# **C and work-related variables**

* **Task performance**

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis.*Personnel Psychology, 44*(1), 1-26. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/docview/617946789?accountid=14553

* + - This is a meta-analysis investigating blah blah blah
    - C is the most consistent predictor of three job performance (job proficiency, training proficiency, and personnel data) across five different types of occupations (professionals, police, managers, sales, and skilled/semi-skilled). The correlations between C and job performance range from 0.20 to 0.23, with the sample size ranging from 3585 to 12,893.
    - Furthermore, the impact C has on subjective criteria ratings is larger than on a variety types of objective criteria ratings.
* On Page 18, the authors cited some papers on military performance.

Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology,44*(4), 703-742. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/docview/618107386?accountid=14553

* C has a small and non-significant validity coefficient: 0.179.

Salgado, J. F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the european community.*Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(1), 30-43. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.1037/0021-9010.82.1.30

* Supported Barrick and Mount (1991); European community sample
* Meta-analyses; C is a valid predictor across job criteria and occupational groups
* The overall validity coefficient for C with 24 studies and 3295 respondents was 0.25, which was the highest among the Big Five personality dimensions.
* C also performed well when validity coefficients were calculated for personality-criterion combinations, and the coefficient ranges from 0.11 to 0.39 for personnel data and training, respectively.
* In terms of personality-occupation combinations, C still showed validity across occupations (police, professionals, managers, sales, and skilled labor), and the coefficient ranges from .10 to .24.

Behling, O. (1998). Employee selection: Will intelligence and conscientiousness do the job?. *The Academy of Management Executive (1993-2005)*, 77-86.

* Some interesting idea about the likeableness of low C people

Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The big five revisited.*Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(6), 869-879. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.1037/0021-9010.85.6.869

* + Previous meta-analyses (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Mount & Barrick, 1995; Salgado, 1997; Tett et al., 1991) are flawed in construct validity, in that a large amount of the measures used in these studies were not designed to explicitly measure the Big Five personality dimensions.
  + Overcame the deficiencies, by including only the scales that were explicitly designed to measure the Big Five.
  + They also explored the criterion-related validity of the Big Five for task versus contextual performance, in the light of Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) and Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996).
  + Among the Big Five personality dimensions, the true validity of C was 0.2 across occupations and performance criterial.
  + This pattern held when the overall performance was broken down to task and contextual performance. The true validity coefficients were equal to .15 for task performance, and .18 and .16 for job dedication and interpersonal facilitation, respectively.
  + ~~The true-score correlation between C and overall job performance was found to be 0.24, which is the largest among the Big Five personality dimensions. The true-score correlations between C and task performance and contextual performance respectively were .16 and .18~~
  + ~~The criterion-related validity of C may have been overestimated by Mount and Barrick (1995) and Salgado (1997).~~ Although the coefficient was small to moderate, C still managed to have consistently explain a small portion of variance in job performance, regardless of jobs and criterion dimensions. However, considering the correlations between C and other selection techniques such as interviews and reference checks, the value of this small portion may be questionable and it would be unreasonable to say that C has the same status as that of intelligence for personnel selection purposes (cf. Behling, 1998).

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. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.1111/1468-2389.00160

* They quantitatively summarized 15 prior meta-analyses, which studied the relationship between the FFM and job performance, and found that C was a valid predictor across performance measures and occupational types.
* Across all jobs, C is related to work performance. Furthermore, the magnitude of the validity coefficient of C was found to be consistently the highest among the Big Five personality dimensions. The average true score correlation estimates ranged from the mid .20s to low .30s. The 90% credibility values showed that these validity estimates had the upper bound generally in the upper .30s.
* Therefore, C appears to consistently predict success in virtually all jobs moderately well, and may predict success strongly when moderator effects are accounted for in certain situations.

Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: A socioanalytic perspective.*Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(1), 100-112. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.100

* To eliminate the need to classify predictors by construct, Hogan and Holland (2003) included only studies using HPI to measure personality. In HPI, the construct that is the same as C in the Big Five is prudence (median *r* = .51) (Hogan & Holland, 2003). Task performance (getting ahead) and contextual performance (getting along) were investigated both together and separately.
* They found that the estimated true validity of prudence for the overall job performance was .24. The estimated true validity of prudence for contextual performance was .31, which was higher than that of task performance (*ρ* = .20). This indicated that prudence was valid for predicting criteria reflecting both getting a long and getting ahead at work, but more specifically, getting along was better predicted by prudence.

Dudley, N. M., Orvis, K. A., Lebiecki, J. E., & Cortina, J. M. (2006). A meta-analytic investigation of conscientiousness in the prediction of job performance: examining the intercorrelations and the incremental validity of narrow traits. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(1), 40.

* Examined the degree to which narrow traits of C predict job performance above and beyond global C
* Narrow traits of C are achievement, dependability, order, and cautiousness. The finding was that type of performance was indeed functioning as a moderator of the relationship between these four narrow traits and job performance. The estimated true score validity of achievement is the highest for task performance (*ρ* = .25). For job dedication, interpersonal facilitation, and counterproductive work behavior (CWB), dependability always had the greatest absolute magnitude estimated true score validity (*ρ* = .46, *ρ* = .23, and *ρ* = -.34, respectively).
* Narrow traits of C also were shown to have incremental validity above and beyond global C, but the magnitude depends on the particular type of criteria. For job dedication and CWB, narrow traits explained a substantial amount of variance above and beyond global C (*ΔR2*= .259 and *ΔR2*= .136, respectively). In particular, dependability was shown to be the best predictor for dedication. For overall job performance and task performance, however, narrow traits explained only a small to moderate portion of variance (*ΔR2*= .037 and *ΔR2*= .046, respectively).
* Occupational type also turned out to be a moderator of the relationship between narrow C traits and overall job performance. Achievement had the highest validity for sales workers (*ρ* = .28), and customer service (*ρ* = .19), while dependability had the highest validity for managers (*ρ* = .27) and skilled and semiskilled workers (*ρ* = .27).
* In terms of incremental validity, for customer service positions, the percentage of variance explained by the narrow traits over and above global C was small, while it’s moderate to substantial for the other three types of occupations. Narrow traits contribute to the prediction of overall performance in some occupations but not others.

Salgado, J. F., Moscoso, S., & Berges, A. (2013). Conscientiousness, its facets, and the prediction of job performance ratings: Evidence against the narrow measures.*International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 21*(1), 74-84. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.1111/ijsa.12018

* Used a Schmid-Leiman transformation that excluded the common variance from the facets of C, and found that the facet measure containing only specific variance, did not predict job performance, nor did they have any incremental validity above and beyond C.
* C, on the other hand, predicted all three job performance criteria (true validities of .25, .28 and .37, respectively).
* The authors attribute contrary findings in previous studies to the artifacts produced by methodological limitations of their statistical analyses.
* On debates over whether C or facets of C will predict job performance better? (refer to p.2)

Shaffer, J. A., & Postlethwaite, B. E. (2013). The validity of conscientiousness for predicting job performance: A meta‐analytic test of two hypotheses. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 21(2), 183-199. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.1111/ijsa.12028

* This meta-analysis found that C was a stronger predictor of performance in highly routinized jobs than of performance in jobs that have high levels of cognitive ability requirements.

O'Neill, T. A., & Allen, N. J. (2011). Personality and the prediction of team performance. European Journal of Personality, 25(1), 31-42. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.1002/per.769

* Not only to task performance, C was also a predictor of team performance, and the mean correlation between C composite and team performance was .31. However, among the other four facets of the Big Five personality dimensions, only openness was moderately negatively related to team performance, and the other three didn’t predict team performance at all.

**OCB**

Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9(1-2), 52-69. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.1111/1468-2389.00163

* Organ and Ryan (1995) in their meta-analysis, found that C was the only variable that significantly positively correlated with both the altruism component (directed towards individuals; corrected *r* = .22) and the generalized compliance component of (directed towards organizations; corrected *r* = .30) OCB.
* Neuman and Kickul (1998) discovered that C was correlated to all five types of OCB identified by Organ (1988; *r*s = .20-.41).
* Miller, Griffin and Hart (1999) found that even above and beyond neuroticism and extraversion, C was still a valid predictor of OCB (*r* = .42).
* Hogan, Rybicki, Motowidlo, and Borman (1998) found that when promotion was unlikely, employees’ C was the best predictor of citizenship performance, but when promotion was likely, citizenship performance was best predicted by ambition.
* Motowidlo, Borman, and Schmit (1997) proposed the hypothesis that personality-citizenship performance correlation should be stronger than personality-task performance correlation. Results of several studies have supported this hypothesis (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996; Hattrup, O’Connell, & Wingate, 1998; Hense, 2000). For example, Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) found that the correlation between the dependability facet of C and citizenship performance was .31, but that between dependability and task performance was only .18, though both were significant. Later, Hense (2000) discovered that C correlated .20 with supervisor-rated citizenship performance, but only .10 with task performance rated by the same source.
* Although some studies have showed evidence against the notion that C is a strong predictor of citizenship performance (McManus & Kelly, 1999; Facteau, Allen, Facteau, Bordas, & Tears, 2000), most studies on this topic have supported the hypothesis that C is a more valid predictor of citizenship performance, than of task performance.
* In this meta-analysis (Broman et al., 2001) including studies post Organ and Ryan (1995), the authors found that the mean uncorrected, sample-size weighted correlation between C and citizenship performance was .24, if studies using self-rated and other-rated citizenship performance were included, and the correlation dropped slightly (*r* = .19) when studies using self-rated citizenship performance were excluded.

**CWB, procrastination**

Le, K., Donnellan, M. B., Spilman, S. K., Garcia, O. P., & Conger, R. (2014). Workers behaving badly: Associations between adolescent reports of the big five and counterproductive work behaviors in adulthood.*Personality and Individual Differences, 61-62*, 7-12. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.1016/j.paid.2013.12.016

* Found that self-reported C at adolescence was correlated with self-reported CWB in adulthood (18 years later; *r* = -.16 with both CWB-I and CWB-O, and *r* = -.18 with total CWB).