importance of both person and situation to the understanding and amelioration of societal if not global events and persons. Going forward, we hope that social and personality psychology can come together to better approximate Allport's lofty vision such that society is better prepared to handle these episodes.

Conclusion

We will end with apologies to the domains of personality psychology that we have not covered in this review. In most cases, our omission is not a sign of contempt, but it is due to prioritizing because of limited space. The field deserves a book length review. Topics such as person-perception (Funder, 2012), well-being and happiness (Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2003; Lucas, 2007), attachment (Fraley, 2019), evolution and personality (Nettle, 2006), behavioral genetics of personality (Briley, Livengood, & Derringer, 2018), self-dimensions (Lodi-Smith & DeMarree, 2018; Robins et al., 2001), machine learning and personality (Bleidorn & Hopwood, 2019) and personality psychology's interface with other areas, such as clinical (Hopwood, Thomas, Markon, Wright, & Krueger, 2012), industrial (Oswald & Hough, 2010), and health psychology (Graham et al., 2017; Hampson, 2012; Segerstrom, 2019) clearly deserve coverage and attention.

To conclude, personality psychology has grown up, it seems, and like a teenager appears ready to leave home on its own. The field has established robust empirical edifices that are replicable and can and should inform any emerging theoretical understandings of human nature. The answers to the four basic questions posed at the beginning of this chapter are far from complete, but they are richer, more satisfying than at any other time in the history of the field. We hope that the future holds more mutually and respectful conversations with other areas of psychology as well as other fields that contribute to improving psychological science in general and personality science in particular.

References

Abrahams, L., Pancorbo, G., Primi, R., Santos, D., Kyllonen, P., John, O. P., & De Fruyt, F. (2019). Social-emotional skill assessment in children and adolescents: Advances and challenges in personality, clinical, and educational contexts. *Psychological Assessment, 31*, 460-473. doi: 10.1037/pas0000591

Adler, J. M. (2012). Living into the story: Agency and coherence in a longitudinal study of narrative identity development and mental health over the course of psychotherapy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*(2), 367-389.

Adler, J.M., Dunlop, W.L., Fivush, R., Lilgendahl, J.P., Lodi-Smith, J., McAdams, D.P., McLean, K.C., Pasupathi, M., & Syed, M. (2017). Research methods for studying narrative identity: A primer. *Social Psychology and Personality Science, 8*, 519-527.

Adler, J. M., Lodi-Smith, J., Philippe, F. L., & Houle, I. (2016). The incremental validity of narrative identity in predicting well-being: A review of the field and recommendations for the future. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 20*, 142-175.

Adler, J. M., Turner, A. F., Brookshier, K. M., Monahan, C., Walder-Biesanz, I., Harmeling, L. H., ... & Oltmanns, T. F. (2015). Variation in narrative identity is associated with trajectories of mental health over several years. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 108*, 476-496.

Adorno, T., Frenkel-Brenswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality: Studies in prejudice*. New York: Harper & Row.

Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation.* New York : Holt.

Anonymous. (1946). Letters from Jenny. *Joumal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 41*,315-350.

Anusic, I., & Schimmack, U. (2016). Stability and change of personality traits, self-esteem, and well-being: Introducing the meta-analytic stability and change model of retest correlations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 110*, 766-781.

Ardelt, M. (2000). Still stable after all these years? Personality stability theory revisited. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 63*, 391-405.

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2020). Objections to the HEXACO model of personality structure—And why those objections fail. *European Journal of Personality, 34*, 492-510.

Atherton, O. E., Grijalva, E., Roberts, B. W., & Robins, R. W. (2020). Stability and Change in Personality Traits and Major Life Goals from College to Midlife. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167220949362.

Barresi, J., & Juckes, T. J. (1997). Personology and the narrative interpretation of lives. *Journal of Personality, 65*(3), 693-719.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel psychology, 44*(1), 1-26.

Baumeister, R.F. (2016). Charting the future of social psychology on stormy seas: Winners, losers, and recommendations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.

Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Funder, D. C. (2007). Psychology as the science of self-reports and finger movements: Whatever happened to actual behavior? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 2*(4), 396-403.

Baumert, A., Schmitt, M., Perugini, M., Johnson, W., Blum, G., Borkenau, P., Costantini, G., Denissen, J.A., Fleeson, W., Grafton, B., Jayawickreme, E., Kurzius, E., MacLeod, C., Miller, L.C., Read, J., Roberts, B., Robinson, M.D., Wood, D., Wrzus, C. (2017). Integrating personality structure, personality process, and personality development. *European Journal of Personality*, *31*(5), 503-528.

Bazana, P. G., & Stelmack, R. M. (2004). Stability of personality across the life span: A meta-analysis. In R. Stelmack (Ed.), *On the psychobiology of personality* (pp. 113–144). New York, NY: Elsevier.

Blain, S. D., Sassenberg, T. A., Xi, M., Zhao, D., & DeYoung, C. G. (2019, December 19). Extraversion but not depression predicts implicit reward sensitivity: Revisiting the measurement of anhedonic phenotypes. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/vzt6d

Bleidorn, W., & Hopwood, C. J. (2019). Using machine learning to advance personality assessment and theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *23*(2), 190-203.

Bleidorn, W., Hopwood, C. J., Back, M. D., Denissen, J. J., Hennecke, M., Jokela, M., … Zimmermann, J. (2020). Longitudinal experience-wide association studies—A framework for studying personality change. *European Journal of Personality, 34*(3), 285–300. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2247

Bohn, A., & Berntsen, D. (2013). The future is bright and predictable: The development of prospective life stories across childhood and adolescence. *Developmental Psychology, 49*(7), 1232-1241.

Borghans, L., Duckworth, A. L., Heckman, J. J., & Ter Weel, B. (2008). The economics and psychology of personality traits. *Journal of Human Resources, 43*(4), 972-1059.

Borghuis, J., Denissen, J. J., Oberski, D., Sijtsma, K., Meeus, W. H., Branje, S., ... & Bleidorn, W. (2017). Big Five personality stability, change, and codevelopment across adolescence and early adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113*(4), 641-657.

Branje, S. J., Van Lieshout, C. F., Van Aken, M. A., & Haselager, G. J. (2004). Perceived support in sibling relationships and adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 45*(8), 1385-1396.

Breil, S. M., Geukes, K., Wilson, R. E., Nestler, S., Vazire, S., Back, M. D., & Donnellan, M. B. (2019). Zooming into real-life extraversion–How personality and situation shape sociability in social interactions. *Collabra: Psychology, 5*(1).

Briley, D. A., Livengood, J., & Derringer, J. (2018). Behaviour genetic frameworks of causal reasoning for personality psychology. *European Journal of Personality, 32*(3), 202-220.

Burt, S. A., Donnellan, M. B., Humbad, M. N., Hicks, B. M., McGue, M., & Iacono, W. G. (2010). Does marriage inhibit antisocial behavior?: An examination of selection vs causation via a longitudinal twin design. *Archives of general psychiatry, 67*(12), 1309-1315.

Button, K. S., Ioannidis, J. P., Mokrysz, C., Nosek, B. A., Flint, J., Robinson, E. S., & Munafò, M. R. (2013). Power failure: why small sample size undermines the reliability of neuroscience. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 14*(5), 365-376.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*(2), 81-105.

Campbell, J. P., & Wiernik, B. M. (2015). The modeling and assessment of work performance. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 2*, 47-74.

Caspi, A., Roberts, B. W., & Shiner, R. L. (2005). Personality development: Stability and change. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 453-484.

Chabris, C. F., Hebert, B. M., Benjamin, D. J., Beauchamp, J., Cesarini, D., Van der Loos, M., ... & Laibson, D. (2012). Most reported genetic associations with general intelligence are probably false positives. *Psychological Science, 23*(11), 1314-1323.

Chow, P. I., & Roberts, B. W. (2014). Examining the relationship between changes in personality and changes in depression. *Journal of Research in Personality, 51*, 38-46.

Clayton, D. M., Moore, S. E., & Jones-Eversley, S. D. (2019). The impact of Donald Trump's presidency on the well-being of African Americans. *Journal of Black Studies*, *50*(8), 707-730.

Condon, D. M., & Mroczek, D. K. (2016). Time to move beyond the big five?. *European journal of personality*, *30*(4), 311.

Cook, C. L., Krems, J. A., & Kenrick, D. T. (2021). Fundamental Motives Illuminate a Broad Range of Individual and Cultural Variations in Thought and Behavior. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 0963721421996690.

Corker, K. S., Oswald, F. L., & Donnellan, M. B. (2012). Conscientiousness in the classroom: A process explanation. *Journal of Personality, 80*(4), 995-1028.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: happy and unhappy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(4), 668-678.

Credé, M., Tynan, M. C., & Harms, P. D. (2017). Much ado about grit: A meta-analytic synthesis of the grit literature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113*(3), 492-511.

Cuijpers, P., Smit, F., Penninx, B. W., de Graaf, R., ten Have, M., & Beekman, A. T. (2010). Economic costs of neuroticism: a population-based study. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 67*(10), 1086-1093.

Damian, R. I., & Roberts, B. W. (2015). The associations of birth order with personality and intelligence in a representative sample of US high school students. *Journal of Research in Personality, 58*, 96-105.

Deary, I. J., Whiteman, M. C., Starr, J. M., Whalley, L. J., & Fox, H. C. (2004). The impact of childhood intelligence on later life: following up the Scottish mental surveys of 1932 and 1947. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*(1), 130-147.

De Fruyt, F., Bartels, M., Van Leeuwen, K. G., De Clercq, B., Decuyper, M., & Mervielde, I. (2006). Five types of personality continuity in childhood and adolescence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*(3), 538-552.

Denissen, J. J. (2014). A roadmap for further progress in research on personality development. *European Journal of Personality, 28*, 213–215. doi: 10.1002/per.1967

DeYoung, C. G. (2015). Cybernetic big five theory. *Journal of Research inPpersonality, 56*, 33-58.

Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*(1), 403-425.

Dobewall, H., & Aavik, T. (2016). Rank-order consistency and profile stability of self-and informant-reports of personal values in comparison to personality traits. *Journal of Individual Differences, 37*, 40–48. doi:10.1027/1614-0001/a000186

Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*(6), 1087-1101.

Duckworth, A. L., & Yeager, D. S. (2015). Measurement matters: Assessing personal qualities other than cognitive abilities for educational purposes. *Educational Researcher, 44*, 237-251. doi: 10.3102/0013189X15584327

Dunlop, W. L., Guo, J., & McAdams, D. P. (2016). The autobiographical author through time: Examining the degree of stability and change in redemptive and contaminated personal narratives. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 7*(5), 428-436.

Dweck, C. S. (2017). From needs to goals and representations: Foundations for a unified theory of motivation, personality, and development. *Psychological Review, 124,* 689–719. doi:10.1037/rev0000082

Elliot, A. J., & Church, M. A. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(1), 218-232.

Elliot, A.J., Gable, S.L., & Mapes, R.R. (2006). Approach and avoidance motivation in the social domain. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 378–391.

Elliot, A. J., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1996). Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 968-980.

English, T., & Carstensen, L. L. (2014). Will interventions targeting conscientiousness improve aging outcomes? *Developmental Psychology, 50*(5), 1478 –1481. doi:10.1037/a0036073

Ferguson, C. J. (2010). A meta-analysis of normal and disordered personality across the life span. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*(4), 659-667. doi: 10.1037/a0018770

Fiske, D. W. (1971). *Measuring the concepts of personality*. Chicago: Aldine.

Fiske, S.T. (2016). In H.T. Reise & C.M. Judd, (Eds.). Scratch an itch with a brick: Why we do research. *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology*, 1-7.

Fleeson, W. (2001). Toward a structure-and process-integrated view of personality: Traits as density distributions of states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*(6), 1011-1027.

Fleeson, W., & Jayawickreme, E. (2015). Whole trait theory. *Journal of Research in Personality, 56*, 82-92.

Fraley, R. C. (2019). Attachment in adulthood: Recent developments, emerging debates, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 70*, 401-422.

Fraley, R. C., & Roberts, B. W. (2005). Patterns of continuity: a dynamic model for conceptualizing the stability of individual differences in psychological constructs across the life course. *Psychological Review, 112*(1), 60-74.

Funder, D. C. (2001). Personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 197-221.

Funder, D. C. (2008). *Persons, situations, and person-situation interactions.* In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (p. 568–580). The Guilford Press.

Funder, D. C. (2012). Accurate personality judgment. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 21*(3), 177-182.

Gable, S. L., & Impett, E. A. (2012). Approach and avoidance motives and close relationships. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 6*, 95–108. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00405.x

Garrison, S. M., Doane, M. J., & Elliott, M. (2018). Gay and lesbian experiences of discrimination, health, and well-being: Surrounding the presidential election. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *9*(2), 131-142.

Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, *48*(1), 26-34.

Göllner, R., Roberts, B.W., Damian, R.I., Lüdtke, O., Jonkmann, K., & Trautwein, U. (2017). Whose "storm and stress" is it? Parent and child reports of personality development in the transition to early adolescence. *Journal of Personality, 85*, 376-387.

Graham, E.K**.,** Rutsohn, J.P., Turiano, N.A., Bendayan, R., Batterham, P., Gerstorf, D., Katz, M., Reynolds, C., Schoenhofen, E., Yoneda, T., Bastarache, E., Elleman, L.G., Zelinski, E.M., Johansson, B., Kuh, D., Barnes, L.L., Bennett, D., Deeg, D., Lipton, R., Pedersen, N., Piccinin, A., Spiro, A., Muniz-Terrera, G., Willis, S., Schaie, K.W., Roan, C., Herd, P., Hofer, S.M., & Mroczek, D.K. (2017). Personality predicts mortality risk: An integrative analysis of 15 international longitudinal studies. *Journal of Research in Personality, 70,* 174-186.

Graham, E.K., Weston, S.J., Gerstorf, D., Yoneda, T.B., Booth, T., Beam, C.R., Petkus, A.J., Drewelies, J., Hall, A.N., Bastarache, E.D., Estabrook, R., Katz, M.J., Turiano, N.A., Lindenberger, U., Smith, J., Wagner, G.G., Pedersen, N.L., Allemand, M., Spiro, A., Deeg, D.J.H., Johansson, B., Piccinin, A.M., Lipton, R.B., Schaie, K.W., Willis, S., Reynolds, C.R., Deary, I.J., Hofer, S.M., & Mroczek, D.K. (2020). Trajectories of Big Five Personality Traits: A Coordinated Analysis of 16 Longitudinal Samples. *European Journal of Personality, 34*, 301-321. doi:10.1002/per.2259

Habermas, T., & de Silveira, C. (2008). The development of global coherence in life narratives across adolescence: Temporal, causal, and thematic aspects. *Developmental Psychology, 44*(3), 707-721.

Hampson, S. E. (2012). Personality processes: Mechanisms by which personality traits "get outside the skin". *Annual Review of Psychology, 63*, 315-339.

Hannuschke, M., Gollwitzer, M., Geukes, K., Nestler, S., & Back, M. (2020). Neuroticism and interpersonal perception: Evidence for positive, but not negative, biases. *Journal of Personality, 88*(2), 217-236.

Heckman, J. J., Pinto, R., and Savelyev, P. A., (2013). Understanding the Mechanisms through Which an Influential Early Childhood Program Boosted Adult Outcomes. *American Economic Review, 103* (6), 1–35.

Hennecke, M., Czikmantori, T., Brandstätter, V., & Laceulle, O. (2019). Doing despite disliking: Self–regulatory strategies in everyday aversive activities. *European Journal of Personality, 33*(1), 104-128.

Hill, P. L., Turiano, N. A., Hurd, M. D., Mroczek, D. K., & Roberts, B. W. (2011). Conscientiousness and longevity: an examination of possible mediators. *Health Psychology, 30*(5), 536-541.

Hoff, K. A., Briley, D. A., Wee, C. J., & Rounds, J. (2018). Normative changes in interests from adolescence to adulthood: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 144*(4), 426-451.

Hoff, K. A., Einarsdóttir, S., Chu, C., Briley, D. A., & Rounds, J. (2021). Personality Changes Predict Early Career Outcomes: Discovery and Replication in 12-Year Longitudinal Studies. *Psychological Science, 32*(1), 64-79.

Hofmann, W., Finkel, E. J., & Fitzsimons, G. M. (2015). Close relationships and self-regulation: How relationship satisfaction facilitates momentary goal pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109*, 434–452. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000020

Hooker, K., & McAdams, D. P. (2003). Personality reconsidered: A new agenda for aging research. *Journal of Gerontology Series: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 58*(6), 296-304.

Hopwood, C. J., & Bleidorn, W. (2018). Stability and change in personality and personality disorders. *Current opinion in psychology, 21*, 6-10.

Hopwood, C. J., Thomas, K. M., Markon, K. E., Wright, A. G., & Krueger, R. F. (2012). DSM-5 personality traits and DSM–IV personality disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 121*(2), 424-432.

Horstmann, K. T., Rauthmann, J. F., Sherman, R. A., & Ziegler, M. (2020). Unveiling an exclusive link: Predicting behavior with personality, situation perception, and affect in a preregistered experience sampling study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Advance online publication.

Hudson, N. W., Fraley, R. C., Chopik, W. J., & Briley, D. A. (2020). Change goals robustly predict trait growth: A mega-analysis of a dozen intensive longitudinal studies examining volitional change. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 11* (6), 723-732.

Hudson, N. W., Roberts, B. W., & Lodi-Smith, J. (2012). Personality trait development and social investment in work. *Journal of Research in Personality, 46*(3), 334-344.

Impett, E. A., Gordon, A. M., Kogan, A., Oveis, C., Gable, S. L., & Keltner, D. (2010). Moving toward more perfect unions: daily and long-term consequences of approach and avoidance goals in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*(6), 948-963.

Inzlicht, M., Werner, K. M., Briskin, J. L., & Roberts, B. W. (2021). Integrating models of self-regulation. *Annual Review of Psychology, 72*, 319-345.

Jonason, P. K., Kaufman, S. B., Webster, G. D., & Geher, G. (2013). What lies beneath the dark triad dirty dozen: varied relations with the big five. *Individual Differences Research, 11*(2), 81-90.

Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 530-541.

Kankaraš, M. and J. Suarez-Alvarez (2019), "Assessment framework of the OECD Study on Social and Emotional Skills", *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 207, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/5007adef-en.

Kasser, T. (2016). Materialistic values and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology, 67*, 489-514.

Kenrick, D. T., & Funder, D. C. (1988). Profiting from controversy: Lessons from the person-situation debate. *American Psychologist*, *43*(1), 23.

Köber, C., Schmiedek, F., & Habermas, T. (2015). Characterizing lifespan development of three aspects of coherence in life narratives: A cohort-sequential study. *Developmental Psychology, 51*(2), 260-275.

Kosse, F., Deckers, T., Pinger, P., Schildberg-Hörisch, H., & Falk, A. (2020). The formation of prosociality: causal evidence on the role of social environment. *Journal of Political Economy, 128*(2), 434-467.

Krueger, R. F., & Markon, K. E. (2014). The role of the DSM-5 personality trait model in moving toward a quantitative and empirically based approach to classifying personality and psychopathology. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 10*, 477-501.

Kuncel, N. R., & Hezlett, S. A. (2010). Fact and fiction in cognitive ability testing for admissions and hiring decisions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *19*(6), 339-345.

Kuncel, N. R., Hezlett, S. A., & Ones, D. S. (2004). Academic performance, career potential, creativity, and job performance: Can one construct predict them all?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*(1), 148.

Laceulle, O. M., Nederhof, E., Karreman, A., Ormel, J., & Van Aken, M. A. G. (2012). Stressful events and temperament change during early and middle adolescence: The TRAILS study. *European Journal of Personality, 26*(3), 276-284.

Lanning, K. (2017). What is the relationship between "personality" and "social" psychologies? Network, community, and whole text analyses of the structure of contemporary scholarship. *Collabra: Psychology, 3*(1), Article 8.

Le, K., Donnellan, M. B., Spilman, S. K., Garcia, O. P., & Conger, R. (2014). Workers behaving badly: Associations between adolescent reports of the Big Five and counterproductive work behaviors in adulthood. *Personality and Individual Differences, 61*, 7-12.

Lee, M. R., Ellingson, J. M., & Sher, K. J. (2015). Integrating social-contextual and intrapersonal mechanisms of "maturing out": Joint influences of familial-role transitions and personality maturation on problem-drinking reductions. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 39*(9), 1775-1787.

Lehnart, J., & Neyer, F. J. (2006). Should I stay or should I go? Attachment and personality in stable and instable romantic relationships. *European Journal of Personality, 20*(6), 475-495.

Lehnart, J., Neyer, F. J., & Eccles, J. (2010). Long-term effects of social investment: The case of partnering in young adulthood. *Journal of Personality, 78*(2), 639-670.

Lilienfeld, S. O., Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2018). The Goldwater Rule: Perspectives from, and implications for, psychological science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 13*(1), 3-27.

Lodi-Smith, J. & DeMarree, K. (Eds). (2018). *Self-Concept Clarity: Perspectives on Assessment, Research, and Application*. New York: Springer Press.

Lodi-Smith, J., Geise, A. C., Roberts, B. W., & Robins, R. W. (2009). Narrating personality change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(3), 679-689.

Low, K. S., Yoon, M., Roberts, B. W., & Rounds, J. (2005). The stability of vocational interests from early adolescence to middle adulthood: a quantitative review of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 131*(5), 713-737.

Lucas, R. E. (2007). Adaptation and the set-point model of subjective well-being: Does happiness change after major life events? *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16*(2), 75-79.

Lucas, R. E., & Donnellan, M. B. (2009). If the person-situation debate is really over, why does it still generate so much negative affect? *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*(2), 146–149.

Lucas, R. E., & Donnellan, M. B. (2011). Personality development across the life span: Longitudinal analyses with a national sample from Germany. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(4), 847-861.

Lüdtke, O., Roberts, B. W., Trautwein, U., & Nagy, G. (2011). A random walk down university avenue: life paths, life events, and personality trait change at the transition to university life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(3), 620-637.

McAdams, D. P. (2010). *George W. Bush and the redemptive dream: A psychological portrait*. Oxford University Press.

McAdams, D. P. (2013). The psychological self as actor, agent, and author. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 8*(3), 272-295.

McAdams, D. P. (2020). *The Strange Case of Donald J. Trump: A Psychological Reckoning*. Oxford University Press.

McAdams, D. P., Bauer, J. J., Sakaeda, A. R., Anyidoho, N. A., Machado, M. A., Magrino-Failla, K., ... & Pals, J. L. (2006). Continuity and change in the life story: A longitudinal study of autobiographical memories in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Personality, 74*(5), 1371-1400.

McAdams, D. P., & Pals, J. L. (2006). A new Big Five: fundamental principles for an integrative science of personality. *American Psychologist, 61*(3), 204-217.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2008). Empirical and theoretical status of the five-factor model of personality traits. In G. Boyle, G. Matthews, & D. H. Saklofske (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of personality theory and assessment* (pp. 273-294). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

McIntosh, A. M., Gow, A., Luciano, M., Davies, G., Liewald, D. C., Harris, S. E., ... & Tenesa, A. (2013). Polygenic risk for schizophrenia is associated with cognitive change between childhood and old age. *Biological Psychiatry, 73*(10), 938-943.

McLean, K. C., Syed, M., Pasupathi, M., Adler, J. M., Dunlop, W. L., Drustrup, D., ... & McAdams, D. P. (2019). The empirical structure of narrative identity: The initial Big Three. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4*, 920-944.

Milyavskaya, M., & Inzlicht, M. (2017). What's so great about self-control? Examining the importance of effortful self-control and temptation in predicting real-life depletion and goal attainment. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *8*(6), 603-611.

Mischel, W. (1968). *Personality and assessment*. New York: Wiley

Mondak, J. J., & Halperin, K. D. (2008). A framework for the study of personality and political behaviour. *British Journal of Political Science, 38*(2), 335-362.

Mõttus, R., Wood, D., Condon, D. M., Back, M. D., Baumert, A., Costantini, G., ... & Zimmermann, J. (2020). Descriptive, predictive and explanatory personality research: Different goals, different approaches, but a shared need to move beyond the Big Few traits. *European Journal of Personality, 34*(6), 1175-1201.

Mroczek, D.K. (2014). Personality plasticity, healthy aging, and interventions. *Developmental Psychology, 50,* 1470-1474*.*

Mroczek, D.K., Graham, E.K., Turiano, N.A., & Oro-Lambo, M.O. (2021). Personality Development in Adulthood and Later Life. In Robins, R.W., John. O.P., & Pervin, L.A. (Eds.) *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (4th Edition). New York: Guilford.

Mroczek, D. K., & Spiro III, A. (2003). Modeling intraindividual change in personality traits: Findings from the Normative Aging Study. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 58*(3), 153-165.

Mroczek, D. K., Spiro III, A., & Turiano, N. A. (2009). Do health behaviors explain the effect of neuroticism on mortality? Longitudinal findings from the VA Normative Aging Study. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*(4), 653-659.

National Research Council. (2012). *Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Nettle, D. (2006). The evolution of personality variation in humans and other animals. *American Psychologist, 61*, 622-631.

Newman, D. A., & Lyon, J. S. (2009). Recruitment efforts to reduce adverse impact: Targeted recruiting for personality, cognitive ability, and diversity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(2), 298.

Nguyen, P. L. L., Kim, H. L., Romain, A. M. N., Tabani, S., & Chaplin, W. F. (2020). Personality change and personality as predictor of change in psychotherapy: A longitudinal study in a community mental health clinic. *Journal of Research in Personality, 87*, 1-8.

Noftle, E. E., & Robins, R. W. (2007). Personality predictors of academic outcomes: big five correlates of GPA and SAT scores. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*(1), 116-130.

Nye, C. D., Su, R., Rounds, J., & Drasgow, F. (2012). Vocational interests and performance: A quantitative summary of over 60 years of research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7*(4), 384-403.

Nye, C. D., Wille, B., Amory, J., & De Fruyt, F. (2020). Are work activities related to interest change over time? A 22-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* Advance online publication. https://doi-org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.1037/pspp0000360

Oltmanns, J. R., Jackson, J. J., & Oltmanns, T. F. (2020). Personality change: Longitudinal self-other agreement and convergence with retrospective-reports. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 118*(5), 1065-1079.

Oswald, F. L., & Hough, L. M. (2010). Personality and its assessment in organizations: Theoretical and empirical developments. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Vol. 2. Selecting and developing members for the organization* (pp. 153– 184). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ozer, D. J., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2006). Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57,* 401-421.

Pals, J. L. (2006). Narrative identity processing of difficult life experiences: Pathways of personality development and positive self-transformation in adulthood. *Journal of Personality, 74*(4), 1079-1110.

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*(6), 556-563.

Pinquart, M., Fröhlich, C., & Silbereisen, R. K. (2007). Optimism, pessimism, and change of psychological well-being in cancer patients. *Psychology, Health & Medicine, 12*(4), 421-432.

Poropat, A. E. (2009). A meta-analysis of the five-factor model of personality and academic performance. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*(2), 322-338.

Rauthmann, J. F. (2020). Übersicht über DPPD Professuren im deutschsprachigen Raum (November/Dezember 2020). [Overview of professorships of personality psychology and psychological assessment in German-speaking countries (November/December 2020). Internal

Document of the Fachgruppe für Differentielle Psychologie, Persönlichkeitspsychologie und Psychologische Diagnostik (DPPD).

Revelle, W., Wilt, J., & Condon, D. M. (2011). Individual differences and differential psychology: A brief history and prospect. In T. Chamorro-Premuzic, S. von Stumm & A. Furnham (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of individual differences* (pp. 1–38). Oxford, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ritchie, S. J., Bates, T. C., & Deary, I. J. (2015). Is education associated with improvements in general cognitive ability, or in specific skills?. Developmental psychology, 51(5), 573-582.

Ritchie, S. J., & Tucker-Drob, E. M. (2018). How much does education improve intelligence? A meta-analysis. *Psychological Science, 29*(8), 1358-1369.

Roberts, B. W. (2007). Contextualizing personality psychology. *Journal of Personality, 75*(6), 1071-1082.

Roberts, B. W. (2009). Back to the future: Personality and assessment and personality development. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*(2), 137-145.

Roberts, B. W. (2018). A revised sociogenomic model of personality traits. *Journal of Personality, 86*(1), 23-35.

Roberts, B. W., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2003). Work experiences and personality development in young adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(3), 582-593.

Roberts, B. W., & DelVecchio, W. F. (2000). The rank-order consistency of personality traits from childhood to old age: a quantitative review of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(1), 3-25.

Roberts, B. W., Harms, P. D., Smith, J., Wood, D., & Webb, M. (2006). Methods in personality psychology. In M. Eid & E. Diener (Eds.), *Handbook of psychological assessment: A multimethod perspective* (pp. 321-335). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Roberts, B. W., Hill, P. L., & Davis, J. P. (2017). How to change conscientiousness: The sociogenomic trait intervention model. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 8*(3), 199-205.

Roberts, B. W., Kuncel, N. R., Shiner, R., Caspi, A., & Goldberg, L. R. (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*(4), 313-345.

Roberts, B. W., Luo, J., Briley, D. A., Chow, P. I., Su, R., & Hill, P. L. (2017). A systematic review of personality trait change through intervention. *Psychological Bulletin, 143*(2), 117-141.

Roberts, B. W., & Mroczek, D. (2008). Personality trait change in adulthood. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 17*(1), 31-35.

Roberts, B. W., & Nickel, L. B. (2020). Personality development across the life course: A neo-socioanalytic perspective. In O.P. John & R.W. Robins (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality Theory and Research*. Guilford Press

Roberts, B. W., & Robins, R. W. (2000). Broad dispositions, broad aspirations: The intersection of personality traits and major life goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*(10), 1284-1296.

Roberts, B.W., Walton, K., & Viechtbauer, W. (2006). Personality changes in adulthood: Reply to Costa & McCrae (2006). *Psychological Bulletin, 132*, 29-32.

Roberts, B. W., & Wood, D. (2006). Personality development in the context of the neo-socioanalytic model of personality. In D. K. Mroczek & T. D. Little (Eds.), *Handbook of personality development* (pp. 11–39). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Roberts, B. W., Wood, D., & Caspi, A. (2008). The development of personality traits in adulthood. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 375-398). New York: The Guilford Press.

Robins, R. W., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2002). It's not just who you're with, it's who you are: Personality and relationship experiences across multiple relationships. *Journal of Personality, 70*(6), 925-964.

Robins, R. W., Tracy, J. L., Trzesniewski, K., Potter, J., & Gosling, S. D. (2001). Personality correlates of self-esteem. *Journal of Research in Personality, 35*(4), 463-482.

Salmela-Aro, K., Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2007). Personal goals during emerging adulthood: A 10-year follow up. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 22*(6), 690-715.

Salmela-Aro, K., Nurmi, J. E., Saisto, T., & Halmesmäki, E. (2000). Women's and men's personal goals during the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Family Psychology, 14*(2), 171-186.

Schaie, K. W., & Strother, C. R. (1968). A cross-sequential study of age changes in cognitive behavior. *Psychological Bulletin, 70*, 671-680.

Schuerger, J. M., Zarrella, K. L., & Hotz, A. S. (1989). Factors that influence the temporal stability of personality by questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*(5), 777-783.

Schultheiss, O. C., Wirth, M. M., Torges, C. M., Pang, J. S., Villacorta, M. A., & Welsh, K. M. (2005). Effects of Implicit Power Motivation on Men's and Women's Implicit Learning and Testosterone Changes After Social Victory or Defeat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(1), 174–188. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.174

Schultz, L. H., Connolly, J. J., Garrison, S. M., Leveille, M. M., & Jackson, J. J. (2017). Vocational interests across 20 years of adulthood: Stability, change, and the role of work experiences. *Journal of Research in Personality, 71*, 46-56.

Schwaba, T., & Bleidorn, W. (2018). Individual differences in personality change across the adult life span. *Journal of Personality, 86*(3), 450-464.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues, 50*(4), 19-45.

Scollon, C. N., & Diener, E. (2006). Love, work, and changes in extraversion and neuroticism over time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*(6), 1152-1165.

Segerstrom, S. C. (2019). Between the error bars: how modern theory, design, and methodology enrich the personality-health tradition. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 81*(5), 408-414.

Sengsavang, S., Pratt, M. W., Alisat, S., & Sadler, P. (2018). The life story from age 26 to 32: Rank-order stability and mean-level change. *Journal of Personality, 86*(5), 788-802.

Solomon, B. C., & Jackson, J. J. (2014). Why do personality traits predict divorce? Multiple pathways through satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*(6), 978-996.

Soto, C. J. (2019). How replicable are links between personality traits and consequential life outcomes? The life outcomes of personality replication project. *Psychological Science, 30*(5), 711-727.

Soto, C. J., Napolitano, C. M., & Roberts, B. W. (2020). Taking Skills Seriously: Toward an Integrative Model and Agenda for Social, Emotional, and Behavioral Skills. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1-8.

Stieger, M., Flückiger, C., Rüegger, D., Kowatsch, T., Roberts, B. W., & Allemand, M. (2021) Changing Personality Traits with the Help of a Digital Personality Change Intervention. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS)*.

Stoll, G., Rieger, S., Lütdke, O., Nagengast, B., Trautwein, U., Roberts, B.W. (2017). Vocational interests at the end of High School predict life outcomes assessed 10 years later over and above IQ and Big Five personality traits. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113 (1), 167.

Stoll, G., Rieger, S., Nagengast, B., Trautwein, U., & Rounds, J. (2020). Stability and change in vocational interests after graduation from high school: A six-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* doi: 10.1037/pspp0000359. Advance online publication.

Su, R., Tay, L., Liao, H. Y., Zhang, Q., & Rounds, J. (2019). Toward a dimensional model of vocational interests. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 104*(5), 690-714.

Sun, J., Harris, K., & Vazire, S. (2019). Is well-being associated with the quantity and quality of social interactions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 119*(6), 1478-1496.

Swann Jr, W. B., & Seyle, C. (2005). Personality psychology's comeback and its emerging symbiosis with social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(2), 155-165.

Tabbarah, M., Crimmins, E. M., & Seeman, T. E. (2002). The relationship between cognitive and physical performance: MacArthur Studies of Successful Aging. *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences, 57*(4), 228-235.

Tang, T. Z., DeRubeis, R. J., Hollon, S. D., Amsterdam, J., Shelton, R., & Schalet, B. (2009). Personality change during depression treatment: a placebo-controlled trial. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 66*(12), 1322-1330.

Thalmayer, A. G., & Saucier, G. (2014). The questionnaire big six in 26 nations: Developing cross-culturally applicable big six, big five and big two inventories. *European Journal of Personality, 28*(5), 482-496.

Tissera, H., Gazzard Kerr, L., Carlson, E. N., & Human, L. J. (2020). Social anxiety and liking: Towards understanding the role of metaperceptions in first impressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* doi:10.1037/pspp0000363. Advance online publication.

Tracy, J. L., Robins, R. W., & Sherman, J. W. (2009). The practice of psychological science: Searching for Cronbach's two streams in social–personality psychology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(6), 1206-1225.

Tucker-Drob, E. M., & Briley, D. A. (2014). Continuity of genetic and environmental influences on cognition across the life span: a meta-analysis of longitudinal twin and adoption studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 140*(4), 949-979.

Turiano, N. A., Pitzer, L., Armour, C., Karlamangla, A., Ryff, C. D., & Mroczek, D. K. (2012). Personality trait level and change as predictors of health outcomes: Findings from a national study of Americans (MIDUS). *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 67*(1), 4-12.

Valentijn, S. A., Van Boxtel, M. P., Van Hooren, S. A., Bosma, H., Beckers, H. J., Ponds, R. W., & Jolles, J. (2005). Change in sensory functioning predicts change in cognitive functioning: Results

from a 6-year follow-up in the Maastricht Aging Study. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 53*(3), 374-380.

Van Aken, M. A., Denissen, J. J., Branje, S. J., Dubas, J. S., & Goossens, L. (2006). Midlife concerns and short-term personality change in middle adulthood. *European Journal of Personality, 20*(6), 497-513.

Van Iddekinge, C. H., Ferris, G. R., & Heffner, T. S. (2009). Test of a multistage model of distal and proximal antecedents of leader performance. *Personnel Psychology, 62*(3), 463-495.

Van Scheppingen, M. A., Jackson, J. J., Specht, J., Hutteman, R., Denissen, J. J., & Bleidorn, W. (2016). Personality trait development during the transition to parenthood: A test of social investment theory. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 7*(5), 452-462.

Vecchione, M., Alessandri, G., Barbaranelli, C., & Caprara, G. (2012). Gender differences in the Big Five personality development: A longitudinal investigation from late adolescence to emerging adulthood. *Personality and Individual Differences, 53*(6), 740-746.

Vecchione, M., Schwartz, S., Alessandri, G., Döring, A. K., Castellani, V., & Caprara, M. G. (2016). Stability and change of basic personal values in early adulthood: An 8-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Research in Personality, 63*, 111-122.

West-Eberhard, M. J. (2003). *Developmental plasticity and evolution*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Wilkowski, B. M., Fetterman, A., Lappi, S. K., Williamson, L. Z., Leki, E. F., Rivera, E., & Meier, B. P. (2019). Lexical derivation of the PINT taxonomy of goals: Prominence, inclusiveness, negativity prevention, and tradition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Advance online publication.

Wille, B., Beyers, W., & De Fruyt, F. (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*(3), 307-321.

Wilson, R. S., Schneider, J. A., Arnold, S. E., Bienias, J. L., & Bennett, D. A. (2007). Conscientiousness and the incidence of Alzheimer disease and mild cognitive impairment. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 64*(10), 1204-1212.

Wirth, J., Stebner, F., Trypke, M., Schuster, C., & Leutner, D. (2020). An interactive layers model of self-regulated learning and cognitive load. *Educational Psychology Review, 32*(4), 1127-1149.

Wrzus, C., & Roberts, B. W. (2017). Processes of personality development in adulthood: The TESSERA framework. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *21*(3), 253-277.

Zettler, I., Thielmann, I., Hilbig, B. E., & Moshagen, M. (2020). The nomological net of the HEXACO model of personality: A large-scale meta-analytic investigation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 15*(3), 723-760.

Zimbardo, P. (2007). The Lucifer Effect. *Understanding how good people turn evil.* Random House, London.

Zimmermann, J., & Neyer, F. J. (2013). Do we become a different person when hitting the road? Personality development of sojourners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*(3), 515-530.