



**Who are the Most Committed at Work?**  
**- Linking Personality to Organizational Commitment**

**Lisa Guppy och Carl-Johan Holmberg**

**Personalvetarprogrammet, Examensarbete 15hp**  
**Institutionen för individ och samhälle/Högskolan Väst**  
**Vårterminen 2021**  
**Handledare: Elias Johannesson**  
**Examinator: Petri Kajonius**

### **Abstract**

Organizational commitment has been linked to several important outcomes, including employee turnover and work performance. Despite that the antecedents of organizational commitment have been a subject of research for several decades, the relation between personality and organizational commitment is relatively unexplored. The aim of this study was to examine the relations between the personality traits in the five-factor model (Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Neuroticism, Openness to Experience, and Extraversion) and organizational commitment. Personality was measured by the IPIP30 questionnaire. Three types of organizational commitment (affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment) were measured by the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. The respondents ( $N = 303$ ) consisted of workers from both the public and the private sector in Sweden. Multiple linear regression analyzes showed that Conscientiousness was statistically significantly related to affective commitment. Agreeableness, Neuroticism, and Extraversion were statistically significantly related to continuance commitment. Practical implications of the results as well as future research directions are discussed.

*Keywords:* Five-factor model of personality, organizational commitment

Organizational commitment has been a subject of research for several decades (Abdirahman, 2018). For organizations, having a committed workforce is beneficial since organizational commitment has been linked to numerous important outcomes. One of the outcomes that has been given much attention is employee turnover (Al-Jabari & Ghazzawi, 2019). In their meta-analysis, Tett and Meyer (1993) found a negative correlation of  $r = -.33$  between organizational commitment and employee turnover. According to Firth et al. (2004), lack of commitment is a consistently found predictor of intentions to leave an organization. For employers, employee turnover is expensive since it is related to lost sales and lost productivity (Ongori, 2007). Furthermore, there are costs associated with finding a replacement for the lost employee. According to Johnson et al. (2000), the estimated cost of hiring and training a replacement worker is approximately 50 percent of the employee's annual salary.

Another consistently found outcome of organizational commitment is work performance (Jaramillo et al., 2005). Ricketta (2002) conducted a meta-analysis and found a positive correlation of  $r = .20$  between organizational commitment and work performance. According to Schmidt and Hunter (1998), work performance has a direct impact on organizations' profitability and productivity.

Given that organizational commitment is related to financially important outcomes such as employee turnover and work performance, organizations may benefit from knowing what variables predict organizational commitment. In psychological research, personality is a consistently found predictor of numerous organizational outcomes (Ones et al., 2007). However, the relation between personality and organizational commitment is relatively unexplored (Farrukh et al., 2017). The aim of this study was to expand the literature on the relations between personality and organizational commitment. Studies have shown that organizational commitment is related to informal learning (Payne & Huffman, 2005) and different health variables (Jain et al., 2013). Therefore, these variables were included in this study in order to examine if personality predicts organizational commitment after controlling for other variables that are related to organizational commitment.

### **Organizational Commitment**

Mowday et al. (1979) defined organizational commitment as the degree to which an individual identifies with – and gets involved in – a particular organization. Meyer and Allen (1991) suggested that organizational commitment should be divided into three components: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. This three-

dimensional model is the most common approach when studying organizational commitment (Keskes et al., 2018).

**Table 1**

*The Three Dimensions of Organizational Commitment*

Affective commitment	Continuance commitment	Normative commitment
Affective commitment refers to the employee's emotional connection to the organization. Individuals with a strong affective commitment choose to continue their employment within the organization because they want to do so.	Continuance commitment refers to the costs related to leaving an organization. Individuals with the main connection to the organization based on continued commitments remain because they need to do so.	Individuals with a strong normative commitment believe that they are obligated to remain in the organization.

*Source.* Meyer and Allen (1991).

Meyer and Allen (1991) referred to commitment as a psychological state. Ko et al. (1997) criticized that the definition of this psychological state was not further specified. Another critique of Meyer and Allen's model is that members of an organization may interpret the dimensions of commitment differently depending on how long they have worked for the organization (Cohen, 2007). Despite the criticism, the three-dimensional model has been able to predict several work-related outcomes. For instance, in their meta-analysis, Meyer et al. (2002) found that affective commitment correlated negatively with voluntary absence ( $\rho = -.22$ ), continuance commitment correlated positively with work-family conflict ( $\rho = .24$ ), and normative commitment correlated positively with organizational citizenship behavior ( $\rho = .24$ ).

### **Personality**

Personality can be defined as an individual's consistent set of traits, behaviors, and emotions (Boyd & Pennebaker, 2017). The prevailing paradigm in personality research is the five-factor model (FFM) (McCrae, 2009; O'Boyle et al., 2015). The FFM consists of five basic traits (also known as the Big Five), which in turn contain narrower subtraits or facets (McCrae, 2010). The five basic traits are: Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Neuroticism, Openness to Experience, and Extraversion (McCrae & Costa Jr, 1997). Adjectives describing

each trait are presented in Table 2. Cross-cultural investigations have shown that these five personality traits can be generalized across all the major cultural regions of the world, indicating that the trait structure of personality is universal (McCrae & Costa Jr, 1997; Schmitt et al., 2007). Personality is influenced by both genes and environment. Briley and Tucker-Drob (2014) found that approximately half of the variance in personality can be attributed to genes and half of the variance can be attributed to environmental factors. With regard to the environmental influence, it is especially the non-shared environment that contributes to variance in personality (Kandler et al., 2010; Spengler et al., 2012).

**Table 2**

*Adjectives Describing Each Trait in the FFM*

	High	Low
Conscientiousness	Well-organized, reliable, hardworking	Disorganized, undependable, lazy
Agreeableness	Forgiving, sympathetic, soft-hearted	Vengeful, callous, ruthless
Neuroticism	Worrying, nervous, insecure	Calm, at ease, secure
Openness to Experience	Imaginative, original, daring	Down to earth, conventional, unadventurous
Extraversion	Sociable, affectionate, spontaneous	Retiring, reserved, inhibited

*Source.* McCrae and Costa (1987).

Claims have been made that the Big Five lie at the top of the hierarchy of human personality (Goldberg, 1993; John & Srivastava, 1999). Block (2010) criticized this, stating that there are intercorrelations between the Big Five, which indicates the existence of higher-order personality factors above the Big Five. Another potential limitation of the FFM is that five factors might not be enough to capture human personality. Lee and Ashton (2004) factor-analyzed lexical investigations in different languages and found six factors of personality instead of five. This finding led to the emergence of the HEXACO model, which consists of a reorganization of the Big Five, combined with a new factor called Honesty-Humility (Ashton & Lee, 2005). Although the FFM may not be a flawless model of personality, it has been successful in predicting outcomes in numerous work-related areas, including work

performance (Barrick et al., 2001), job satisfaction (Steel et al., 2008), and work engagement (Young et al., 2018).

### **Organizational Commitment and Personality**

To our knowledge, there is only one meta-analysis (Choi et al., 2015) of the relations between all of the Big Five traits and organizational commitment, and one meta-analysis (Thoresen et al., 2003) of the relations between two of the Big Five traits (Neuroticism and Extraversion) and organizational commitment. The results of these meta-analyses and the results of some primary studies are presented below.

#### ***Conscientiousness***

In their meta-analysis, Choi et al. (2015) found a positive correlation of  $\rho = .24$  between Conscientiousness and affective commitment. Conscientious workers tend to be punctual and highly involved in their job (Diefendorff et al., 2002). Erdheim et al. (2006), who also found a positive correlation between Conscientiousness and affective commitment ( $r = .18$ ), speculated that this high job involvement might stretch to involvement in the organization itself, possibly explaining why conscientious individuals tend to be affectively committed to their organization.

Hypothesis 1a: Conscientiousness will positively relate to affective commitment.

Choi et al. (2015) also found a positive correlation between Conscientiousness and normative commitment ( $\rho = .18$ ). One of the facets of Conscientiousness is dutifulness (Johnson, 2014). Conscientiousness is also related to loyalty (Guay et al., 2016). Choi et al. (2015) speculated that the values of loyalty and duty might be the reason why conscientious workers develop a normative commitment to their organization.

Hypothesis 1b: Conscientiousness will positively relate to normative commitment.

#### ***Agreeableness***

Workers high in Agreeableness tend to be helpful, cooperative, and show less aggression towards co-workers (Farhadi et al., 2012). Spagnoli and Caetano (2012) hypothesized that this friendly behavior might foster the development of normative commitment. In line with their assumption, Spagnoli and Caetano found a positive correlation of  $r = .21$  between Agreeableness and normative commitment. In the meta-analysis conducted

by Choi et al. (2015), Agreeableness showed a correlation of  $\rho = .26$  with normative commitment.

Hypothesis 2a: Agreeableness will positively relate to normative commitment.

Agreeableness has also been linked to affective commitment. Spagnoli and Caetano (2012) found a correlation of  $r = .19$  between these two variables and speculated that agreeable employees' care for their co-workers might foster an affective tie to the organization. In the meta-analysis conducted by Choi et al. (2015), the correlation between Agreeableness and affective commitment ( $\rho = .31$ ) was the single strongest correlation between any of the Big Five traits and organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 2b: Agreeableness will positively relate to affective commitment.

### ***Neuroticism***

In their meta-analysis, Thoresen et al. (2003) found a correlation of  $\rho = -.19$  between Neuroticism and affective commitment. In the meta-analysis conducted by Choi et al. (2015), Emotional Stability (reversed Neuroticism) showed a positive correlation of  $\rho = .20$  with affective commitment. According to Yik and Russell (2001), Neuroticism is strongly related to the tendency to experience negative emotions. Given that affective commitment is about getting emotionally attached to the workgroup and the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991), we speculate that the tendency to experience negative emotions might prevent neurotic individuals from developing an affective commitment to their organization.

Hypothesis 3: Neuroticism will negatively relate to affective commitment.

### ***Openness to Experience***

In the meta-analysis conducted by Choi et al. (2015), Openness to Experience showed a weak negative correlation ( $\rho = -.10$ ) with continuance commitment. People high in Openness to Experience tend to be creative and novelty seeking (Gocłowska et al., 2019). Erdheim et al. (2006), who also found a negative correlation between Openness to Experience and continuance commitment ( $r = -.23$ ), speculated that the seek for novelty might drive individuals high in Openness to Experience to pursuit new job alternatives, making them less committed to continue working for their current organization.

Hypothesis 4: Openness to Experience will negatively relate to continuance commitment.

### ***Extraversion***

In their meta-analysis, Thoresen et al. (2003) found a correlation of  $\rho = .22$  between Extraversion and affective commitment. In the meta-analysis conducted by Choi et al. (2015), Extraversion showed a positive correlation of  $\rho = .28$  with affective commitment. According to Panaccio and Vandenberghe (2012), extraverts are sociable and more likely to experience interactions with others as enjoyable, and the workplace should therefore be perceived positively by extraverted individuals. We speculate that this might drive extraverts to become affectively committed to their organization.

Hypothesis 5a: Extraversion will positively relate to affective commitment.

Extraversion has also been linked to normative commitment. Choi et al. (2015) found a positive correlation of  $\rho = .21$  between Extraversion and normative commitment. Erdheim et al. (2006) speculated that since extraverts find social interactions rewarding, extraverts might want to reciprocate their organization for fulfilling their social needs, thus making them normatively committed to their organization.

Hypothesis 5b: Extraversion will positively relate to normative commitment.

### **The Present Study**

The overall aim of this study was to examine the relations between the personality traits in the FFM and organizational commitment. Furthermore, the aim was also to examine if the personality traits in the FFM predict organizational commitment after controlling for other variables that are related to organizational commitment, such as informal learning and health variables. Studies have shown that organizational commitment is related to different kinds of informal learning, including mentoring (Payne & Huffman, 2005) and coaching (Cao & Hamori, 2016). Therefore, informal learning was included as a control variable. Organizational commitment has also been linked to health variables such as physical training (Bartlett, 2001), self-assessed health (Jain et al., 2013), and work–family conflict (Meyer et al., 2002). Therefore, these health variables were included in this study. Furthermore, previous research has shown that organizational commitment is related to age (Patrick &



Sonia, 2012) and gender (Aydin et al., 2011). Other control variables that were included in this study are associated with employment. These are tenure (Cohen, 1993) and managerial position (ul Haque et al., 2018). Since the COVID-19 pandemic began to spread, many workers have shifted into home offices (Davis et al., 2020). In order to contribute to the ongoing evaluation of work from home outcomes, data on the respondents' locations of work were also collected in this study.

## **Method**

### **Participants and Procedure**

In total, 303 individuals from 11 organizations participated in the study. The gender distribution consisted of 220 (73%) women and 81 (27%) men. The sample consisted of workers from both the public and the private sector in Sweden. In order to maintain the anonymity of the respondents, data on their specific occupations were not collected.

A questionnaire intended to measure all the variables in this study was put together in Google Forms. In some organizations, the questionnaire was emailed directly to the employees. In other organizations, the questionnaire was published on the organization's intranet. A missive with information about participation was attached to the Google Forms link (see Appendix). In total, 3 437 workers had access to the questionnaire.

### **Measurements**

#### ***Organizational Commitment***

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used to measure organizational commitment. OCQ is a self-assessment form that consists of three components of commitment: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). OCQ consists of 15 items, where 6 of the items are negatively poled. Items were scored on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = “totally disagree” to 5 = “totally agree”. Examples of items are “I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization” and “I feel no obligation to stay with my organization”. OCQ has shown acceptable reliability and validity (Kanning & Hill, 2013). In this study, a Swedish translation of OCQ was used. OCQ has been translated into different languages without an effect on the validity of the measuring instrument (Kanning & Hill, 2013).

#### ***Personality***

IPIP30 – an abbreviation of the IPIP-NEO-120 – was used to measure personality. IPIP-NEO-120 is a personality inventory that consists of 120 items that measure the personality traits in the FFM. IPIP-NEO-120 has shown acceptable reliability and validity (Johnson, 2014). Abbreviations of the IPIP-NEO-120 have been useful to measure the

personality traits in the FFM (Baldasaro et al., 2013). IPIP30 is a self-assessment form that consists of 30 items. Of the 30 items, 11 of them are negatively poled. Items were scored on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = “totally disagree” to 5 = “totally agree”. Examples of items are “I get stressed out easily” and “I make friends easily”. In this study, a Swedish version of IPIP30 (Bäckström, 2010) was used.

### ***Informal Learning***

Learning Potential of the Workplace Scale (LPW) was used to measure informal learning. LPW is a self-assessment form that consists of four aspects: learning through reflection, learning through experimentation, learning from colleagues, and learning from supervisor (Nikolova et al., 2014). LPW consists of a total of 12 items. The items were scored on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = “totally disagree” to 5 = “totally agree”. Examples of items are “In my work, I am given the chance to think about how I can conduct my tasks more efficiently” and “My colleagues are eager to collaborate with me in finding a solution to a work problem”. LPW has shown acceptable reliability and validity (Nikolova et al., 2014). In this study, a Swedish version of LPW was used. LPW has been translated into different languages without an effect on the reliability and validity of the measuring instrument (Cangialosi et al., 2019).

### ***Work-Family Conflict***

Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ) is a self-assessment form that consists of questions about different aspects of the organizational and social work environment (Kristensen & Borg, 2003). In this study, items that measure work and family were used. The items were scored on a four-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = “no, not at all” to 4 = “yes, for sure”. Examples of items are “Does your family or friends tell you that you work too much?” and “Do you often experience a conflict between your work and private life, so that you would have preferred to be in "both places at the same time"?”. Furthermore, a separate question was asked about work-family satisfaction. The item was scored on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = “bad” to 5 = “excellent”. The question to measure work-family satisfaction was “Overall, do you feel that you have a good balance between your work and private life?”. In this study, a Swedish version was used. COPSOQ has been translated into different languages without an effect on the reliability and validity of the measuring instrument (Nübling et al., 2006).

### ***Health Variables***

The health variables were measured through five self-assessment questions. The question to measure self-assessed health was “How would you rate your general state of

health?”. The item was measured on a ten-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = “very bad” to 10 = “very good”. Two items were used to measure exercise aspects. These were “How much time do you spend a regular week doing physical exercise that makes you breathless? (E.g., running, gymnastics or ball sports)” and “How much time do you spend a regular week doing everyday exercise? (E.g., walking or cycling)”. The items were scored on a scale from 1 = “0 minutes” to 6 = “more than 120 minutes”. Two items were used to measure sleeping habits. One of the items was “How many hours do you sleep on average per night during work weeks?”. The item was measured on a scale from 1 = “less than 4 hours” to 4 = “more than 8 hours”. The other item was “Do you generally feel satisfied with the amount of sleep you get during the work weeks?”, where the respondents were asked to answer the question with yes or no. In this study, a Swedish translation of the questions was used.

### ***Employment Variables***

The employment variables were measured through two self-assessment questions. The item used to measure managerial position was “Do you have any type of managerial position in your current role?”. The respondents were asked to answer the question with yes or no. The item used to measure tenure was “How many years have you worked at your current workplace?”. The item was scored on a scale from 1 = “less than a year” to 4 = “11 years or more”. In this study, a Swedish translation of the questions was used.

### ***Other Control Variables***

The respondents were asked to state which gender they identify as (male, female or other) and how old they are. Furthermore, one question to measure the eventual effect of the COVID-19 pandemic was asked. The question was “How many days a week do you currently work remotely?”. The item was scored on a scale from 1 = “0 days” to 8 = “7 days”. In this study, a Swedish translation of the questions was used.

### ***Reliability***

Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha$ ) is one of the most used measures of reliability (Bonett et al., 2015). Despite the popularity of  $\alpha$ , Hayes and Coutts (2020) recommend using McDonald's omega ( $\omega$ ) for an even more accurate measure of reliability. In accordance with this recommendation,  $\omega$  was used to measure reliability in this study. According to Field (2018), a reliability value exceeding .70 is considered acceptable. In this study, nearly all of the instruments showed acceptable values of reliability. The only exception was the items used to measure Agreeableness, which showed a reliability value of  $\omega = .67$ . Therefore, we suggest that no conclusions should be drawn from the relations between Agreeableness and organizational commitment found in this study.

## **Statistical Analyzes**

The statistical analyzes were performed in IBM SPSS Statistics 27. First, descriptive data (means, standard deviations, correlations ( $r$ ), and reliability ( $\omega$ )) were calculated for all variables included in the study. To interpret the magnitude of the correlations, Gignac and Szodorai's (2016) guidelines for effect sizes (i.e., .10 – .19 is small, .20 – .29 is medium, .30 or higher is large) were used. According to Schönbrodt and Perugini (2013), correlations tend to stabilize when the sample size reaches 250. Given that the sample size of the current study was 303, we assume that the correlational data is stable.

Second, all the variables that showed statistically significant correlations with organizational commitment were added to multiple linear regression analyzes. One multiple linear regression analysis for each type of organizational commitment was performed. The regression models were bootstrapped. DiCiccio and Efron (1996) recommended using at least 2 000 bootstrap samples when calculating confidence intervals. In this study, 5 000 bootstrap samples were used. In order to detect multicollinearity, variance inflation factor (VIF) was used. Following the recommendations provided by Akinwande et al. (2015), only variables with a VIF value of less than 5 were allowed in the regression analyzes.

## **Ethical Considerations**

According to Swedish Research Council (2002), there are four ethical principles researchers should take into account. These are the information requirement, the consent requirement, the confidentiality requirement, and the utilization requirement. The requirements for information and consent were taken into account by informing the participants via a missive about the purpose of the study and the voluntary participation. The confidentiality requirement was considered by anonymizing the collected data. The requirement of utilization was taken into account by only using the collected data for the purpose to implement this study.

## **Results**

Table 3 contains descriptive statistics of organizational commitment and personality. Except for Agreeableness, the items used in the computed variables showed acceptable reliability. Tables 4 and 5 contain descriptive statistics of organizational commitment and the control variables.

**Table 3***Means, standard deviations, correlations (r) and reliability ( $\omega$ )*

Variables	M	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Affective commitment	3.24	.90	(.85)							
2. Continuance commitment	3.10	.92	.40**	(.72)						
3. Normative commitment	2.33	.83	.48**	.43**	(.76)					
4. Conscientiousness	4.10	.52	.27**	.09	.10	(.70)				
5. Agreeableness	4.34	.53	.15**	.17**	.07	.27**	(.67)			
6. Neuroticism	1.85	.70	-.19**	.13*	.06	-.36**	-.15*	(.84)		
7. Openness to Experience	3.51	.82	.06	.09	.08	-.03	.11	-.06	(.78)	
8. Extraversion	3.61	.72	.20**	-.14*	.02	.42**	.25**	-.36**	.04	(.75)

*Note.* *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

**Table 4***Means, standard deviations, correlations (r) and reliability ( $\omega$ )*

Variables	M	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1. Affective commitment	3.24	.90	(.85)						
2. Continuance commitment	3.10	.92	.40**	(.72)					
3. Normative commitment	2.33	.83	.48**	.43**	(.76)				
4. Informal learning	3.74	.64	.37**	.22**	.20**	(.83)			
5. Gender	1.73	.44	.04	.09	-.12*	.02			
6. Age	45.68	11.59	.33**	.05	.02	-.00	.11*		
7. Work from home	2.62	1.87	-.01	-.06	-.07	.03	.07	-.06	
8. Managerial position	1.72	.45	-.14*	.03	-.05	.05	.05	-.14*	.02

*Note.* *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Gender has been coded 1 = Male, 2 = Female. Managerial position has been coded 1 = Yes, 2 = No.

**Table 5***Means, standard deviations, correlations (r) and reliability ( $\omega$ )*

Variables	M	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.
1. Affective commitment	3.24	.90	(.85)										
2. Continuance commitment	3.10	.92	.40**	(.72)									
3. Normative commitment	2.33	.83	.48**	.43**	(.76)								
4. Tenure	2.67	1.00	.16**	.17**	-.05								
5. Self-assessed health	7.72	1.54	.14*	-.04	-.02	.00							
6. Physical training	3.26	1.72	.03	-.12*	.03	-.04	.23**						
7. Everyday exercise	4.49	1.55	.05	-.00	-.02	.00	.22**	.17**					
8. Number of hours of sleep	2.88	.48	.11	-.08	-.03	-.12*	.17**	-.03	.03				
9. Sleep satisfaction	1.29	.45	-.14*	.05	-.04	.07	-.16**	-.04	-.00	-.38**			
10. Work-family satisfaction	3.65	1.03	.26**	.06	-.01	.01	.41**	.14*	.12*	.19**	-.28**		
11. Work-family conflict	2.01	.84	-.02	-.03	.05	.08	-.17**	-.03	-.03	-.08	.10	-.49**	(.84)

*Note.* *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . Sleep satisfaction has been coded 1 = Yes, 2 = No.

With regard to personality, the results in this study showed that affective commitment was statistically significantly related to Conscientiousness ( $r = .27$ ), Agreeableness ( $r = .15$ ), Neuroticism ( $r = -.19$ ), and Extraversion ( $r = .20$ ). Continuance commitment was statistically significantly related to Agreeableness ( $r = .17$ ), Neuroticism ( $r = .13$ ), and Extraversion ( $r = -.14$ ). There was no statistically significant relation between personality and normative commitment. With regard to the variable added due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the number of days employees work remotely was not related to any type of organizational commitment. The variables that showed statistically significant correlations with organizational commitment were added to the multiple linear regression analyzes. The results from the multiple linear regression analyzes, one for each type of commitment, are presented below.

### **Affective Commitment**

Table 6 contains a multiple linear regression analysis with affective commitment as the dependent variable. The highest VIF value was 2.46. Thus, the presence of multicollinearity could be rejected. After controlling for the other variables included in the model, the only personality trait that remained statistically significantly related to affective commitment was Conscientiousness ( $p = .04$ ). Furthermore, informal learning, age, and managerial position showed statistically significant relations with affective commitment. Among these variables, informal learning showed the strongest standardized beta value ( $\beta = .32$ ). Together, the variables in the model explained 27% of the variance in affective commitment.

**Table 6**

*Multiple linear regression analysis, outcome variable = affective commitment*

	$\beta^*$	95% CI*		Std. $\beta$	t	p-value*	VIF
Constant	-.04	[-1.51;	1.37]		-.06	.95	
Conscientiousness	.22	[.01;	.44]	.13	2.22	.04	1.40
Agreeableness	.00	[-.18;	.19]	.00	.02	.99	1.24
Neuroticism	.04	[-.10;	.17]	.03	.46	.61	1.45
Extraversion	.00	[-.15;	.15]	.00	-.00	1.00	1.37
Informal learning	.45	[.28;	.62]	.32	6.00	<.001	1.19
Age	.02	[.01;	.31]	.27	4.52	<.001	1.42
Managerial position	-.22	[-.43;	-.01]	-.11	-2.14	.04	1.12
Tenure	.06	[-.04;	.15]	.06	1.11	.25	1.26



Self-assessed health	.01	[-.06;	.09]	.02	.41	.71	1.34
Sleep satisfaction	-.08	[-.28;	.11]	-.04	-.77	.43	1.15
Work-family satisfaction	.03	[-.10;	.17]	.03	.38	.71	2.46
Work-family conflict	-.09	[-.24;	.70]	-.09	-1.23	.25	2.09

*Note.* Adjusted  $R^2 = 27\%$ . *CI* = 95% confidence intervals for  $\beta$ . *VIF* = Variance Inflation Factor. \* = Number of bootstrap samples are 5 000. Managerial position has been coded 1 = Yes, 2 = No. Sleep satisfaction has been coded 1 = Yes, 2 = No.

### Continuance Commitment

Table 7 contains a multiple linear regression analysis with continuance commitment as the dependent variable. The highest VIF value was 1.28. Thus, the presence of multicollinearity could be rejected. After controlling for the other variables in the model, all of the included personality traits (Agreeableness, Neuroticism, and Extraversion) remained statistically significantly related to continuance commitment. Furthermore, informal learning and tenure showed statistically significant relations with continuance commitment. Among these variables, informal learning showed the strongest standardized beta value ( $\beta = .26$ ). Together, the variables in the model explained 15% of the variance in continuance commitment.

**Table 7**

*Multiple linear regression analysis, outcome variable = continuance commitment*

	$\beta^*$	95% CI*	Std. $\beta$	t	p-value*	VIF
Constant	.60	[-.45; 1.74]		1.05	.28	
Agreeableness	.30	[.11; .50]	.18	3.13	<.001	1.11
Neuroticism	.16	[.03; .29]	.12	2.13	.02	1.16
Extraversion	-.23	[-.38; -.08]	-.18	-3.05	<.001	1.28
Informal learning	.37	[.21; .53]	.26	4.76	<.001	1.05
Tenure	.17	[.08; .26]	.19	3.48	<.001	1.04
Physical training	-.03	[-.08; .03]	-.05	-.95	.32	1.07

*Note.* Adjusted  $R^2 = 15\%$ . *CI* = 95% confidence intervals for  $\beta$ . *VIF* = Variance Inflation Factor. \* = Number of bootstrap samples are 5 000.

## Normative Commitment

Table 8 contains a multiple linear regression analysis with normative commitment as the dependent variable. The highest VIF value was 1.00. Thus, the presence of multicollinearity could be rejected. The two variables included in the model (informal learning and gender) both remained statistically significantly related to normative commitment. Of these two variables, informal learning showed the strongest standardized beta value ( $\beta = .23$ ). Together, informal learning and gender explained 6% of the variance in normative commitment.

**Table 8**

*Multiple linear regression analysis, outcome variable = normative commitment*

	$\beta^*$	95% CI*		Std. $\beta$	t	p-value*	VIF
Constant	1.64	[1.04;	2.30]		5.10	<.001	
Informal learning	.29	[.152;	.42]	.23	4.06	<.001	1.00
Gender	-.23	[-.45;	-.01]	-.13	-2.24	<.001	1.00

*Note.* Adjusted  $R^2 = 6\%$ . *CI* = 95% confidence intervals for  $\beta$ . *VIF* = Variance Inflation Factor. \* = Number of bootstrap samples are 5 000. Gender has been coded 1 = Male, 2 = Female.

## Discussion

### Results

#### *Conscientiousness*

In line with previous research (Choi et al., 2015; Erdheim et al., 2006), Conscientiousness correlated positively with affective commitment ( $r = .27$ ). Thus, hypothesis 1a was supported. Conscientiousness remained statistically significantly related to affective commitment after controlling for the other variables included in the multiple linear regression analysis. Contrary to hypothesis 1b, there was no significant correlation between Conscientiousness and normative commitment in this study. Since conscientious individuals tend to be hardworking in general (Matzler et al., 2011), we speculate that conscientious employees show a high work ethic regardless of which organization they are in, which might be the reason why this trait was not related to normative commitment.

#### *Agreeableness*

Contrary to previous findings (Choi et al., 2015; Spagnoli & Caetano, 2012), there was no statistically significant relation between Agreeableness and normative commitment. Thus, hypothesis 2a was not supported. In line with previous research (Choi et al., 2015;

Spagnoli & Caetano, 2012), Agreeableness correlated positively with affective commitment ( $r = .15$ ). Thus, hypothesis 2b was supported. However, Agreeableness did not remain statistically significantly related to affective commitment after controlling for the other variables included in the multiple linear regression analysis. It should be noted that the items used to measure Agreeableness showed low reliability ( $\omega = .67$ ). Thus, the results for this trait may be unreliable.

### ***Neuroticism***

The negative relation between Neuroticism and affective commitment found in this study was of the same magnitude ( $r = -.19$ ) as in the meta-analysis conducted by Thoresen et al. (2003). Thus, hypothesis 3 was supported. However, Neuroticism did not remain statistically significantly related to affective commitment after controlling for the other variables included in the multiple linear regression analysis. Although it was not hypothesized, there was a positive correlation between Neuroticism and continuance commitment ( $r = .13$ ). Neuroticism remained statistically significantly related to continuance commitment after controlling for the other variables included in the multiple linear regression analysis. Although the correlation was weak, we speculate that the worrying nature of Neuroticism might explain why individuals high in this trait remain in an organization for financial reasons.

### ***Openness to Experience***

In line with the meta-analysis conducted by Choi et al. (2015), Openness to Experience did only show weak correlations with the three dimensions of commitment. In this study, none of these correlations were statistically significant. Thus, hypothesis 4 was not supported. Individuals high in Openness to Experience tend to be creative (Gocłowska et al., 2019). George and Zhou (2001) found that in order for this creativity to be expressed, organizations must provide these individuals with the right prerequisites. Therefore, we speculate that individuals high in Openness to Experience that are in creativity-promoting organizations for that reason may lack the incentive to change organization.

According to Christensen et al. (2019), Openness to Experience is a complex trait that consists of facets such as fantasy and openness to emotions. Given the emotional aspect of the trait, one could assume that Openness to Experience would be related to affective commitment. However, with regard to personality and emotions, Extraversion and Neuroticism are the two traits that are specifically related to positive and negative affectivity, respectively (Steel et al., 2008). We speculate that although people high in Openness to

Experience may appreciate experiencing emotions, these emotions are not necessarily positive, which might be the reason why this trait is not related to affective commitment.

### ***Extraversion***

In line with previous research (Choi et al., 2015; Erdheim et al., 2006; Thoresen et al., 2003), Extraversion correlated positively with affective commitment ( $r = .20$ ). Thus, hypothesis 5a was supported. However, Extraversion did not remain statistically significantly related to affective commitment after controlling for the other variables included in the multiple linear regression analysis. Although it was not hypothesized, there was a negative correlation between Extraversion and continuance commitment ( $r = -.14$ ). Extraversion remained statistically significantly related to continuance commitment after controlling for the other variables included in the multiple linear regression analysis. According to Zimmerman et al. (2012), extraverts tend to look for new jobs that can pay more, even if they are happy with their current job. We speculate that this might explain why Extraversion is negatively related to continuance commitment. Contrary to the results found in the meta-analysis by Choi et al. (2015), there was no significant correlation between Extraversion and normative commitment in this study. Thus, hypothesis 5b was not supported.

### **Theoretical and Practical Implications**

The current results provide further evidence that personality is related to organizational commitment. Given that organizational commitment is related to financially important outcomes such as turnover (Al-Jabari & Ghazzawi, 2019) and work performance (Jaramillo et al., 2005), knowing the predictors of organizational commitment may be practically useful. For instance, the relations between the FFM and organizational commitment may function as an incentive to use personality measures in recruitment processes. The relations between informal learning and organizational commitment may function as an incentive to facilitate a learning climate.

### **Limitations**

This study has several limitations. First, of the 3 437 workers who had access to the survey, only 303 (9%) participated. According to Baruch and Holtom (2008), a low response rate increases the probability of statistical bias. Except for those who did not respond because they did not want to, we assume that not all workers visiting the organization's intranet may be a reason for non-responses. Second, in order to maintain the respondents' anonymity, data on their specific occupations were not collected. This means that there might be differences between different occupational groups that are not reflected in this study. Third, the items

used to measure Agreeableness did not show sufficient reliability. Thus, the relations between Agreeableness and organizational commitment may be unreliable.

### **Future Research**

As previously stated, the relation between personality and organizational commitment is relatively unexplored. Therefore, future research in this field may be necessary in order to obtain a broader, overarching theoretical framework to further understand the relations between the traits in the FFM and organizational commitment.

In this study, the multiple linear regression analyzes showed that some of the personality traits were not statistically significantly related to organizational commitment after controlling for the other variables included in the models. However, informal learning remained statistically significantly related to organizational commitment in every multiple linear regression analysis. Studies (e.g., Cerasoli et al., 2018; Noe et al., 2013) have found that all of the Big Five traits are related to informal learning. Given what was found in this study, combined with what has been found in previous studies, it may be relevant to examine possible interaction effects (e.g., mediation or moderation) between personality, informal learning, and organizational commitment.

### **Conclusion**

Except for Openness to Experience, all of the Big Five personality traits showed statistically significant correlations with organizational commitment. The effect sizes ranged from small to medium magnitudes. However, not all of these relations remained statistically significant after controlling for other variables. The purpose of this study was to answer the question "Who are the most committed at work?". The answer is that it depends on the type of commitment. For instance, personality was related to affective commitment and continuance commitment, but not to normative commitment. Of the variables included in this study, the single best predictor of all three types of commitment was informal learning.

## References

- Abdirahman, H. I. H. (2018). The relationship between job satisfaction, work-life balance and organizational commitment on employee performance. *Academic Journal of Economic Studies*, 4(3), 12–17.  
<https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-2005077681>
- Akinwande, M. O., Dikko, H. G., & Samson, A. (2015). Variance inflation factor: as a condition for the inclusion of suppressor variable (s) in regression analysis. *Open Journal of Statistics*, 5(7), 754-767.  
<https://doi.org/10.4236/ojs.2015.57075>
- Al-Jabari, B., & Ghazzawi, I. (2019). Organizational Commitment: A Review of the Conceptual and Empirical Literature and a Research Agenda. *International Leadership Journal*, 11(1), 78-119.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2005). Honesty-humility, the Big Five, and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality*, 73(5), 1321-1354.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00351.x>
- Aydin, A., Sarier, Y., & Uysal, S. (2011). The Effect of Gender on Organizational Commitment of Teachers: A Meta Analytic Analysis. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 11(2), 628-632.
- Baldasaro, R. E., Shanahan, M. J., & Bauer, D. J. (2013). Psychometric Properties of the Mini-IPIP in a Large, Nationally Representative Sample of Young Adults. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 95(1), 74-84.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.700466>
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next?. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1-2), 9-30.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00160>
- Bartlett, K. R. (2001). The relationship between training and organizational commitment: A study in the health care field. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(4), 335-352.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1001>
- Baruch, Y., & Holtom, B. C. (2008). Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research. *Human Relations*, 61(8), 1139-1160.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708094863>
- Block, J. (2010). The five-factor framing of personality and beyond: Some ruminations. *Psychological Inquiry*, 21(1), 2-25.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/10478401003596626>
- Bonett, D. G., & Wright, T. A. (2015). Cronbach's alpha reliability: Interval estimation, hypothesis testing, and sample size planning. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *36*(1), 3-15.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1960>
- Boyd, R. L., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2017). Language-based personality: a new approach to personality in a digital world. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, *18*, 63-68.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2017.07.017>
- Briley, D. A., & Tucker-Drob, E. M. (2014). Genetic and environmental continuity in personality development: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *140*(5), 1303-1331.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037091>
- Bäckström, M. (2010). *IPIP-NEO Manual*. Institution for Psychology, Lund University.
- Cangialosi, N., Deprez, G. R. M., Odoardi, C., & Battistelli, A. (2019). Work based learning: Italian adaptation of the Learning Potential of the Workplace scale (LPW). *BPA-Applied Psychology Bulletin (Bollettino di Psicologia Applicata)*, *67*(284), 31-44.  
<https://doi.org/10.26387/bpa.284.4>
- Cao, J., & Hamori, M. (2016). The impact of management development practices on organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management*, *55*(3), 499-517.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21731>
- Cerasoli, C. P., Alliger, G. M., Donsbach, J. S., Mathieu, J. E., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Orvis, K. A. (2018). Antecedents and outcomes of informal learning behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *33*(2), 203-230.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-017-9492-y>
- Choi, D., Oh, I. S., & Colbert, A. E. (2015). Understanding organizational commitment: A meta-analytic examination of the roles of the five-factor model of personality and culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(5), 1542-1667.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/ap10000014>
- Christensen, A. P., Cotter, K. N., & Silvia, P. J. (2019). Reopening openness to experience: A network analysis of four openness to experience inventories. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *101*(6), 574-588.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2018.1467428>
- Cohen, A. (1993). Age and tenure in relation to organizational commitment: A meta-analysis. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *14*(2), 143-159.  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp1402\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp1402_2)

- Cohen, A. (2007). Commitment before and after: An evaluation and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, *17*(3), 336-354.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2007.05.001>
- Davis, K. G., Kotowski, S. E., Daniel, D., Gerding, T., Naylor, J., & Syck, M. (2020). The home office: Ergonomic lessons from the “new normal”. *Ergonomics In Design*, *28*(4), 4-10.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1064804620937907>
- DiCiccio, T. J., & Efron, B. (1996). Bootstrap confidence intervals. *Statistical Science*, *11*(3), 189-228.
- Diefendorff, J. M., Brown, D. J., Kamin, A. M., & Lord, R. G. (2002). Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *23*(1), 93-108.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.123>
- Erdheim, J., Wang, M., & Zickar, M. J. (2006). Linking the Big Five personality constructs to organizational commitment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *41*(5), 959-970.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.04.005>
- Farhadi, H., Fatimah, O., Nasir, R., & Shahrazad, W. W. (2012). Agreeableness and conscientiousness as antecedents of deviant behavior in workplace. *Asian Social Science*, *8*(9), 2-7.  
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n9p2>
- Farrukh, M., Ying, C. W., & Mansori, S. (2017). Organizational commitment: an empirical analysis of personality traits. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, *9*(1), 18-34.  
<https://doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2019.72031>
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics* (5 ed.). Sage Publications.
- Firth, L., Mellor, D. J., Moore, K. A., & Loquet, C. (2004). How can managers reduce employee intention to quit?. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *19*(2), 170-187.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940410526127>
- George, J. M., & Zhou, J. (2001). When openness to experience and conscientiousness are related to creative behavior: an interactional approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 513-524.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.513>
- Gignac, G. E., & Szodorai, E. T. (2016). Effect size guidelines for individual differences researchers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *102*, 74-78.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.069>



- Gocłowska, M. A., Ritter, S. M., Elliot, A. J., & Baas, M. (2019). Novelty seeking is linked to openness and extraversion, and can lead to greater creative performance. *Journal of Personality, 87*(2), 252-266.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12387>
- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist, 48*(1), 26-34.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.48.1.26>
- Guay, R. P., Choi, D., Oh, I. S., Mitchell, M. S., Mount, M. K., & Shin, K. H. (2016). Why people harm the organization and its members: Relationships among personality, organizational commitment, and workplace deviance. *Human Performance, 29*(1), 1-15.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2015.1120305>
- Hayes, A. F., & Coutts, J. J. (2020). Use omega rather than Cronbach's alpha for estimating reliability. But.... *Communication Methods and Measures, 14*(1), 1-24.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2020.1718629>
- Jain, A. K., Giga, S. I., & Cooper, C. L. (2013). Stress, health and well-being: the mediating role of employee and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 10*(10), 4907-4924.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph10104907>
- John, O. J., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (pp. 102–138). Guilford.
- 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.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2014.05.003>
- Johnson, J. T., Griffeth, R. W., & Griffin, M. (2000). Factors discriminating functional and dysfunctional salesforce turnover. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 15*(6), 399-415.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/08858620010349493>
- Kandler, C., Riemann, R., Spinath, F. M., & Angleitner, A. (2010). Sources of variance in personality facets: A multiple-rater twin study of self-peer, peer-peer, and self-self (dis) agreement. *Journal of Personality, 78*(5), 1565-1594.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00661.x>

- Kanning, U. P., & Hill, A. (2013). Validation of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) in six languages. *Journal of Business and Media Psychology*, 4(2), 11-20.
- Keskes, I., Sallan, J. M., Simo, P., & Fernandez, V. (2018). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of leader-member exchange. *Journal of Management Development*, 37(3), 271-284.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-04-2017-0132>
- Ko, J. W., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1997). Assessment of Meyer and Allen's three-component model of organizational commitment in South Korea. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 961-973.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.6.961>
- Kristensen, T. S., & Borg, V. (2003). Copenhagen psychosocial questionnaire (COPSOQ). *Mental Health*, 5(5), 1-19.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39(2), 329-358.  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3902\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8)
- Matzler, K., Renzl, B., Mooradian, T., von Krogh, G., & Mueller, J. (2011). Personality traits, affective commitment, documentation of knowledge, and knowledge sharing. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(02), 296-310.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.540156>
- McCrae, R. R. (2009). The Five-Factor Model of personality traits: consensus and controversy. In P. J. Corr, G. Matthews (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Personality Psychology* (pp. 148-161). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511596544.012>
- McCrae, R. R. (2010). The place of the FFM in personality psychology. *Psychological Inquiry*, 21(1), 57-64.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10478401003648773>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa Jr, P. T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52(5), 509-516.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.5.509>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81>

- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1), 61-89.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*(1), 20-52.  
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*(2), 224-247.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(79\)90072-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1)
- Nikolova, I., Van Ruysseveldt, J., De Witte, H., & Syroit, J. (2014). Work-based learning: Development and validation of a scale measuring the learning potential of the workplace (LPW). *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 84*(1), 1-10.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.09.004>
- Noe, R. A., Tews, M. J., & Marand, A. D. (2013). Individual differences and informal learning in the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 83*(3), 327-335.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.06.009>
- Nübling, M., Stöbel, U., Hasselhorn, H. M., Michaelis, M., & Hofmann, F. (2006). Measuring psychological stress and strain at work-Evaluation of the COPSOQ Questionnaire in Germany. *GMS Psycho-Social Medicine, 3*.
- O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., Story, P. A., & White, C. D. (2015). A meta-analytic test of redundancy and relative importance of the dark triad and five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Personality, 83*(6), 644-664.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12126>
- Ones, D. S., Dilchert, S., Viswesvaran, C., & Judge, T. A. (2007). In support of personality assessment in organizational settings. *Personnel Psychology, 60*(4), 995-1027.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00099.x>
- Ongori, H. (2007). A review of the literature on employee turnover. *African Journal of Business Management, 1*(3), 49-54.
- Panaccio, A., & Vandenberghe, C. (2012). Five-factor model of personality and organizational commitment: The mediating role of positive and negative affective states. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*(3), 647-658.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.03.002>

- Patrick, H. A., & Sonia, J. (2012). Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *11*(1), 23-36.
- Payne, S. C., & Huffman, A. H. (2005). A longitudinal examination of the influence of mentoring on organizational commitment and turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*(1), 158-168.  
<https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.15993166>
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, *124*(2), 262-274.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.262>
- Schmitt, D. P., Allik, J., McCrae, R. R., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2007). The geographic distribution of Big Five personality traits: Patterns and profiles of human self-description across 56 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *38*(2), 173-212.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022106297299>
- Schönbrodt, F. D., & Perugini, M. (2013). At what sample size do correlations stabilize?. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *47*(5), 609-612.  
<https://10.1016/j.jrp.2013.05.009>
- Spagnoli, P., & Caetano, A. (2012). Personality and organisational commitment. *Career Development International*, *17*(3), 255-275.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13620431211241081>
- Spengler, M., Gottschling, J., & Spinath, F. M. (2012). Personality in childhood—A longitudinal behavior genetic approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *53*(4), 411-416.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.01.019>
- Steel, P., Schmidt, J., & Shultz, J. (2008). Refining the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, *134*(1), 138-161.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.1.138>
- Swedish Research Council (2002). *Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning*. Swedish Research Council.
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, *46*(2), 259-293.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00874.x>

- Thoresen, C. J., Kaplan, S. A., Barsky, A. P., Warren, C. R., & de Chermont, K. (2003). The affective underpinnings of job perceptions and attitudes: A meta-analytic review and integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*(6), 914 –945.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.6.914>
- ul Haque, A., Aston, J., & Kozlovski, E. (2018). The impact of Stressors on organizational commitment of managerial and non-managerial personnel in contrasting economies: Evidences from Canada and Pakistan. *International Journal of Business*, *23*(2), 166-182.
- Yik, M. S., & Russell, J. A. (2001). Predicting the Big Two of affect from the Big Five of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *35*(3), 247-277.  
<https://doi.org/10.1006/JRPE.2001.2322>
- Young, H. R., Glerum, D. R., Wang, W., & Joseph, D. L. (2018). Who are the most engaged at work? A meta-analysis of personality and employee engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*(10), 1330-1346.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2303>
- Zimmerman, R. D., Boswell, W. R., Shipp, A. J., Dunford, B. B., & Boudreau, J. W. (2012). Explaining the pathways between approach-avoidance personality traits and employees' job search behavior. *Journal of Management*, *38*(5), 1450-1475.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310396376>

## Appendix

### Missive

Vi är två studenter, Lisa Guppy och Carl-Johan Holmberg, som läser personalvetarprogrammet med inriktning mot arbets- och organisationspsykologi vid Högskolan Väst i Trollhättan. Vårt examensarbete har som syfte att undersöka organisationslojalitet och individuella skillnader. Vi vänder oss därför till dig som är yrkesverksam. Vi har sammanställt en enkät som beräknas ta cirka 10–15 minuter att besvara.

Deltagandet är helt frivilligt och du kan välja att avbryta din medverkan när du vill. Svaren är anonyma och kommer att behandlas konfidentiellt. Resultatet kommer endast att användas i forskningssyfte i form av vårt examensarbete och eventuellt i form av en vetenskaplig artikel. Resultatet kommer att presenteras på gruppnivå, vilket innebär att några enskilda svar inte kommer att kunna identifieras. Vi kommer således inte kunna koppla dina svar till någon IP-adress.

Genom att du besvarar denna enkät bekräftar du att du har tagit del av ovanstående information samt att du ger ditt samtycke till att svaren får användas för examensarbetet och framtida forskningspublikationer. Materialet kommer att hållas på en lösenordsskyddad USB-sticka som endast vi och vår handledare kommer ha tillgång till. Examensarbetet kommer att publiceras i databasen DiVA ([www.diva-portal.org](http://www.diva-portal.org), alternativt [www.uppsatser.se](http://www.uppsatser.se)) där du kan ta del av uppsatsens resultat. Om du har några frågor är du välkommen att kontakta oss eller vår handledare:

Lisa Guppy – [lisa.guppy@student.hv.se](mailto:lisa.guppy@student.hv.se)

Carl-Johan Holmberg – [carl-johan.holmberg@student.hv.se](mailto:carl-johan.holmberg@student.hv.se)

Elias Johannesson – [elias.johannesson@hv.se](mailto:elias.johannesson@hv.se)