What makes an interesting job? Job characteristic preferences and personality amongst

undergraduates

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of Master of Psychology

(Organisational Psychology and Human Factors)

School of Psychology

University of Adelaide

October 2019

Word count: 11,745

Literature Review: 4,653

Research report: 7,092 (intended to submit to *Personality and Individual difference*, formatting

instructions attached at the end of the research report)

Literature Review

Modern businesses are increasingly globalised, and technology based. Striving for operational excellence and product quality can no longer provide businesses with sufficient advantage against their competitors. In order to generate an advantage, companies must own resources that are valuable to the organisation, hard to be imitated by competitors, rare in supply and transferrable to other areas of the organisation (Wright, McMahan & McWilliams, 1994). Human capital is one such resource. The basic principles behind human resource management (HRM) practices is to construct and maintain a pool of suitable talents that allows an organisation to differentiate itself from its competitors and gain an advantage (Breaugh, 2008). Base on this theoretical stance, companies can adjust recruitment practices to attract people with specific skills and potentials that advantage the organisation in the present and the future, this practice is called targeted recruitment.

By presenting a set of job and organisational characteristics that attracts talents with specific skills, needs and preferences, companies hope to achieve an improved fit between its employees and the organisation. Research in organisational psychology has long supported the theory of person-organisational fit (P-O fit) and the benefits it brings to performance and job satisfaction (Chapman et al., 2005). From a business perspective, recruiting talents that share company values allows them to perform in ways that aligns with organisational image and goals. A strong P-O fit had been shown to improve pre-employment attraction and job satisfaction, which are both predictors of job performance (Chapman et al., 2005).

To investigate the effects of job and organisation characteristics at the recruitment and selection stage, many studies have associated these with attraction and job choice. A meta-analysis by Uggersley and colleagues (2012) summarised results from 232 studies and reported that job and organisation characteristics (e.g. salary, benefits, promotion opportunities, challenges, company reputation, job security, relationship with co-

workers/supervisor) significantly predicted job attraction and job pursuit decision. Job and organisation characteristics were also significantly correlated with perceived fit with the job and company, which in turn predicted attraction to the job and company. Although no moderation or mediation analysis were conducted, these results suggested that applicants' perceived fit with an organisation is based on their evaluation of job and organisational characteristics being presented, which ultimately affects their attraction and decision to pursuit a career in that organisation. Therefore, understanding preferences for job and organisational characteristics allows tailoring of recruitment and selection strategy and better person and job outcomes.

Early studies of job characteristic preferences

Despite years of research interest, there is yet to be a consensus on which job characteristics recruiters should focus on when considering recruitment strategies. Jurgensen (1978) was the first to examine preferences for job characteristics in recruitment practice. His study focused on examining preference for job characteristics amongst 56,621 job applicants of a gas company between 1945 and 1975. Using a self-developed job preference form, job applicants were asked to rank the importance of ten job characteristics for themselves and for the general population. Job characteristics examined included: advancement opportunities, benefits, company reputation, relationship with co-workers, reasonable working hours, salary, job security, considerate and fair supervisor, type of work and working conditions (Jurgensen, 1978).

Jurgensen (1978) concluded that over the 30-year period, there was an increase in the importance of type of work, benefits and pay, and a decrease in preference for advancement and job security. In addition, when comparing rankings for self and for the general population, both men and women consistently predicted salary as more important for other people, and relationship with co-workers to be less important. It was proposed that this

discrepancy arose from the common perception that money is the primary motivator for work. There were also small differences in preference with respect to age and gender (Jurgensen, 1978). Compared to their older counterparts, men under the age of 20 attached more importance to relationship with co-workers and supervisor, working hours, salary, and working conditions, but they ranked advancement opportunities, benefits and job security lower. Rankings amongst women remain consistent across different age groups, with an emphasis on the type of work performed. In contrast, male generally placed attached higher importance on job security and company reputation compared to female.

Posner (1981) expanded upon Jurgensen's study and compared job characteristics preferences amongst students and company recruiters. It was found that undergraduate students placed higher significance on opportunities to learn and use abilities, as well as performing interesting work. However, students did not express preferences for type of work and pay. On the other hand, expectations of recruiters were found to be reflective of students' most important preferences, but they also expected students to place less significances on autonomy and job security. A misalignment between students' and recruiters' expectations can lead to misunderstandings in the job, therefore reducing job satisfaction and productivity (Posner, 1981). In support of Jurgensen's (1978) results, Harris and Fink (1987) reported that job applicants' perception of the job role, salary and benefits, work environment and company reputation were all important factors for consideration when applying for a job. More importantly, these job characteristics were all positively correlated with applicants' intention to accept job offers. In short, individual differences in job characteristic preferences influence attraction and job pursuit intentions.

However, more recent researchers have proposed that changes in the global business environment have been reflected as changes in the nature of work, leading to new job characteristic emerging (John, 2006). Some changes include a shift from manufacturing to

service-based industries, expansion of knowledge-based industries, technological advancements that promotes new ways of working and globalisation. As a result, modern job roles are more team-based, offer flexibility in working time and location, and have increased demands on transferable skills (e.g. communication, customer service, word-processing) and specialised knowledge (Wegman, Hoffman, Carter, Twenge and Guenole, 2018). According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (1991, 2016), the proportion of part-time employee have increased from 15% to 34.5% from 1991 to 2016. The largest industries have also shifted from manufacturing and agricultural to wholesale retail, community service and health care (Australia Bureau of Statistics, 1991; 2016). These continuing changes mean that no longer will an individual be attached to a particular role, field or location for an extended period of time due to working conditions and different types of jobs developing within and between organisations (Hernaus & Vokic, 2014).

To investigate and quantify changes in the business environment, Wegman and colleague (2018) conducted a cross-temporal meta-analysis to examine changes in job characteristics since 1975. Their results were in line with previous literature and suggested that workers perceived a greater level of variety in jobs and increased autonomy since 1975. There were also a greater level of interaction and interdependence between job roles and co-workers since 1985, reflecting the fact that modern job roles are more group-oriented and reliant on communication. Perceived changes in job characteristics were partially a function of gender and occupation; females working in more complex roles perceived a greater level of interdependence compared to their male counterparts. These changes suggest that new generations of workers may have preferences for job characteristic different from previous generations.

Job characteristics, preferences and personality

Research in job characteristic and preferences is often associated with job and person outcomes. However, there is a lack of research exploring the underpinnings of job characteristic preferences. Given that preferences and personality are theoretically associated, understanding the statistical relationship between the two variables will have implications not only for recruitment and selection, but also for training and development.

Integrating theories of personality and job characteristics, Barricks, Mount and Li (2013) argued that personality traits guide the formation of implicit work goals that vary across individuals. Under the assumption that work behaviours are purposeful in fulfilling these implicit goals, individuals are predisposed to express preferences for certain work characteristics that are consistent with their personality and associated goals. Self-verification theory and selective interaction hypothesis (Heider, 1958; Swann, 1983) provide support for this view and suggest that people confirm self-concepts through expressing preferences for, and selection of, certain life experiences, and therefore are motivated to seek out situations that provide self-verifying feedback. For example, individuals with higher personality scores on neuroticism or anxiety may actively seek consistency and predictability in their work environment, hence expressing a preference for high job security (Barricks, Mount and Li, 2013). There are also empirical studies supporting the link between personality and job characteristics preferences. Casper, Wayne and Manegold (2013) found that psychological characteristics (values and attitudes) are more predictive of job-pursuit intention than demographic characteristics (age, race, gender and education). This indicates that personal values are more predictive of job applicant's attraction to an organisation than demographic variables. This can be applied to the hypothetical relationship between personality and job characteristics as well, where individual differences in personality will also be predictive of job characteristics preference.

Judge and Zapata (2015) compared and integrated two theoretical perspectives in explaining the effect of personality on job performance. They proposed that situational strengths and trait activation theory provide a description of the optimal situation where personality will have the greatest influence on job outcomes. Situational strength refers to the degree to which situational constraints are present in the work context. Jobs with clear instructions provide little room for improvisation and therefore present greater situational constraints, in turn limiting the expression of personality traits through relevant work behaviour. On the other hand, personality traits can be activated when job context permits certain trait-consistent behaviour. For example, a sales role provides more opportunities for social interaction than a clerical role, and therefore permits more social behaviours that are related to high extraversion.

Situational strength and trait activation will interact and contribute to the relationship between personality and job performance, through presence of specific job characteristics. This interactionist model was confirmed through a systematic review of 125 studies (Judge and Zapata, 2015). As expected, the relationship between the big-five personality traits and job performance were stronger when the job situation is unstructured, allows for freedom to make decisions and involves a variety of activities. With respect to trait activation, trait-specific job requirements mediated the relationship between each of the big-five personality traits and job performance. Individuals who scored high on conscientiousness had better job performance in jobs requiring high self-efficacy and independence. Individuals who are highly extraverted, agreeable and emotionally stable performed better in jobs role that are service-oriented and require frequent use of social skills. Finally, those who scored high on the openness scale were more suited to job roles that emphasise innovation and creativity. In short, there is strong evidence suggesting that individuals will perform better if they select situations that are consistent with their personality traits.

From a practical perspective, linking personality and job characteristics provides a new perspective for understanding individual preferences and their influence on job attraction. Despite its demonstrated validity in predicting behaviours, attitudes and personal values, personality assessment has traditionally suffered from its weak correlation with job performance (Barrick, Mount & Li, 2013; Shorey, 2018). To improve the reliability and validity of personality assessments in attracting applicants to particular job contexts, personality will need to be related to tangible, job variables that are relevant to both job seekers and employers (Moyle & Hackston, 2018). Job characteristic preferences is one such variable, which has been related to job outcomes at various stages of the employment cycle. Although job choices are often influenced by practical constraints, such as salary and work location, personality can express its effects on job outcomes through influencing applicants' job choices. The next section of this review will present different types of job characteristics that have attracted the attention of research over the past decades, and their relationship with personality.

Job characteristics review

Task Characteristics

Job simplification as an approach to job design in early 1900s has been heavily criticised as monotonous and demotivating. In response to this, Hackman and Oldham (1980) developed the Job Characteristics Model (JCM) that emphasised the importance of creating meaning and significances in job roles, which can lead to increased motivation and satisfaction of employee's needs and expectations. According to the JCM, in order for employees to feel motivated, the following **task characteristics** must be present in a job: 1) *task significance*, employees must understand the ways in which their job brings benefit to the relevant population; 2) *task identity*, employees will need to know how their job fits into a larger part of a project or function; 3) *skill variety*, there are opportunities for employees to

use a variety of their skills and knowledge; 4) *feedback* is regularly provided to help employees understand their performance; and 5) employees must be given the *autonomy* to make work-related decisions (Hackman and Oldham, 1980). Hackman and Oldham (1980) argue that these characteristics enhance the meaningfulness and responsibility of employees' experience, thereby increasing their motivation to perform in a job role.

A meta-analysis conducted by Humphrey and colleagues (2007) replicated results from earlier studies and showed that elements of the JCM were positively and strongly correlated with job satisfaction, motivation and organisational commitment. Presence of all task characteristics were correlated significantly with high satisfaction with supervisor, co-workers, compensation, and promotion opportunities (Humphrey, Nahrgang, and Morgeson, 2007). Given the association between task characteristics and important job outcomes, job applicants may be more likely to pursue a job role in an organisation in which such characteristics are perceived to be present.

To investigate that relationship between personality and job characteristic preferences, recent research has examined the relationship between Big-Five personality and aspects of the JCM concluded that higher ratings on all JCM task characteristics were positively correlated with the big five factors; Conscientiousness, Openness and Extraversion (Rubenstein, Zhang, Ma, Morrison, & Jorgensen, 2019). Moreover, task characteristics were also found to mediate the relationship between two of the Big-Five traits (Openness and Conscientiousness) with job satisfaction. These results suggest that highly conscientious, open and extraverted individuals are more likely to perceive the presence of JCM task characteristics in their job. Moreover, those who are conscientious and open are more likely to feel satisfied about their job through the presence of these task characteristics.

In addition to characteristics identified within the JCM, opportunities for advancement and training are highly relevant to modern job roles. Narrative analysis by Winder and Jackson (2016) suggests that young workers between the age of 18 to 29 attach high significances to career advancements and opportunities for training. Advancements and training opportunities also contributed to perceived attractiveness of an organisation and job pursuit intentions (Winder and Jackson, 2016). Interestingly, there is inconsistent evidence showing a gender difference in such preference but male employees generally express higher emphasis on advancement while female employees are more receptive to receiving training (Winder and Jackson, 2016).

Social Characteristics

While the JCM focused on the characteristics of tasks within a job, an alternative job characteristics category was introduced through the classic Hawthorne study in organisational behaviour. The Hawthorne effect, derived from the name of the study, represents the influence that working in the presence of other people will have on performance, regardless of environmental conditions and task characteristics (Carnevale and Rios, 1995). The original study was conducted in a manufacturing environment and even though the effect was poorly replicated, it proliferated research on the social characteristics of the workplace (Chant, 1993). Social characteristics commonly investigated are relationships with colleagues and supervisor, support from inside and outside the work context, interdependence of job tasks, and the amount of interaction with external stakeholders.

There is considerable research documenting the positive effects of working in a socially rich and satisfying context. Opportunities for developing positive workplace relationships with colleagues and superiors has been frequently associated with an increase in perceived emotional and work support, which in turn boosts job satisfaction (Grant, Fried and Juillerat, 2011). Those who reported having a positive relationship in the workplace were also

found to be less susceptible to poor psychological and physical well-being. Winter and Jackson (2016) suggest that individual's need for efficiency may underlie a preference for forming workplace relationships and working in groups for young workers. In comparison to task characteristics, Humphrey et al. (2007) concluded that presences of social characteristics accounts for more variance in turnover intentions, satisfaction with supervisor and colleagues, organisation commitment and job involvement. Therefore, perceived social characteristics of the workplace are likely to make a significant contribution to a job applicant's attraction for and intention to pursuit a job.

Preference for social characteristics is also associated with personality traits. Vandenberghe, St-Onge and Robineau (2008) found that highly extraverted and agreeable individuals expressed high preference for positive relationships with supervisors and colleagues in the workplace. Similarly, Extraversion and Agreeableness were also found to be positively correlated with preference for teamwork, collaboration and development of workplace relationships (Berings, Fruyt, Bouwen, 2004). Similarly, a meta-analysis by Rubenstein and colleagues (2019) demonstrated that preference for social characteristics in the workplace had a significant correlation with Agreeableness (.29), but there were only weak correlations with Extraversion (.19) and Neuroticism (-.20).

Organisational characteristics.

Although the term "organisational reputation" is often used in the literature as a measure of organisational characteristic, there is little consensus in the definition and measurement of reputation. Jurgensen (1978) defined good reputation as being proud of being associated with the company. An alternative approach adopted by the human resources literature is to define reputation in terms of corporate social responsibilities (CSR). CSR refers to any discretionary action toward improving social welfare that serves as a means of enhancing relationships with key stakeholders (e.g. customers, employees, general

community). Through implementing and promoting relevant policies, organisations can appeal to various stakeholders. For example, work-diversity policies are directed at raising awareness of an organisation's anti-discriminatory actions, while a policy of flexible working hours is intended to appeal to individuals with family responsibilities.

Companies with a positive reputation, however that is defined, are often associated with other positive characteristics as a potential employer. Based on reputation, job applicants can make judgements about their fit with the company and the likelihood that their work related needs can be satisfied (Breaugh, 2008; Dogl and Holtbrugge, 2014). Vercic & Coric (2018) suggested that as the most valuable but intangible asset of an organisation, reputation is associated with reduced uncertainty about future organisational performance and contributes to public confidence and loyalty to the brand. In addition, reputation has a positive correlation with higher familiarity, suggesting more information will be available to job applicants to evaluate the organisation as a prospective employer. Social identity theory suggests that people self-identify with social groups that will enhance their personal identity (Rynes and Cable, 2003) and that people are more likely to join groups or organisations which they believe to have an image congruent to their identity. In support of this theory, research has concluded that job applicant's perceived image of an organisation is related to job attraction and pursuit intention (Chapman et al, 2005).

Kausel and Slaughter (2011) measured job applicants' perception of a company's reputation and its effects on job attraction, as moderated by the facets of the "big five". It was found that individuals who are low on trust (a facet of the Agreeableness trait) and imagination (a facet of the Openness trait) are more attracted to organisations which they perceive as more trustworthy and innovative respectively. Similarly, those who score high on assertiveness (a facet of the Extraversion trait) were more attracted to organisations that are

less popular and active, presumably an optimal environment for highly assertive individuals to exert control.

An organisation's reputation as a determinant of job pursuit intentions is also based on perceptions of its policies. Individuals who endorse family, diversity and work values were found to be attracted to in companies that promotes human resource policies consistent with those values (Casper, Wayne & Manegold, 2013). These relationships were also found to be stronger than those predicted by gender, marital status and ethnicity. Despite a small sample size and weak effect sizes, Casper and colleagues (2013) provided some evidence that personal values are related to attraction to company policies and reputation.

Location of the organisation also appeared to be an important consideration for job seekers. With globalisation and convenience in communication technology, modern job roles frequently cross geographical boundaries and employees are often required to travel to different locations for work. With cities and urban areas expanding, the volume of transportation is also proportionally larger, which makes travel time to work an important consideration. However, there is currently no theory or research linking personality and preferences for work location. It is possible that work location consideration is non-compensatory, meaning job applicants will only further evaluate other job characteristics if the role is available in a practically feasible location.

Employment conditions

Although salary and benefits are basic features of employment, their inclusion in job characteristic research has been inconsistent. This is mainly due to a shift in focus to research on non-monetary motivators in the modern workplace. There is evidence to suggest that task and social characteristics are stronger predictors of attraction and job pursuit intentions when compared with monetary variables (Chapman et al, 2005). However, some researchers have

argued that salary and benefits are still fundamental conditions of employment and will have a unique impact of job applicants' attraction and job choice decision (Grant, Fried & Juillerat, 2011).

With respect to the influence of monetary benefits on job choices, Osborn (1990) makes a distinction between non-compensatory and compensatory approach to evaluating job characteristics. He theorised that with the non-compensatory approach, certain criteria must be met before job applicants would consider pursuing a job role. On the other hand, the compensatory approach suggests that different job characteristics can compensate for one another when considering the suitability of a job role. Based on their results, Chapman and colleagues (2005) suggested that both approaches may be used depending on what job characteristics are being considered. Their meta-analysis showed that salary and benefits both weakly correlated with job pursuit intentions but not with job attraction. This suggests that momentary factors may be more relevant at the earlier stages of recruitment, where applicants may decide to further research the job role based on the salary and benefits offered. Once the job applicant is satisfied with the paid and benefits, they will then consider other characteristics of the job role.

To further investigate preferences for salary and benefits, Vandenberghe, St-Onge and Robineau (2008) showed that individuals high on Extraversion and Openness expressed a preference for performance-based bonuses and high salary, while those who were more Conscientiousness and Agreeable preferred other forms of benefits (e.g. employee insurance schemes, pension plans and paid time off). However, all effect sizes were weak and only openness remained a significant predictor once the effects of age and gender were controlled. There was also no apparent explanation for these results and given that there are no further studies were conducted, their work on individual differences in preference for salary and benefits remain inconclusive.

Other relevant employment conditions that are often considered by job seekers are employment tenure and working hours. Preferences for more stable tenures and flexible working hours are usually associated with family commitments and marital status. Individuals with higher a number of dependents and household labour expressed increased preference for short, flexible work hours and part-time or causal roles (Konrad, 2003). This effect was found to be more significant in women than men. In a separate study, it was found that increased family responsibilities negatively predicted weekly working hours and engagement in full-time work (Corrigall and Konrad, 2006). Taken together, family responsibilities predict both preferences for and actual working hours.

Physical characteristics

In Jurgensen's study (1978), working conditions include characteristics related to the comfortableness of the working environment. These characteristics include temperature, odour, noise and cleanliness of the workspace. Research interest in the effects of working conditions on productivity and satisfaction has diminished due to a shift in focus to social and task characteristics of jobs. However, there is a recent resurgence in the topic's popularity due to its relationship with physical well-being and productivity. In addition to conditions of the working environment, human factor researchers have suggested that spaciousness and design of workspace also have an impact on well-being and productivity. According to the person-environment relations model (Carnevale & Rios, 1995), the quality of the workplace is evaluated based on the objective features of the environment. Environmental features may satisfy the user's needs directly by assisting completion of a task, or indirectly by providing an environment which is comfortable and suitable for the type of work.

Carnevale and Rios (1995) examined this proposition by analysing relationships between objective work conditions (such as lighting, temperature), perceived quality of the working environment and job satisfaction. Their results indicated that work conditions were

moderately correlated with quality ratings of the environment and job satisfaction. Workspaces with perceived level of optimal lightings, temperature, air quality and spaciousness were rated as a high-quality environment (Carnevale & Rios, 1995). More recently, Kim and Young (2014) investigated a similar set of working conditions (density, darkness, indoor environment and ergonomics) and their relationship with turnover intentions and physical well-being. Expanding upon earlier research, Kim and Young (2014) suggest that perceived comfortable and well-designed workspaces allow for a balance between social interaction and independent work. Open office layout with shared spaces creates more opportunities for social interaction and communication, whereas closed or partitioned office spaces can minimise distractions and stimulations. Their results suggest that working in an environment that is crowded and dark reduces perceived productivity and increases employee's perceived health problems and turnover intentions. In contrast, they found that air quality, temperature, noise level and ergonomically designed furniture enhance productivity and mitigate negative job outcomes. More importantly, they found that office characteristics significantly contributed to employees' perceived health problems after controlling for demographics and job satisfaction.

In terms of office design, open offices have been a popular trend in many businesses and industries, due to the assumed benefits that they bring. While typical office spaces have walls and partitions, open-office design adopts a space-sharing design with minimal walls that are assumed to facilitate communication and interaction between employees. This design also provides flexible work arrangements to accommodate for the increasing number of part-time and causal employees. From a cost-saving perspective, a greater number of employees can work together in a reduced amount of space, with minimal effort required in maintenance and building costs. However, it has been argued that the downside of this design outweighs its benefits. For example, there is evidence to suggest that open-offices are perceived to be

noisy and crowded, leading to employees experiencing loss of privacy and productivity (Clearwater, 1979; Hundert & Greenfield, 1969). A survey on workspace satisfaction analysed responses from 42,764 employees from 303 different offices (66.9% were open-offices) and supported the claims made above (Kim & Dear, 2013). Although open-offices were rated high on air quality, lightings, cleanliness and ease of interaction, they also received negative ratings in terms of noise level, privacy and amount of space. With respect to individual differences in preference for open office, a study by Maher and Hippel (2005) showed that people with lower levels of concentration and inhibitory abilities reported lower job satisfaction in open offices, especially when they were asked to perform a more complex task. However, there are no study in the current literature to suggest a relationship between personality and preferences for open or private office designs.

Summary

In summary, research have focused on investigating the effects of job characteristic and job outcomes but there are comparatively less that focused on preference for these characteristic and recruitment outcomes. Although there is some research to support the relationship between Big-Five personality traits and job characteristic preferences, the nature of this relationship remains inconclusive due to variations in methodologies. To address this gap, future research should focus on exploring the underpinnings of job characteristic preferences. This will bring better understanding towards job applicants' job choice and in turn inform best practices in recruitment.

Table of Content

List of Tables

Abstract

Understanding job applicants' preferences towards job characteristics can help companies focus on promoting and developing the important aspects of workplace, which in turn is linked to better job satisfaction and productivity. By advertising specific job and organisational characteristics, companies aim to recruit applicants who are attracted to such characteristics, hence achieving a fit between its employees and the organisation. Currently, there is a lack of research investigating the underpinnings of JCPs. The current study aims to explore JCPs amongst undergraduate students and clarify the relationship between personality factors and JCPs. 109 Psychology undergraduate students were asked to rate the importance of 23 job characteristics and completed a personality trait and facet measure. The results showed that students rated employment conditions (salary, benefits, tenure and working hours) as more important to other than to themselves. There were also differences in perception with regards to the importance of task, social and organisational characteristics. It was also found that Extraversion, Openness and Conscientiousness were significant predictors of JCPs, and personality facets accounted for more variance in JCP than Big-Five personality traits. These findings have implications for company recruiters and human resource practitioner in areas of recruitment, selection and development, and provide insight into the use of personality assessment in these areas.

Keywords: Job characteristic preferences, Big-Five personality, job design, human resource, recruitment

Declaration

This report contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any University, and, to the best of my knowledge, this report contains no materials previously published except where due reference is made.

I give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the School to restrict access for a period of time

██████

October, 2019

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Dr Neil Kirby for providing guidance and feedback on this thesis.

Introduction

Basic principles of human resource management (HRM) support that attracting talents with specific skills and demographics through targeted recruitment can boast competitive advantage for organisations. By advertising specific job characteristics, companies aim to recruit applicants who are attracted to such characteristics, hence achieving a fit between its employees and the organisation (Sekiguchi & Huber, 2011). By presenting a set of job and organisational characteristics that attracts talents with specific skills, needs and preferences, companies hope to achieve an improved fit between its employees and the organisation. Research in organisational psychology has long supported the theory of person-organisational fit (P-O fit) and person-job fit (P-J fit) as well as the benefits these bring to performance and job satisfaction (Lin, Yu & Yi, 2014; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). From a business perspective, recruiting talents that share company values allows them to perform in ways that aligns with organisational image and goals.

A meta-analysis by Uggersley and colleagues (2012) summarised results from 232 studies and reported that job characteristics (e.g. salary, benefits, promotion opportunities, challenges, company reputation, job security, relationship with co-workers/supervisor) significantly predicted job attraction and job pursuit decision. These results suggested that applicants' perceived fit with an organisation is based on their preference for, and evaluation of relevant job characteristics, which affects job applicant's attraction and decision to pursuit a career in that organisation. Therefore, understanding preferences for job characteristics, also called job characteristic preferences (JCPs) allows recruitment and selection strategy to be tailored and potentially improves person and job outcomes.

1.1.   Early research in job characteristic preferences

Jurgensen (1978) was the first to examine preferences for job characteristics in recruitment practice. His study focused on examining JCPs amongst 56,621 job applicants of

the Minnesota Gas Company between 1945 and 1975. Using a self-developed job preference form, job applicants were asked to rank the importance of ten job characteristics for themselves and for the general population. Job characteristics examined included: advancement opportunities, benefits, company reputation, relationship with co-workers, reasonable working hours, salary, job security, consider and fair supervisor, type of work and working conditions (Jurgensen, 1978).

Jurgensen (1978) concluded that over the 30-year period, there was a small increase in the importance of type of work, benefits and pay, and a decrease in preference for advancement and job security. There were also small differences in preference with respect to age and gender (Jurgensen, 1978). Compared to their older counterparts, men under the age of 20 attached more importance to relationship with co-workers and supervisor, working hours, salary, and working conditions, but they ranked advancement opportunities, benefits and job security lower. Rankings amongst women remain consistent across different age groups, with an emphasis on the type of work performed. In contrast, men attached higher importance to job security and company reputation compared to women. When comparing rankings for self and for the general population, both men and women consistently predicted salary as more important for other people, and relationship with co-workers to be less important. Jurgensen (1978) proposed that a misconception of money being the primary motivator for work underlie this perception that above average salary is an important job characteristic for others but not for oneself. As a result, company recruiters tend to focus on offering attractive renumeration packages to attract and retain talents. However, this will not always match job applicants' expectations and needs as there are other job characteristics to be considered.

Posner (1981) expanded upon Jurgensen's study and compared JCPs amongst students and company recruiters. It was found that undergraduate students placed higher

significance on opportunities to learn and use abilities, as well as performing interesting work. However, students did not express preferences for type of work and pay. On the other hand, recruiters' expectations were found to be reflective of students' most important preferences, but they also expected students to place lower significances on autonomy and job security. A misalignment between students' and recruiters' expectations can lead to misunderstandings in the job, therefore reducing job satisfaction and productivity (Posner, 1981). Furthermore, Harris and Fink (1987) reported that job applicants' perception of the job role, salary and benefits, work environment and company reputation were all important factors for consideration when applying for a job. Taken together, individual differences in JCPs influence attraction and job pursuit intentions and therefore can be applied to recruitment and selection practices (Breaugh, 2008; Sekiguchi & Huber, 2011). However, but there is limited understanding of the nature of the individual differences of JCPs and its correlation with other predictors. In order to address this gap, the current study aims to explore preferences for job characteristics in modern job context and investigating the relationship between JCPs and personality. The theoretical link between personality and JCPs will be outlined in the next section.

1.2.   Job characteristic preferences and personality

Integrating theories of personality and job characteristics, Barricks, Mount and Li (2013) argued personality traits guide the formation of implicit goals which vary across individuals. Under the assumption that work behaviour are purposeful in fulfilling these implicit goals, individuals are predisposed to express preferences for certain job characteristics that are consistent with his/her personality and associated goals. Self-verification theory and selective interaction hypothesis (Heider, 1958; Swann, 1983) provided support for this view and suggested that people confirm self-concepts through expressing preferences for, and selection of life experiences, and therefore are motivated to

seek out situations that provide self-verifying feedback. For example, individuals with higher scores on Neuroticism may actively seek consistency and predictability in their work environment, hence expressing a preference for high job security (Barricks, Mount and Li, 2013). Research on different categories of job characteristics and their relationship with personality will be summarised in the following section.

1.2.1. Task characteristics.

Approach to job simplification in early 1800s were criticised as monotonous and demotivating, since it neglected employees' expectations and needs. In contrast, Hackman and Oldham (1980) have developed a Job Characteristics Model (JCM) that emphasised the importance of creating meaning and significances in job roles, resulting in higher employee motivation. The JCM proposed that for jobs to be meaningful and significant, there must be task significance, task identity, skill variety, feedback and autonomy. A meta-analysis conducted by Humphrey and colleagues (2007) replicated results from earlier studies and showed that the JCM were positively and strongly correlated with job satisfaction, motivation and organisational commitment. More specifically, presences of all task characteristics were significantly correlated with high satisfaction with supervisor, co-workers, compensation, and promotion opportunities (Humphrey, Nahrgang, and Morgeson, 2007).

A recent meta-analysis by Rubenstein and colleague (2019) examined the relationship between Big-Five personality and perceived presence of JCM task characteristic in workplace. It was concluded that perceived presence of task characteristics was positively correlated with Conscientiousness, Openness and Extraversion (Rubenstein, Zhang, Ma, Morrison, and Jorgensen, 2019). Moreover, perceived task characteristics were also found to mediate the relationship between two of the Big-Five traits (Openness and Conscientiousness) with job satisfaction. This suggests that highly Conscientious, Opened and Extraverted individuals are more likely to perceive a presence of task characteristics in

their job. Moreover, those who are Conscientious and Opened are more likely to feel satisfied about their job through the presence of task characteristics. However, there is no research in linking personality and preference for task characteristics.

1.2.2. Social characteristics.

There is considerable research documenting the positive effects of working in a socially rich and satisfying context. Opportunities for developing positive workplace relationship with colleagues and superior had been frequently associated with an increase in perceived emotional and work support, which in turn boost job satisfaction (Grant, Fried and Juillerat, 2011). Those who reported having a positive relationship with colleagues and superior were also found to be less suspectable to poor psychological and physical well-being (Grant, Fried, and Juillerat, 2011). For young workers, a need for efficiency may underlie their preferences for forming workplace relationships and working in groups, but no studies have examined this yet (Winter and Jackson, 2016). In comparison to task characteristics, Humphrey et al. (2007) concluded that presence of social characteristics in a workplace account for more variances in turnover intention, satisfaction with supervisor and colleagues, organisation commitment and job involvement. Therefore, social characteristics are likely to have a unique contribution to job applicant's attraction and job pursuit attention.

Preference for social characteristics had been associated with personality traits in several studies. Vandenberghe, St-Onge and Robineau (2008) found that highly extraverted and agreeable individuals expressed high preference for positive relationship with supervisors and colleagues at workplace. Given that extroverted people are more socially outgoing and friendly in general, while agreeable individuals are likely to be group-oriented and conflict-avoidant, hence explaining these results. Similarly, Extraversion and Agreeableness were also found to be positively correlated with preference for teamwork, collaboration and development of workplace relationship (Berings, Fruyt, Bouwen, 2004). Meta-analysis by

Rubenstein and colleagues (2019) report similar results where preference for social characteristics at workplace had a moderate correlation with Agreeableness (.29) and weak correlation with Extraversion (.19) and Neuroticism (-.20).

1.2.3. Organisational characteristics.

Although the term "organisational reputation" is often used in the literature as a measure of organisational characteristic, there is little consensus in the definition and measurement of reputation. Jurgensen (1978) defined good reputation as being proud of being associated with the company. An alternative approach is to define reputation in terms of corporate social responsibilities (CSR). CSR refers to any discretionary action toward improving social welfare that serves as a means of enhancing relationships with key stakeholders (e.g. customers, employees, general community). Through implementing and promoting relevant policies, organisations can appeal to various stakeholders. For example, work-diversity policies are directed at raising awareness of an organisation's anti-discriminatory actions, while a policy of flexible working hours is intended to appeal to individuals with family responsibilities. Companies with a positive reputation, measured as high CSR, are often associated with other positive characteristics as a potential employer. Therefore, by evaluating companies based on the policies implemented, job applicants can make a judgement about their fit with the company and the likelihood that their work-related needs can be satisfied (Dogl and Holtbrugge, 2014).

Kausel and Slaughter (2011) measured job applicant's perception of a company's reputation and its effects on job attraction, as moderated by personality facets. It was found that individuals who are low on trust (a facet of the Agreeableness trait) and imagination (a facet of the Openness trait) are more attracted to organisations which they perceived as more trustworthy and innovative respectively. Similarly, those who score high on assertiveness (a

6

facet of the Extraversion trait) were more attracted to organisations that are less popular and active, presumably an optimal environment for highly assertive individuals to exert control.

Location of the organisation also appeared to be an important consideration for job seekers. Globalisation and advance in communication technology enabled jobs to cross geographical boundaries and employees are often required to travel to national or international location for work. With cities and urban areas expanding, the volume of transportation is also proportionally larger, which makes travel time to work an important consideration. However, there are current no research in linking personality and preferences for work location.

1.2.4. Employment conditions.

Salary and benefits are basic features of employment, but some argues that task and social characteristics are stronger predictors of job attraction and job pursuit intention when compared with monetary variables (Chapman et al, 2005). With respect to the influence of monetary benefits on job choices, Osborn (1990) had make a distinction between non-compensatory and compensatory approach to evaluating job characteristics. He theorised that with the non-compensatory approach, certain criteria must be met before job applicants would consider pursuing a job role. On the other hand, compensatory approach suggests that different job characteristics can compensate for one another when considering the suitability of a job role. Based on their results, Chapman and colleagues (2005) suggested that both approaches may be used depending on which job characteristics are being considered. Their meta-analysis showed that salary and benefits both weakly correlated with job pursuit intention but not to job attraction. This suggests that momentary factors may be more relevant at the earlier stages of recruitment, where only when job applicants are satisfied with the renumeration, then they will consider other job characteristics.

To further investigate preferences for salary and benefits, Vandenberghe, St-Onge and Robineau (2008) showed that Extraverted and Opened individuals expressed a preference for performance-based bonuses and high salary, while those who were more Conscientiousness and Agreeable preferred other forms of benefits (e.g. employee insurance schemes, pension plans and paid time off). However, all effect sizes were weak and only Openness remained a significant predictor once the effects of age and gender were controlled. Given that there was no apparent explanation for these results and no further studies conducted, relationships between personality and preference for salary and benefits remain inconclusive.

Other relevant employment conditions that are often considered by job seekers are employment tenues and working hours. Preferences for stable tenues and flexible working hours are commonly associated with family commitments and marital status, but not with personality traits. Individuals with higher number of independent and household labour expressed increased preference for short, flexible work hours and part-time or causal roles (Konrad, 2003). This effect was found to be more significant in women than men. In a separate study, it was found that increased family responsibilities negatively predicted weekly working hours and engagement in full-time work (Corrigall and Konrad, 2006). Yet, relationship between personality and preferences for tenue and working hours are not explored in the literature.

1.2.5. Physical characteristics.

Physical characteristics relate to the conditions of the working environment, including lighting, temperature, odour, noise and cleanliness of workspace. Human factor researchers also suggested that spaciousness and design of workspace also have an impact on well-being and productivity (Kim & Dear, 2013). According to the person-environment relations model, people evaluate the quality of workplace based on the objective features of the environment (Carnevale & Rios, 1995). Environmental features may satisfy the user's needs directly by

assisting completion of a task, or indirectly by providing an environment which is comfortable and suitable for the type of work (Oldham & Rotchford, 1983).

Carnevale and Rios (1995) examined this proposition by analysing relationships between objective work conditions (such as lighting, temperature), perceived quality of the working environment and job satisfaction. Their results indicated that work conditions were moderately correlated with quality ratings of the environment and job satisfaction. Workspaces with perceived level of optimal lightings, temperature, air quality and spaciousness were rated as a high-quality environment (Carnevale & Rios, 1995). More recently, Kim and Young (2014) investigated a similar set of working conditions (density, darkness, indoor environment and ergonomics) and their relationship with turnover intentions and physical well-being. Expanding upon earlier research, Kim and Young (2014) suggested that perceived comfortable and well-designed workspaces allow for a balance between social interaction and productivity. Open office layout with shared spaces creates more opportunities for social interaction and communication, whereas closed or partitioned office spaces can minimise distractions and stimulations. Hence, several researchers (Oldham & Brass, 1979; Oldham & Fried, 1987; Vischer, 2008) suggested that preference for physical characteristics and office design are related to individual cognitive ability and preferred work style. However, no research has related personality with preference for physical characteristic of the workplace.

1.3.   The Present Study

Reviewing of literature on JCP revealed that there is a need to investigate preferences in modern job context. As suggested by Jurgenson's study (1978), there are differences in JCPs for oneself and others. Hence the first aim of the present study is to explore JCP for self and others amongst undergraduate students. With regards to personality and JCPs, there is evidence to suggest preferences for social characteristics are related to positively to

Extraversion and Agreeableness, and negatively to Neuroticism. However, no previous study has explored the relationship between personality and preference for task characteristics, organisational, employment conditions and physical characteristics, hence no hypothesis were proposed related to these job characteristics. Furthermore, the application of JCPs research is limited without understanding the personality underpinnings of JCPs. To address these gaps, this study aims to explore JCPs amongst undergraduate students and clarify the relationship between Big-Five personality (trait and facets) and JCPs. Aims and hypothesis are listed below.

Aim 1: Explore job characteristic preferences for self and others amongst undergraduates

> **Hypothesis 1**: Preferences for above average salary will be rated as higher for others than for self, regardless of gender.

Aim 2: Explore and clarify the relationship between Big-Five personality (trait and facets) and job characteristic preferences

> **Hypothesis 2a:** Social characteristics will be positively and significantly related to Extraversion and Agreeableness.

> **Hypothesis 2b:** Social characteristics will be negatively and significantly related to Neuroticism.

Method

2.1.   Participants

Student participants were recruited from the Bachelor of Psychological Science and Honours Degree of Bachelor of Psychology (Advanced) at the University of Adelaide. Recruitment posters (appendix G) were posted around study areas at the North Terrace campus and online on a Facebook group for University of Adelaide Psychology students. The poster was also posted online through the Research Participation System (RPS) of the University of Adelaide to recruit Year 1 students enrolled in *Psychology 1A* and *Psychology 1B* course. Students participated through the RPS will be awarded 0.5 course credit (equivalent to 5% of their overall grade) upon completion of the survey. The poster provided background information on the study and a link for students to access the survey on surveymonkey.com. All participants were informed that participation was voluntary, that they could withdraw from the study at any time, and all information they provided were confidential. As an incentive to participate, a brief personality profile was offered to all participants who wished to receive it.

2.2.   Materials and Measures

2.2.1.   Demographic characteristics.

For statistical control purposes, participants were asked to indicate their age, gender, year level, marital status and the number of jobs they previously had. Year 1 psychology students participating through the RPS were also asked to provide their RPS identification number. No other personal information was collected.

2.2.2.   Job Characteristic Preferences (JCPs).

Based on the list by Jurgenson (1978), further research was conducted to identify job characteristics that closely represents modern job climates. JCPs items were sourced from

studies reviewed in section 1.2.1 to 1.2.5. Items were presented in five categories according

to their thematic similarities. The categories are 1) task characteristics, 2) social

characteristics, 3) organisational characteristics, 4) employment conditions and 5) physical

characteristics. Participants were asked to rate the importance of each item related to

themselves and others on a seven-point scale, ranging from not important at all (1) to

extremely important (7). See table 1 for a summary list of JCPs items. All job characteristic

will be referred to using their abbreviation for the remaining of this report.

Table 1.

Summary list of job characteristic preference items

Category	Item		Abbreviation
	1.	Performing intellectually challenging and interesting work (e.g. require you to solve complex problems)	Interest
	2.	Opportunities for promotion/advancement	Promotion
Task characteristics	3.	Opportunities to use a number of different abilities and skills	Ability
	4.	Opportunities for training and development	Training
	5.	Opportunities to perform a wide variety of activities	Variety
	6.	Have autonomy in making work-related decisions	Autonomy
	7.	Co-workers/colleagues are competent and sociable	Colleague
Social characteristics	8.	Have a positive relationship with superior and managers	Manager
	9.	Have frequent interaction with external stakeholders (e.g. clients and suppliers)	Interact
	10.	The company/organisation promotes workforce diversity policies	Diversity
	11.	The company/organisation promotes work-life balance policies	WL balance
	12.	The company/organisation promotes workplace safety policies	Safety
Organisational characteristics	13.	The company/organisation promotes anti-bullying and discrimination policies	Bully
	14.	The company/organisation promotes environment protection and waste reduction policies	Environment
	15.	The company/organisation is in a desirable geographic location (e.g. close to home, family or friends)	Location
	16.	Above average starting salary	Salary
Employment conditions	17.	Fringe benefits (e.g. paid time off, health and life insurance, housing allowance, entertainment allowance, retirement plan contributions)	Benefit

	18. Secure employment tenure (prefer long-term contracts over temporary, short-term contracts)	Tenure
	19. Flexible working hours	Hour
	20. Comfortable working conditions (e.g. lights, noise level, temperature, air quality, cleanliness)	Condition
Physical characteristics	21. Ergonomically designed workspace (e.g. adjustable chairs and tables, sufficient distance from computer screen)	Ergonomics
	22. Open office with sharing workspace	Open
	23. Have a private workspace/office	Private

Task characteristics.

Expanding upon Jurgensen's study, task characteristics identified in the Job

Characteristics Model (JCM) by Hackman and Oldham (1980) were included. However, the

JCM inventory is designed to assess employee's perception of job characteristics in their

current work role, rather than preference for job characteristics. Hence items measuring the

relevant job characteristics were adopted from previous studies, which provides an overall

measure of preferences for performing interesting and meaningful work, as well as excising

autonomy at work. Preferences for promotions and training were also suggested to be

relevant (Carless & Imber, 2007; Humphrey, Nahrgang and Morgeson, 2007) and were also

included.

Social characteristics.

A review of literature supports that preference for three social characteristics were

frequently assessed. These are preference in having competent and sociable colleagues

(Carless & Imber, 2007), having positive relationship with superior/managers (Vandenberghe

et al., 2008), and having frequent social interactions with external stakeholders (Morgeson &

Humphrey, 2006). Emotional and social support from outside of work were not included

since it is more relevant to characteristic of current job role rather than preferences.

Organisational characteristics.

Instead of using one general item to measure preference for working in a company

with high reputation, items measuring corporate social responsibilities (CSR) were used for

this category. Specifically, items measured participant's preference to five different organisation policies which has been showed to be a quantifiable representation of a company's reputation and image (Dahlsrud, 2008). Preference for location of the organisation is also included as it is identified to be relevant in the modern work context.

Employment conditions.

All items from Jurgensen's (1978) study were retained but reworded to better reflect more recent research by Vandenberghe and colleagues (2008). New items assessed participant's preferences for above average salary, fringe benefits, secure employment tenure and flexible working hours.

Physical characteristic.

In addition to assessing preferences for comfortable working conditions, ergonomically designed workspace was found to be relevant to modern workplace and hence was included in the category. Also, preferences for open workspace or private office were also included.

Table 2.

Big-Five Personality trait and facets (Costa & McCrae, 1992)

Trait	Facet	
Openness	O1: Imagination O2: Artistic Interests O3: Emotionality	O4: Adventurousness O5: Intellect O6: Liberalism
Conscientiousness	C1: Self-efficacy C2: Orderliness C3: Dutifulness	C4: Achievement-striving C5: Self-discipline C6: Cautiousness
Extraversion	E1: Friendliness E2: Gregariousness E3: Assertiveness	E4: Activity level E5: Excitement-seeking E6: Cheerfulness
Agreeableness	A1: Trust A2: Morality A3: Altruism	A4: Cooperation A5: Modesty A6: Sympathy

Neuroticism	N1: Anxiety	N4: Self-consciousness
	N2: Anger	N5: Immoderation
	N3: Depression	N6: Vulnerability

2.2.3. Personality.

The International Personality Item Pool NEO-120 (IPIP-NEO-120; Johnson, 2014) was used to measure Big-Five Personality and the underlying 30 narrower facets (see table 2). This inventory is a validated substitute for the NEO Personality Inventory Revised (NEO PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1992). The IPIP-NEO-120 consists of 120 items, with four items for each of the 30 facets of the FFM, and 24 items for each factor. Each item is a statement describing people's behaviour and participates were asked to rate the extent to which each statement describes them on five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree).

2.3.   Procedure

The study was conducted through the online survey website Survey Monkey. Information about the study and consent were presented in the first section of the online survey. After informed consent was obtained, the questionnaires were administered (demographic questions, JCPs and IPIP-NEO). The survey was available online for 11 weeks, from 27th May 2019 to 5th August 2019. Questions were administered in short-segments to motivate participant's retention, and the estimated completion time was 20 minutes. No personal information was collected during the study. Participants were offered a choice to provide their email address if they would like to receive a brief account of their personality profile. This study was approved by the Human Research Ethics Subcommittee of the School of Psychology at the University of Adelaide (Code Number: 19/62)

Results

3.1. Data screening

Data were analysed using the statistical package R (v1.1.453) with R Studio for Mac (R Core Team, 2019). Prior to data analysis, all participant responses were deidentified and screened for missing answers and integrity. A total of 113 respondents participated in the study; however, four participants were removed due to either incomplete or ingenuine responses (selecting all the same responses). Therefore, 109 responses were included in the data analysis phase. A priori power analysis was conducted using G*Power 3.1.92. The results indicated that a sample size of $N = 97$ was necessary to achieve a power level of 0.80 when adopting a significance criterion of $\alpha = 0.05$, measuring small effect sizes (minimum $r = 0.25$). Therefore, the study had sufficient statistical power for the primary analysis.

3.2. Participant demographics

As shown in table 3, the sample is heavily skewed in age, gender, year level and relationship status. Majority of the participants were between 18 to 24 years old, female, year 1 psychology student and single (never married). Hence, only previous number of jobs were used as grouping variable when comparing job characteristic preferences (JCPs). Goodness of fit test returned insignificant ($\chi^2 = 7.65$, $p = 0.11$), suggesting that the number of previous jobs reported by participant were evenly distributed across the five categories. Therefore, ANOVA on all JCPs using number of jobs as grouping variable were conducted. Results of one-way ANOVA revealed no significant differences in preference between each group, suggesting pervious job experience have no impact on JCPs in the current sample. Regardless of the number of jobs participant had previously, they express no differences in their JCPs.

Table 3.

Participant demographics (N = 109)

Age	Counts (percentage)
Under 18 years old	4 (3.67)
18-24 years old	87 (79.82)
25-34 years old	11 (10.09)
35-44 years old	7 (6.42)
Year level	
Year 1	80 (73.39)
Year 2	14 (12.84)
Year 3	5 (4.59)
Honours	10 (9.17)
Gender	
Female	84 (77.06)
Male	25 (22.94)
Relationship status	
Single (never married)	82 (75.23)
In a domestic partnership	17 (15.60)
Married	5 (4.59)
Prefer not to say	5 (4.59)
Number of previous jobs	
0	13 (11.93)
1	22 (20.18)
2	20 (18.35)
3	23 (21.10)
4+	31 (28.44)

3.3. IPIP descriptive statistics

Table 4.

Descriptive statistics of personality traits and facets. (N = 109)

	Mean (SD)	Min – Max (Range)	Skew
Openness	3.48 (0.47)	2.33 – 4.63 (2.30)	0.15
O1: Imagination	3.89 (0.81)	2.00 – 5.00 (3.00)	-0.20
O2: Artistic Interests	3.67 (0.85)	1.50 – 5.00 (3.50)	-0.19
O3: Emotionality	3.52 (0.89)	1.00 – 5.00 (4.00)	-0.30
O4: Adventurousness	3.03 (0.82)	1.00 – 5.00 (4.00)	0.39
O5: Intellect	3.78 (0.90)	1.75 – 5.00 (3.25)	-0.33
O6: Liberalism	3.01 (0.59)	1.75 – 4.75 (3.00)	0.27
Conscientiousness	3.59 (0.48)	2.50 – 4.79 (2.29)	0.01
C1: Self-efficacy	3.82 (0.56)	2.50 – 5.00 (2.50)	-0.07
C2: Orderliness	3.40 (0.90)	1.50 – 5.00 (3.50)	0.03
C3: Dutifulness	4.14 (0.59)	2.25 – 5.00 (2.75)	-0.53
C4: Achievement-striving	3.94 (0.69)	2.00 – 5.00 (3.00)	-0.47
C5: Self-discipline	2.91 (0.61)	1.50 – 4.25 (2.75)	0.17
C6: Cautiousness	3.32 (1.00)	1.25 – 5.00 (3.75)	-0.18
Extraversion	3.34 (0.55)	1.50 – 4.63 (3.13)	-0.39
E1: Friendliness	3.64 (0.80)	1.50 – 5.00 (3.50)	-0.26
E2: Gregariousness	2.92 (0.96)	1.00 – 5.00 (4.00)	0.04
E3: Assertiveness	3.29 (0.72)	1.75 – 5.00 (3.25)	-0.02
E4: Activity level	3.28 (0.86)	1.25 – 5.00 (3.75)	-0.01
E5: Excitement-seeking	3.61 (0.81)	1.00 – 5.00 (4.00)	-0.49
E6: Cheerfulness	3.86 (0.69)	1.50 – 5.00 (3.50)	-0.60
Agreeableness	3.76 (0.48)	2.54 – 4.83 (2.29)	-0.29
A1: Trust	3.37 (0.78)	1.50 – 5.00 (3.50)	-0.22
A2: Morality	3.71 (0.78)	1.50 – 5.00 (3.50)	-0.41
A3: Altruism	4.20 (0.64)	1.75 – 5.00 (3.25)	-0.87
A4: Cooperation	4.02 (0.83)	1.25 – 5.00 (3.75)	-0.96
A5: Modesty	3.40 (0.84)	1.50 – 5.00 (3.50)	0.07
A6: Sympathy	3.86 (0.78)	1.00 – 5.00 (4.00)	-0.72
Neuroticism	2.80 (0.63)	1.25 – 4.33 (3.08)	-0.17
N1: Anxiety	3.34 (0.96)	1.00 – 5.00 (4.00)	-0.36
N2: Anger	2.59 (0.96)	1.00 – 5.00 (4.00)	0.17
N3: Depression	2.66 (1.00)	1.00 – 5.00 (4.00)	0.14
N4: Self-consciousness	2.78 (0.78)	1.25 – 4.50 (3.25)	0.10
N5: Immoderation	2.97 (0.84)	1.00 – 5.00 (4.00)	-0.10
N6: Vulnerability	2.49 (0.77)	1.00 – 4.75 (3.75)	0.37

Descriptive statistics for personality traits and facets are presented in table 4. Skewness greater than -0.5 suggests that psychology students exhibit slightly higher level of dutifulness (C3), achievement-striving (C4), excitement-seeking (E5), cheerfulness (E6), altruism (A3), cooperation (A4) and sympathy (A6). It is possible that psychology students exhibit a unique pattern of personality facets, meaning further interpretation should consider the influence of these patterns.

3.4. Aim 1: Explore job characteristic preferences for self and others amongst undergraduates

Descriptive statistics of all 23 JCPs rating for self and others are summarised in table 5. All JCPs ratings were negatively skewed, suggesting many participants have rated most job characteristic as highly important on multiple occasions. Paired sample T-test were conducted to compare rated preferences for self and others for all 23 job characteristics.

T-test results shown in table 5 suggests small to moderate differences in 10 JCPs. The most notable discrepancy was observed with relation to employment conditions. Above average salary, benefits, stable tenure and flexible working hours were all perceived to be more important to others than to self. The effect size for salary, benefits and tenure were moderate; while differences in preferences for flexible hours is comparatively smaller. Since no demographic differences were tested, hypothesis 1 is partially supported. A similar pattern is observed in preferences for ergonomically designed workplace and open office set up, where preferences for these job characteristics were rated as more important for others in the general population. On the other hand, participant rated being able to do interesting work and having positive relationship with managers/superior as more important to themselves compared to other people. However, the effect sizes were small. Anti-workplace bullying and environmental protection policies were also rated as more important to self than others, with a moderate effect size.

Table 5.

Descriptive statistics for job characteristic preferences (self and others) and Paired sample t-test results. (N = 109)

	Self		Other		Paired sample T-test results	
	Mean (SD)	Skew	Mean (SD)	Skew	t-value	*d* [95%CI]
Task characteristics						
Interest	5.31 (1.40)	-0.70	4.89 (1.51)	-0.29	2.88*	0.28 [0.13, 0.71]
Promotion	5.71 (1.26)	-0.83	5.98 (1.12)	-1.09	-1.85	0.18 [-0.55, 0.02]
Ability	5.61 (1.25)	-0.56	5.37 (1.30)	-0.72	1.62	0.16 [-0.05, 0.53]
Training	5.84 (1.27)	-0.89	5.68 (1.22)	-0.72	1.02	0.10 [-0.15, 0.46]
Variety	5.38 (1.32)	-0.52	5.31 (1.30)	-0.41	0.42	0.04 [-0.24, 0.37]
Autonomy	5.42 (1.23)	-0.57	5.28 (1.33)	-0.58	1.08	0.10 [-0.12, 0.42]
Social characteristics						
Colleagues	5.87 (1.13)	-0.97	6.05 (0.95)	-0.67	-1.55	0.15 [-0.40, 0.05]
Manager	6.19 (1.04)	-1.22	5.90 (1.07)	-0.79	2.36*	0.23 [0.05, 0.54]
Interact	4.39 (1.55)	-0.22	4.56 (1.43)	-0.20	-0.99	0.10 [-0.50, 0.17]
Organisational characteristics						
Diversity policy	5.43 (1.52)	-0.96	5.43 (1.48)	-0.66	0	0
Work-life balance	6.03 (1.06)	-1.22	6.07 (0.97)	-0.69	-0.40	0.04 [-0.27, 0.18]
Safety policy	5.89 (1.30)	-1.45	5.76 (1.26)	-1.00	1.11	0.11 [-0.10, 0.36]
Anti-bullying policy	5.96 (1.28)	-1.23	5.45 (1.51)	-0.81	4.00**	0.38 [0.26, 0.76]
Environment protection	5.47 (1.46)	-0.87	4.83 (1.74)	-0.33	4.17**	0.40 [0.34, 0.95]
Location	5.44 (1.31)	-0.67	5.62 (1.15)	-0.40	-1.29	0.12 [-0.44, 0.09]
Employment condition						
Salary	5.11 (1.39)	-0.56	5.74 (1.20)	-0.62	-4.28**	-0.41 [-0.93, -0.34]
Benefit	5.47 (1.33)	-0.98	5.95 (1.19)	-1.16	-3.53**	-0.34 [-0.73, -0.21]
Tenure	5.35 (1.47)	-0.71	6.00 (1.24)	-1.29	-4.82**	-0.46 [-0.91, -0.38]
Hours	5.57 (1.31)	-0.92	5.96 (1.04)	-0.82	-2.98**	-0.29 [-0.64, -0.13]
Physical characteristics						
Condition	5.90 (0.98)	-0.68	5.83 (1.15)	-0.72	0.67	0.07 [-0.14, 0.29]
Ergonomics	4.95 (1.54)	-0.63	5.28 (1.49)	-0.74	-2.40*	-0.23 [-0.62, -0.06]
Open office	3.95 (1.60)	-0.41	4.43 (1.46)	-0.37	-3.98**	-0.38 [-0.72, -0.42]
Private office	4.47 (1.74)	-0.40	4.92 (1.55)	-0.62	-2.50	-0.24 [-0.81, -0.09]

Note. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$

3.5.   Aim 2: Explore and clarify the relationship between personality traits and facets, and job characteristics preferences

With respect to hypothesis 2a and b, Preference for sociable and competent colleagues was significantly and positively correlated with Conscientiousness ($r = 0.20$, $p < 0.05$), Extraversion ($r = 0.20$, $p < 0.05$) and Agreeableness ($r = 0.21$, $p < 0.05$). Only Extraversion was significantly correlated with preference for manager ($r = 0.30$, $p < 0.01$) and interaction ($r = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$). Therefore, hypothesis 2a is partially support and hypothesis 2b is rejected. See appendix D for correlation matrix of all personality facets and JCPs and appendix E for correlation matrix of all personality traits and JCPs.

To further examine the correlation between Big-Five personality and JCPs, personality traits and facets that are significantly correlated with JCP are selected for multiple linear regression. Five job characteristics did not have correlation with any personality traits or facets and hence were removed from the analysis. These characteristics were, training, anti-bullying policy, location, condition and ergonomics. Regression analysis were conducted using a two-stage approach to compare the predictivity of personality traits and facets. Each of the remaining 18 characteristics were first regressed against all big five personality traits using a stepwise regression method. Both backward and forward regression were used to determine the best fitting model. The process was repeated for personality facets that showed significant correlation with JCPs. All regression models that yielded the highest R^2 statistics are summarised in table 6.

In all regression models, personality facets accounted for more variance in JCPs than personality traits, except in preference for competent and sociable colleagues. However, differences in R^2 statistics does not exceed 15% in any model and the highest amount of variance accounted for is 28.67% (preference for variety), suggesting the potential of other

predictor variables that are not accounted for in the current study. Practical implications of these results will be further explored in the discussion section.

Table 6.

Multiple regression model for 18 job characteristics predicted by personality trait and facets.

		Personality trait				**Personality facet**		
		β	F (df)	Adj. R^2		β	F (df)	Adj. R^2
Interest	C	0.58*	5.63 (2, 106)	7.90%**	C4	0.47*	9.55 (3, 105)	19.19%**
	E	0.59*			E3	0.53*		
								ΔR² = 11.29%
Promotion	E	0.61**	8.03 (1, 107)	6.11%**	E1	0.38*	6.54 (3, 105)	13.34%**
					O6	-0.44*		
								ΔR² = 7.23%
Ability	E	0.77**	13.70 (1, 107)	10.52%**	C1	0.45*	7.29 (4, 104)	18.89%**
					E3	0.34*		
					N2	0.35*		
								ΔR² = 8.37 %
Variety	E	1.03**	5.40 (4, 104)	14.02%**	E3	0.54*	8.23 (6, 102)	28.67%**
					N2	0.35*		
					O1	0.28*		
					O6	-0.39*		
								ΔR² = 14.56%
Autonomy	O	0.77*	6.77 (4, 104)	17.61%**	C4	0.46*	12.4 (3, 105)	24.05%**
	C	0.77*			E3	0.54**		
	E	0.44*			O1	0.36*		
	A	-0.57*						**ΔR² = 6.44 %**
Colleague	C	0.88**	6.46 (3, 105)	13.17%**	C3	0.44*	6.01 (3, 105)	12.21%**
	E	0.53*			O3	0.24*		
	N	0.63*						
								ΔR² = -0.96%
Manager	C	0.48*	5.41 (3, 105)	10.91%*	A3	0.43*	8.09 (4, 104)	20.79%**
	E	0.65**			C1	0.45*		
	N	0.37*						
								ΔR² = 9.88%
Interaction	E	0.93**	6.43 (2, 106)	9.13%*	C1	0.53*	5.49 (4, 104)	14.25%**
					N2	0.41*		
								ΔR² = 5.12%
Diversity	C	0.84*	6.38 (4, 104)	16.58%**	A5	0.49*	6.21 (5, 103)	19.43%**
	E	0.86*			E2	0.36*		
	N	0.75*			E4	0.32*		
								ΔR² = 2.85%
Work-life balance	C	0.48*	10.12 (2, 106)	14.45%**	C3	0.38*	5.73 (5, 103)	17.96%**
	E	0.63**			E1	0.45*		
								ΔR² = 3.51%
Anti-Bully	E	0.73*	5.09 (3, 105)	10.19%*	A5	0.44*	5.43 (5, 103)	17.03%*
	N	0.61*			E6	0.39*		
					N2	0.25*		

								$\Delta R^2 = 6.84\%$
Environment	C	0.86*	4.36 (3, 105)	8.52%*	C1	0.76*	6.41 (3, 105)	13.07%**
	E	0.70*			O3	0.35*		
								$\Delta R^2 = 4.55\%$
Salary	A	-0.92*	4.40 (4, 104)	11.19%*	A2	-0.42*	9.82 (3, 105)	19.68**
	N	0.72*			O6	-0.81**		
								$\Delta R^2 = 8.94\%$
Benefit	C	0.87*	5.46 (4, 104)	14.18%**	A2	-0.31*	9.66 (4, 104)	24.28%**
	E	0.68*			C4	0.58**		
	A	-0.83*			N2	0.41**		
	N	0.85**			O6	-0.62*		
								$\Delta R^2 = 10.10\%$
Tenure	N	0.84*	3.81 (3, 105)	7.24%*	O6	-0.65*	5.20 (3, 105)	10.44%**
								$\Delta R^2 = 3.20\%$
Hour	E	0.52*	3.62 (2, 106)	4.62%*	A4	-0.39*	7.51 (3, 105)	15.31%**
					C4	0.67**		
					C6	-0.29*		
								$\Delta R^2 = 10.69\%$
Open office	O	-0.73*	4.38 (4, 104)	11.13%*	E5	0.55*	6.22 (3, 105)	12.65%**
	E	0.88*			O5	-0.40*		
								$\Delta R^2 = 1.52\%$
Private office	C	0.91*	4.74 (3, 105)	9.42%*	A2	-0.61*	7.01 (2,106)	10.10%**
	A	-1.12*			E6	-0.47*		
	N	0.77*						
								$\Delta R^2 = 0.68\%$

Note. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$

Discussion

Targeted recruitment is a key strategy in the field of human resource and is essential to creating a person-job fit, which is believed to contribute to job performance and satisfaction (Lin, Yu & Yi, 2014). By advertising certain job and organisational characteristics, company recruiters can attract talents with preferences or needs that fit with those of the organisation's, thus creating better person-organisation fit (Sekiguchi & Huber, 2011). The overarching purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between job characteristic preferences (JCPs) and its predictors in modern job context. The first aim was to explore JCPs for self and others amongst undergraduates. Based on Jurgenson's results (1978), it was proposed that there will be a difference in the perceived importance of salary for self and other, regardless of gender. T-test results partially supported the hypothesis and revealed differences in other preferences as well. The second aim was to explore the relationship between personality and JCPs. Only two hypotheses were proposed since there is little research in the literature to suggests a strong relationship between personality and JCPs. The results and practical implications, along with methodological strengths and limitations are discussed below.

4.1. Aim 1: Explore job characteristic preferences for self and others amongst undergraduates.

Results suggested that employment conditions (salary, benefits, stable tenure and flexible working hours) and some physical characteristics (open-office layout and ergonomics) tend to be perceived as more important for others than self. These findings do not suggest that certain job characteristics are more important than others but showed that there are differences in the perceived importance of job characteristic for self and others. This is most applicable to the recruitment context, in which recruiters need to decide on recruitment strategies to attract talents that are suited to the company's needs. In line with

Jurgenson's (1978) results, current results showed that the importance of providing an attractive and competitive reward scheme is generally over-emphasised. As suggested by Chapman and colleagues (2005), providing a competitive renumeration package may have an effect on attraction but only to a certain extend. The same can be concluded about the use of open-office layout and ergonomically designed furniture, where the influence it has on employee satisfaction and productivity is far less clear than the benefit of cost and space saving.

There were also differences in perception with regards to several task, social and organisational characteristics. Specifically, interesting work, relationship with manager, and workplace policies (anti-bully and environmental protection) were rated as more important to oneself than to others. Recruiters should consider providing more information on these areas to applicants throughout different stages of the recruitment process. As these are seen as important aspects of work, such can help applicants form a more accurate image of the workplace, thereby enhancing person-organisation fit. To enhance the application of job characteristic research, future studies should aim to establish a link between JCPs, satisfaction of preference and various job and organisational outcomes. For example, future studies can investigate whether individuals with a preference for challenging work will be more satisfied and productive compared to those who do not have the preference, when working in the same job role.

Despite confirming findings from Jurgenson's study, the current sample is highly skewed in terms of demographics, preferences and personality, hence affecting the generalisability of our findings. Previous research suggested that formation of preferences is primarily influenced by intrinsic goals and individual characteristics (Barrick, Mount and Li, 2013). However, employment experience in a specific discipline may shape individual preferences to reflect the reality of the job market. Therefore, undergraduate students with

little employment experience may have general expectations of, and preference for job characteristics, but these may be unrepresentative of employment in their respective field. Since preliminary analysis also showed that the number of previous jobs did not influence JCPs, this effect may only relate to employment experience in the field of study. Further study will be needed to investigate the influence of study disciplines (e.g. commerce versus engineering students) on JCPs.

4.2. Aim 2: Explore the relationship between Big-Five personality (trait and facets) and job characteristic preferences.

With respect to the second aim, it was confirmed that Extraversion was predictive of preferences for all social characteristics, while Agreeableness only predicted preference for competent and sociable colleagues. However, our results showed that there were distinctive patterns of personality facets associated with JCPs.

Preference in task characteristics were primarily associated with Extraversion, Openness and Conscientiousness facets. Assertiveness (E3) consistently predicted preference for four task characteristics (interest, ability, variety and autonomy) but did not predict any other JCPs. This suggests that highly assertive individuals prefer performing in roles that allow for autonomy and variety and offer opportunities to demonstrate different skills. They are also likely to prefer challenging and interesting work for similar reasons. Highly assertive individuals tend to prefer taking charge and be leaders of activity, hence explains its association with preference for several task characteristics.

Achievement-striving (C4) was associated with preference for challenging work and autonomy. Individuals scoring high on C4 are driven to be recognised for their success and have a strong sense of direction. They are likely to prefer completing challenging tasks at their own discretion as this will directly associate their ability and success. High imagination (O1) was correlated with creativity, and therefore linked to preferences for work variety and

autonomy. Finally, liberalism (O6) was a negative predictor of preference for variety and promotion. Individuals scoring low on O6 tend to be conservative and less ready to challenge authorities, hence they are likely to accept the job role as it is and are less driven to negotiate for change.

Preference for employment conditions were consistently predicted by Agreeableness and Openness facets. Both morality (A2) and liberalism (O6) were negative predictors of preference for above average salary and benefits. O6 was also the sole predictor for preference for stable tenure. Individuals scoring high on O6 and A2 tend to be conservative and perceive others as trustworthy. They are agreeable, sincere and less inclined to challenge authority. Therefore, they might see less opportunities and need to negotiate for their own benefit. This was also in line with the negative correlation between O6 and preference for task characteristics (promotion and variety). Interestingly, achievement-striving (C4) was a strong positive predictor of preference for benefit and flexible working hours. Benefits such as performance-based bonus provide clear recognition of success and are clearly linked to preferences of individuals scoring high on C4. However, the relationship between C4 and preference for flexible working hours is less clear. Given the positive correlation between C4 and activity-level (E4), it could be argued that those scoring high on C4 are often quick and energetic. Therefore, they might prefer to arrange working hours on their own terms to accommodate a variety of activities and duties.

On the other hand, correlations between personality traits and social, organisational and physical characteristics displayed less distinctive patterns. Although one hypothesis was partially confirmed, there were fewer personality facets that predicted multiple job characteristics in the same category (social, organisational and physical characteristics). Preference for three social characteristics was associated with different personality facets. Preference for competent and sociable colleagues is strongly predicted by high dutifulness

(C3). It is possible that due to the wording of the items, participants showed preference for colleagues who are competent and can make a worthy contribution to work, hence explaining the relationship with C3. Preference for establishing positive relationship with managers and interaction with customer were both predicted by self-efficacy (C1), suggesting preference for social interaction is partially reliant on perceived competency. With respect to organisational characteristics, Modesty (A5), Gregariousness (E2), Activity level (E4), and Cheerfulness (E6) were strong predictors of preference for diversity and anti-bully policies. Finally, preference for office layout (open vs. private) were predicted by different personality traits. Open office preference was positively predicted by Excitement-Seeking (E5) and negatively predicted by Intellect (O5), suggesting individuals who prefer to be constantly stimulated would prefer working in open offices. On the contrary, low Cheerfulness (E6) and Morality (A2) predicted preferences for private offices.

4.3.   Implications

The current study provides rationale for tailoring recruitment strategies to attract talents that fits with the company. It was revealed that there are differences in the perceived importance of several job characteristics for self and others. Applying this to the recruitment context, time and resources are often misused by focusing on seemingly important aspects of job and workplace that may have little impact on recruitment and employment outcomes. Instead, there should be a focus on distributing information about the organisation and nature of work in addition to employment conditions and physical characteristics of the workspace. Companies and recruitment managers should also pay attention to how the organisation is perceived through various media. Previous research suggests that job applicants form an image of a potential employer through gathering information from various sources, such as employer website, third-party reviews, general media and social networks (Breaugh, 2008). By delivering a consistent message across different medium and focus on presenting

important job characteristics, recruiters are able to target applicants with specific preferences that will fit with the organisation's needs and goals. For example, preference for task characteristics were strongly predicted by Extraversion and Conscientiousness facets. For new start companies that are looking for motivated individuals to lead and take charge, it would be best to highlight potential opportunities for challenging and interesting work in the workplace as oppose to solely focusing on offering attractive renumeration schemes and promoting the utility of workspace design.

Although the present study is primarily driven by recruitment research, strong correlations between personality traits and several JCPs suggest new ways to utilise personality profiling for selection and development purposes. Researchers have struggled to identify a consistent relationship between personality and work-related outcomes, such as performance and satisfaction (Moyle & Hackston, 2018). This is primarily due to the fact that personality traits only infer the likely behaviour within the given context. Study by Judge and Zapata (2015) clearly indicate the importance of work context when considering the influence of personality. When work context contains trait-specific characteristics, the influence of personality on work performance were found to be higher. Therefore, by linking personality traits and JCPs, the effect of personality on job outcomes will also become apparent. This will ensure that tailored recruitment practice will also have an impact at later stages of employment. For example, personality profile and preference can provide useful information for employee development. By understanding individual preferences for challenges and autonomy through performance and development conversation, managers can alter practices around work delegation and organisation in ways that account for personality and needs, thus improving job performance.

4.4.   Strengths and limitations

Expanding upon previous research, the current study examined the relationship between JCPs and both personality traits and facets. Current findings showed that personality facets provide additional information to help understand individual differences in preferences. To the author's knowledge, this approach has yet to be applied to the job characteristics literature and future research should aim to adopt a similar methodology. In the same vein, the current study explored preferences using rating rather than forced rankings. This helped clarified the relationship between preferences and multiple personality traits. For future research, JCPs can also be correlated with other personal and organisational variables.

Several methodological limitations will need to be taken into consideration when interpreting our findings. As mentioned, the sample size is small and skewed on many variables, which is unrepresentative of the general population. This prevented us from further examine the effects of demographics on JCPs and generalise findings to the larger population.

The psychometric properties of the JCPs instrument poses a significant weakness. As the instrument is an aggregation of items from different research and was not developed based on factor analysis, the validity and reliability were not examined. Based on differential correlation patterns between different categories of preference and personality facets, we can only hypotheses that there is an underlying structure to JCPs. Without a taxonomy supported by strong empirical evidence, results cannot be interpreted beyond the items itself.

Moreover, personality facets only accounted for 28% of the variance in preference at best. Most regression models did not account for more than 20% of the variance, indicating job characteristics selected may not be relevant and there are other predictors no accounted for. Finally, there were many correlations between preference and personality facets were underexplored or unexplained. For example, anger (N2) appeared to be a consistent predictor

for a number of different preferences but the meaning of these relationships is not apparent. On the other hand, thematically linked facets and preferences were not detected, such as Achievement-striving (C4) and preference for demonstrating a variety of abilities, or Friendliness (E1) and preference for customers interaction.

4.5.   Future research

In light of the implications and limitations discussed, there are several areas in which future research should focus on.

The first area relates to consolidating our understanding of job characteristics and preferences in the modern workplace. As previously mentioned, there are no empirical studies conducted to produce a JCPs framework and inventory that can comprehensively capture the complex and multidimensional nature of work in the modern days. Further research should direct effort into creating and validating job characteristics and preferences measures, while also developing a job characteristics framework for researchers to follow. This will assist researcher in selecting and measuring job characteristics that are relevant to the workplace. Moreover, further research should direct effort into reviewing and validating the relationship between job characteristics and organisational outcomes.

The second area focuses on further exploring the relationship between job characteristics and preferences with other predictor variables, and the implication this has on personal and organisational outcomes. Future research should explore the effect of socio-demographic variables, such as field of education, education level, occupation, and family and marital status, on JCPs. The relationship between individual preferences and workplace outcomes should also be established.

4.6.   Conclusion

As human resource practices become increasingly important in today's global business environment, companies will need to improve and adapt practices to create a fit

between its employees and the organization. Despite several methodological limitations, the present study revealed differences in JCPs associated with self and others, as well as distinctive patterns of correlation between certain personality traits and JCPs. The results provide meaningful insight into the ways in which individual perceive certain job characteristic to be more important for others and vice versa, thus contributing to recruitment practices that are misaligned with job applicants' preferences. The current study also provided a starting point for future studies to further explore personality underpinnings of JCPs, which have strong implications at various stages of the employment cycle for both the employee and employer.

References

Ashkanasy, N. M., Ayoko, O. B., & Jehn, K. A. (2014). Understanding the physical

environment of work and employee behavior: An affective events perspective.

Journal of Organizational Behavior, *35*, 1169-1184.

Australia Bureau of Statistics (1991). *Census of Population and Housing: 1991 Census of*

Population and Housing. Retrieved from

https://www.ausstats.abs.gov.au/ausstats/free.nsf/0/792BBD9457634FFECA2574BE0

0826627/$File/27100_1991_20_Census_Characteristics_of_Australia.pdf

Australia Bureau of Statistics (2016). *2006 Census of Population and Housing: Working*

Population Profile. Retrieved from

https://quickstats.censusdata.abs.gov.au/census_services/getproduct/census/2016/com

munityprofile/036?opendocument

Barakat, S. R., Isabella, G., Boaventura, J. M. G., & Mazzon, J. A. (2016). The influence of

corporate social responsibility on employee satisfaction. *Management Decision*,

54(9), 2325-2339.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K. & Li, N. (2013). The theory of purposeful work behaviour: The

role of personality, higher-order goals, and job characteristics. *Academy of*

Management Review, *38*(1), 132-153.

Berings, D., Fruyt, F. D., Bouwen, R. (2004). Work values and personality traits as predictors

of enterprising and social vocational interests. *Personality and Individual Difference*,

36, 349-364.

Breaugh, J. A. (2008). Employee recruitment: Current knowledge and important areas for

future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, *18*, 103-118.

Carless, S. A. & Imber, A. (2007). Job and organisational characteristics: A construct evaluation of applicant perceptions. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *67*(2), 328-341.

Carnevale, D. G., & Rios, J. M. (1995). How employees assess the quality of physical work settings. *Productivity in Review*, *18*(3), 221-231.

Casper, W. J., Wayne, J. H., & Manegold, J. G. (2013). Who will we recruit? Targeting deep- and surface-level diversity with human resource policy advertising. *Human Resource Management*, *52*(3), 311-332.

Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., Carroll, S. A., Piasentin, K. A., & Jones, D. A. (2005). Applicant attraction to organisations and job choice: A meta-analytic review of the correlates of recruiting outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(5), 928-944.

Corrigall, E. A., & Konrad, A. M. (2006). The relationship of job attribute preferences to employment, hours of paid work, and family responsibilities: an analysis comparing women and men. *Sex Roles*, *54*, 95-111.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO PI-RTM) and NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI): Professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How corporate social responsibility is defined: an analysis of 37 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *15*, 1-13.

Dogl, C., & Holtbrugge, D. (2014). Corporate environmental responsibility, employer reputation and employee commitment: an empirical study in developed and emerging economics. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *25*(12), 1739-1762.

Fried, Y., & Ferris, G. R. (1987). The validity of the job characteristics model: A review and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *40*, 287-322.

Grant, A. M., Fried, Y., & Juillerat, T. (2011). Work matters: Job design in classic and contemporary perspectives. In S. Zedeck (Eds.), *APA handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Volume III* (417-453). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association

Gomes, D., & Neves, J. (2011). Oragnizational attractiveness and prospective applicant's intentions to apply. *Personnel Review*, 40(6), 684-699.

Harris, M. M., & Fink, L. S. (1987). A field study of applicant reactions to employment opportunities: Does the recruiter make a difference? *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 765-784.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: A meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5), 1332-1356.

Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 386-408.

Johnson, J. A. (2014). Measuring thirty facets of the Five Factor Model with a 120-item public domain inventory: Development of the IPIP-NEO-120. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 51, 78-89.

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), 1149-11

Jurgensen, C. E. (1978). Job Preferences (What Makes a Job Good of Bad?). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(3), 267-276

Kausel, E. E. & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Narrow personality traits and organizational attraction: Evidence for the complementary hypothesis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 114, 3-14

Kim, J., & Dear, R. (2013). Workspace satisfaction: The privacy-communication trade-off in open-plan offices. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 36, 18-26

Kim, S. E., & Young, W. R. (2014). Office characteristics and perceived behavioural outcomes in a public agency. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 38(1), 76-99

Konrad, A. M. (2003). Family demands and job attributes preferences: A 4-year longitudinal study of women and men. *Sex Roles*, 49, 35- 46

Lin, Y., Yu, C., & Yi, C. (2014). The effects of positive affect, person-job fit, and well-being on job performance. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *42*(9), 1537-1548.

Liu, Y., Combs, J. G., Ketchen Jr., D. J., & Ireland, R. D. (2007). The value of human resource management for organizational performance. *Business Horizons*, 50, 503-511

Maher, A., & Hippel, C. (2005). Individual differences in employee reactions to open-plan offices. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 25, 219-229

Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The work design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1321-1339

Moyle, P., & Hackston, J. (2018). Personality assessment for employee development: Ivory tower or real world? *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 100(5), 507-517

Oldham, G. R., & Brass, D.J. (1979). Employee reactions to an open-plan office: A naturally occurring quasi-experiment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*(2), 267–284

Oldham, G. R., & Fried, Y. (2016). Job design research and theory: Past, present and future. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 136, 20-35

Oldham, G.R., & Fried, Y. (1987). Employee reactions to workspace characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(1), 75–80

Oldham, G. R., & Rotchford, N. L. (1983). Relationships between office characteristics and employee reactions: A study of the physical environment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 542-556

Osborn, D. P. (1990). A re-examination of the organizational choice process. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 36, 45-60

Posner, B. Z. (1987). Comparing recruiter, student, and faculty perceptions of important applicant and job characteristics. *Personnel Psychology*, 34, 329-339

Rubenstein, A. L., Zhang, Y., Ma, K., Morrison, H. M., & Jorgensen, D. F. (2019). Trait expression through perceived job characteristics: A meta-analytic path model linking personality and job attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 112, 141-157

Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job information sources, applicant perceptions of fit and work outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, *50*, 359-426.

Sekiguchi, T., & Huber, V. L. (2011). The use of person-organization fit and person-job fit information in making selection decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 116, 203-216

Shorey, H. S. (2018). Introduction to the special issues on the role of personality assessment in consulting to organizations. *Journal of Personality assessment*, 100(5), 493-497

Swann, W. B. (1983). Self-verification: Bringing social reality into harmony with the self. In

J. Suls & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.) *Social Psychological Perspectives on the Self* (pp.

33–66). Psychology Press.

Swider, B. W., Zimmerman, R. D., Charlier, S. D., & Pierotti, A. J. (2015). Deep-level and

surface-level individual differences and applicant attraction to oragnizations: A meta-

analysis. 88, 73-83

Uggersley, K. L, Fassina, N. E., & Kraitchy, D. (2012). Recruiting through the stages: A

meta-analytic test of predictors of applicant attraction at different stages of the

recruiting process. 65, 597-600

Vandenberghe, C., St-Onge, S., & Robineau, E. (2008). An analysis of the relation between

personality and the attractiveness of total rewards components. *Industrial relations*,

63(3), 425-453.

Vercic, A. T., & Coric, D. S. (2018). The relationship between reputation, employer branding

and corporate social responsibility. *Public Relations Review*, 44, 444-452.

Vischer, J.C. (2008). Toward a user-centered theory of the built environment. *Building

Research & Information, 36*(3), 231–240.

Winter, R. P., & Jackson, B. A. (2016). Work values preferences of Generation Y:

performance relationship insights in the Australian Public Service. The International

Journal of Human Resource Management, 27(17), 1997-2015

Wegman, L. A., Hoffman, B. J., Carter, N. T., Twenge, J. M., & Guenole, N. (2018). Placing

job characteristics in context: Cross-temporal meta-analysis of changes in job

characteristics since 1975. *Journal of Management*, 44(1), 352-386

Wright, P. M., McMahan, G. C., & McWilliams, A. (1994). Human resources and sustained

competitive advantage: a resource-based perspective. *International Journal of Human

Resource Management*, 5(2), 301-326.

JOB CHARACTERISTIC PREFERENCES AND PERSONALITY
Appendix A: Job Characteristic Preferences (Self) Correlation Matrix

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
1.	Interest	1																						
2.	Promo	0.40	1																					
3.	Ability	0.45	0.40	1																				
4.	Train	0.35	0.50	0.42	1																			
5.	Variety	0.57	0.43	0.67	0.47	1																		
6.	Auto	0.50	0.26	0.38	0.25	0.47	1																	
7.	Colleague	0.28	0.16	0.44	0.28	0.40	0.28	1																
8.	Manager	0.27	0.26	0.36	0.26	0.30	0.20	0.39	1															
9.	Interact	0.35	0.23	0.46	0.31	0.53	0.29	0.29	0.31	1														
10.	Diversity	0.18	0.29	0.23	0.12	0.32	0.37	0.35	0.25	0.33	1													
11.	WL balance	0.18	0.47	0.23	0.29	0.31	0.30	0.35	0.35	0.08	0.57	1												
12.	Safety	0.46	0.36	0.23	0.29	0.33	0.27	0.32	0.27	0.24	0.33	0.41	1											
13.	Bully	0.13	0.26	0.28	0.16	0.36	0.29	0.44	0.35	0.29	0.60	0.51	0.44	1										
14.	Environment	0.28	0.27	0.34	0.10	0.44	0.27	0.32	0.28	0.16	0.48	0.39	0.27	0.49	1									
15.	Location	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.18	0.23	0.14	0.25	0.12	0.07	0.05	0.10	0.34	0.09	0.09	1								
16.	Salary	0.15	0.29	0.31	0.30	0.32	0.18	0.15	0.10	0.20	-0.09	0.06	0.07	-0.04	-0.02	0.15	1							
17.	Benefit	0.43	0.64	0.45	0.38	0.57	0.31	0.22	0.19	0.32	0.25	0.32	0.46	0.32	0.41	0.22	0.47	1						
18.	Tenure	0.24	0.47	0.23	0.28	0.32	0.18	0.34	0.16	0.17	0.21	0.34	0.37	0.31	0.28	0.23	0.47	0.59	1					
19.	Hour	0.24	0.15	0.38	0.07	0.44	0.21	0.20	0.33	0.21	0.17	0.25	0.22	0.20	0.18	0.30	0.20	0.23	-0.02	1				
20.	Condition	0.13	0.32	0.22	0.37	0.24	0.17	0.22	0.35	0.06	0.19	0.39	0.49	0.4	0.23	0.26	0.16	0.33	0.32	0.27	1			
21.	Ergo	0.43	0.33	0.29	0.31	0.43	0.31	0.24	0.09	0.30	0.12	0.23	0.57	0.22	0.21	0.23	0.32	0.54	0.40	0.16	0.39	1		
22.	Open	0.22	0.11	0.23	0.05	0.33	0.06	0.22	0.06	0.38	0.12	0.13	0.38	0.27	0.20	0.15	0.19	0.27	0.22	0.19	0.13	0.39	1	
23.	Private	0.41	0.29	0.14	0.15	0.29	0.28	-0.05	0.07	0.20	-0.04	0.06	0.11	-0.05	0.17	0.06	0.42	0.41	0.31	0.20	0.27	0.40	0.09	1

Note. Green = $p < 0.001$; yellow = $p < 0.05$.

39

Appendix B: Job Characteristic Preferences (Others) Correlation matrix

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
1.	Interest	1																						
2.	Promotion	0.29	1																					
3.	Ability	0.45	0.27	1																				
4.	Train	0.31	0.40	0.43	1																			
5.	Variety	0.57	0.29	0.6	0.42	1																		
6.	Autonomy	0.27	0.47	0.31	0.33	0.33	1																	
7.	Colleague	0.37	0.26	0.32	0.21	0.35	0.22	1																
8.	Manager	0.33	0.22	0.23	0.16	0.17	0.42	0.41	1															
9.	Interact	0.48	0.18	0.48	0.21	0.37	0.39	0.21	0.38	1														
10.	Diversity	0.51	0.21	0.45	0.28	0.51	0.15	0.3	0.26	0.48	1													
11.	WL balance	0.36	0.35	0.37	0.32	0.48	0.27	0.62	0.36	0.28	0.44	1												
12.	Safety	0.54	0.26	0.46	0.2	0.46	0.26	0.28	0.26	0.42	0.42	0.37	1											
13.	Bully	0.47	0.23	0.44	0.24	0.46	0.1	0.22	0.18	0.39	0.64	0.36	0.69	1										
14.	Environment	0.47	-0.03	0.36	0.26	0.42	-0.02	0.1	0.16	0.39	0.56	0.22	0.49	0.55	1									
15.	Location	0.20	0.14	0.16	0.19	0.17	-0.01	0.21	0.08	0.15	0.15	0.33	0.30	0.29	0.21	1								
16.	Salary	0.09	0.31	-0.01	0.02	0.02	0.14	0.11	0.09	0.07	-0.06	0.06	0	-0.01	-0.05	0.14	1							
17.	Benefit	0.27	0.43	0.2	0.18	0.24	0.16	0.36	0.18	0.29	0.23	0.39	0.19	0.19	0.17	0.24	0.46	1						
18.	Tenure	0.27	0.48	0.33	0.40	0.35	0.23	0.25	0.25	0.28	0.35	0.32	0.25	0.37	0.29	0.09	0.26	0.62	1					
19.	Hour	0.28	0.31	0.37	0.37	0.42	0.11	0.35	0.13	0.21	0.31	0.55	0.3	0.34	0.24	0.30	0.24	0.55	0.37	1				
20.	Condition	0.28	0.25	0.30	0.34	0.32	-0.03	0.21	0.12	0.25	0.43	0.30	0.53	0.52	0.42	0.37	0.1	0.28	0.4	0.38	1			
21.	Ergonomic	0.38	0.31	0.38	0.31	0.39	0.24	0.29	0.2	0.31	0.44	0.35	0.55	0.52	0.40	0.32	0.1	0.29	0.29	0.41	0.58	1		
22.	Open	0.39	0.06	0.24	0.11	0.34	0.04	0.16	0.02	0.27	0.32	0.16	0.37	0.35	0.41	0.22	0.01	0.05	0.08	0.19	0.37	0.42	1	
23.	Private	0.31	0.25	0.26	0.30	0.24	0.23	0.11	0.06	0.31	0.12	0.1	0.25	0.16	0.31	0.13	0.37	0.42	0.36	0.28	0.28	0.37	0.24	1

Note. Green = $p < 0.001$; yellow = $p < 0.05$

40

Appendix C: Personality trait and facets correlation matrix

	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	O	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A	N1	N2	N3	N4	N5	N6	N
O1	1																																		
O2	0.31	1																																	
O3	0.28	0.31	1																																
O4	0.11	0.39	0.06	1																															
O5	0.4	0.49	0.23	0.34	1																														
O6	-0.18	0.02	-0.08	0.06	0.05	1																													
O	0.58	0.75	0.56	0.57	0.75	0.17	1																												
C1	-0.12	-0.01	-0.11	0.04	0.05	0.11	-0.02	1																											
C2	-0.19	0.19	-0.12	-0.08	0.11	0.14	0	0.39	1																										
C3	-0.07	0.02	-0.03	0.25	0.21	0.13	0.14	0.37	0.32	1																									
C4	-0.01	0.18	0.07	0.18	0.33	0.09	0.25	0.56	0.28	0.32	1																								
C5	-0.25	-0.08	-0.09	-0.04	-0.13	0.31	-0.11	0.27	0.3	0.27	0.16	1																							
C6	-0.07	0.11	-0.12	0.01	0.29	0.08	0.09	0.19	0.25	0.47	0.33	0.22	1																						
C	-0.17	0.13	-0.11	0.07	0.24	0.21	0.09	0.66	0.68	0.68	0.66	0.54	0.69	1																					
E1	0.05	0.1	0.23	0.21	-0.03	-0.24	0.11	0.26	0	0.04	0.24	-0.07	-0.2	0.03	1																				
E2	0.04	0.16	0.25	0.3	0.15	-0.18	0.23	0.06	-0.06	-0.09	0.07	-0.04	-0.23	-0.1	0.64	1																			
E3	-0.01	0.18	0.04	0.2	0.04	0	0.13	0.3	0.05	-0.01	0.27	0.05	-0.06	0.13	0.39	0.28	1																		
E4	-0.17	0.04	-0.02	0.19	-0.12	0.1	-0.01	0.42	0.12	0.13	0.42	0.24	0.06	0.32	0.29	0.16	0.31	1																	
E5	0.28	0.14	0.21	0.21	0.14	-0.08	0.27	-0.01	-0.11	-0.11	0.07	-0.2	-0.36	-0.21	0.42	0.37	0.21	0.14	1																
E6	0.17	0.17	0.1	0.33	0.19	-0.08	0.27	0.2	-0.06	0.13	0.3	-0.17	0.04	0.1	0.45	0.34	0.31	0.38	0.54	1															
E	0.08	0.19	0.21	0.35	0.09	-0.12	0.25	0.3	-0.02	0.01	0.33	-0.04	-0.2	0.06	0.8	0.72	0.6	0.56	0.66	0.72	1														
A1	-0.03	0.03	0.07	0.25	0.08	-0.03	0.11	0.04	0.06	0.27	0.16	0.05	0.17	0.19	0.38	0.29	0.01	0.16	0.22	0.4	0.36	1													
A2	-0.04	0.18	0.06	0.2	0.19	0.04	0.18	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.19	0.09	0.38	0.38	-0.05	-0.17	-0.13	0.01	-0.22	0.08	-0.12	0.27	1												
A3	0.04	0.18	0.24	0.28	0.35	-0.07	0.32	0.21	0.04	0.3	0.42	0.13	0.11	0.28	0.5	0.47	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.33	0.51	0.33	0.22	1											
A4	0.04	0.29	0	0.27	0.37	0.01	0.29	0.18	0.29	0.53	0.36	0.02	0.5	0.5	-0.05	-0.1	-0.16	0.01	-0.17	0.11	-0.1	0.25	0.63	0.31	1										
A5	-0.06	0.06	0.04	-0.07	-0.1	0.08	-0.02	-0.2	0	0.19	-0.13	0	0.13	0.01	-0.14	-0.1	-0.28	-0.17	-0.2	-0.28	-0.28	0.03	0.45	0.03	0.27	1									
A6	0.18	0.19	0.43	0.12	0.35	-0.02	0.38	-0.06	-0.06	0.13	0.17	-0.02	0.04	0.04	0.27	0.36	0.17	0.09	0.19	0.25	0.33	0.14	0.17	0.64	0.16	0.11	1								
A	0.03	0.25	0.21	0.27	0.32	0	0.33	0.06	0.14	0.52	0.3	0.07	0.36	0.38	0.22	0.17	-0.06	0.07	0	0.22	0.16	0.53	0.75	0.64	0.71	0.54	0.57	1							
N1	0.18	-0.05	0.35	-0.41	-0.05	-0.12	-0.02	-0.28	-0.10	-0.19	-0.07	-0.15	-0.12	-0.22	-0.10	-0.01	-0.24	-0.19	-0.12	-0.27	-0.22	-0.06	0.00	-0.01	-0.06	0.29	0.17	0.1	1						
N2	0.07	-0.14	0.22	-0.21	-0.25	-0.06	-0.11	-0.23	-0.29	-0.36	-0.14	-0.11	-0.38	-0.4	0.03	0.14	0.07	0.06	0.17	-0.02	0.12	-0.12	-0.27	-0.05	-0.53	-0.04	-0.01	-0.28	0.42	1					
N3	0.20	-0.11	0.25	-0.26	-0.14	0.02	-0.01	-0.49	-0.28	-0.27	-0.31	-0.17	-0.32	-0.47	-0.13	-0.04	-0.26	-0.26	0.02	-0.36	-0.24	-0.13	-0.12	-0.11	-0.28	0.33	0.11	-0.05	0.6	0.35	1				
N4	0.08	-0.16	0.10	-0.36	-0.05	-0.09	-0.13	-0.36	-0.13	-0.21	-0.28	-0.14	-0.14	-0.3	-0.38	-0.23	-0.59	-0.39	-0.15	-0.41	-0.52	-0.12	0.10	-0.23	0.00	0.31	-0.06	0.02	0.55	0.11	0.47	1			
N5	0.04	-0.05	0.21	-0.13	-0.18	-0.15	-0.07	-0.38	-0.32	-0.31	-0.20	-0.39	-0.43	-0.52	0.04	0.05	0.02	-0.10	0.09	-0.09	0	-0.06	-0.17	-0.10	-0.29	0.03	0.06	-0.14	0.33	0.42	0.41	0.07	1		
N6	0.13	0.02	0.36	-0.20	-0.12	-0.22	-0.07	-0.52	-0.19	-0.26	-0.19	-0.14	-0.24	-0.38	-0.05	0.06	-0.23	-0.35	-0.04	-0.30	-0.21	0.05	-0.10	-0.03	-0.14	0.16	0.13	0.02	0.58	0.37	0.59	0.35	0.37	1	
N	0.17	-0.12	0.35	-0.37	-0.19	-0.14	-0.07	-0.52	-0.31	-0.38	-0.28	-0.25	-0.38	-0.54	-0.13	0	-0.28	-0.27	0	-0.34	-0.24	-0.11	-0.14	-0.12	-0.32	0.26	0.1	-0.08	0.82	0.65	0.81	0.59	0.61	0.76	1

Note. Green = p < 0.001; yellow = p < 0.05.

Appendix D: Job Characteristic Preferences (Self) and Personality facets correlation matrix

		A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	N1	N2	N3	N4	N5	N6	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
1	Interest			0 25				0 28			0 36			0 21		0 34														0 24	
2	Promotion										0 19			0 33		0 21		0 2													-0 25
3	Ability			0 26				0 24			0 24			0 29	0 21	0 32		0 2			0 22		-0 21								
4	Train																														
5	Variety							0 24			0 27			0 26	0 19	0 4	0 24	0 25			0 24		-0 23			0 2					-0 19
6	Autonomy							0 3			0 34			0 22		0 38							-0 31			0 23	0 26			0 21	
7	Colleague			0 29			0 22	0 22		0 28	0 26			0 19														0 2			
8	Manager			0 39			0 2	0 28			0 35			0 28			0 24		0 26									0 21		0 23	
9	Interact			0 2				0 19			0 19			0 2	0 22	0 28					0 24										
10	Diversity			0 33		0 25	0 28			0 2				0 27	0 26		0 19											0 23	0 23		
11	WL balance			0 24			0 22	0 27		0 25	0 28			0 35	0 21	0 19			0 26				-0 26			0 2					
12	Safety																														
13	Bully					0 21										0 19	0 2	0 2			0 21							0 23			
14	Environment						0 19	0 28			0 21			0 21	0 21	0 22	0 2											0 21			
15	Location																														
16	Salary		-0 29		-0 24					-0 2											0 22									-0 19	-0 36
17	Benefit		-0 22								0 2										0 32									0 19	-0 27
18	Tenure																				0 22	0 19		0 22							-0 27
19	Hour				-0 23			0 21			0 19		-0 23			0 22					0 2										
20	Condition																														
21	Ergonomic																														
22	Open		-0 22		-0 23					-0 21			-0 26					0 21												-0 2	-0 25
23	Private		-0 29		-0 2					-0 2									-0 21											-0 23	

Note. Only correlation <- 0.20 or > 0.20 are shown

Appendix E: Job characteristic Preferences (self) and personality trait correlation matrix

		O	C	E	A	N
1.	Interest	0.13	0.21	0.24	0.14	-0.07
2.	Promotion	0.03	0.06	0.26	-0.02	0.01
3.	Ability	0.07	0.07	0.34	-0.03	-0.03
4.	Train	0.09	0.18	0.12	0.07	-0.03
5.	Variety	0.13	0.07	0.37	-0.01	-0.01
6.	Autonomy	0.3	0.25	0.25	0.02	-0.17
7.	Colleague	0.13	0.2	0.2	0.21	0.09
8.	Manager	0.18	0.12	0.3	0.18	0.03
9.	Interact	-0.03	0.02	0.29	0.01	0.07
10.	Diversity	0.17	0.17	0.27	0.27	0.08
11.	WL balance	0.16	0.24	0.34	0.16	-0.11
12.	Safety	-0.01	0.09	0.04	0.05	0.07
13.	Bully	0.19	0.07	0.25	0.07	0.11
14.	Environment	0.17	0.18	0.23	0.12	0
15.	Location	-0.1	0.19	0.01	0.06	0
16.	Salary	-0.13	-0.12	0.06	-0.26	0.22
17.	Benefit	0.03	0	0.16	-0.17	0.19
18.	Tenure	-0.06	-0.01	0.1	-0.04	0.23
19.	Hour	-0.01	-0.05	0.19	-0.13	0.01
20.	Condition	0.07	-0.01	-0.02	-0.05	0.16
21.	Ergonomic	0.05	0.08	0.06	-0.08	0.09
22.	Open	-0.2	-0.08	0.19	-0.17	0.12
23.	Private	-0.11	-0.02	-0.07	-0.24	0.17

Note. Green = p < 0.001; yellow = p < 0.05; O = Openness, C = Conscientiousness, E = Extraversion, A= Agreeableness, N = Neuroticism

Appendix F: Survey

What makes an interesting job? (student)

Participant Information

1. **What is this project about?**
This research project is designed to investigate what job characteristics attract students when applying for a job, and how their preferences for paricular job characteristics are influenced by their personality. The study aim is to investigate recent changes in such preferences and to compare them with those currently in the workforce.

2. **Who is undertaking the project?**
This project is being conducted by Brian Tang. This research will form the basis for the degree of Master of Psychology (Organisational and Human Factors) at the University of Adelaide under the supervision of Dr Neil Kirby.

3. **Who is being invited to participate?**
We are recruiting Undergraduate Psychology students (all year levels) in University of Adelaide.

4. **What am I being invited to do?**
You are being invitied to complete a 20-minute online survey, which includes some basic demographic questions, a personality questionnaire and a job characteristics preference questionnaire.

There will be no follow-up requirements after completing the survey. This information will be accessed by the principal supervisor (Dr Neil Kirby) and student researcher (Brian Tang). All data will be de-identified for data analysis and reporting to ensure the protection of your privacy.

Upon completion of this survey, you can request a summary personality profile for personal development purposes!

5. **Can I withdraw from the project?**
Participation in this project is completely voluntary. You may withdraw or from the study at any time. If you do withdraw from the study, it will not affect your ongoing study at the university in any way.

6. **What will happen to my information?**
The information you provide from the survey will be confidentially stored, with no identifiable information attached to it, within the University of Adelaide database for a minimum of 5 years. ONLY the student researcher (Brian Tang) and principal researcher (Dr. Neil Kirby) will have access to the data and materials. All data and materials will be used in the thesis stated above. Your information will only be used as described in this participant information sheet and it will only be disclosed according to the consent provided, except as required by law.

7. **Who do I contact if I have questions about the project?**
If you have any questions about the project, please contact the student researcher:
Brian Tang (Student researcher)

Email: *brian.tang@student.adelaide.edu.au*

8. What if I have a complaint or any concerns?
The study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of Adelaide (approval number H-2019-62). This research project will be conducted according to the NHMRC National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research 2007 (Updated 2018). If you have questions or problems associated with the practical aspects of your participation in the project, or wish to raise a concern or complaint about the project, then you should consult the Principal Investigator.
For any questions concerning the ethics of this project, please contact the convener of the Subcommittee for Human Research in the School of Psychology, Dr.Paul Delfabbro, 8313 4936

* 1. I have read the information above, and understood that:

1. While information gained during the study may be published, I will be not be identified, and my personal information and responses will not be divulged;
2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time and that this will not affect my study at the University now or in the future

Do you give consent to participate in the study described above?

☐ Yes

☐ No

What makes an interesting job? (student)

Thank you for giving your consent!
A few things to keep in mind before proceeding:

1. **Instructions are provided for each set of the questionnaire, please read them carefully before answering the questions**
2. **Please complete the survey alone in a quiet environment where you are unlikely to be disturbed or distracted**

2. If you are a **Year 1 Psychology student** participating through the RPS, please enter your 5 digit RPS ID below so your course credits can be allocated. Otherwise, please ignore this question

What makes an interesting job? (student)

Demographics

* 3. What is your age?

○ Under 18   ○ 35-44

○ 18-24   ○ 45-54

○ 25-34   ○ 55+

* 4. What is your gender?

○ Male

○ Female

○ Other

○ Prefer not to say

* 5. What is your year level?

○ Year 1

○ Year 2

○ Year 3

○ Honours

* 6. Which of the following best describes your current relationship status?

○ Single (never married)   ○ Widowed

○ Married   ○ Divorced

○ In a domestic partnership   ○ Prefer not to say

* 7. How many jobs have your had? (including current jobs)

○ 0   ○ 3

○ 1   ○ 4+

○ 2

What makes an interesting job? (student)

Job Characteristics Preference

What are the important things for you?

* 8. For each of the job characteristics listed below, please indicate how important you think they are to **YOURSELF**, with 1 being "not important at all" and 7 being "extremely important"

	1 - Not important at all	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Extremely important
Performing intellectually challenging and interesting work (e.g. require you to solve complex problems)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Opportunities for promotion/advancement	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Opportunities to use a number of different abilities and skills	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Opportunities for training and development	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Allows you to perform a wide variety of activities	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Have autonomy in making work-related decisions	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Co-workers/colleagues are competent and sociable	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Have a positive relationship with superior and managers	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Have frequent interaction with external stakeholders (e.g. clients and suppliers)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
The company/organisation promotes workforce diversity policies	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
The company/organisation promotes work-life balance policies	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

* 9. For each of the job characteristics listed below, please indicate how important you think they are to **YOURSELF**, with 1 being "not important at all" and 7 being "extremely important"

	1 - Not important at all	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Extremely important
The company/organisation promotes workplace safety policies	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The company/organisation promotes anti-bullying and discrimination policies	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The company/organisation promotes environment protection and waste reduction policies	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The company/organisation is in a desirable geographic location (e.g. close to home, family or friends)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Above average starting salary	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Fringe benefits (e.g. paid time off, health and life insurance, housing allowance, entertainment allowance, retirement plan contributions)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Secure employment tenure (prefer long-term contracts over temporary, short-term contracts)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Flexible working hours	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Comfortable working conditions (e.g. lights, noise level, temperature, air quality, cleanliness)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ergonomically designed workspace (e.g. adjustable chairs and tables, sufficient distance from computer screen)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Open office with sharing workspace	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

	1 - Not important at all	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Extremely important
Have a private workspace/office	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

What makes an interesting job? (student)

Personality questionnaire

Instructions:

The following section contains phrases describing people's behaviour. Please indicate how strongly each phrase describes you, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree"

* 10. Please try and describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Go with your first instincts and try not to think too hard about each item.

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Slightly disagree	3 - Neither agree/disagree	4 - Slightly agree	5 - Strongly agree
Worry about things	○	○	○	○	○
Fear for the worst	○	○	○	○	○
Am afraid of many things	○	○	○	○	○
Gest stressed out easily	○	○	○	○	○
Get angry easily	○	○	○	○	○
Get irritated easily	○	○	○	○	○
Lose my temper	○	○	○	○	○
Rarely get irritated	○	○	○	○	○
Often feel blue	○	○	○	○	○
Dislike myself	○	○	○	○	○
Am often down in the dumps	○	○	○	○	○
Have a low opinion of myself	○	○	○	○	○
Find it difficult to approach others	○	○	○	○	○
Am easily intimidated	○	○	○	○	○
Am not embarrassed easily	○	○	○	○	○
Am able to stand up for myself	○	○	○	○	○
Often eat too much	○	○	○	○	○
Go on binges	○	○	○	○	○
Rarely overindulge	○	○	○	○	○
Am able to control my cravings	○	○	○	○	○

* 11. Please try and describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Go with your first instincts and try not to think too hard about each item.

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Slightly disagree	3 - Neither agree/disagree	4 - Slightly agree	5 - Strongly agree
Feel that I'm unable to deal with things	○	○	○	○	○
Remain calm under pressure	○	○	○	○	○
Know how to cope	○	○	○	○	○
Am calm even in tense situations	○	○	○	○	○
Make friends easily	○	○	○	○	○
Warm up quickly to others	○	○	○	○	○
Feel comfortable around people	○	○	○	○	○
Act comfortably with others	○	○	○	○	○
Love large parties	○	○	○	○	○
Talk to a lot of different people at parties	○	○	○	○	○
Don't like crowded events	○	○	○	○	○
Avoid crowds	○	○	○	○	○
Take charge	○	○	○	○	○
Try to lead others	○	○	○	○	○
Take control of things	○	○	○	○	○
Wait for others to lead the way	○	○	○	○	○
Am always busy	○	○	○	○	○
Am always on the go	○	○	○	○	○
Do a lot in my spare time	○	○	○	○	○
Can manage many things at the same time	○	○	○	○	○

What makes an interesting job? (student)

Personality questionnaire

Instructions:

The following section contains phrases describing people's behaviour. Please indicate how strongly each phrase describes you, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree"

* 12. Please try and describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Go with your first instincts and try not to think too hard about each item.

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Slightly disagree	3 - Neither agree/disagree	4 - Slightly agree	5 - Strongly agree
Love excitement	○	○	○	○	○
Seek adventure	○	○	○	○	○
Love action	○	○	○	○	○
Enjoy being reckless	○	○	○	○	○
Radiate joy	○	○	○	○	○
Have a lot of fun	○	○	○	○	○
Love life	○	○	○	○	○
Laugh aloud	○	○	○	○	○
Have a vivid imagination	○	○	○	○	○
Enjoy wild flights of fantasy	○	○	○	○	○
Love to daydream	○	○	○	○	○
Like to get lost in thought	○	○	○	○	○
See beauty in things that others might not notice	○	○	○	○	○
Do not like art	○	○	○	○	○
Do not like poetry	○	○	○	○	○
Do not enjoy going to art museums	○	○	○	○	○
Experience my emotions intensely	○	○	○	○	○
Seldom get emotional	○	○	○	○	○
Am not easily affected by my emotions	○	○	○	○	○
Experience very few emotional highs and lows	○	○	○	○	○

* 13. Please try and describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Go with your first instincts and try not to think too hard about each item.

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Slightly disagree	3 - Neither agree/disagree	4 - Slightly agree	5 - Strongly agree
Prefer to stick with things that I know	○	○	○	○	○
Dislike changes	○	○	○	○	○
Don't like the idea of change	○	○	○	○	○
Am attached to conventional ways	○	○	○	○	○
Am not interested in abstract ideas	○	○	○	○	○
Avoid philosophical discussions	○	○	○	○	○
Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas	○	○	○	○	○
Am not interested in theoretical discussion	○	○	○	○	○
Tend to vote for liberal political candidates	○	○	○	○	○
Believe in one true religion	○	○	○	○	○
Tend to vote for conservative political candidates	○	○	○	○	○
Like to stand during the national anthem	○	○	○	○	○
Trust others	○	○	○	○	○
Believe that others have good intentions	○	○	○	○	○
Trust what people say	○	○	○	○	○
Distrust people	○	○	○	○	○
Use flattery to get ahead	○	○	○	○	○
Know how to get around the rules	○	○	○	○	○
Cheat to get ahead	○	○	○	○	○
Take advantage of others	○	○	○	○	○

What makes an interesting job? (student)

Personality questionnaire

Instructions:

The following section contains phrases describing people's behaviour. Please indicate how strongly each phrase describes you, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree"

* 14. Please try and describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Go with your first instincts and try not to think too hard about each item.

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Slightly disagree	3 - Neither agree/disagree	4 - Slightly agree	5 - Strongly agree
Make people feel welcome	○	○	○	○	○
Love to help others	○	○	○	○	○
Am concerned about others	○	○	○	○	○
Turn my back on others	○	○	○	○	○
Love a good fight	○	○	○	○	○
Yell at people	○	○	○	○	○
Insult people	○	○	○	○	○
Get back at others	○	○	○	○	○
Believe that I am better than others	○	○	○	○	○
Think highly of myself	○	○	○	○	○
Have a high opinion of myself	○	○	○	○	○
Make myself the centre of attention	○	○	○	○	○
Sympathise with the homeless	○	○	○	○	○
Feel sympathy for those who are worse off than myself	○	○	○	○	○
Suffer from others' sorrows	○	○	○	○	○
Am not interested in other people's problems	○	○	○	○	○
Complete tasks successfully	○	○	○	○	○
Excel in what I do	○	○	○	○	○
Handle tasks smoothly	○	○	○	○	○
Know how to get things done	○	○	○	○	○

* 15. Please try and describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Go with your first instincts and try not to think too hard about each item.

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Slightly disagree	3 - Neither agree/disagree	4 - Slightly agree	5 - Strongly agree
Like order	○	○	○	○	○
Like to tidy up	○	○	○	○	○
Leave a mess in my room	○	○	○	○	○
Leave my belongings around	○	○	○	○	○
Keep my promises	○	○	○	○	○
Tell the truth	○	○	○	○	○
Break my promises	○	○	○	○	○
Get others to do my duties	○	○	○	○	○
Work hard	○	○	○	○	○
Do more than what's expected of me	○	○	○	○	○
Set high standards for myself and others	○	○	○	○	○
Am not highly motivated to succeed	○	○	○	○	○
Start tasks right away	○	○	○	○	○
Find it difficult to get down to work	○	○	○	○	○
Need a push to get started	○	○	○	○	○
Have difficulty starting tasks	○	○	○	○	○
Jump into things without thinking	○	○	○	○	○
Make rash decisions	○	○	○	○	○
Rush into things	○	○	○	○	○
Act without thinking	○	○	○	○	○

What makes an interesting job? (student)

Job Characteristics Preference

What do you think are important to other people?

* 16. For each of the job characteristics listed below, please indicate how important you think they are to **OTHER PEOPLE in the workforce**, with 1 being "not important at all" and 7 being "extremely important"

	1 - Not important at all	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Extremely important
Performing intellectually challenging and interesting work (e.g. require you to solve complex problems)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Opportunities for promotion/advancement	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Opportunities to use a number of different abilities and skills	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Opportunities for training and development	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Allows you to perform a wide variety of activities	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Have autonomy in making work-related decisions	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Co-workers/colleagues are competent and sociable	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Have a positive relationship with superior and managers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Have frequent interaction with external stakeholders (e.g. clients and suppliers)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The company/organisation promotes workforce diversity policies	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The company/organisation promotes work-life balance policies	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 17. For each of the job characteristics listed below, please indicate how important you think they are to **OTHER PEOPLE in the workforce**, with 1 being "not important at all" and 7 being "extremely important"

important

	1 - Not important at all	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Extremely important
The company/organisation promotes workplace safety policies	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The company/organisation promotes anti-bullying and discrimination policies	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The company/organisation promotes environment protection and waste reduction policies	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The company/organisation is in a desirable geographic location (e.g. close to home, family or friends)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Above average starting salary	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Fringe benefits (e.g. paid time off, health and life insurance, housing allowance, entertainment allowance, retirement plan contributions)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Secure employment tenure (prefer long-term contracts over temporary, short-term contracts)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Flexible working hours	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Comfortable working conditions (e.g. lights, noise level, temperature, air quality, cleanliness)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ergonomically designed workspace (e.g. adjustable chairs and tables, sufficient distance from computer screen)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Open office with sharing workspace	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Have a private workspace/office	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

What makes an interesting job? (student)

Thank you for completing this survey!

We are also recruiting participants over the age of 25, who are currently in full-time employment, or had been in full-time employment within the last 12 months. If you know anyone who fits the criteria (even your parents), please pass on the information about this survey (link below) and invite them to complete it as well. Your help is very much appreciated !

The link to the survey for working adult participants is:

████████████████████████████

18. If you would like to receive a summary of your personality profile, please enter your preferred contact email below

Appendix G: Recruitment Poster

What Makes an Interesting Job?

SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY | THE UNIVERSITY of ADELAIDE

Job Characteristics Preference and Personality amongst Undergraudates

What's important for you when you look for a job?

For students

Contact information

WHY?

This research project is designed to investigate what job characteristics attract students when applying for a job, and how their preferences for particular job characteristics are influenced by their personality. The study aims is to investigate recent changes in such preferences and to compare them with those currently in the workforce.

WHO?

Students studying a Bachelor of Psychological Science or Honours (all year levels) are invited! Year 1 students can participate through the Research Participation System for course credits.

We are ialso inviting participant who are over the age of 25 years old, currently in full-time employment, or had been in full-time employment within the last 12 months. Please invite anyone who might be interested!

WHAT?

You are being invited to complete a 15-20 minute online survey. The online survey consist of a personality questionnaire and a list of job characteristics that you need to rate in terms of their importance.

Once you completed the survey, **you can request for a brief summary of your personality profile!**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DESCRIPTION

Personality and Individual Differences is primarily devoted to the publication of articles (experimental, correlational, theoretical, expository/review) which enhance our understanding of the structure of personality and other forms of individual differences, the processes which cause these individual differences to emerge, and their practical applications. Accessible methodological contributions are also welcome. The Editors invite papers that focus on the genetic, biological, and environmental foundations of individual differences, and possible interaction effects. While we recognize the importance of questionnaires for the measurement of individual differences, we encourage their link to experimental and behavioural measures. Ultimately the editors of PAID view human beings as bio-social organisms and that work on individual differences can be most fruitfully pursued by attending to both these aspects of our nature.

AUDIENCE

Social, experimental, educational, clinical and industrial psychologists.

IMPACT FACTOR

2017: 1.967 © Clarivate Analytics Journal Citation Reports 2018

ABSTRACTING AND INDEXING

Research Alert
Current Contents/Social & Behavioral Sciences
ASSIA
PASCAL/CNRS
Social Sciences Citation Index
PsycINFO
PsycLIT
Scopus

L. Newman, Syracuse University
G. Norris, Aberystwyth University
P.J. O'Connor, Queensland University of Technology
T.M. Olino, Temple University
R. Plomin, King's College London
A. Poropat, Griffith University
C.L. Reeve, University of North Carolina at Charlotte
J. E. Roberts, The State University of New York at Buffalo
S. B. Sherry, Dalhousie University
L. D. Smillie, University of Melbourne
F. Spinath, Universität des Saarlandes
M. Stolarski, Uniwersytet Warszawski
K. Taku, Oakland University
P. Tremblay, University of Western Ontario
S. van der Linden, University of Cambridge
M. Voracek, University of Vienna
W. Wang, Zhejiang University School of Medicine
L. G. Weiss, Research and Measurement Consultant, USA
P. Wilson, Queen's University Belfast
G. Yan, Beijing Normal University
M. Zajenkowski, University of Warsaw
M. Zeidner, University of Haifa
B. Zhu, Beijing Normal University

GUIDE FOR AUTHORS

Your Paper Your Way

We now differentiate between the requirements for new and revised submissions. You may choose to submit your manuscript as a single Word or PDF file to be used in the refereeing process. Only when your paper is at the revision stage, will you be requested to put your paper in to a 'correct format' for acceptance and provide the items required for the publication of your article.
To find out more, please visit the Preparation section below.

INTRODUCTION

The Official Journal of the International Society for the Study of Individual Differences (ISSID).

Neither the Editors nor the Publisher accept responsibility for the views or statements expressed by authors.

All incoming papers are subject to the refereeing process, unless they are not appropriate for the Aims and Scope of the journal as outlined, do not follow the Guide for Authors, or clearly suffer from methodological problems (e.g. unsatisfactory sample size). Correspondence regarding decisions reached by the editorial committee is not encouraged.
Click here to watch the recording of an author workshop presented by the Editor and Publisher of PAID. This video offers many practical tips for the preparation of your manuscript as well as useful background on the peer review and publication process.

BEFORE YOU BEGIN

Ethics in publishing

Please see our information pages on Ethics in publishing and Ethical guidelines for journal publication.

Studies in humans and animals

If the work involves the use of human subjects, the author should ensure that the work described has been carried out in accordance with The Code of Ethics of the World Medical Association (Declaration of Helsinki) for experiments involving humans. The manuscript should be in line with the Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals and aim for the inclusion of representative human populations (sex, age and ethnicity) as per those recommendations. The terms sex and gender should be used correctly.

Authors should include a statement in the manuscript that informed consent was obtained for experimentation with human subjects. The privacy rights of human subjects must always be observed.

All animal experiments should comply with the ARRIVE guidelines and should be carried out in accordance with the U.K. Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act, 1986 and associated guidelines, EU Directive 2010/63/EU for animal experiments, or the National Institutes of Health guide for the care and use of Laboratory animals (NIH Publications No. 8023, revised 1978) and the authors should clearly indicate in the manuscript that such guidelines have been followed. The sex of animals must be indicated, and where appropriate, the influence (or association) of sex on the results of the study.

Declaration of interest

All authors must disclose any financial and personal relationships with other people or organizations that could inappropriately influence (bias) their work. Examples of potential competing interests include employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony, patent applications/registrations, and grants or other funding. Authors must disclose any interests in two places: 1. A summary declaration of interest statement in the title page file (if double-blind) or the manuscript file (if single-blind). If there are no interests to declare then please state this: 'Declarations of interest: none'. This summary statement will be ultimately published if the article is accepted. 2. Detailed disclosures as part of a separate Declaration of Interest form, which forms part of the journal's official records. It is important for potential interests to be declared in both places and that the information matches. More information.

Submission declaration and verification

Submission of an article implies that the work described has not been published previously (except in the form of an abstract, a published lecture or academic thesis, see 'Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication' for more information), that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere, that

its publication is approved by all authors and tacitly or explicitly by the responsible authorities where the work was carried out, and that, if accepted, it will not be published elsewhere in the same form, in English or in any other language, including electronically without the written consent of the copyright-holder. To verify originality, your article may be checked by the originality detection service Crossref Similarity Check.

Preprints
Please note that preprints can be shared anywhere at any time, in line with Elsevier's sharing policy. Sharing your preprints e.g. on a preprint server will not count as prior publication (see 'Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication' for more information).

Use of inclusive language

Inclusive language acknowledges diversity, conveys respect to all people, is sensitive to differences, and promotes equal opportunities. Articles should make no assumptions about the beliefs or commitments of any reader, should contain nothing which might imply that one individual is superior to another on the grounds of race, sex, culture or any other characteristic, and should use inclusive language throughout. Authors should ensure that writing is free from bias, for instance by using 'he or she', 'his/her' instead of 'he' or 'his', and by making use of job titles that are free of stereotyping (e.g. 'chairperson' instead of 'chairman' and 'flight attendant' instead of 'stewardess').

Author contributions

For transparency, we encourage authors to submit an author statement file outlining their individual contributions to the paper using the relevant CRediT roles: Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Funding acquisition; Investigation; Methodology; Project administration; Resources; Software; Supervision; Validation; Visualization; Roles/Writing - original draft; Writing - review & editing. Authorship statements should be formatted with the names of authors first and CRediT role(s) following. More details and an example

Changes to authorship

Authors are expected to consider carefully the list and order of authors **before** submitting their manuscript and provide the definitive list of authors at the time of the original submission. Any addition, deletion or rearrangement of author names in the authorship list should be made only **before** the manuscript has been accepted and only if approved by the journal Editor. To request such a change, the Editor must receive the following from the **corresponding author**: (a) the reason for the change in author list and (b) written confirmation (e-mail, letter) from all authors that they agree with the addition, removal or rearrangement. In the case of addition or removal of authors, this includes confirmation from the author being added or removed.
Only in exceptional circumstances will the Editor consider the addition, deletion or rearrangement of authors **after** the manuscript has been accepted. While the Editor considers the request, publication of the manuscript will be suspended. If the manuscript has already been published in an online issue, any requests approved by the Editor will result in a corrigendum.

Copyright

Upon acceptance of an article, authors will be asked to complete a 'Journal Publishing Agreement' (see more information on this). An e-mail will be sent to the corresponding author confirming receipt of the manuscript together with a 'Journal Publishing Agreement' form or a link to the online version of this agreement.

Subscribers may reproduce tables of contents or prepare lists of articles including abstracts for internal circulation within their institutions. Permission of the Publisher is required for resale or distribution outside the institution and for all other derivative works, including compilations and translations. If excerpts from other copyrighted works are included, the author(s) must obtain written permission from the copyright owners and credit the source(s) in the article. Elsevier has preprinted forms for use by authors in these cases.

For gold open access articles: Upon acceptance of an article, authors will be asked to complete an 'Exclusive License Agreement' (more information). Permitted third party reuse of gold open access articles is determined by the author's choice of user license.

Author rights

As an author you (or your employer or institution) have certain rights to reuse your work. More information.

Elsevier supports responsible sharing
Find out how you can share your research published in Elsevier journals.

Role of the funding source
You are requested to identify who provided financial support for the conduct of the research and/or preparation of the article and to briefly describe the role of the sponsor(s), if any, in study design; in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; and in the decision to submit the article for publication. If the funding source(s) had no such involvement then this should be stated.

Funding body agreements and policies
Elsevier has established a number of agreements with funding bodies which allow authors to comply with their funder's open access policies. Some funding bodies will reimburse the author for the gold open access publication fee. Details of existing agreements are available online.

Open access
This journal offers authors a choice in publishing their research:

Subscription
• Articles are made available to subscribers as well as developing countries and patient groups through our universal access programs.
• No open access publication fee payable by authors.
• The Author is entitled to post the accepted manuscript in their institution's repository and make this public after an embargo period (known as green Open Access). The published journal article cannot be shared publicly, for example on ResearchGate or Academia.edu, to ensure the sustainability of peer-reviewed research in journal publications. The embargo period for this journal can be found below.
Gold open access
• Articles are freely available to both subscribers and the wider public with permitted reuse.
• A gold open access publication fee is payable by authors or on their behalf, e.g. by their research funder or institution.

Regardless of how you choose to publish your article, the journal will apply the same peer review criteria and acceptance standards.

For gold open access articles, permitted third party (re)use is defined by the following Creative Commons user licenses:

Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY)
Lets others distribute and copy the article, create extracts, abstracts, and other revised versions, adaptations or derivative works of or from an article (such as a translation), include in a collective work (such as an anthology), text or data mine the article, even for commercial purposes, as long as they credit the author(s), do not represent the author as endorsing their adaptation of the article, and do not modify the article in such a way as to damage the author's honor or reputation.

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)
For non-commercial purposes, lets others distribute and copy the article, and to include in a collective work (such as an anthology), as long as they credit the author(s) and provided they do not alter or modify the article.

The gold open access publication fee for this journal is **USD 2500**, excluding taxes. Learn more about Elsevier's pricing policy: https://www.elsevier.com/openaccesspricing.

Green open access
Authors can share their research in a variety of different ways and Elsevier has a number of green open access options available. We recommend authors see our open access page for further information. Authors can also self-archive their manuscripts immediately and enable public access from their institution's repository after an embargo period. This is the version that has been accepted for publication and which typically includes author-incorporated changes suggested during submission, peer review and in editor-author communications. Embargo period: For subscription articles, an appropriate amount of time is needed for journals to deliver value to subscribing customers before an article becomes freely available to the public. This is the embargo period and it begins from the date the article is formally published online in its final and fully citable form. Find out more.

This journal has an embargo period of 24 months.

Language (usage and editing services)
Please write your text in good English (American or British usage is accepted, but not a mixture of these). Authors who feel their English language manuscript may require editing to eliminate possible grammatical or spelling errors and to conform to correct scientific English may wish to use the English Language Editing service available from Elsevier's WebShop.

Submission

Our online submission system guides you stepwise through the process of entering your article details and uploading your files. The system converts your article files to a single PDF file used in the peer-review process. Editable files (e.g., Word, LaTeX) are required to typeset your article for final publication. All correspondence, including notification of the Editor's decision and requests for revision, is sent by e-mail.

Submit your article
Please submit your article via http://ees.elsevier.com/paid

PAID gives you the opportunity to enrich your article by providing readers with access to relevant statistical R-code and data. To **share your R-code** and corresponding (example) data set, please submit your R-code and data set with the manuscript. Multiple files can be submitted. We support the .R format for R-code and .CSV, .XLS, .TXT and .DAT files for datasets. Each R-file and corresponding data set will have to be zipped together and uploaded to online submission system via the "R data" submission category. Recommended size of a single uncompressed file is 100 MB. Please provide a short informative description for each file by filling in the "Description" field when uploading a dataset. Please mention dependencies on R libraries as comment in your R-code.

"Additional Information: Article Types and Length"

Manuscripts must be submitted using double-spacing including line and page numbers. These should not exceed the word count provided below. The word count includes: title, abstract, full text, references and footnotes/acknowledgements. Tables and figures are also considered in the word count but only those essential to the study should be included in the body of the paper; all other tables, etc. should be placed as supplemental material.

Lengthier reviews, theoretical and expository articles, and meta-analyses: Articles of exceptional quality and importance will be considered for publication and typically be no more than 10,000 words. Longer papers may be submitted and will be considered at the discretion of the editors; in your covering letter, please justify why you are requesting greater than 10,000 word count.

Review articles: These papers are typically in the 5,000-10,000 word range and provide a critical analysis of important and new topics related to personality and individual differences. Please select Review Article from the dropdown menu upon submission.

Single study research articles: Single study research articles should not exceed 5000 words.

Multiple study research articles: Research articles reporting multiple (two or more) studies should not exceed 10,000 words in total.

Brief Reports: These articles should not exceed a total of 2,500 words (including tables, figures, and references). Additional tables or figures can be included in Supplementary Material.

PREPARATION

NEW SUBMISSIONS

* Submission to this journal proceeds totally online and you will be guided stepwise through the creation and uploading of your files. The system automatically converts your files to a single PDF file, which is used in the peer-review process.
As part of the Your Paper Your Way service, you may choose to submit your manuscript as a single file to be used in the refereeing process. This can be a PDF file or a Word document, in any format or lay-out that can be used by referees to evaluate your manuscript. It should contain high enough quality

figures for refereeing. If you prefer to do so, you may still provide all or some of the source files at the initial submission. Please note that individual figure files larger than 10 MB must be uploaded separately.

Reporting Requirements:
All empirical submissions are required to: (a) provide sufficient detail on the samples studied and the population from which they constitute a random or convenience sample; (b) compile basic descriptive statistics of all variables of relevance used in the study (e.g., indices of central tendency and dispersion; reliability coefficients for scale scores); and (c) report effect sizes for focal tests (correlations r and regression weights beta count as effect size measures). In addition to these required reporting practices, we encourage but do not strictly require (a) providing 95% CIs around focal effect size estimates, (b) detailing any a priori power considerations made that led to the final sample size, and (c) whether and where any data, materials, code or syntax, or additional analyses of the reported studies can be found openly accessible; authors may include such information as supplemental information for inclusion in the online publication.

Power:
For empirical studies, we recommend but do not strictly require at least 80% power for focal statistical tests.

References
There are no strict requirements on reference formatting at submission. References can be in any style or format as long as the style is consistent. Where applicable, author(s) name(s), journal title/ book title, chapter title/article title, year of publication, volume number/book chapter and the article number or pagination must be present. Use of DOI is highly encouraged. The reference style used by the journal will be applied to the accepted article by Elsevier at the proof stage. Note that missing data will be highlighted at proof stage for the author to correct.

Formatting requirements
There are no strict formatting requirements but all manuscripts must contain the essential elements needed to convey your manuscript, for example Abstract, Keywords, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Conclusions, Artwork and Tables with Captions.
If your article includes any Videos and/or other Supplementary material, this should be included in your initial submission for peer review purposes.
Divide the article into clearly defined sections.

Figures and tables embedded in text
Please ensure the figures and the tables included in the single file are placed next to the relevant text in the manuscript, rather than at the bottom or the top of the file. The corresponding caption should be placed directly below the figure or table.

Peer review
This journal operates a double blind review process. All contributions will be initially assessed by the Editor-in-Chief for suitability for the journal. Papers deemed suitable are then typically sent onto a (Senior) Associate Editor for assessment and then to a minimum of two independent expert reviewers to assess the scientific quality of the paper. The handling editor is responsible for the final decision regarding acceptance or rejection of articles, and the editor's decision is final.

REVISED SUBMISSIONS
Use of word processing software
Regardless of the file format of the original submission, at revision you must provide us with an editable file of the entire article. Keep the layout of the text as simple as possible. Most formatting codes will be removed and replaced on processing the article. The electronic text should be prepared in a way very similar to that of conventional manuscripts (see also the Guide to Publishing with Elsevier). See also the section on Electronic artwork.
To avoid unnecessary errors you are strongly advised to use the 'spell-check' and 'grammar-check' functions of your word processor.

Article structure
Subdivision - numbered sections
Divide your article into clearly defined and numbered sections. Subsections should be numbered 1.1 (then 1.1.1, 1.1.2, ...), 1.2, etc. (the abstract is not included in section numbering). Use this numbering also for internal cross-referencing: do not just refer to 'the text'. Any subsection may be given a brief heading. Each heading should appear on its own separate line.

Introduction
State the objectives of the work and provide an adequate background, avoiding a detailed literature survey or a summary of the results.

Material and methods
Provide sufficient details to allow the work to be reproduced by an independent researcher. Methods that are already published should be summarized, and indicated by a reference. If quoting directly from a previously published method, use quotation marks and also cite the source. Any modifications to existing methods should also be described.

Theory/calculation
A Theory section should extend, not repeat, the background to the article already dealt with in the Introduction and lay the foundation for further work. In contrast, a Calculation section represents a practical development from a theoretical basis.

Results
Results should be clear and concise.

Discussion
This should explore the significance of the results of the work, not repeat them. A combined Results and Discussion section is often appropriate. Avoid extensive citations and discussion of published literature.

Conclusions
The main conclusions of the study may be presented in a short Conclusions section, which may stand alone or form a subsection of a Discussion or Results and Discussion section.

Appendices
If there is more than one appendix, they should be identified as A, B, etc. Formulae and equations in appendices should be given separate numbering: Eq. (A.1), Eq. (A.2), etc.; in a subsequent appendix, Eq. (B.1) and so on. Similarly for tables and figures: Table A.1; Fig. A.1, etc.

Essential title page information
• **Title.** Concise and informative. Titles are often used in information-retrieval systems. Avoid abbreviations and formulae where possible.
• **Author names and affiliations.** Please clearly indicate the given name(s) and family name(s) of each author and check that all names are accurately spelled. You can add your name between parentheses in your own script behind the English transliteration. Present the authors' affiliation addresses (where the actual work was done) below the names. Indicate all affiliations with a lower-case superscript letter immediately after the author's name and in front of the appropriate address. Provide the full postal address of each affiliation, including the country name and, if available, the e-mail address of each author.
• **Corresponding author.** Clearly indicate who will handle correspondence at all stages of refereeing and publication, also post-publication. This responsibility includes answering any future queries about Methodology and Materials. **Ensure that the e-mail address is given and that contact details are kept up to date by the corresponding author.**
• **Present/permanent address.** If an author has moved since the work described in the article was done, or was visiting at the time, a 'Present address' (or 'Permanent address') may be indicated as a footnote to that author's name. The address at which the author actually did the work must be retained as the main, affiliation address. Superscript Arabic numerals are used for such footnotes.

Abstract
An abstract, not exceeding 200 words should constitute the first page of the article.

Graphical abstract
Although a graphical abstract is optional, its use is encouraged as it draws more attention to the online article. The graphical abstract should summarize the contents of the article in a concise, pictorial form designed to capture the attention of a wide readership. Graphical abstracts should be submitted as a separate file in the online submission system. Image size: Please provide an image with a minimum of 531 × 1328 pixels (h × w) or proportionally more. The image should be readable at a size of 5 × 13 cm using a regular screen resolution of 96 dpi. Preferred file types: TIFF, EPS, PDF or MS Office files. You can view Example Graphical Abstracts on our information site.
Authors can make use of Elsevier's Illustration Services to ensure the best presentation of their images and in accordance with all technical requirements.

Highlights
Highlights are optional for this journal. If they are added, then they should consist of a short collection of bullet points that convey the core findings of the article and should be submitted in a separate editable file in the online submission system. Please use 'Highlights' in the file name and include 3 to 5 bullet points (maximum 85 characters, including spaces, per bullet point). You can view example Highlights on our information site.

Keywords
Immediately after the abstract, provide a maximum of 8 keywords, reflecting the essential topics of the article, which may be taken from both the title and the text. These keywords will be used for information retrieval systems and indexing purposes.

Abbreviations
Define abbreviations that are not standard in this field in a footnote to be placed on the first page of the article. Such abbreviations that are unavoidable in the abstract must be defined at their first mention there, as well as in the footnote. Ensure consistency of abbreviations throughout the article.

Acknowledgements
Collate acknowledgements in a separate section at the end of the article before the references and do not, therefore, include them on the title page, as a footnote to the title or otherwise. List here those individuals who provided help during the research (e.g., providing language help, writing assistance or proof reading the article, etc.).

Formatting of funding sources
List funding sources in this standard way to facilitate compliance to funder's requirements:

Funding: This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health [grant numbers xxxx, yyyy]; the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Seattle, WA [grant number zzzz]; and the United States Institutes of Peace [grant number aaaa].

It is not necessary to include detailed descriptions on the program or type of grants and awards. When funding is from a block grant or other resources available to a university, college, or other research institution, submit the name of the institute or organization that provided the funding.

If no funding has been provided for the research, please include the following sentence:

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Footnotes
Footnotes should be used sparingly. Number them consecutively throughout the article. Many word processors build footnotes into the text, and this feature may be used. Should this not be the case, indicate the position of footnotes in the text and present the footnotes themselves separately at the end of the article.

Artwork
Electronic artwork
General points
• Make sure you use uniform lettering and sizing of your original artwork.
• Preferred fonts: Arial (or Helvetica), Times New Roman (or Times), Symbol, Courier.
• Number the illustrations according to their sequence in the text.
• Use a logical naming convention for your artwork files.
• Indicate per figure if it is a single, 1.5 or 2-column fitting image.
• For Word submissions only, you may still provide figures and their captions, and tables within a single file at the revision stage.
• Please note that individual figure files larger than 10 MB must be provided in separate source files.
A detailed guide on electronic artwork is available.
You are urged to visit this site; some excerpts from the detailed information are given here.
Formats
Regardless of the application used, when your electronic artwork is finalized, please 'save as' or convert the images to one of the following formats (note the resolution requirements for line drawings, halftones, and line/halftone combinations given below):
EPS (or PDF): Vector drawings. Embed the font or save the text as 'graphics'.

TIFF (or JPG): Color or grayscale photographs (halftones): always use a minimum of 300 dpi.

TIFF (or JPG): Bitmapped line drawings: use a minimum of 1000 dpi.

TIFF (or JPG): Combinations bitmapped line/half-tone (color or grayscale): a minimum of 500 dpi is required.

Please do not:

• Supply files that are optimized for screen use (e.g., GIF, BMP, PICT, WPG); the resolution is too low.

• Supply files that are too low in resolution.

• Submit graphics that are disproportionately large for the content.

Figure captions

Ensure that each illustration has a caption. A caption should comprise a brief title (**not** on the figure itself) and a description of the illustration. Keep text in the illustrations themselves to a minimum but explain all symbols and abbreviations used.

Tables

Tables and figures should be constructed so as to be intelligible without reference to this text, each table and column being provided with a heading. Tables. Captions should be typewritten together on a separate sheet. The same information should not be reproduced in both tables and figures.

References

References should be prepared using the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* for style. They should be placed on a separate sheet at the end of the paper, double-spaced, in alphabetical order.

References should be quoted in the text by giving the author's name, followed by the year, e.g. (Hubbard & Ramachandran, 2001) or Hubbard and Ramachandran (2001).

For *more than two* authors, all names are given when first cited, but when subsequently referred to, the name of the first author is given followed by the words et al., as for example--First citation: Reuter, Roth, Holve and Hennig (2006) but subsequently, Reuter et al. (2006).

References to journals should include the author's name followed by initials, year, paper title, journal title, volume number and page numbers, e.g.

[1] Nettle, D. (2006). Schizotypy and mental health amongst poets, visual artists, and mathematicians. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*, 876-890.

References to books should include the author's name followed by initials, year, paper title, editors, book title, volume and page numbers, place of publication, publisher, e.g.

Fitzgerald, M. (2004). Autism and creativity: Is there a link between autism in men and exceptional ability? Hove and New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Or

Thompson, J. (2006). The Mad, the 'Brut', the 'Primitive' and the Modern. A discursive history. In F. Andrada, E. Martin, & A. Spira (Eds.), Inner worlds outside (pp. 51-69). Dublin: Irish Museum of Modern Art.

Reference to a dataset:

[dataset] [2] Oguro, M., Imahiro, S., Saito, S., Nakashizuka, T. (2015). Mortality data for Japanese oak wilt disease and surrounding forest compositions. Mendeley Data, v1. http://dx.doi.org/10.17632/xwj98nb39r.1.

This journal should be cited in lists of references as Personality and Individual Differences.

Web references

As a minimum, the full URL should be given and the date when the reference was last accessed. Any further information, if known (DOI, author names, dates, reference to a source publication, etc.), should also be given. Web references should be listed separately after the reference list under a different heading - Web References.

Citation in text

Please ensure that every reference cited in the text is also present in the reference list (and vice versa). Any references cited in the abstract must be given in full. Unpublished results and personal communications are not recommended in the reference list, but may be mentioned in the text. If these

references are included in the reference list they should follow the standard reference style of the journal and should include a substitution of the publication date with either 'Unpublished results' or 'Personal communication'. Citation of a reference as 'in press' implies that the item has been accepted for publication.

Data references
This journal encourages you to cite underlying or relevant datasets in your manuscript by citing them in your text and including a data reference in your Reference List. Data references should include the following elements: author name(s), dataset title, data repository, version (where available), year, and global persistent identifier. Add [dataset] immediately before the reference so we can properly identify it as a data reference. The [dataset] identifier will not appear in your published article.

References in a special issue
Please ensure that the words 'this issue' are added to any references in the list (and any citations in the text) to other articles in the same Special Issue.

Reference management software
Most Elsevier journals have their reference template available in many of the most popular reference management software products. These include all products that support Citation Style Language styles, such as Mendeley. Using citation plug-ins from these products, authors only need to select the appropriate journal template when preparing their article, after which citations and bibliographies will be automatically formatted in the journal's style. If no template is yet available for this journal, please follow the format of the sample references and citations as shown in this Guide. If you use reference management software, please ensure that you remove all field codes before submitting the electronic manuscript. More information on how to remove field codes from different reference management software.

Users of Mendeley Desktop can easily install the reference style for this journal by clicking the following link:
http://open.mendeley.com/use-citation-style/personality-and-individual-differences
When preparing your manuscript, you will then be able to select this style using the Mendeley plug-ins for Microsoft Word or LibreOffice.

Reference formatting
There are no strict requirements on reference formatting at submission. References can be in any style or format as long as the style is consistent. Where applicable, author(s) name(s), journal title/ book title, chapter title/article title, year of publication, volume number/book chapter and the article number or pagination must be present. Use of DOI is highly encouraged. The reference style used by the journal will be applied to the accepted article by Elsevier at the proof stage. Note that missing data will be highlighted at proof stage for the author to correct. If you do wish to format the references yourself they should be arranged according to the following examples:

Journal abbreviations source
Journal names should be abbreviated according to the List of Title Word Abbreviations.

Data visualization
Include interactive data visualizations in your publication and let your readers interact and engage more closely with your research. Follow the instructions here to find out about available data visualization options and how to include them with your article.

Supplementary material
Supplementary material such as applications, images and sound clips, can be published with your article to enhance it. Submitted supplementary items are published exactly as they are received (Excel or PowerPoint files will appear as such online). Please submit your material together with the article and supply a concise, descriptive caption for each supplementary file. If you wish to make changes to supplementary material during any stage of the process, please make sure to provide an updated file. Do not annotate any corrections on a previous version. Please switch off the 'Track Changes' option in Microsoft Office files as these will appear in the published version.

Research data
This journal encourages and enables you to share data that supports your research publication where appropriate, and enables you to interlink the data with your published articles. Research data refers to the results of observations or experimentation that validate research findings. To facilitate reproducibility and data reuse, this journal also encourages you to share your software, code, models, algorithms, protocols, methods and other useful materials related to the project.

Below are a number of ways in which you can associate data with your article or make a statement about the availability of your data when submitting your manuscript. If you are sharing data in one of these ways, you are encouraged to cite the data in your manuscript and reference list. Please refer to the "References" section for more information about data citation. For more information on depositing, sharing and using research data and other relevant research materials, visit the research data page.

Data linking
If you have made your research data available in a data repository, you can link your article directly to the dataset. Elsevier collaborates with a number of repositories to link articles on ScienceDirect with relevant repositories, giving readers access to underlying data that gives them a better understanding of the research described.

There are different ways to link your datasets to your article. When available, you can directly link your dataset to your article by providing the relevant information in the submission system. For more information, visit the database linking page.

For supported data repositories a repository banner will automatically appear next to your published article on ScienceDirect.

In addition, you can link to relevant data or entities through identifiers within the text of your manuscript, using the following format: Database: xxxx (e.g., TAIR: AT1G01020; CCDC: 734053; PDB: 1XFN).

Mendeley Data
This journal supports Mendeley Data, enabling you to deposit any research data (including raw and processed data, video, code, software, algorithms, protocols, and methods) associated with your manuscript in a free-to-use, open access repository. During the submission process, after uploading your manuscript, you will have the opportunity to upload your relevant datasets directly to *Mendeley Data*. The datasets will be listed and directly accessible to readers next to your published article online.

For more information, visit the Mendeley Data for journals page.

Data in Brief
You have the option of converting any or all parts of your supplementary or additional raw data into one or multiple data articles, a new kind of article that houses and describes your data. Data articles ensure that your data is actively reviewed, curated, formatted, indexed, given a DOI and publicly available to all upon publication. You are encouraged to submit your article for *Data in Brief* as an additional item directly alongside the revised version of your manuscript. If your research article is accepted, your data article will automatically be transferred over to *Data in Brief* where it will be editorially reviewed and published in the open access data journal, *Data in Brief*. Please note an open access fee of 500 USD is payable for publication in *Data in Brief*. Full details can be found on the Data in Brief website. Please use this template to write your Data in Brief.

Data statement
To foster transparency, we encourage you to state the availability of your data in your submission. This may be a requirement of your funding body or institution. If your data is unavailable to access or unsuitable to post, you will have the opportunity to indicate why during the submission process, for example by stating that the research data is confidential. The statement will appear with your published article on ScienceDirect. For more information, visit the Data Statement page.

Submission checklist
Ensure that:
One author has been designated as the corresponding author with contact details:
• E-mail address
• Full postal address
• Telephone number
All necessary files have been uploaded, and contain:
• Keywords
• All figure captions
• All tables (including title, description, footnotes)
Further considerations
• Manuscript has been 'spell-checked' and 'grammar-checked'

- References are in the correct format for this journal
- All references mentioned in the Reference list are cited in the text, and vice versa
- Permission has been obtained for use of copyrighted material from other sources (including the Web)
- Color figures are clearly marked as being intended for color reproduction on the Web (free of charge) and in print, or to be reproduced in color on the Web (free of charge) and in black-and-white in print
- If only color on the Web is required, black-and-white versions of the figures are also supplied for printing purposes
- Title page has to be uploaded separately and it is a mandatory submission item
- Cover letter has to be uploaded as a separate document
- Articles should contain page number
- Ensure that the manuscript including the references are in double line spacing
- Ensure that the author's identity is removed from the original manuscript
- Highlights are submitted in the proper format
- Acknowledgments has to be uploaded as separate document

AFTER ACCEPTANCE

Proofs

Proofs will be sent to the author (first-named author if no corresponding author is identified on multi-authored papers) by PDF wherever possible and should be returned within 48 hours of receipt, preferably by e-mail. Corrections should be restricted to typesetting errors, any other amendments may be charged to the author. Any queries should be answered in full. Elsevier will do everything possible to get your article corrected and published as quickly and accurately as possible. Therefore, it is important to ensure that all of your corrections are returned to us in one all-inclusive e-mail or fax. Subsequent additional corrections will not be possible, so please ensure that your first communication is complete. Should you choose to mail your corrections, please return to: Elsevier, Stover Court, Bampfylde Street, Exeter, Devon EX1 2AH, UK.

Article Based Publishing

In order to provide you with optimal service and publish your accepted article as quickly as possible, this journal is using the Article Based Publishing system. If you would like to learn more about Article Based Publishing, please see here .

Offprints

The corresponding author will, at no cost, receive a customized Share Link providing 50 days free access to the final published version of the article on ScienceDirect. The Share Link can be used for sharing the article via any communication channel, including email and social media. For an extra charge, paper offprints can be ordered via the offprint order form which is sent once the article is accepted for publication. Both corresponding and co-authors may order offprints at any time via Elsevier's Webshop. Corresponding authors who have published their article gold open access do not receive a Share Link as their final published version of the article is available open access on ScienceDirect and can be shared through the article DOI link.

AUTHOR INQUIRIES

Visit the Elsevier Support Center to find the answers you need. Here you will find everything from Frequently Asked Questions to ways to get in touch.
You can also check the status of your submitted article or find out when your accepted article will be published.