

From Traits to Training: Personality-Informed Education for Health Professions Students

Aixian Zhang^{1,2} and Siliang Chen^{1,*}

¹ Department of Dermatology and Venereology, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610041, China

² The Fifth Affiliated Hospital (The Fifth Clinical Medical College), Xinjiang Medical University, Urumqi 830011, China

Abstract: Health professions education is asked to do several things at once: lay down biomedical knowledge, train clinical skill, and grow communication, teamwork, professionalism, and a capacity for working when the answers are not yet clear. And yet students who sit through the very same curriculum come out looking remarkably different—in how they organise their studying, how they take feedback, how they deal with patients and colleagues, and how they hold up under pressure. Personality traits offer one lens for making sense of that spread, even if their bearing on education is often overstated. This narrative review pulls together the evidence on personality and the main outcomes of students in medicine, nursing, dentistry, pharmacy, rehabilitation, and the other health professions. The sharpest signal in the literature is that conscientiousness follows academic achievement, largely through planning, persistence, the regulation of effort, and simply seeing tasks through to the end. Ties to clinical competence are looser, turning more on the format of the assessment, the stage of training, and the environment in which learning happens. Agreeableness and openness bear on particular corners of empathy and interprofessional learning, whereas neuroticism is the trait most dependably linked to vulnerability under stress, personal distress, and burnout. When it comes to specialty choice, the findings are too tangled to justify prediction at the level of any single individual. Personality assessment can hold modest formative value where it nudges students to reflect on things they are actually in a position to change—self-regulation, communication, engagement with feedback, coping, and reaching out for help—but it has no place standing alone as grounds for admission, ranking, progression, remediation, or the assignment of a career. Handled with care, personality-informed education holds every student to the same competency standards while varying the paths, and the support, that carry them there.

Keywords: personality traits; Big Five; health professions education; academic performance; clinical competence; student well-being

1. Introduction

Health professions education is meant to prepare students to do more than accumulate biomedical and clinical knowledge; the harder task is to fuse that knowledge with technical skill, communication, teamwork, ethical judgement, and a sense of professional responsibility [1]. Yet students who receive identical teaching and sit identical assessments still diverge—in how they plan their work, keep their effort going, respond to feedback, contribute in groups, talk with patients, and sit with uncertainty. Prior academic attainment and cognitive

measures remain useful predictors of performance, but they leave much of this variation unexplained. Reviews across medical and other health professions programmes suggest that non-academic characteristics account for a further slice of it, though the size of the effect shifts with profession, measure, and outcome [2,3].

Personality traits give us a coherent, dimensional vocabulary for that variation. In modern trait psychology, personality refers to the relatively durable patterns of thought, feeling, and behaviour that differ continuously from one person to the next [4,5]. Such patterns are meaningfully stable, but stability is not permanence: both average trait levels and individual trajectories can shift over the course of development [6]. Nor does a trait dictate behaviour line by line. A student who is scrupulously organised in structured coursework may falter once the clinical environment turns unpredictable. Behaviour, in other words, emerges from the interplay of person, task, and setting rather than from disposition alone [7].

The distinction matters because personality findings drift so readily into deterministic labels. Associations that are modest at the group level cannot single out an ideal health professions student, cannot forecast any given individual's competence with real precision, and certainly cannot warrant selection or tracking by personality. The evidence is lopsided, too: most of it comes from medical students, outcomes are pinned down differently from one study to the next, and a good many designs are cross-sectional or lean on self-report. So we treat personality here as a source of educational tendencies rather than of destiny. The review gathers what is known about learning, academic performance, clinical competence, professional behaviour, empathy, communication, teamwork, well-being, and career exploration, and then asks how information about personality might be put to work without labelling students or pulling attention away from the educational conditions that can actually be changed.

2. Conceptual and Measurement Framework

The Five-Factor Model—the Big Five—dominates this literature. Openness picks up curiosity, cognitive flexibility, and an appetite for the new; conscientiousness covers planning, self-discipline, persistence, and dependability; extraversion has to do with social initiative, expressiveness, and positive affect; agreeableness takes in cooperation, trust, and a concern for others; and neuroticism indexes sensitivity to stress and negative emotion, sometimes reported the other way around as emotional stability [5]. These domains sit in a hierarchy, and the facets beneath each one can bring out distinctions that a single domain score papers over. The achievement-striving and order facets of conscientiousness, for instance, may bear quite differently on how someone performs when the situation is uncertain.

Studies in the health professions typically rely on dimensional self-report instruments descended from the NEO inventories or the Big Five Inventory. Choosing among them means weighing construct coverage, reliability, the burden placed on respondents, cultural and linguistic validity, and whether the interpretation needs to happen at the domain or the facet level. The BFI-2 is a good example of a modern hierarchical measure, pairing the five domains with fifteen more specific facets [8]. The HEXACO model provides an alternative six-domain structure, its distinctive contribution being the Honesty-Humility dimension [9], though direct evidence in health professions students is still thin. Categorical typologies such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator are a different animal and should not be mistaken for dimensional trait models: the categories are unstable, information is lost the moment continuous scores are forced across a cut-point, and the instrument is poorly suited to decisions that carry consequences [10].

Personality also needs to be kept apart from empathy, emotional intelligence, resilience, coping, self-efficacy, perfectionism, grit, and learning strategies. These constructs correlate with traits, but they sit closer to specific situations and behaviours and tend to be more open to change. The most useful educational model, then, is not a straight line from personality to outcome. It runs from traits, through proximal processes, to student outcomes, with context colouring every step. Traits may shape how a student plans, exerts effort, procrastinates, seeks help, regulates emotion, responds to feedback, communicates, and works in a team; those processes, in turn, feed into achievement, clinical performance, professionalism, well-being, and career exploration. And at each junction the training stage, assessment format, profession, culture, and learning environment can amplify an association, mute it, or turn it around. This interactionist reading squares with long-standing advice that personality scores be read with caution and never stand in for direct evidence of learning or competence [11].

3. Personality and Educational Outcomes

3.1. Learning and Academic Performance

Of all the findings in this area, the one that holds up best on repeated testing is the positive tie between conscientiousness and academic achievement. Meta-analyses in higher education consistently place conscientiousness ahead of the rest of the Big Five as a correlate of grades and exam scores; openness and agreeableness carry smaller average effects, while the picture for extraversion and neuroticism is murkier and resists any tidy summary [12,13]. Studies in medical schools tell much the same story, but with a caveat worth flagging: the predictive weight of conscientiousness waxes and wanes across the training years, and it hinges on which criterion you happen to be predicting [14,15]. Even at full strength, personality explains only a slice of the variance. It cannot stand in for prior attainment, cognitive ability, or exposure to the curriculum—still less for a direct test of what a student can actually do.

What makes conscientiousness interesting from a teaching standpoint is that it cashes out in behaviours you can watch. On average, students who score high are quicker to set goals, hold to a routine, spend their effort where it counts, meet deadlines, and get back on their feet after a stumble. Conscientiousness lines up with self-regulated learning strategies [16]; its mirror image, procrastination, marks a costly failure of self-regulation and tends to travel with weaker performance and lower conscientiousness scores [17]. The real takeaway lands on teachable targets rather than on prescriptions about personality. Planning, retrieval practice, tracking one's progress, staggering deadlines, and asking for help before it is too late—all of these can be taught, and taught to students anywhere along the trait continuum. A high score is no free pass: the same student can come unstuck when the groundwork is shaky, the workload is unreasonable, or perfectionistic double-checking swallows the time available.

Openness tends to nourish curiosity, reflection, and a readiness to wrestle with complicated or ambiguous material—an asset in case analysis, inquiry-based learning, and interdisciplinary work, even if it does little for a student's marks on an exam built around recall of facts. Extraversion can smooth discussion, contact with peers, and visible participation, yet it buys no across-the-board edge once the task calls for long stretches of solitary study. Agreeableness greases cooperative learning, though a student who defers too readily may sand away the very friction a group needs to do good work. None of this should ossify into fixed “learning styles” or become an excuse for sorting students into supposedly personality-matched teaching.

Neuroticism can touch achievement by way of worry, an inflated sense of threat, and the kind of cognitive interference that surfaces under the pressure of being evaluated. Test anxiety is negatively associated with a wide sweep of educational outcomes [18], and broader meta-analytic work confirms that anxiety-related variables and self-regulatory ones both feed into university performance [19]. That said, neuroticism does not convert uniformly into lower grades. A modest amount of concern can actually tighten preparation in some settings, whereas severe anxiety, disrupted sleep, high-stakes assessment, and a string of failures can flatten performance outright. The causal arrow likely runs in both directions, since academic difficulty itself stirs up anticipatory distress. The sensible response is to work on the symptoms and the behaviours—through low-stakes practice, transparent expectations for assessment, feedback, and easy access to academic or psychological support—rather than writing underperformance off as a fixed disposition.

3.2. Clinical Competence and Professional Behaviour

Clinical competence is a bigger thing than how one performs on a knowledge examination. It demands a context-sensitive knitting-together of knowledge, technical skill, communication, values, reflection, and judgement, all in the patient's service. Miller's well-known pyramid pulls apart knowing, knowing how, showing how, and doing [20], while broader accounts dwell on the habitual and judicious use of these capacities in the thick of real practice [21]. Written papers, objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs), simulation, and observation in the workplace each sample a different rung of that ladder. Because every method is shaped by content sampling, assessor judgement, case difficulty, and the conditions of testing, competence is far more defensibly established by a programme of assessment than by any solitary score [22].

Set against this, the mixed relationship between personality and clinical performance is exactly what one would expect. Longitudinal data show that the validity of traits shifts as students move out of the classroom and into clinical training [15]. In one study, conscientiousness predicted computer-based examination performance but did not, on its own, predict OSCE scores; its bearing on OSCE performance depended on how students perceived their educational environment [23]. Another longitudinal study found that very high conscientiousness was not an unqualified good, and that a moderate level of anxiety could actually accompany stronger acquisition of clinical skill [24]. The point is not that anxiety should be manufactured, or that conscientiousness does harm. It is that trait effects can be non-linear and tied to the task at hand. Adherence to protocol and careful preparation are genuinely valuable, but rigidity carried too far can get in the way of re-prioritising when the information is incomplete.

Professional behaviour overlaps with personality without collapsing into it. Conscientious tendencies surface as attendance, punctuality, preparation, prompt completion of tasks, and dependable follow-through, and a Clinical Conscientiousness Index built from such routine behaviours has been linked to faculty judgements of professionalism and to some performance outcomes [25]. Even so, a behavioural index and a self-reported trait score are not interchangeable currencies. Professionalism also takes in integrity, respect, accountability, ethical judgement, patient-centredness, and the willingness to speak up—qualities that only repeated observation, across settings and across observers, can fairly capture. What looks like unreliability may in fact trace back to illness, disability, caring responsibilities, expectations that were never made clear, or a system that failed the student. Decisions, therefore, should rest on documented behaviour, on context, and on how a student responds to support—not on inferences drawn from a personality profile.

3.3. Empathy, Communication, and Interprofessional Learning

Empathy has more than one dimension. Perspective taking is about grasping another person's point of view; empathic concern is an other-directed emotional response; and personal distress is the self-focused discomfort that another's suffering can provoke [26]. Clinical empathy leans hardest on understanding a patient's experience, conveying that understanding, and acting on an intention to help [27]. In medical students, agreeableness generally goes with empathic concern and perspective taking, and openness with the more cognitive or imaginative sides of empathy [28,29]. Neuroticism, by contrast, lines up more consistently with personal distress than with the kind of patient-centred understanding that actually helps. All of these effects are modest and move around with the instrument, gender, culture, and stage of training. A high score on a self-report empathy scale, in short, cannot be taken as a proxy for empathy observed at the bedside.

Personality may colour how a student opens a conversation, shows feeling, or takes part in a group, but it does not settle the question of communicative competence. Extraversion can help with social initiative; pushed too far into dominance, it can shut down patient disclosure or crowd out quieter peers. Introversion, equally, says nothing about poor listening or a lack of empathy. In simulated consultations, extraversion by itself failed to predict empathic communication; the better ratings appeared when extraversion was paired with a stronger ability to read emotion [30]. Nor do students' self-reported empathy scores necessarily match what simulated patients make of them [31]. Direct observation is the safer bet, trained on concrete behaviours—eliciting concerns, naming emotion, checking that the patient has understood, tailoring explanations, and leaving room in the conversation. And communication teaching that stitches together structured instruction, practice, and feedback can move observed performance in the right direction [32].

The evidence on teamwork and interprofessional learning is thinner. Among nursing students, openness, extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness have each been linked to a greater self-reported readiness for interprofessional learning [33]. In mixed cohorts of nursing, occupational therapy, and physical therapy students, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness bore on particular attitudes toward collaboration—though prior learning experience counted for something as well [34]. It is worth keeping in mind that readiness scales gauge attitudes rather than how a team actually performs, and that cross-sectional links can settle nothing about cause. The apparent advantages, moreover, come with a bill: agreeableness aids cooperation but may smother constructive dissent, and extraversion drives participation but can tip into conversational dominance. Teaching is better aimed at specific team behaviours—clarifying roles, taking turns, managing conflict, sharing information,

and speaking up for patient safety—than at any project to make every student more extraverted or more agreeable. Role-play, simulation, structured team tasks, video review, and behaviour-specific feedback are all more defensible than that. Interventions built around empathy can improve the outcomes we measure, though the methods and the quality of the studies remain uneven [35].

4. Well-Being and Career Development

4.1. Stress, Burnout, and Student Support

Of the Big Five, neuroticism—or, put the other way, low emotional stability—has the steadiest association with perceived stress, anxiety, depressive symptoms, and burnout. A six-year longitudinal study found that neuroticism predicted stress during medical school [36], and later work connected it to psychological distress and burnout in medical students and clinical clerks alike [37,38]. What these findings mark out is vulnerability, not a diagnosis. Because many of the studies measure traits and symptoms at the same moment, they are open to shared-method bias and to reverse causation: a student in the grip of current distress may describe their “usual” emotional tendencies rather differently, and no personality inventory can substitute for validated mental-health screening or a clinical assessment.

Conscientiousness can prop up well-being through organisation and the satisfaction of finishing what one starts, but it must be told apart from maladaptive perfectionism. High standards and careful work do no harm in themselves. What corrodes is the persistent fear of error, the rigid re-checking, the harsh self-criticism, and the habit of pinning one’s self-worth to achievement. Perfectionism and impostor feelings have been linked to poorer psychological adjustment across medical, dental, nursing, and pharmacy students [39], and one longitudinal study found that perfectionism can climb while resilience falls over the course of medical training—changes that baseline personality does not fully account for [40]. The learning environment, on this reading, may be reinforcing troublesome patterns rather than simply exposing traits that were already there.

Workload, autonomy, a sense of belonging, psychological safety, feedback practices, financial strain, mistreatment, and discrimination can each cushion or sharpen an individual’s vulnerability. Multicentre evidence has tied modifiable features of the medical-school environment to burnout [41], and a systematic review found some support for interventions—restructuring the curriculum, mentoring, pass/fail grading, easy-to-reach wellness services—while noting that the quality of the evidence was limited [42]. Students often stay away from those services anyway, deterred by time pressure, stigma, worries about confidentiality, cost, documentation, or fear of professional fallout [43]. Support, accordingly, should be confidential, easy to reach, and walled off from decisions about progression. Personality-informed reflection may help a student notice a recurring stress response or a habitual barrier to asking for help, but it must never be allowed to shift the responsibility for excessive demands or unsafe learning conditions from the institution onto the learner.

4.2. Career Exploration and Specialty Choice

Research on career choice clusters almost entirely in medicine. Reviews turn up loose associations between certain traits and interest in particular specialties, but the patterns wobble with country, instrument, how specialties are grouped, and stage of training [44]. Most studies capture a current preference rather than eventual entry, completion, performance, or satisfaction—and preference is a moving target, pushed and pulled by clinical exposure, role models, values, the anticipated content of the work, lifestyle, status, income, and sheer opportunity [45]. Personality information, at best, earns a place here as a prompt for reflection. A mentor can open up a student’s leanings toward continuity of care, procedural work, the intensity of team life, pace, autonomy, and tolerance for uncertainty, and then hold those leanings up against actual experience and demonstrated ability. What trait scores must not do is assign specialties, talk students out of applying, or conjure up a “surgical”, “psychiatric”, or “primary-care” personality.

5. Personality-Informed Education and Ethical Safeguards

Personality-informed education ought to start from a deliberately modest claim: trait information can help students and teachers notice recurring tendencies, but the decisions themselves must stay tethered to observed behaviour, the learner's own goals, and context. Reviews of personality frameworks in health science education sound the same warning against crude typing and high-stakes use [46]. The goal is neither to nudge a student's trait score upward nor to locate some ideal profile. Everyone is held to the same competency standards; what may vary is the route taken, the pace, and the scaffolding used to get there.

When it comes to learning support, the most useful targets are the close-in, observable ones. A student who struggles to get organised may do well with staged goals, schedules that are actually realistic, reminders, a bit of peer accountability, and frequent check-ins on how things are going. One who shies away from uncertain tasks may gain from low-stakes rehearsal, repeated attempts, a structured debrief, and complexity turned up a notch at a time. A student who tends to take over the discussion can practise summarising what others have said and drawing in the quieter members, while one who hesitates to speak up might prepare beforehand or lean on a defined role before moving on to less supported participation. Crucially, all of this can be offered on the strength of demonstrated need, without any personality testing at all.

When personality assessment is used at all, it should be voluntary, low-stakes, confidential, and explicitly formative. Institutions should reach for validated dimensional instruments and satisfy themselves that the reliability, the validity evidence, the norms, and the interpretation all fit the population and the purpose at hand. General testing standards make the same demands: valid interpretation, fairness, and a sensible proportion between the evidence and the use to which it is put [47]. A translated instrument needs proper linguistic and cultural adaptation, not a literal rendering word for word [48]. Before anyone fills anything in, students should know why the data are being gathered, who will see them, how long they will be kept, whether they can decline, and whether the results will land in any formal record. Those results should come back privately, delivered by someone trained to do it, framed as estimates rather than diagnoses, and left open to context and to disagreement.

Feedback should describe behaviour, not identity. "You interrupted before the patient had finished describing the concern" gives a student something to work with; "you are too extraverted" does not. In clinical education, feedback earns its keep when it delivers specific information about observed performance measured against an intended standard [49], and whether it is taken up depends on a credible educational relationship—one marked by trust, shared goals, direct observation, and a genuine commitment to the learner's development [50]. A mentor may use optional trait results to get a conversation going about study routines, reactions to feedback, interpersonal preferences, recurring stressors, or the kind of work environment a student is drawn to, but the conversation should always circle back to evidence and to action. Personality results are no stand-in for psychological screening, clinical assessment, or the direct evaluation of competence.

The strongest safeguards belong wherever a score could touch a student's opportunities or standing. Personality measures should never be the sole criterion for admission, ranking, progression, exclusion, specialty allocation, or compulsory remediation. The modest, context-bound associations reviewed above simply will not bear that weight. Such uses also invite socially desirable responding and threaten to entrench cultural assumptions about how a "competent" student is supposed to behave. A quiet student may be misread as disengaged, an emotionally expressive one as unstable, and a neurodivergent student may be pressed to mimic the dominant interaction style instead of being offered the reasonable environmental support that would actually help.

Data governance should cover the basics and then some: collecting as little as possible, restricting access by role, setting clear windows for retention and deletion, keeping the data apart from summative records, and putting explicit limits on any secondary use. Institutions ought to audit for subgroup effects, for linguistic validity, for what the assessment means where disability is involved, and for any capacity to do adverse harm—and they should guarantee that a student who turns down assessment still reaches the same support. The ethical test at the centre of all this is a plain one: does the personality information widen a student's options, or does it narrow them? Handled responsibly, it opens up the routes to competence by making support more responsive; handled carelessly, it sets uncertain, group-level evidence into fixed labels pinned onto individuals.

6. Research Priorities

The evidence base is, frankly, fragmented. Studies are too often single-centre, observational, and trained on medical students and their grades. Nursing, dentistry, pharmacy, rehabilitation, and the other health professions remain under-represented, and objective clinical performance, repeated workplace behaviour, and long-term career outcomes rarely make it into the data at all. Cross-sectional self-report designs cannot pin down temporal order and may inflate associations through common-method variance. Comparability suffers further from the sheer variety of personality instruments, facet-scoring schemes, outcome definitions, and approaches to cultural adaptation.

What is needed instead are multicentre, longitudinal, cross-professional cohorts with hypotheses registered in advance and outcomes harmonised across sites. Repeated measurement is the only way to prise apart stable individual differences, developmental change, and the reciprocal effects that unfold during training. Studies should test whether self-regulation, coping, feedback engagement, and team behaviour actually mediate the trait-to-outcome links, and whether training stage, assessment format, profession, culture, and learning environment moderate them. Personality ought to be judged on the incremental value it adds beyond prior attainment and directly observed behaviour, never as a stand-alone predictor. Most important of all, intervention studies should pit personality-informed support against equally intensive support keyed only to demonstrated need, and should measure acceptability, privacy, fairness, labelling, and any unintended harm along the way.

7. Conclusions

Personality traits are, in the end, modestly bound up with how health professions students learn, relate to others, handle stress, and explore their careers. Conscientiousness has the most dependable relationship with academic achievement, though even that shifts with the task and the environment. Agreeableness and openness map onto certain interpersonal outcomes, while neuroticism is the trait most consistently tied to stress vulnerability and personal distress. For clinical competence, teamwork, and specialty choice, the evidence is simply too heterogeneous to predict anything about a single individual. There is no ideal student personality. Where personality assessment is used at all, it should be voluntary, confidential, dimensional, and formative, and its legitimate purpose is to support reflection on the processes a student can change—planning, feedback engagement, communication, coping, and help-seeking. Selection, progression, remediation, and career decisions should continue to rest on direct evidence of behaviour and competence. Done well, personality-informed education multiplies the ways in which different students can reach a common professional standard; done badly, it narrows their opportunities with a label.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (82404175) and the Funds of Science & Technology Department of Sichuan Province (2025ZNSFSC1629).

Author Contributions

Writing—original draft, A.Z. and S.C.; writing—review and editing, A.Z. and S.C. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- 1 Frenk J, Chen L, Bhutta ZA, *et al.* Health Professionals for a New Century: Transforming Education to Strengthen Health Systems in an Interdependent World. *The Lancet* 2010; **376(9756)**: 1923–1958. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(10\)61854-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61854-5).
- 2 Chisholm-Burns MA, Berg-Poppe P, Spivey CA, *et al.* Systematic Review of Noncognitive Factors Influence on Health Professions Students' Academic Performance. *Advances in Health Sciences Education* 2021; **26(4)**: 1373–1445. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-021-10042-1>.
- 3 Ferguson E, James D, Madeley L. Factors Associated with Success in Medical School: Systematic Review of the Literature. *BMJ* 2002; **324(7343)**: 952–957. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.324.7343.952>.
- 4 McCrae RR, Costa PT, Jr. Validation of the Five-Factor Model of Personality Across Instruments and Observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1987; **52(1)**: 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81>.
- 5 McCrae RR, John OP. An Introduction to the Five-Factor Model and Its Applications. *Journal of Personality* 1992; **60(2)**: 175–215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00970.x>.
- 6 Bleidorn W, Schwaba T, Zheng A, *et al.* Personality Stability and Change: A Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Studies. *Psychological Bulletin* 2022; **148(7–8)**: 588–619. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000365>.
- 7 Fleeson W. Toward a Structure- and Process-Integrated View of Personality: Traits as Density Distributions of States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2001; **80(6)**: 1011–1027. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.6.1011>.
- 8 Soto CJ, John OP. The Next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2): Developing and Assessing a Hierarchical Model with 15 Facets to Enhance Bandwidth, Fidelity, and Predictive Power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2017; **113(1)**: 117–143. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000096>.
- 9 Ashton MC, Lee K. Empirical, Theoretical, and Practical Advantages of the HEXACO Model of Personality Structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 2007; **11(2)**: 150 – 166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868306294907>.
- 10 Pittenger DJ. Cautionary Comments Regarding the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research* 2005; **57(3)**: 210–221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1065-9293.57.3.210>.
- 11 Hojat M, Erdmann JB, Gonnella JS. Personality Assessments and Outcomes in Medical Education and the Practice of Medicine: AMEE Guide No. 79. *Medical Teacher* 2013; **35(7)**: e1267–e1301. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2013.785654>.
- 12 Poropat AE. A Meta-Analysis of the Five-Factor Model of Personality and Academic Performance. *Psychological Bulletin* 2009; **135(2)**: 322–338. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014996>.
- 13 Mammadov S. Big Five Personality Traits and Academic Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Personality* 2022; **90(2)**: 222–255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12663>.
- 14 Lievens F, Coetsier P, De Fruyt F, *et al.* Medical Students' Personality Characteristics and Academic Performance: A Five-Factor Model Perspective. *Medical Education* 2002; **36(11)**: 1050–1056. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2923.2002.01328.x>.
- 15 Lievens F, Ones DS, Dilchert S. Personality Scale Validities Increase Throughout Medical School. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 2009; **94(6)**: 1514–1535. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016137>.
- 16 Bidjerano T, Dai DY. The Relationship between the Big-Five Model of Personality and Self-Regulated Learning Strategies. *Learning and Individual Differences* 2007; **17(1)**: 69 – 81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2007.02.001>.
- 17 Steel P. The Nature of Procrastination: A Meta-Analytic and Theoretical Review of Quintessential Self-Regulatory Failure. *Psychological Bulletin* 2007; **133(1)**: 65–94. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.1.65>.
- 18 von der Embse N, Jester D, Roy D, *et al.* Test Anxiety Effects, Predictors, and Correlates: A 30-Year Meta-

- Analytic Review. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 2018; **227**: 483–493. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2017.11.048>.
- 19 Richardson M, Abraham C, Bond R. Psychological Correlates of University Students' Academic Performance: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 2012; **138**(2): 353–387. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026838>.
 - 20 Miller GE. The Assessment of Clinical Skills/Competence/Performance. *Academic Medicine* 1990; **65**(9): S63–S67. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-199009000-00045>.
 - 21 Epstein RM, Hundert EM. Defining and Assessing Professional Competence. *JAMA* 2002; **287**(2): 226–235. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.287.2.226>.
 - 22 van der Vleuten CPM, Schuwirth LWT. Assessing Professional Competence: From Methods to Programmes. *Medical Education* 2005; **39**(3): 309–317. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02094.x>.
 - 23 Schrempft S, Piumatti G, Gerbase MW, et al. Pathways to performance in undergraduate medical students: role of conscientiousness and the perceived educational environment. *Advances in Health Sciences Education* 2021; **26**(5): 1537–1554. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-021-10059-6>.
 - 24 Ferguson E, Semper H, Yates J, et al. The “Dark Side” and “Bright Side” of Personality: When Too Much Conscientiousness and Too Little Anxiety Are Detrimental with Respect to the Acquisition of Medical Knowledge and Skill. *PLoS ONE* 2014; **9**(2): e88606. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0088606>.
 - 25 Kelly M, O’Flynn S, McLachlan J, et al. The Clinical Conscientiousness Index: A Valid Tool for Exploring Professionalism in the Clinical Undergraduate Setting. *Academic Medicine* 2012; **87**(9): 1218–1224. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0b013e3182628499>.
 - 26 Davis MH. Measuring Individual Differences in Empathy: Evidence for a Multidimensional Approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1983; **44**(1): 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113>.
 - 27 Hojat M, Gonnella JS, Nasca TJ, et al. Physician Empathy: Definition, Components, Measurement, and Relationship to Gender and Specialty. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 2002; **159**(9): 1563–1569. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.159.9.1563>.
 - 28 Song Y, Shi M. Associations between Empathy and Big Five Personality Traits among Chinese Undergraduate Medical Students. *PLoS ONE* 2017; **12**(2): e0171665. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0171665>.
 - 29 Guilera T, Batalla I, Forné C, et al. Empathy and Big Five Personality Model in Medical Students and Its Relationship to Gender and Specialty Preference: A Cross-Sectional Study. *BMC Medical Education* 2019; **19**: 57. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-019-1485-2>.
 - 30 Schreckenbach T, Ochsendorf F, Sterz J, et al. Emotion Recognition and Extraversion of Medical Students Interact to Predict Their Empathic Communication Perceived by Simulated Patients. *BMC Medical Education* 2018; **18**: 237. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-018-1342-8>.
 - 31 Berg K, Majdan JF, Berg D, et al. A Comparison of Medical Students' Self-Reported Empathy with Simulated Patients' Assessments of the Students' Empathy. *Medical Teacher* 2011; **33**(5): 388–391. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2010.530319>.
 - 32 Yedidia MJ, Gillespie CC, Kachur E, et al. Effect of Communications Training on Medical Student Performance. *JAMA* 2003; **290**(9): 1157–1165. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.290.9.1157>.
 - 33 Axelsson M, Jakobsson J, Carlson E. Which Nursing Students Are More Ready for Interprofessional Learning? A Cross-Sectional Study. *Nurse Education Today* 2019; **79**: 117–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2019.05.019>.
 - 34 Avrech Bar M, Katz Leurer M, Warshawski S, et al. The Role of Personal Resilience and Personality Traits of Healthcare Students on Their Attitudes Towards Interprofessional Collaboration. *Nurse Education Today* 2018; **61**: 36–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2017.11.005>.
 - 35 Batt-Rawden SA, Chisolm MS, Anton B, et al. Teaching Empathy to Medical Students: An Updated, Systematic Review. *Academic Medicine* 2013; **88**(8): 1171 – 1177. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0b013e318299f3e3>.
 - 36 Tyssen R, Dolatowski FC, Røvik JO, et al. Personality Traits and Types Predict Medical School Stress: A Six-Year Longitudinal and Nationwide Study. *Medical Education* 2007; **41**(8): 781–787. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meduc.2007.06.005>.

- 1111/j.1365-2923.2007.02802.x.
- 37 Yusoff MSB, Hadie SNH, Yasin MAM. The Roles of Emotional Intelligence, Neuroticism, and Academic Stress on the Relationship between Psychological Distress and Burnout in Medical Students. *BMC Medical Education* 2021; **21**: 293. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-021-02733-5>.
 - 38 Lin CC, Lin BYJ, Lin CD. Influence of Clerks' Personality on Their Burnout in the Clinical Workplace: A Longitudinal Observation. *BMC Medical Education* 2016; **16**: 30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-016-0553-0>.
 - 39 Henning K, Ey S, Shaw D. Perfectionism, the Impostor Phenomenon and Psychological Adjustment in Medical, Dental, Nursing and Pharmacy Students. *Medical Education* 1998; **32(5)**: 456–464. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2923.1998.00234.x>.
 - 40 Eley DS, Leung J, Cloninger KM. A Longitudinal Cohort Study Observed Increasing Perfectionism and Declining Resilience, Ambiguity Tolerance and Calling during Medical School Which Is Not Explained by Student Personality. *BMC Medical Education* 2022; **22**: 784. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03850-5>.
 - 41 Dyrbye LN, Thomas MR, Harper W, et al. The Learning Environment and Medical Student Burnout: A Multicentre Study. *Medical Education* 2009; **43(3)**: 274–282. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2008.03282.x>.
 - 42 Wasson LT, Cusmano A, Meli L, et al. Association between Learning Environment Interventions and Medical Student Well-Being: A Systematic Review. *JAMA* 2016; **316(21)**: 2237–2252. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.17573>.
 - 43 Givens JL, Tjia J. Depressed Medical Students' Use of Mental Health Services and Barriers to Use. *Academic Medicine* 2002; **77(9)**: 918–921. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-200209000-00024>.
 - 44 Borges NJ, Savickas ML. Personality and Medical Specialty Choice: A Literature Review and Integration. *Journal of Career Assessment* 2002; **10(3)**: 362–380. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10672702010003006>.
 - 45 Querido SJ, Vergouw D, Wigersma L, et al. Dynamics of Career Choice among Students in Undergraduate Medical Courses. A BEME Systematic Review: BEME Guide No. 33. *Medical Teacher* 2016; **38(1)**: 18–29. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2015.1074990>.
 - 46 Childs-Kean L, Edwards M, Smith MD. Use of Personality Frameworks in Health Science Education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* 2020; **84(8)**: ajpe7231. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7231>.
 - 47 American Educational Research Association; American Psychological Association; National Council on Measurement in Education. *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*; American Educational Research Association: Washington, DC, USA, 2014.
 - 48 International Test Commission. The ITC Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests (Second Edition). *International Journal of Testing* 2018; **18(2)**: 101–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15305058.2017.1398166>.
 - 49 van de Ridder JMM, Stokking KM, McGaghie WC, et al. What Is Feedback in Clinical Education? *Medical Education* 2008; **42(2)**: 189–197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2007.02973.x>.
 - 50 Telio S, Ajjawi R, Regehr G. The “Educational Alliance” as a Framework for Reconceptualizing Feedback in Medical Education. *Academic Medicine* 2015; **90(5)**: 609–614. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000560>.

