



Unraveling the Employees Personality in New Normal: An Interdisciplinary Exploration

Mary Faith N. Penales
Faculty, General Education Department
Bohol Island State University- Calape, Bohol
E-mail: maryfaith.penales@bisu.edu.ph

Abstract

Personality traits influence employees' behavior, attitudes, and performance within the workplace. The main thrust of the study was to determine the level of employees' conscientiousness and neuroticism. To measure a comprehensive model of general personality traits a standardized questionnaire developed by Costa & McCrae (1992), the NEO Personality Inventory-Revised (NEO-PI-R). The data were analyzed and interpreted using inferential statistical tools such as chi-square and t-Test for independent samples were used to determine significant relationship and difference between variables of the study through Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS). On employees' neuroticism level, it reveals that respondents had the highest composite mean in depression. On employees' conscientiousness level, it reveals that the respondents had the highest composite mean in deliberation. Furthermore, personality awareness is the key to improve team dynamics and collaboration to enhance employees job satisfaction, engagement and integration.

Keywords: *personality, neuroticism, conscientiousness, employees*

Rationale

Personality plays a vital role in shaping employees' attitudes, behaviors, and performance within an organization. As the management strive to optimize their productivity and attain sustainable success, understanding the personalities of their employees becomes crucial. Personality traits encompass a wide range of individual differences along with its positive and negative traits including conscientiousness and neuroticism. These traits influence how employees interact with their colleagues, handle job-related tasks, respond to challenges, and contribute to the overall organizational culture. According to the Five-Factor Model, traits can and do change in response to distress and treatment for distress, (Sutin et al., 2020). Therefore, gaining a comprehensive understanding of employees' personalities is vital for fostering a positive work environment, nurturing talent, and aligning individuals' strengths within an organization's objectives.

In this trying time, employees in the academe are bombarded with bulks of workloads due to drastic change caused by the pandemic. According to Eurofound (2020), in Covid-19 crisis, 25% felt emotionally drained by their work (Savolainen et al, 2021). As Covid-19 impacted individual's life especially on mental health issue, there is a need for employee to be moreresilient. As highlighted in the report (CNN Philippines, February 16, 2021), mental health is an issue among workers amid pandemic. Statistics show that the Philippines has the highest number of depressed people in Southeast Asia (CNN Philippines, 2021).

Bohol Island State University (BISU), is a premier Science and Technology University of the formation of world-class and virtuous human resources. With the university's efforts to met

the demand for virtuous human resources, it is still need to improve and promote mental health in educational institutions. In response to the university’s vision, the researcher was motivated to conduct a study on “ Unraveling the Employees Personality in New Normal: An Interdisciplinary Exploration”.

Objectives

This study aims to assess the level of employees’ neuroticism and conscientiousness and its relationship in the new normal set up in Bohol Island State University.

Methodology

This study uses a quantitative method and utilized the descriptive research design. The research questionnaire was adopted the standardized questionnaire developed by Costa & McCrae (1992), the NEO Personality Inventory-Revised (NEO-PI-R). The data were analyzed and interpreted using inferential statistical tools such as chi-square and t-Test for independent samples were used to determine significant relationship and difference between variables of the study through Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS)

Results and Discussion

Profile of the respondents

Table 1
Profile of Respondents
n = 282

Profile	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Rank
Type of Personnel			
Teaching	187	66.31	1
Non-Teaching	95	33.69	2
Total	282	100	
Age (in years)			
20 – 25	108	38.30	1
26 – 35	106	37.59	2
36 – 45	49	17.38	3
46 – 50	15	5.32	4
51 – 60	4	1.42	5
Total	282	100	
Sex			
Male	114	40.43	2
Female	168	59.57	1
Total	282	100	
Educational Attainment			
Bachelor	156	55.32	1
Masteral	72	25.53	2
Doctoral	54	19.15	3
Total	282	100	
Employment Status			
JO or COS	58	20.57	2
Part Time	49	17.38	3
Temporary	28	9.93	4
Regular	147	52.13	1
Total	282	100	
Length of Service			
Less than 5	134	47.52	1
5 – 10	100	35.46	2
11 – 15	37	13.12	3
16 – 20	10	3.55	4
21 – 30	0	0	6
More than 30	1	0.35	5
Total	282	100	

Table 1 shows that in terms of age, majority (75.89) of the respondents are between ages 20 to 40 years. There are more female respondents, as to educational attainment majority are bachelor and master’s degree holders. There are more regular respondents with more or less 1 to 10 years of experience.

Respondents’ Neuroticism Level

Table 2
Respondents’ Neuroticism
n = 282

Item Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Response	Interpretation
Anxiety	3.42	High	The respondents have high level of neuroticism in terms of Anxiety
Anger Hostility	1.68	Very Low	The respondents have very low level of Neuroticism in terms of Anger Hostility
Depression	3.46	High	The respondents have high level of neuroticism in terms of depression
Self-Consciousness	2.08	Average	The respondents have average level of neuriticism in terms of self-consciousness
Impulsiveness	1.97	Low	The respondents have low level of neuroticism in terms of impulsiveness
Vulnerability	1.50	Very Low	The respondents have very low level of neuroticism in terms of vulnerability

Table 2 shows respondents’ neuroticism in terms of anxiety, anger hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness and vulnerability. It reveals that depression got the highest composite mean of 3.46 which denote high. This indicates that the respondents’ behavior like self-blaming and being hopeless categorized under depression represents the tendency of the respondents towards experiencing minor frustrations as hopelessly overwhelming. Widiger et al.,(2017) support this finding, which stated that neuroticism is the trait disposition to experience negative effects, including irritability, emotional instability, and depression.

Garcia and Zoellner (2017) concluded that people with high levels of neuroticism perceive higher levels of risk and show attention biases toward ambiguous stimuli. In the essence, employees tend to feel helpless and hopeless which lead to depression. In relation to mental health issue, Philippines has the highest number of depressed people in Southeast Asia

(Metro Manila Philippines, 2021) and that the respondents of the study are not exempted to have experienced such negative emotion.

Respondents' Conscientiousness Level

Table 3
Respondents' Conscientiousness Level
n = 282

Item Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Response	Interpretation
Competennce	2.53	Low	The respondents have low level of conscientiousness in terms of competence
Order	2.43	Low	The respondents have low level of conscientiousness in terms of order
Dutifulness	2.56	Low	The respondents have low level of conscientiousness in terms of dutifulness
Achieving Striving	2.60	Average	The respondents have average level of conscientiousness in terms of achieving striving
Self-Discipline	2.61	Average	The respondents have average level of conscientiousness in terms of self-discipline
Deliberation	3.41	High	The respondents have high level of conscientiousness in terms of deliberation

Table 3 shows respondents' conscientiousness in terms of competence, order, dutifulness, achieving striving, self-discipline and deliberation. It reveals that deliberation got the highest composite mean of 3.41 which denote high. This means that respondents can control their social prescribed impulses, which motivates them to think before arriving a decision. Arora & Rangnekar (2016) support this finding, that individuals can prioritize their work, which makes them a follower of norms and rules. Fredrickson's (2001) Broaden-and-build Theory, support this finding, as he stated that organizational practices such as autonomy, competency and meaningfulness should upsurge experiences of positive emotions among employees. In this manner respondents are able to accomplish task though how tough it is still can manage their work effectively.

Correlation of Profile, Neuroticism, and Conscientiousness

Table 4

Correlation of Profile, Neuroticism, and Conscientiousness

n = 282

	Chi-Square Value	Degrees of Freedom	p-value @ alpha = 0.05	Decision	Interpretation
Neuroticism					
Age	9.182	16	0.906	Accept H ₀ Insignificant	Not Related
Sex	4.318	4	0.365	Accept H ₀ Insignificant	Not Related
Educational Attainment	2.718	8	0.951	Accept H ₀ Insignificant	Not Related
Employment Status	24.318	12	0.018	Accept H ₀ Insignificant	Not Related
Length of Service	16.814	20	0.665	Accept H ₀ Insignificant	Not Related
Conscientiousness					
Age	7.100	8	0.526	Accept H ₀ Insignificant	Not Related
Sex	2.021	2	0.364	Accept H ₀ Insignificant	Not Related
Educational Attainment	0.741	4	0.946	Accept H ₀ Insignificant	Not Related
Employment Status	3.902	6	0.690	Accept H ₀ Insignificant	Not Related
Length of Service	10.290	8	0.245	Accept H ₀ Insignificant	Not Related

Since all their p-values are greater than alpha level at 0.05, hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

In addition, all profiles are not related to resilience such as age ($x^2=7.714$, $df= 8$, p -value= 0.462), sex ($x^2= 3.785$, $df= 2$, p -value=0.151), educational attainment ($x^2= 1.553$, $df= 4$, p -value= 0.817), employment status ($x^2= 10.656$, $df= 6$, p -value= 0.100), length of service ($x^2=7.728$, $df=8$, p -value=0.460). All their p-values are greater than alpha level at 0.05 thus accepting the null hypotheses.

Correlation between Two Variables

Table 5
Correlation between Two Variables
 n = 282

Variables	Chi-Square Value	Degrees of Freedom	p-value @ alpha = 0.05	Decision	Interpretation
Neuroticism vs. Conscientiousness	25.488	8	0.001	Reject H ₀ Significant	Related

Table 5 displays the correlation between employees’ neuroticism and conscientiousness level. It reveals that the computed p-value (0.001) is less than the alpha value (0.05). Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that employees’ neuroticism and conscientiousness level reflects a correlation between the two variables. This entails that when employees’ neuroticism reaches its elevated level, hence their conscientiousness level is low. But then, if employees’ neuroticism is low then conscientiousness is at high level. Moreover, it is associated with Big Five Model by Farrukh et al.,(2017) which stated that personality emerged as one of the most extensively established frameworks used to describe the most striking aspects of an individual’s personality. Marlow, (2016) support this finding, as he stated that persons with high levels of neuroticism feel threatened and responded negatively to environmental stress. In addition, low in conscientiousness individual is less likely to engage in counterproductive work behaviors.

Conclusion

In conclusion, unraveling employees’ personalities holds significant implications for organizations seeking to optimize their performance and create a positive work environment. By recognizing the unique traits and characteristics of their employees, may it be high or low in their personality traits what is important is that the organization can make informed and pave way for evidence-based practices that enhances organization success.

References

Anderson, J., Rainie, L., Vogels, E. (2021). Experts say the ‘new normal’ in 2025 will be far more tech-driven, presenting more big challenges. PEW Research Center. Retrieved on March 22, 2021 from <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2021/02/18/experts-say-the-new-normal-in-2025-will-be-far-more-tech-driven-presenting-more-big-challenges/>

Arellano Law Foundation. The law hip Project. Retrieved on May4,2021 from <https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2018-11036>

Arora, R., & Rangnekar, S. (2016). Moderating mentoring relationships and career resilience: Role of conscientiousness personality disposition. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 31(1), 19-36. Retrieved on

- December20,2020fromhttps://Moderating_mentoring_relationships_and_career_resilience_Role_of_conscientiousness_personality_disposition
- Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development*. Vol. 6. Six theories of child development (pp. 1-60). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- CNN Philippines. (2021). Addressing mental health issues in workplace amid pandemic. Retrieved on May 12, 2021 from <https://cnnphilippinds.com>
- Baptiste, B (2018). The relationship between the big five personality traits and authentic leadership. Walden University. Retrieved on March 7, 2021 from <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5993&context=dissertations>
- Caci, B., Miceli, S., Scrima, F., Cardaci, M. (2020). Neuroticism and fear of covid-19. The interplay between boredom, fantasy engagement, and perceived control over time. *Front. Psychol.* Retrieved on February 13, 2021 from <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.574393>
- De Guzman (2018). Mental health of Filipinos today. *The Philippine star*. Retrieved on December 5, 2021 from <https://www.philstar.com>
- de la Serna, J. M., & Valent, P. (2021). *Stress and trauma in pandemic times*. Retrieved on April 10, 2021 from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Juan-Moises-De-La-Serna-2/publication/348977259_Stress_and_Trauma_In_Pandemic_Times/
- Farrukh, M., Ying, C. W., & Mansori, S. (2017). Organizational commitment: an empirical analysis of personality traits. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*. Retrieved on January5,2021from<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JWAM-12-2016-0026/full/html>
- Gewin, V. (2021). Pandemic burnout is rampant in academia. *Nature, Career Feature*. Retrieved on April 1, 2021 from <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-00663-2>
- Harris, L. (2020). Growth and change. Professional business consultancy and mental health first aid, North West. Retrieved on January 9, 2020 from <https://growthandchange.co.uk/resilience-one-of-the-10-keys-to-happier-living/>
- Hobfoll, S. E., Shirom, A., & Golembiewski, R. (2000). Conservation of resources theory. *Handbook of organizational behavior*, 57-81.
- Khosravi, M. (2020). Neuroticism as a marker of vulnerability to covid-19 infection. *Psychiatry Investigation*, 17(7), 710. Retrieved on February 6, 2021 from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7385216/>
- Kroencke, L., Geukes, K., Utesch, T., Kuper, N., & Back, M. D. (2020). Neuroticism and emotional risk during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of research in personality*, 89, 104038. Retrieved on April 7, 2021 from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7550263/>
- Kuntz, J. C. (2021). Resilience in times of global pandemic: Steering recovery and thriving trajectories. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 188-215. Retrieved on May 1, 2021 from<https://iaapjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/apps.12296>
- Liu, S., Lithopoulos, A., Zhang, C. Q., Garcia-Barrera, M. A., & Rhodes, R. E. (2021). Personality and perceived stress during COVID-19 pandemic: Testing the mediating role of perceived threat and efficacy. *Personality and individual differences*, 168, 110351. Retrieved on May 1, 2021 from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7442020/>

- Nandy et. al. (2020). Lessons from Covid-19 and a resilience model for higher education. *Industry and higher education*, 0950422220962696. Retrieved on December 22, 2020 from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0950422220962696>
- Peacock, J. (2021). University employees' perceptions of health during the early stages of the Covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 1-8. Retrieved on May 21, 2021 from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0309877X.2021.1887464>
- Rezapour-Nasrabad, R. A. F. A. T. (2020). Effects of Covid-19 on higher education: Challenges and responses. *Pakistan Journal of Medical and Health Sciences*, 14(3), 1366-1370. Retrieved on March 3, 2021 from <https://pjmhsonline.com/2020/july-sep/1366.pdf>
- Roberts, B. W., Lejuez, C., Krueger, R. F., Richards, J. M., & Hill, P. L. (2014). What is conscientiousness and how can it be assessed? *Developmental psychology*, 50(5), 1315. Retrieved on November 5, 2020 from <https://motamem.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/What-is-Conscientious-and-how-can-we-assess-it.pdf>
- Ryan, B. J., Coppola, D., Canyon, D. V., Brickhouse, M., & Swienton, R. (2020). COVID-19 community stabilization and sustainability framework: an integration of the Maslow hierarchy of needs and social determinants of health. *Disaster medicine and public health preparedness*, 14(5), 623-629. Retrieved on January 2, 2021 from <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/>
- Savolainen, I.; Oksa, R.; Savela, N.; Celuch, M.; Oksanen, A. (2021). COVID-19 anxiety—a longitudinal survey study of psychological and situational risks among Finnish workers. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2021, 18, 794. Retrieved on May 25, 2021 from <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18020794>
- Sriram (2019). 15 ways to improve education quality and student achievement with outcome-based education. Retrieved on November 20, 2020 from <https://www.creatrixcampus.com/blog/15-ways-to-improve-education-quality-and-student-achievement-with-outcome-based-education>
- Sutin, A. R., Luchetti, M., Aschwanden, D., Lee, J. H., Sesker, A. A., Strickhouser, J. E., ... & Terracciano, A. (2020). Change in five-factor model personality traits during the acute phase of the coronavirus pandemic. *PLoS one*, 15(8), e0237056. Retrieved on February 19, 2021 from <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0237056>
- Ungar, M., & Liebenberg, L. (2018). 1. Putting resilience theory into action: five principles for intervention. In *resilience in action* (pp. 17-36). University of Toronto Press. Retrieved on December 12, 2020 from <https://esteemjourney.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Putting-Resilience-Theory-Into-Action.pdf>
- Widiger, T. A. (2009). *Neuroticism*. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (p. 129–146). The Guilford Press. Retrieved on January 24, 2021 from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2009-12071-009>
- Widiger, T. A., & Oltmanns, J. R. (2017). Neuroticism is a fundamental domain of personality with enormous public health implications. *World Psychiatry*, 16(2), 144. Retrieved on February 3, 2021 from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5428182/>

