



FIELD NOTES / PEOPLE AND PERFORMANCE

A Personality Finding Is Not a Review Rule

Test the proposed assignment rule before changing who gets which kind of review.

WHAT YOU WILL DO

Check whether the proposed personality-to-review assignment was actually tested before adopting it.



SOURCE



INSIGHT



APPLICATION

ARTICLE / FILLABLE WORKSHEET / SOURCE NOTES



Approve the rule, not just the research citation

A supplier proposes choosing each employee's performance review approach from a personality questionnaire. A research citation makes the proposal sound grounded. Before approving it, ask whether the study tested that assignment rule. A finding about differences between people is not itself a tested way to decide who gets which review.

What this study actually tested

A 2022 *Frontiers in Psychology* study reported that the statistical relationship between developmental appraisal and job meaningfulness varied with respondents' external locus of control. That measure concerns beliefs that outcomes depend on luck, chance or powerful other people. It is not a diagnosis.

The researchers surveyed pharmaceutical salespeople in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan, using convenience sampling and a time-lag design. They did not assign different review approaches according to personality and compare the results. The finding alone does not establish which approach should be assigned to a particular employee, or that doing so improves sales.

This is a limit on what the study establishes, not a claim that tailored reviews can never help. No direction, personality cutoff or individual response rule is supplied here.



A completed assignment decision

Fictional example: a supplier sends Morgan a matrix that allocates some employees to coaching-focused reviews and others to rating-focused reviews solely from questionnaire scores. Morgan records: "Do not adopt this allocation rule. Missing evidence: a comparison testing this exact rule against our existing approach for the relevant staff and intended outcome. Owner: Morgan. Reconsider when that evidence is available."

Morgan asks the supplier for that comparison. Another correlation, or a different study merely mentioning personality, would not answer the question about the proposed rule. The team can keep evaluating the proposal without treating it as ready to use.

Keep support available while the rule is unproven

GTMA proposal: retain the existing review process while the assignment decision remains open. Agree support from observed work and the employee's stated needs. In the fictional example, Nia asks to practise handling price objections; Morgan agrees to rehearse one recent conversation at their next one-to-one. No personality category is needed to record that request.

This alternative and the worksheet are GTMA proposals, not approaches proved superior by the study. Use the worksheet to name the proposed rule, the evidence gap and the decision to withhold or reconsider it.



Worksheet: inspect the assignment rule

A GTMA proposed decision record. It is not a personality test or a validated appraisal method.

Type into the fields, or print. Save a copy to retain your answers.

01 / Write the exact proposed assignment rule

Who would receive which review approach, based on what measure? Fictional example: a supplier matrix allocates coaching or rating-focused reviews from questionnaire scores.

02 / Separate the finding from the tested rule

What did the cited study measure or compare? Identify evidence for this exact allocation rule, relevant staff and intended outcome. Keep missing evidence explicit.

03 / Record the decision, owner and reconsideration point

Fictional record: do not adopt; request the rule-versus-current-approach comparison; Morgan owns follow-up; reconsider when that evidence is available.

04 / Agree support without an unproven assignment rule

Record an observed work need, the employee request and a specific action. Fictional example: Nia requests price-objection practice; Morgan rehearses one conversation at the next one-to-one.



Read further. Know the limits.

Source findings, GTMA proposals and fictional examples have different roles. Use the original research to examine its methods and context.

[1] What matters when examining the performance of salespersons? Analyzing the boundary conditions of personal dispositional factor

Frontiers in Psychology / Published: 2022-12-05

Naeem, Shah, Kakakhel and Gul (2022). Questionnaire study of pharmaceutical salespeople in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan; convenience sample and time-lag design. A reported moderation finding about job meaningfulness, not a tested personality-to-review assignment or sales uplift.

<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1006270/full>

Attribution and changes

Authors: Muhammad Naeem, Fayaz Ali Shah, Shahid Jan Kakakhel and Shabana Gul. The article carries a Creative Commons Attribution licence. GTMA adds its own interpretation, fictional example and worksheet; the authors and publisher do not endorse these additions.

Scope and limitations

The finding concerns external locus of control, developmental appraisal and job meaningfulness. No direction, coefficient, personality threshold or other moderation result is presented. The source note above identifies the population and design; no sales-performance or revenue effect is established. The calendar observation period remains unknown here, distinct from publication date.

The authors recommend considering personality in appraisal design. That recommendation differs from testing an employee-to-review assignment rule: the methods describe questionnaires about existing appraisal practices, not assignment of approaches by personality.

Fictional example and proposed alternative

Morgan, Nia and the supplier matrix are fictional. No real employee is classified. The comparison is one GTMA proposes requesting, not one the study performed. Retaining the current process and agreeing support are GTMA guidance, not demonstrated superior approaches. Tailored reviews are not ruled out universally.

The worksheet is a GTMA proposal, not a research-validated instrument. Fictional examples are illustrations, not evidence of results.