The Effects of Personality and Age on Job Satisfaction and Job Stress

Shasvini Naidu Nagiah[1]

Lin Mei-Hua[1*]

[1]*Department of Psychology,*
Sunway University

*Corresponding e-mail: [mhlin@sunway.edu.my]

Past research has found that personality assist us in coping with job stressors and boost performance. In the current study, we aim to examine whether age or personality has a stronger role in predicting job satisfaction and job stress. We proposed that higher agreeableness and older adult will have higher job satisfaction. We also proposed that individuals with higher neuroticism and younger employees will have higher stress with their job. One hundred and thirty-one full time employees (64 males, 67 females) aged between 18 to 65 years old from Malaysia were recruited. Participants completed the Big Five Inventory, Facet Satisfaction Scale, Perceived Stress Scale and demographic form. Findings indicated that higher agreeableness predicted higher job satisfaction while higher neuroticism predicted higher job stress. Personality played a stronger role than age in predicting job satisfaction and job stress. The paper further suggested to research on the impact of personality and age on employee retention rate.

Keywords: personality, agreeableness, age, job satisfaction, job stress

There has been an increase in older population nationwide over time due to the longevity and declining in fertility (United Nations, 2015; Giang & Le, 2018). In Malaysia, people are projected to live up to 85 years old in 2050, in comparison with the projection rate during 1950 which was 49 years (Teh & Sapuan, 2018). According to the United Nations (2013), population who are 60 years old and above will represent 20% of the entire population by the year 2050. While this is an achievement of the human evolvement, it can be detrimental as well (Giang & Le, 2018). Slow economic growth will become more prominent as the nation age due to a shortage for younger employees (Kunze, Boehm & Bruch, 2011; Maestas, Mullen & Powell. 2016). Thus, slowing down

Malaysia's vision to achieve the status of being a developed country by the year 2020 (Yusoff & Buja, 2013).

In order to improve the economic growth of the country, there is a need to monitor employee's job satisfaction and job stress. Based on the evidence above, it would be necessary to take in account of their age as the demographic pattern in Malaysia is changing. Another factor which needs to be considered is our personality as it influences our level of job satisfaction and job stress (Penland, Masten, Zelhart, Fournet, & Callahan, 2000; Judge, Heller and Mount, 2002). Thus, the aim of the current study is to get a clearer understanding regarding the effects of personality and age on job satisfaction and job stress and hopefully, provide useful

information in understanding Malaysia's ageing workforce.

Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a construct in organisational studies that has been researched widely across the globe. The term "job satisfaction" was coined by Hoppock (1935) who defined job satisfaction as a mix of psychological, physiological and environmental situations which leads to a person being satisfied about his or her job. Job satisfaction is defined as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (Locke,1969). It is highly crucial to any organisation's productivity, turnover intentions, employee's absenteeism rate, and their well-being (Nash,1985; Drabe, Hauff, & Richter, 2015).

Besides measuring overall job satisfaction, the construct can also be measured through five components that accumulate and form one's opinion towards the job: satisfaction towards the work itself, supervision, co-workers, pay and promotional opportunities (Nash, 1985; Bowling, Wagner, & Beehr, 2018). The facet of work itself measures the extent to which employee is intrinsically motivated with his or her job (Bowling et al., 2018). Supervision facet measures the extent to which one is satisfied with her or her supervisor while the Co-workers facet measures the extent to which one is satisfied with the support and interpersonal treatment received by their co-workers (Bowling et al., 2018). The facet of pay measures the extent to which one is satisfied and fairness in terms of the pay they receive for their work while the facet of promotion measures the extent to which one is satisfied with the opportunities obtained for promotion (Bowling et al., 2018). High pay, high promotion, friendly supervision and co-workers were some of the factors which led to high job satisfaction (Nash,1985; Beehr, Glaser, Beehr, Beehr, Wallwey, & Erofeev, 2006).

Personality and Job Satisfaction

An employee's level of job satisfaction can be influenced by their personality (Kumar & Singh, 2011). Hoppock (1935), for example, noted a strong correlation between workers' emotional adjustment and their levels of job satisfaction. Thus, job satisfaction is, in part, dispositionally based. The Big Five Model, developed by McCrae and Costa (1996) consists of five dimensions (OCEAN), and these serve as the core model in universally determining a person's personality traits. The Openness to Experience traits illustrates individuals with the willingness to accept new things. Individuals high on this dimension are often seen as adventurous and creative. The Conscientiousness traits illustrates individuals who are highly thoughtful, and their behaviours are often goal directed. Individuals high on this dimension are often seen as being extremely meticulous in the work they produce.

The Extraversion dimension characterise individuals as people who love socialising and being around with people. Individuals high on this dimension often gain their energy by being with people in comparison with the introverts. The Agreeableness traits portray people as diplomatic and warm. Individuals high on this dimension are often more cooperative. Finally, the Neuroticism trait characterise individuals as people with emotional instability and irrational thoughts. People high on this dimension experiences anxiety and irritability often.

Judge et al. (2002) conducted a meta-analytic review using the five factor model to find out if personality influences job satisfaction. The researchers found that extraversion, conscientiousness and neuroticism predicted job satisfaction while openness to experience and agreeableness had a weak correlation with job satisfaction. Out of all the predictors, Judge et al. (2002) found that neuroticism was the strongest predictor. Thus, an individual with higher

neuroticism trait experiences lower job satisfaction. Judge et al. (2002) attributed neuroticism to emotional instability which lead to the trait being a strong predictor of job satisfaction. On the other hand, Barrick and Mount (1991) found conscientiousness to be the strongest predictor of job satisfaction for all types of occupations groups. This means higher level of conscientiousness leads to higher level of job satisfaction. It is evident now that personality influences our emotions, which in turn influences the extent as to which we are satisfied with our job. On the contrary, Furnham, Petrides, Jackson and Cotter (2002) found that personality does not predict aspects of job satisfaction.

Surprisingly, research conducted with Singaporeans found that agreeableness was the strongest predictor for job satisfaction (Templer 2012). This finding seems to be inconsistent with the metanalytic review findings by Judge et al. (2002) who found that agreeableness had a weak correlation with job satisfaction. After reviewing extensive literature, researcher of the current study questions if agreeableness would predict job satisfaction among Malaysian working population.

Malaysia is a multicultural country consisting of three main ethnic groups, namely, Bumiputeras, Chinese and Indians. A study conducted in an oil and gas company in Malaysia related to personality and job satisfaction found that all five personality traits had a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction, with the strongest predictor being openness to experience (Mohd Said, Abukraa, & Mohd Rose, 2015). This means higher level of openness to experience leads to higher level of job satisfaction. However, the weakest predictor was conscientiousness. This is inconsistent which Judge et al. (2002) which found that openness to experience had a weak correlation to job satisfaction. Another study conducted by Mehrad, Halimatussadiah, Redzuan, and Abdullah

(2015) in Malaysia found that agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to experience had a positive relationship with job satisfaction. The strongest predictor was neuroticism. Thus, higher level of neuroticism leads to lower job satisfaction.

Based on the findings, there seemed to be an inconsistent pattern. Each study found different trait to be the strongest predictor. Furnham et al. (2002) did not find any relationship between personality traits and job satisfaction. However, one personality trait that stood out to the researcher is agreeableness. Judge et al. (2002) as well as Barrick and Mount (2002) found that there was no correlation between agreeableness and job satisfaction. However, Malaysian researchers found a significant relationship between agreeableness and job satisfaction (Mehrad et al., 2015; Mohd Said et al., 2015). Thus, scaling down the population to only Malaysia might have led agreeableness to correlate with job satisfaction. Thus, it is hypothesized that individuals with higher agreeableness will be more satisfied.

Job Stress

Besides job satisfaction, another variable that highly affects the performance of an employee is the level of job stress. Job stress refers to a process in which the person's perceived stress influences the job which negatively affects their health and behaviour (Kahn & Byosiere, 1992; Ismail, Hasan, Chin, Ismail, & Abu Samah, 2013). There are two types of stress: eustress and distress. Eustress refers to stress which can be handled by the individual while distress refers to stress which cannot be handled by the person affected. Different people handle stress differently, and this can be due to their personality (Ismail et al., 2013). High job stress can lead to distress which in turn leads to high rates of turnover, employee's absenteeism, job dissatisfaction and demotivation among employees affected (Ismail et al.,2013). This is supported by a

meta-analysis research with 39,281 employees, which found that high stress led to lower job performance (Gilboa, Shirom, & Fried, 2005).

Personality and Job Stress

Studies have found an association between personality and job stress. For instance, Penland et al. (2000) found that personality moderates stress level within humans. This basically mean that personality affects how we handle stress. There is a significant negative relationship between self-regulation and job stress (Fathizadeh & Sadat Khoshouei, 2017). The trait of neuroticism may have a deep impact on how people perceive and experience stress.

Highly complex jobs entail greater skills, self-confidence and are more challenging. Such jobs can be demanding, triggering greater worry among individuals with high neuroticism. Thus, individuals high in neuroticism would have difficulties in coping with job stress due to the characteristics of having emotional instability, anxiety and irrational thoughts (Fathizadeh & Sadat Khoshouei, 2017). Highly neurotic individual has the tendency to produce mental representations about hypothetical situations, and this in turn creates cognitive vulnerabilities leading to higher stress (Hankin, 2010). Thus, it is hypothesized that individuals with higher neuroticism will have higher stress.

Age, Job Satisfaction and Job Stress

Research conducted on age and job satisfaction have been producing mixed results over the years with some being positive or negative non-linearity, J shape, U shape, direct linear relationship or even no relationship (Ghazzawi, 2011; Sharma, 2017). A recent research conducted by Hoboubi, Choobineh, Ghanavati, Keshavarzi, and Hosseini (2017) found that a U shape relationship exists between age and job satisfaction. The research illustrated that individuals within the age range of 31 to 38 years had lower job satisfaction in comparison with individuals within the age range of 22 to 30 years and 39 to 48 years. Older employees who are highly satisfied were able to perform well in their job, subsequently improving the company's performance (Drabe et al., 2015). In addition, a recent research on thirty seven countries by Andrade and Westover (2018) found that older employees have higher level of job satisfaction. Thus, the current study predicts that older employees will be more satisfied with their job.

On the other hand, past research has shown a higher job stress among the younger employees. Younger employees, usually between the age of 18-29, are more prone to stress. A research by LinkedIn has shown that 32% of the men and 29% of women in Malaysia have experienced quarter life crisis (Rakin, 2018). A recent research conducted in China by Ding and Liu (2019) found that younger employees perceived higher job stress than older employees, which further emphasises the linear relationship between age and job stress. Thus, the current study hypothesise that younger employees will be more stressed with their job.

After reviewing past literatures, researcher of the current study questions if personality and age predicts job satisfaction and job stress. It is hypothesized that:

- H1: Personality and age will affect job satisfaction. Specifically, individuals with higher agreeableness will be more satisfied and older employees will be more satisfied with their job.

- H2: Personality and age will affect job stress. Specifically, individuals with higher neuroticism will have higher stress and younger employees will be more stressed with their job.

Method

Participants

The current study involved 131 full time employees from across Malaysia. To determine the minimum number of participants required for this research, a priori power analysis was conducted using G*Power software and a minimum of 122 participants was derived (Erdfelder, Faul, & Buchner, 1996). The anticipated effect size was set as medium (d = .03) with the desired probability being 0.05. To be eligible to participate in this study, participants had to be full-time employees, between the age of 18 to 65 years old, currently working in Malaysia.

Participants were recruited using the convenience sampling method via circulation of survey form through social media. In addition to the convenience sampling method, snowballing method was used as well. This method provided a greater reach. Most of the participants were between the range of 18 to 65 years old (M = 28.47, SD = 9.907). Many of the participants were also single, Chinese, female and typically worked in organisations that are for-profit based. In addition, many of them have working experience of less than three years and work in the industry which provides professional, scientific and technical services with annual income below RM24,000. The demographic details of participants are in Table 1.

Table 1
Demographic Table (N = 131)

Characteristics	n	$\%$
Gender		
Male	64	48.9
Female	67	51.1
Marital Status		
Single	104	79.4
Married	27	20.6
Type of Organisation		
For Profit	86	65.6
Non-profit	9	6.9
Government	4	3.1
Health Care	6	4.6
Education	26	19.8
Working Experience		
Less than 3 years	92	70.2
3 years – 6 years	15	11.5
6 years and above	24	18.3
Annual Salary		
Below RM 24,000	39	29.8
RM 24,000 – RM 28,000	16	12.2
RM 29,000 – RM 33,000	7	5.3
RM 34,000 – RM 38,000	18	13.7
RM 39,000 – RM 43,000	6	4.6
RM 44,000 – RM 48,000	7	5.3
RM 49,000 – RM 53,000	5	3.8
Above RM 54,000	33	25.2

Instruments

Demographic form was used to collect demographic information such as age, gender, marital status, ethnicity, religion, and industry and work-related information.

Big Five Inventory (John, Donahue & Knetle, 1991) consists of 44 items which assess the five dimensions of personality: Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. There are 16 items reversed scored items. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale with *1* (Strongly Disagree, to *5* (Strongly Agree). A higher average score on any personality trait indicates that individual portray the personality trait often in any given situation. The coefficient of Big Five Inventory obtained in the past study is .84 (Neuroticism), .88 (Extraversion), .81 (Openness), .79 (Agreeableness), and .82 (Conscientiousness) (John & Srivastava, 1999).

Facet Satisfaction Scale (Beehr et al.,2006) consists of 25 items which evaluates the extent to which one is satisfied with their job. It consists of five facets: (a) work itself, (b) supervision, (c) co-workers, (d) pay, and (e) promotional opportunities. Each facet of the Facet Satisfaction Scale contains five items. Ten items in the scale are reversed scored. Each item was rated on a 7-point Likert scale with *1* (Strongly Disagree) to *7* (Strongly Agree). An average score of all items reflects overall job satisfaction while an average score of items in each facets reflect satisfaction of facets. The coefficient of Facet Satisfaction Scale obtained in the past study is >.80 while the Cronbach alpha value of each facets ranged from .86 to .94 (Beehr et al., 2006).

Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983) consists of 10 items which measures the degree to which situations in one's life are appraised as stressful. Four items in the scale are reverse scored. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale with *0* (Never) to *4* (Very often). A higher score on the total items indicate higher job stress. Cohen and Williamson (1998) found that PSS was valid as they found that the PSS was a better than other life events related scale in terms of predicting for psychological and physical symptoms. The internal reliability in past study is .78 (Cohen & Janicki, 2012).

The data was analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics 23 computer software.

Results

To ensure that the predictors are related to the outcomes, a preliminary analysis using correlation analysis (refer to Table 2) was conducted. Based on the correlation analysis, conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, work itself, co-workers, supervision, pay and promotion were significantly correlated to job satisfaction. On the other hand, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, work itself, co-workers, supervision, pay, promotion and age were significantly correlated job stress. Correlation coefficients were < .90, indicating no violation of multicollinearity.

Personality and Age predicting Job Satisfaction

A standard multiple regression analysis was used to investigate the influence of personality traits and age on job satisfaction (refer to Table 3). Both personality traits and age together significantly predict job satisfaction, $R = .37$, $R^2 = .14$, $F (6, 124) = 3.34$, $p = .004$. Agreeableness has a significant beta of .27; thus, as Agreeableness increase by 1 *SD*, job satisfaction increased by .27 *SD*, $t = 2.86$, $p = .01$. The personality traits of Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Neuroticism as well as age did not significantly predict job satisfaction. Overall, the predictors together predicted 14.0% variability in job

satisfaction. Thus, H1 is partially supported.

Table 2
Correlation Analysis (*N*=131)

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Age	28.4	9.91	-												
2. FSS	4.36	.90	.156	(.90)											
3. WI	4.42	.96	.24*	.64**	(.68)										
4. SS	4.58	1.49	-.02	.75**	.38**	(.88)									
5. CW	5.07	1.36	.23*	.70**	.43**	.42	(.91)								
6. PY	3.66	1.40	.15	.71**	.32**	.32**	.36**	(.87)							
7. PN	4.05	1.24	-.02	.66**	.27*	.42**	.20*	.41**	(.80)						
8. PSS	18.6	7.85	-.23*	-.44**	-.33**	-.38**	.26*	-.28*	-.27*	(.88)					
9. O	3.57	.49	.08	.08	.13	.08	.05	.03	.02	.004	(.65)				
10. C	3.41	.64	.44**	.20*	.29*	.10	-.15	.13	.06	-.27*	.06	(.82)			
11. E	3.40	.77	-.24*	.02	-.04	.000*	.09	-.01	.03	-.17	.27*	.22*	(.85)		
12. A	3.89	.58	.29*	.31**	.11	.24*	.39**	.16	.13	.24*	.21*	.37**	.30**	(.78)	
13. N	2.92	.69	-.26*	-.23*	-.19*	-.25*	-.14	-.15	-.06	.60**	-.22*	-.39**	-.43**	-.29*	(.80)

Notes. FSS = Facet Satisfaction Scale, WI = Work Itself, SS = Supervision, CW = Co-workers, PY = Pay, PN = Promotion, PSS = Perceived Stress Scale, O = Openness to Experience, C = Conscientiousness, E = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, N = Neuroticism.
Internal consistency values (Cronbach's alphas) appear across the diagonal in parentheses.
*p < .05, two tailed. ** *p* < .01, two-tailed.

To examine if each of the facets proposed by Nash (1985) and Bowling et al. (2018) has an influence on job satisfaction, further analysis was conducted between the personality traits and age on each facet in Facet Satisfaction Scale using standard multiple regression (refer to Table 4). Both personality traits and age together significantly predict the facet of Work Itself, R =.39 R^2 = .148, F (6,124) = 3.59, p = .003. Extraversion has a significant beta of .21; thus, as Extraversion increase by 1 *SD*, work itself increase by .21 *SD*, t = -2.18, p = .03. Conscientiousness also has a significant beta of .22; thus, as Conscientiousness increase by 1 *SD*, work itself increased by .22 *SD*, t = 2.21, p = .03. The personality traits of Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, Neuroticism as well as age did not significantly predict work itself. Overall, the predictors together predicted 14.8% variability in the facet of Work Itself.

Both personality traits and age together significantly predict the facet of Supervision, R =.36, R^2 = .131, F (6,124) = 3.13, p = .007. Agreeableness has a beta of .24; thus, as Agreeableness increase by 1 *SD*, supervision increased by .24 *SD*, t = 2.53, p = .01. Neuroticism has a beta of -.29; thus, as Neuroticism increase by 1 *SD*, supervision decreased by .29 *SD*, t = -2.86, p = .01. The personality traits of Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, as well as age did not significantly predict supervision. Overall, the predictors together predicted 13.1% variability in the facet of Supervision.

Both personality traits and age together significantly predict the facet of Co-workers, R =.41, R^2 = .172, F (6,124) = 4.28, p = .001. Agreeableness has a beta of .38; thus, as Agreeableness increase by 1 *SD*, co-workers increased by .38 *SD*, t = 4.09, p <.001. The personality traits of Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Neuroticism as well as age did not significantly predict Co-workers. Overall, the predictors together predicted 17.2% variability in the facet of Co-workers.

Both personality traits and age together did not significantly predict the facet of Pay, R =.25, R^2 = .06, F (6,124) = 1.36, p = .24.

Both personality traits and age together also did not significantly predict the facet of Promotion, $R = .16$, $R^2 = .03$, $F (6,124) = .53$, $p = .79$.

Table 3
Multiple Regression Analyses for Personality Traits and Age Predicting FSS

Predictor	B	SE B	β	t	p
Openness	.03	.16	.02	.18	.85
Conscientiousness	.05	.14	.04	.36	.72
Extraversion	-.19	.11	-.17	-1.71	.09
Agreeableness	.42	.15	.27	2.86	.01
Neuroticism	-.25	.13	-.19	-1.92	.06
Age	.01	.01	.05	.54	.59

Notes. $R^2 = .14$ ($N = 131$). $F (6,124) = 3.34$, $p = .004$. SE = Standard Error.

Table 4
Multiple Regression Analyses for Personality Traits and Age Predicting each facet of FSS ($N = 131$)

Predictor	WI B	SE B	β	SS B	SE B	β	CW B	SE B	β	PY B	SE B	β	PN B	SE B	β
O	.26	.17	.13	.08	.27	.03	-.08	.24	-.03	.01	.26	.00	-.12	.24	-.05
C	.33	.15	.22*	-.04	.24	-.02	-.14	.21	-.06	.03	.23	.02	.06	.21	.03
E	-.26	.12	.21*	-.33	.19	-.17	-.10	.17	-.06	-.26	.18	-,14	-.01	.17	-.01
A	-.03	.16	-.02	.61	.24	.24*	.88	.22	.38**	.31	.24	.13	.31	.21	.14
N	-.19	.14	-.13	-.61	.21	-.29*	-.09	.19	-.05	-.28	.21	-.14	-.07	.19	-.04
Age	.01	.01	.15	-.02	.01	-.11*	.02	.01	.15	.01	.01	-.10	-.01	.01	-.07
R		.39			.36			.41			.25			.16	
R²		.15			.13			.17			.06			.03	
F		3.59*			3.13*			4.28*			1.36			.53	

Notes. SE = Standard Error, O = Openness to Experience, C = Conscientiousness, E = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, N = Neuroticism, WI = Work Itself, SS = Supervision, CW = Co-workers, PY = Pay, PN = Promotion. *p < .05, **p <.001.

Personality and Age predicting Job Stress

A standard multiple regression analysis was used to investigate the influence of personality traits and age on job stress (refer to Table 5). Both personality traits and age significantly predict Job Stress, $R = .63$ $R^2 = .40$, $F (6,124) = 13.92$, $p < .001$. Neuroticism has a beta of .64; thus, as neuroticism increased by 1 *SD*, job stress increases by .64 *SD*, $t = 7.73$, $p < .001$. Overall, the predictors together predicted 40% variability in job stress. The personality trait of Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness as well as age did not significantly predict Job Stress. Thus, H2 is partially supported.

Table 5
Multiple Regression Analyses for Personality Traits and Age predicting PSS ($N = 131$)

Predictor	B	SE B	β	t	p
Openness	2.11	1.18	.13	1.79	.08
Conscientiousness	.22	1.03	.02	.22	.83
Extraversion	1.20	.82	.12	1.46	.15
Agreeableness	-1.35	1.06	-.10	-1.27	.21
Neuroticism	7.22	.93	.64	7.73	<.001
Age	-.07	.06	-.08	-1.01	.29

Notes. $R^2 = .40$ ($N = 131$). F (6,124) = 13.92, $p < .001$. SE = Standard Error.

Discussion

As we embrace the ageing workforce, it is important for employers to monitor employee's job satisfaction and job stress. Knowing their personality and age can help in providing effective training to build them holistically, subsequently improving the economic growth in Malaysia. The aim of the current study was to get a clearer understanding regarding the effects of personality and age on job satisfaction and job stress.

The current study hypothesised that personality and age will affect job satisfaction. Specifically, individuals with higher agreeableness will be more satisfied and older employees will be more satisfied with their job. This hypothesis was partially supported (refer to Table 4). Based on the correlation analysis, there was no correlation between age and job satisfaction (refer to Table 2). This finding is inconsistent with Andrade and Westover's (2018) study. This suggest that one could be satisfied with their job regardless of the age.

Further analysis on job satisfaction using multiple regression showed that Agreeableness strongly predicted participant's job satisfaction. This was surprising as the results are inconsistent with findings by Judge et al. (2002) as well as Barrick and Mount (1991) which showed Agreeableness having a weak correlation with job satisfaction. Further analysis on each sub-component of the Facet Satisfaction Scale found that Agreeableness significantly predicted the sub-component of Co-workers as well. However, other traits like Extraversion and Neuroticism significantly predicted the sub-component of Work Itself and Supervision respectively. This is inconsistent with the study by Furnham et al. (2002) which found that there was no relationship between personality traits and the facets of job satisfaction.

One finding that was rather surprising is that when age was taken into account in the regression analysis, results revealed that personality was a stronger predictor and age was not significant. Thus, the hypothesis was partially supported. Researcher of the current study speculate that our personality affects our emotions strongly. This assumption is supported by Judge et al. (2002) who mentioned that the traits of a neurotic individual affects their emotions displayed towards their job. Future research could perhaps tap on this area and expand on it.

The current study also hypothesised that personality and age will affect job stress. Specifically, individuals with higher neuroticism will have higher stress and younger employees will be more stressed with their job. Based on the correlation analysis, there was a correlation between age and job stress (refer to Table 2). This means that young people in the modern society are more prone to experience stress due to lack of life experiences. Thus, the hypothesis was partially supported. This was consistent with the study by Rakin (2018) as well as Ding and Liu (2019) which supports that young people are more distressed.

Regression analysis on job stress indicated that Neuroticism significantly predicted participant's job stress. The result is consistent with findings by Hankin (2010) which illustrated that neurotic individual are prone to stress due to their negative mental representations of the world. The result is further supported in a research by Fathizadeh and Sadat Khoshouei (2017) which stated that neurotic individuals would have difficulties due the characteristics attached to their personality trait such as emotional instability.

The findings regarding job stress was also rather surprising. When age was taken into account in the regression analysis, results revealed that personality was a stronger

predictor and age was not significant. Thus, the hypothesis was partially supported (refer to Table 4). Interestingly, this suggests that age does impact one's job stress, but personality has a stronger effect in our job stress instead of our age. The current findings support Hankin's (2002) findings and speculates that that our world view is affected by our personality which in turn affects our behaviour, leading us either to be resilient or vulnerable towards external factors such as stress. Future studies could investigate on the effects of personality traits on resilience.

However, it is important to note that age was negatively related to both job stress and neuroticism which indicates as one age, job stress and neuroticism are reduced. This may imply that as one gets older, there is better management of stress as well as neurotic tendencies. Hence, it is important to study the coping mechanism or changing worldview the elderly working population has that could be helpful for the younger generation.

To sum it up, hypothesis 1 was partially supported as age did not predict job satisfaction and agreeableness predicted job satisfaction. Hypothesis 2 was supported as age predicted job stress and neuroticism predicted job stress.

Strengths

This research serves as a good foundation for future research to continue in expanding the knowledge in regard to work. Agreeableness was a strong predictor in this study. This was a rather surprising because literature does not appear to show similar result. The findings above also clearly show us how vital our personality is in the workforce and it is a stronger predictor that our age. The current study has shown that employers need to take care of their employee's wellbeing by providing an optimum working environment to improve their job satisfaction and reduce job stress. Their age should not matter. All this while,

there has been a strong focus in tackling issues related to age, but not much emphasis on personality. Thus, this study shows we should not focus highly on age, but on personality of the workers.

Limitations

There is always a need for continuous improvement to widen our understanding on a topic. To improve on this study, the following should be considered. Firstly, there was no correlation between age and job satisfaction. This could be due to sampling error. Even though the sample size for this study were fairly adequate, the participants in this study were young and therefore not representative, especially when age was of one of the predictors. The sample size is adequate but more needs to be done to get representative sample. When using convenience sampling, there has to be a string justification in its use. Future researchers keen to replicate this study could perhaps set a limit for each category of age to avoid getting many participants from the same age group. Future researchers can also opt to scale down their target population by only targeting a specific age group and exclude the rest.

Next, future studies can opt to include different stress measurements that can measure different kind of stress such as eustress. The current measurement only measured the overall stress. Thus, the data obtained was rather vague. Researcher could not pinpoint which part of job stress was predicted by which personality trait.

Future Research

In addition to the suggestions mentioned above to refine the study and make it better, future researchers could consider on other aspects related to this study. Jobs have evolved from satisfying not only needs, but also wants. As we enter Industry 4.0 or the Fourth Industrial Revolution, there is a need for employers to retain talent by looking out for their employees. Thus, future

researchers could research on the impact of personality and age on employee retention, an issue that is increasingly gaining close attention in Malaysia.

Employee retention is strongly affected by job satisfaction and job stress (Masood, 2013; Biason, 2014). Many talents who are switching companies are the youth. Biason's (2014) study illustrated a positive relationship between job satisfaction and job retention. Masood (2013) also showed that job stress does influence Pakistani employee retention in banking sector. Low job satisfaction and high job stress is the key to failure in employee retention Solving this issue is vital to reduce shortage of employees in the future due to the ageing workforce.

Recommendations

There are many things companies can do with the information from this study. Since personality is shown to be more vital in job satisfaction and job stress than age, organisations need to focus on increasing job satisfaction and finding ways to lower their job stress by working with their personality and cultivating a good as well as a safe working environment.

Employee assistance program can be set up to reduce job stress (Ismail et al.,2013). This program is effective in helping them to overcome challenging task by increasing their level of motivation. The decision of taking up this program will allow for employees to thrive in their career as they are now able to handle distress (negative job stress). This will improve the overall performance of the company and subsequently improve the company's performance (Ismail et al., 2013).

Another method that can help neurotic individual to reduce stress is by listening to mindfulness meditations via the mobile applications. Bostock, Crosswell, Prather and Steptoe (2019) found that employees who listened to this for eight weeks had a significant reduction in their overall level of distress. In addition, Bostock et al. (2019) also found that practicing short guided mindfulness meditation reduces anxiety and overall well-being, which effects lasted even after two months. Thus, the mindfulness meditation application will be able to help neurotic individuals to cope with distress.

To sum it all up, the current study has shown some interesting findings, some of which were expected, and some that were not. The findings are a step closer to understanding more about employees' personality and assisting them in growing by providing effective training. However, this is not the end as one close door leads to five open doors. There is still a need to conduct further research on other aspects such as employee retention. The current study has provided useful suggestions whereby organisations can seek to practise to increase their employee's job satisfaction and reduce their job stress. No doubt that there is a long way to go in tackling the issue of slow economic growth, but with a paradigm shift of focusing on personality, it will be possible with all our efforts, together.

References

Andrade, M. S., & Westover, J. H. (2018). Revisiting the Impact of Age on Job Satisfaction: A Global Comparative Examination. *Global Studies Journal*, *11*(4), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.18848/1835-4432/CGP/v11i04/1-24

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

Bostock, S., Crosswell, A. D., Prather, A. A., & Steptoe, A. (2019). Mindfulness on-the-go: Effects of a mindfulness meditation app on work stress and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *24*(1), 127–138. doi:10.1037/ocp0000118

Bowling, N. A., Wagner, S. H., & Beehr, T. A. (2018). The facet satisfaction scale: An effective affective measure of job satisfaction facets. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *33*(3), 383-403.doi: 10.1007/s10869-017-9499-4

Beehr, T. A., Glaser, K.M., Beehr,M. J., Beehr, D. E.,Wallwey, D. A.,& Erofeev, D. (2006). The nature of satisfaction with subordinates: Its predictors and importance to supervisors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*, 1523–1547.

Biason, R. (2014). The effect of job satisfaction to employee retention. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.27677.72161.

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 24, 386-396.

Cohen, S., & Williamson, G. (1988). Perceived stress in a probability sample of the U.S. In S. Spacapam & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *The social psychology of health: Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Cohen, S., & Janicki-Deverts, D. (2012). Who's stressed? Distributions of psychological stress in the United States in probability samples from 1983, 2006 and 2009. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42, 1320-1334.

Ding. N.N., & Liu, B. (2019). Chinese public sector employees' age, emotional dissonance, work meaningfulness, and perceived stress. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, *47*(1), 1–13. doi: 10.2224/sbp.7280

Drabe, D., Hauff, S., & Richter, N. F. (2015). Job satisfaction in aging workforces: an analysis of the USA, Japan and Germany. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *26*(6), 783–805. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2014.939101

Erdfelder, E., Faul, F., & Buchner, A. (1996). GPOWER: A general power analysis program. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, *28*, 1-11

Fathizadeh, A., & Sadat Khoshouei, M. (2017). The relationship between self-regulation and personality traits with job stress in University of Isfahan employees. *Journal of Fundamentals of Mental Health*, *19*(1), 14–21.

Furnham, A., Petrides, K. V., Jackson, C. J., & Cotter, T. (2002). Do personality factors predict job satisfaction? *Personality and individual differences*, *33*(8), 1325-1342.

Ghazzawi, I. (2011). Does age matter in job satisfaction? The case of U.S. information technology professionals. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications & Conflict*, *15*(1), 25-54.

Giang, L. T., & Le, D. D. (2018). Working beyond the traditional retirement

ages: How does chronic health condition influence older workers in Vietnam. *Ageing International, 43*(2), 158–173. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12126-017-9301-y

Gilboa, S., Shirom, A., & Fried, Y. (2005). A meta-analysis of stress and performance at work: Moderating effects of gender, age, and tenure. *Academy of Management Proceedings,* (1), A1-A6.

Hankin, B. L. (2010). Personality and depressive symptoms: Stress generation and cognitive vulnerabilities to depression in a prospective daily diary study. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *29*(4), 369-401.

Hoboubi, N., Choobineh, A., Ghanavati, F. K., Keshavarzi, S., & Hosseini, A. A. (2017). The impact of job stress and job satisfaction on workforce productivity in an Iranian petrochemical industry. *Safety and health at work*, *8*(1), 67-71.

Hoppock, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. Oxford, England: Harper.

Ismail, A., Hasan, N. A., Chin, Y.F., Ismail, Y., & Abu Samah, A. J. (2013). Job Stress as a Predictor of Employee Health. *Studies in Business & Economics*, *8*(2), 20–34.

John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big-Five Inventory-Version 4a and 54*. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Institute of Personality and Social Research, University of California.

John, O.P. & Srivastava, S. (1999) The Big Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Theoretical Perspectives. In: Pervin, L.A. and John, O.P. Eds., Handbook of personality: theory and research, Vol. 2, Guilford Press, New York, 102-138.

Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(3), 530-541. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.530

Kahn, R. L., & Byosiere, P. (1992). Stress in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 571-650). Palo Alto, CA, US: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Kumar, N. & Singh, V. (2011). Job satisfaction and its correlates. *International Journal of Research in Economics & Social Sciences*, *1(*2), 11-24.

Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 4*(4), 309-336.doi: 10.1016/0030-5073(69)90013-0

Masood, A. (2013). Effects of job stress on employees job performance: A study on banking sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, *3*(9), 1-8.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1996). Toward a new generation of personality theories: Theoretical contexts for the five-factor model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 51-87). New York: Guilford.

Mehrad, A., Halimatussadiah, H., Redzuan, M.R., & Abdullah, H. (2015). The role of personality factors on job satisfaction among academic staff at public research university. *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology. 4.* 2088- 3129.

Mohd Said,H., Abukraa, M.K., & Mohd Rose, R. (2015). The relationship between personality and job satisfaction among employees in Libyan oil and gas company.

American Research Journal of Business and Management. *1*(2), 18-24.

Nash, M. (1985). *Managing Organizational Performance.* Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA

Penland, E., Masten, W., Zelhart, P., Fournet, G., & Callahan,T. (2000) . Possible selves, depression, and coping skills in university students. *Journal of Personality and Individual Difference*, *29*, 963-969.

Rakin, E. (2018). *One-third of young Malaysians are experiencing a quarter-life crisis due to personal and professional pressures: Survey*, Business Insider. Retrieved from https://www.businessinsider my/malaysians-quarter-life-crisis-linkedin/

Sharma, P. (2017). Organizational culture as a predictor of job satisfaction: The role of age and gender. *Management: Journal of Contemporary Management Issues*, *22*(1), 35-48.

Teh, L.T., & Sapuan, N. M. (2018). Retirement Planning in Malaysia: Issues and Challenges to Achieve Sustainable Lifestyle. *Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art & Communication*, *8*, 1222–1229. https://doi.org/10.7456/1080SSE/164

Templer, K. J. (2012). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: The importance of agreeableness in a tight and collectivistic Asian society. *Applied Psychology*, (1), 114.

United Nations (2013) *World Population Ageing*. New York: United Nations

United Nations. (2015). Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. World Population Prospects: The 2015 Revision, Key Findings and Advance Tables. Working Paper No. ESA/P/WP.241.

Yusoff, S. N. and Buja, G. A. (2013). Aged society: The way forward. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance, 4*(4), 226