THE HEXACO PERSONALITY MEASURE AS A PREDICTOR OF JOB PERFORMANCE AND JOB SATISFACTION

Gaye Saltukoğlu[1], Arkun Tatar[1], & Hüdanur Özdemir[2]
[1]Department of Psychology, FSM Vakıf University / Associate Professor (Turkey)
[2]Psychologist (Turkey)

Abstract

The study aimed to examine the relationship between personality traits according to the Six Factor Personality Inventory (HEXACO), and job performance and job satisfaction. A total of 852 people (433 women and 419 men) from 154 different professions participated in the study. The age range of the participants was between 20 and 74, and they were working at a job for a period between 1-40 years. Participants answered the HEXACO Personality Inventory long form and evaluated their job performance and job satisfaction on a scale between 1 and 5. To predict job performance and job satisfaction, the data was analyzed by multiple linear regression. The sub-dimensions of Modesty, Fairness, Social Self-Esteem, Liveliness, Perfectionism, Diligence and the factors of Extraversion, Conscientiousness predicted job performance, and sub-dimensions of Modesty, Liveliness, Social Boldness, Forgiveness, Patience, Diligence and the factors of Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness predicted job satisfaction. Afterwards, job performance and job satisfaction levels of the participants were grouped as low, moderate, high. Total HEXACO scores of these groups were compared by MANOVA for sub-dimensions and factors. Job performance groups differed in the factors of Honesty-Humility, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Openness to Experience, and job satisfaction groups differed in the factors of Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. As for the sub-dimensions, groups that were high in job performance and job satisfaction differed from the groups that were low in many personality traits.

Keywords: Job performance, job satisfaction, HEXACO, personality.

1. Introduction

Various factor analytic studies have revealed three, five, six, seven and eight factor theories to assess personality (Almagor, Tellegen and Waller, 1995; Barrett, Petrides, Eysenck and Eysenck, 1998; Caprara, Barbaranelli and Comrey, 1992; Eysenck, Eysenck and Barrett, 1985; Hogan and Hogan, 2007; Goldberg, 1990; McCrae and Costa, 1987; Saucier, 2002; Zuckerman, Kuhlman, Joireman, Teta and Kraft, 1993). Even though the Five Factor Model has been widely used in personality research, there is no consensus about which model better explained personality traits (Block, 1995; Piedmont and Aycock, 2007; Simms, Williams and Nus, 2017). On the other hand, the HEXACO Personality Model has been revealed relatively recently and its validity has been tested in many languages. For this reason, in recent studies this model excels (Ashton and Lee, 2002; 2007; Ashton, Lee and Goldberg, 2004; Lee and Ashton, 2008; 2018). The psycho-lexical approach to personality structure rests on the assumption that personality variation would be represented by adjectives in all languages, and would helps to differentiate most important personality traits. The main difference that distinguishes the HEXACO Model from the Five Factor Model is the sixth factor that has emerged in the psycho-lexical studies and included in the model. This factor is called Honesty-Humility (Allport and Odbert, 1936; Ashton and Lee, 2005; 2008a; 2008b; Goldberg, 1993; Lee, Ogunfowora and Ashton, 2005; Lee and Ashton, 2014). The inclusion of the sixth factor into the model of personality taxonomy, made the HEXACO Model more compressive and powerful than the Five Factor Model (Ashton, Lee, de Vries, Perugini, Gnisci and Sergi, 2006; Ashton, Lee, Perugini, Szarota, de Vries, di Blas, Boies and de Raad, 2004). The HEXACO model consists of Humility-Honesty, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Openness to Experience factors (Ashton and Lee, 2009a; Lee and Ashton, 2004).

The relationship between personality, and job performance and job satisfaction is an often discussed topic in the related studies (Abraham and Morrison, 2003; Rothmann and Coetzer, 2003; Saltukoğlu and Tatar, 2018). It is also seen that the Five Factor Model of personality is the preferred model (Barrick and Mount, 1991; 1993; Barrick, Stewart and Piotrowski, 2002; Mount, Barrick, and Stewart, 1998; Salgado, 1997; Saltukoğlu and Tatar, 2018). The number of studies for business life seems to be on the rise with the widespread acceptance of the Five Factor Model and the development of valid

measuring instruments based on this model. Thus, more systematic and comprehensive personality studies about job performance and job satisfaction were conducted (Alessandri and Vecchione, 2012; Barrick and Mount, 1991; 1993; Barrick, Mount and Judge, 2001; Judge and Zapata, 2015; Rothstein and Goffin, 2006; Salgado, 1997; Zhao and Seibert, 2006). On the other hand, selecting the proper individuals for the job is important. Selecting individuals with appropriate personality characteristics for the job is important in terms of job satisfaction and job performance (Guion and Gottier, 1965; Rothstein and Goffin, 2006).

Although there are many studies that associate the Five Factor model is associated with job satisfaction and job performance, similar studies conducted with the relatively new HEXACO Model are rare. For this reason, in this study it is intended to examine job performance and job satisfaction in the context of the HEXACO Personality Model. Thus, the aim of the study is to compare the personality profiles of the groups created according to the evaluations they made about their job performance and job satisfaction levels.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

A total of 852 people working at a job for a year or longer and working in 154 different professions, 433 women (50.8%) and 419 men (49.2%) participated in the study. Their age range was between 20 and 74 (mean = 37.36, sd = 10.73), and they worked at a job for a period between 1 and 40 years (mean = 13.30, sd = 10.19). Participants consisted of 35 elementary school graduates (4.1%), 47 middle school graduates (5.5%), 244 high school graduates (28.6%) and 526 university graduates (61.7%). Economic status of the participants was as follows: 42 (4.9%) low income, 557 (65.4%) middle income and 248 (29.1%) high income. 5 people did not specify their income (0.6%). Of all the participants 359 (42.1%) were single, 448 (52.6%) were married and 45 (5.3%) were widowed or divorced.

2.2. Instruments

A socio-demographic questionnaire along with the Personality Inventory long form was used in the study. Participants evaluated their job performances and job satisfactions on a 1-5 point scale. The HEXACO Personality Inventory consists of six factors and 24 sub-dimensions located under these factors (Ashton, Lee and de Vries, 2014; Lee and Ashton, 2006). The inventory was translated into Turkish and its psychometric properties were tested (Tatar, 2018). The inventory has two forms, long form with 100 items and short form with 60 items (Ashton and Lee, 2009b; Lee and Ashton, 2004; 2006; 2018). Long form of the Turkish adaptation showed internal consistency coefficients ranging from 0.72 to 0.78 for six factors and from 0.29 to 0.77 for 24 sub-dimensions (Tatar, 2018).

2.3. Application

The study was conducted in Istanbul with those who voluntarily accepted to participate. It took 20-30 minutes for a person to complete the form. All applications were completed in nearly one year.

2.4. Results

First, internal consistence coefficients of the factors and the sub-dimensions were calculated and were found between 0.32-0.76 for the sub-dimensions and between 0.71-0.77 for the factors. Subsequently, to predict job performance and job satisfaction, the data was analyzed by multiple linear regressions. Social Self-Esteem, Liveliness, Perfectionism, Diligence sub-dimensions were found effective in predicting job performance and Modesty, Liveliness, Social Boldness, Forgiveness, Patience, Diligence sub-dimensions were found effective in predicting job satisfaction. Models generated to predict job performance ($R^2 = 0.140$, $F_{24, 851} = 5.588$, $p < 0.001$) and job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.100$, $F_{24, 851} = 3.826$, $p < 0.001$) for sub-dimensions were statistically significant.

Table 1. To predict job performance and job satisfaction with factors of HEXACO Personality Inventory.

Factors	Alpha	Job Performance		Job Satisfaction	
		β	t	β	t
Constant			7.825***		3.818***
Honesty-Humility	0.74	-0.060	-1.716	0.008	0.218
Emotionality	0.71	-0.052	-1.544	0.003	0.081
Extraversion	0.77	0.132	3.721***	0.142	3.902***
Agreeableness	0.74	0.045	1.320	0.146	4.239***
Conscientiousness	0.75	0.224	6.495***	0.088	2.497*
Openness to Experience	0.74	0.035	1.001	0.011	0.318

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

For the factors, Extraversion and Conscientiousness were found effective in predicting job performance, and Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness factors were effective in predicting job satisfaction (Table 1). Models generated for the prediction of job performance ($R^2 = 0,093$, $F_{6, 851} = 14,403$, $p < 0.001$) and job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0,057$, $F_{6, 851} = 8,461$, $p < 0.001$) for the factors were statistically significant.

Afterwards, job performance and job satisfaction levels of the participants were grouped as low, moderate, high. The total factor scores of these groups were compared by MANOVA. Main effect was statistically significant in the comparison of total factor scores of job performance (Wilk's $\lambda = 0.895$, $F_{12, 1688} = 8.008$, $p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.054$) and job satisfaction (Wilk's $\lambda = 0.940$, $F_{12, 1688} = 4.412$, $p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.030$) groups. Factors when examined individually, job performance groups differed in the factors of Honesty-Humility ($F_{2, 849} = 5.122$, $p < 0.01$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.012$), Extraversion ($F_{2, 849} = 18.406$, $p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.042$), Conscientiousness ($F_{2, 849} = 27.924$, $p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.062$), Openness to Experience ($F_{2, 849} = 6.898$, $p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.016$); as for job satisfaction groups, they differed in the factors of Extraversion ($F_{2, 849} = 11.530$, $p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.026$), Agreeableness ($F_{2, 849} = 7.889$, $p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.018$), Conscientiousness ($F_{2, 849} = 9.083$, $p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.021$) (Table 2).

Table 2. Comparison of total factor scores of job performance and job satisfaction groups by MANOVA.

Factors	Job Performance		Job Satisfaction	
	F	Partial η^2	F	Partial η^2
Honesty-Humility	5.122**	0.012	1.299	0.003
Emotionality	2.136	0.005	.498	0.001
Extraversion	18.406***	0.042	11.530***	0.026
Agreeableness	0.990	0.002	7.889***	0.018
Conscientiousness	27.924***	0.062	9.083***	0.021
Openness to Experience	6.898***	0.016	2.116	0.005

**p<0.01; ***p<0.001

3. Discussion

This study aims to detect the personality traits predicting job performance and job satisfaction by the HEXACO model. To this end, first it has to be determined which personality traits in the HEXACO model predicts job performance and job satisfaction. Afterwards, it has been indented to determine whether employees with different job performance and job satisfaction levels differ in terms of personality traits. The originality of the study is the combination of employees from many different professions. The presence of employees from many different professions, at the same time created the difficulty of the study.

Results of both statistical methods are taken together, has shown that only the emotionality factor is clearly ineffective in terms of job performance and job satisfaction. The Emotionality factor consists of Fearfulness, Anxiety, Dependence and Sentimentality sub-dimensions. This factor corresponds to the Emotional Stability Factor in the Five Factor Model however, does not cover characteristics such as hostility, rage and anger (Ashton and Lee, 2005; 2007; 2008a; 2008b; Ashton, Lee and de Vries, 2014; Ashton, Lee, Perugini, Szarota, de Vries, di Blas, Boies and de Raad, 2004).

In terms of other factors, in terms of both job performance and job satisfaction and also in regression analysis and comparison of groups, it is observed that more or less there is an influential factor or sub-dimension. Effective factors in terms of job performance and job satisfaction in the HEXACO model have the following properties.

The Humility-Honesty factor of the HEXACO Personality model consists of Sincerity, Fairness, Greed Avoidance and Modesty sub-dimensions. This factor includes characteristics such as sincere, honest, faithful/loyal, modest/unassuming, fair-minded versus sly, greedy, pretentious, hypocritical, boastful, pompous (Ashton and Lee, 2005; 2007; 2008a; 2008b). The Extraversion factor consists of Social Self-Esteem, Social Boldness, Sociability and Liveliness sub-dimensions. This factor includes characteristics such as lively, extraverted, sociable, talkative, cheerful, and active versus shy, passive, withdrawn, introverted, quiet, and reserved. On the other hand, this factor does not include characteristics such as bravery and durability as in the Five Factor Model (Ashton and Lee, 2007; 2009a; Lee and Ashton, 2004; 2018). The Agreeableness factor consists of Forgiveness, Gentleness, Flexibility and Patience sub-dimensions. This factor includes characteristics such as patient, tolerant, peaceful, mild, agreeable, lenient, gentle versus ill-tempered, quarrelsome, stubborn, choleric. It does not include emotionality in the Five Factor Model (Ashton and Lee, 2007; 2009a; Ashton, Lee and de Vries, 2014; Lee and Ashton, 2004; 2018). The Conscientiousness factor consists of Organization, Diligence, Perfectionism and Prudence sub-dimensions. The characteristics of this factor on the one end are organized, disciplined, diligent, careful, thorough, precise and on the other end are sloppy, negligent, reckless, lazy, irresponsible, absent-minded (Ashton and Lee, 2007; 2009a; Ashton, Lee and de Vries,

2014; Lee and Ashton, 2004; 2018). The Openness to Experience factor consists of Aesthetic Appreciation, Inquisitiveness, Creativity and Unconventionality sub-dimensions. This factor includes characteristics such as intellectual, creative, unconventional, innovative, ironic (Ashton and Lee, 2007; 2009a; Lee and Ashton, 2004; 2018).

The results obtained are especially important for the selection of personnel, especially in terms of job performance and job satisfaction. On the other hand personality traits have a relationship in the similar direction with both job performance and job satisfaction (Barrick, Mount and Judge, 2001; Rothmann and Coetzer, 2003). Besides, these two facts are correlated with each other and job satisfaction is accepted as the predictor of job performance (Wright and Cropanzano, 2000). This study addressed the relationship of personality traits, job performance and job satisfaction, a topic with many examples in the literature, in terms of a relatively new HEXACO model.

References

Abraham, J. D., & Morrison, J. D. (2003). Relationships between the Performance Perspectives Inventory's Selling scale and job performance of real estate agents. *Applied Human Resource Management Research,* 8(1), 45-48.

Alessandri, G., & Vecchione, M. (2012). The higher-order factors of the Big Five as predictors of job performance. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 53(6), 779-784.

Allport, G. W., & Odbert, H. S. (1936). Trait-names: a psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, 47(1), 1-171.

Almagor, M., Tellegen, A., & Waller, N. G. (1995). The Big Seven model: A cross-cultural replication and further exploration of the basic dimensions of natural language trait descriptors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(2), 300-307.

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2002). Six independent factors of personality variation: a response to Saucier. *European Journal of Personality*, 16(1), 63-75.

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2005). Honesty-humility, the Big Five, and the Five-Factor Model. *Journal of Personality*, 73(5), 1321-1354.

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11(2), 150-166.

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2008a). The HEXACO model of personality structure and the importance of the H factor. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(5), 1952-1962.

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2008b). The prediction of Honesty-Humility-related criteria by the HEXACO and Five-Factor Models of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(5), 1216-1228.

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009a). An investigation of personality types within the HEXACO personality framework. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 30(4), 181-187.

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009b). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91(4), 340-345.

Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & de Vries, R. E. (2014). The HEXACO Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness, and Emotionality factors: a review of research and theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 18(2), 139-152.

Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & Goldberg, L. R. (2004). A hierarchical analysis of 1,710 English personality-descriptive adjectives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(5), 707-721.

Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., de Vries, R. E., Perugini, M., Gnisci, A., & Sergi, I. (2006). The HEXACO model of personality structure and indigenous lexical personality dimensions in Italian, Dutch, and English. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(6), 851-875.

Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., Perugini, M., Szarota, P., de Vries, R. E., di Blas, L., Boies, K., & de Raad, B. (2004). A six-factor structure of personality-descriptive adjectives: solutions from psycholexical studies in seven languages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(2), 356-366.

Barrett, P. T., Petrides, K., Eysenck, S. B., & Eysenck, H. J. (1998). The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire: An examination of the factorial similarity of P, E, N, and L across 34 countries. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25(5), 805-819.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1-26.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1993). Autonomy as a moderator of the relationships between the Big Five personality dimensions and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1), 111-118.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1-2), 9-30.

Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., & Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 43-51.

Block, J. (1995). A contrarian view of the Five-Factor Approach to personality description. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(2), 187-215.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., & Comrey, A. L. (1992). Validation of the Comrey Personality Scales on an Italian sample. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 26(1), 21-31.

Eysenck, S. B., Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6(1), 21-29.

Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative" description of personality": the big-five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(6), 1216-1229.

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

Guion, R. M., & Gottier, R. F. (1965). Validity of personality measures in personnel selection. *Personnel Psychology*, 18(2), 135-164.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2007). *The Hogan Personality Inventory Manual*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.

Judge, T. A., & Zapata, C. P. (2015). The person-situation debate revisited: Effect of situation strength and trait activation on the validity of the Big Five personality traits in predicting job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(4), 1149-1179.

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39(2), 329-358.

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2006). Further assessment of the HEXACO Personality Inventory: two new facet scales and an observer report form. *Psychological Assessment*, 18(2), 182-191.

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2008). The HEXACO Personality Factors in the Indigenous Personality Lexicons of English and 11 Other Languages. *Journal of Personality*, 76(5), 1001-1053.

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2014). The Dark Triad, the Big Five, and the HEXACO model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 2-5.

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2018). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO-100. *Assessment*, 25(5), 543-556.

Lee, K., Ogunfowora, B., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Personality traits beyond the big five: Are they within the HEXACO space? *Journal of Personality*, 73(5), 1437-1463.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the Five-Factor Model of personality across instruments and observers. J*ournal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81-90.

Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Stewart, G. L. (1998). Five-Factor Model of personality and performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions. *Human Performance*, 11(2-3), 145-165.

Piedmont, R. L., & Aycock, W. (2007). An historical analysis of the lexical emergence of the Big Five personality adjective descriptors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(6), 1059-1068.

Rothmann, S., & Coetzer, E. P. (2003). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29(1), 68-74.

Rothstein, M. G., & Goffin, R. D. (2006). The use of personality measures in personnel selection: What does current research support? *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2), 155-180.

Salgado, J. F. (1997). The Five Factor Model of personality and job performance in the European community. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(1), 30-43.

Saltukoğlu, G., & Tatar, A. (2018). İş performansının öngörülmesinde kişilik ölçümünün rolü: Öğretmen örneği. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 15(1), 619-634.

Saucier, G. (2002). Gone too far-or not far enough? Comments on the article by Ashton and Lee (2001). *European Journal of Personality*, 16(1), 55-62.

Simms, L. J., Williams, T. F., & Nus, E. (2017). Assessment of the Five Factor Model. In T. A. Widiger (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of the Five Factor Model (pp. 353-380). New York: Oxford University Press.

Tatar, A. (2018). Gözden Geçirilmiş Uzun ve Kısa Form Altı Faktörlü Kişilik Envanteri (HEXACO-PI-R) Türkçe formunun psikometrik özelliklerinin incelenmesi. *Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 19(1), 5-13.

Wright, T. A. ve Cropanzano, R. (2000). Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 84-94.

Zhao, H., & Seibert, S. E. (2006). The Big Five personality dimensions and entrepreneurial status: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(2), 259-271.

Zuckerman, M., Kuhlman, D. M., Joireman, J., Teta, P., & Kraft, M. (1993). A comparison of three structural models for personality: The Big Three, the Big Five, and the Alternative Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(4), 757-768.