



---

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BIG FIVE  
PERSONALITY FACTORS AND THEIR FACETS  
AND BURNOUT:  
A STUDY AMONG ADDITIONAL-JOB HOLDERS<sup>1</sup>**

LAVINIA, ȚÂNCULESCU<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Hyperion University, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences  
Department of Psychology

---

**Abstract**

The present paper describes the relationship between burnout as measured by the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996) and the Big Five personality factors (Costa & McCrae, 1992): neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness and their associated sub-factors (facets), in case of people that voluntarily choose to have an additional job, apart from a main full-time job. The results of 4 separate stepwise multiple regression analyses showed that (a) emotional exhaustion is mostly predicted by Agreeableness; (b) Depersonalization is predicted by Agreeableness and Conscientiousness; and (c) Reduced Professional Accomplishment is predicted by Extraversion, Conscientiousness, but not by Neuroticism. Results and discussions presented rely on a revision of the literature.

**Keywords:** Big-Five, Personality Factors, Personality Facets, Burnout, Full-Time Employees, Additional-Job Holders

---

**1. INTRODUCTION**

Organizational realities are challenged to answer to the tremendous dynamics in and outside work setting. People are becoming more and more eager to compete as they are, sometimes, forced to respond to continuously increasing requests coming from employers, the political contexts or, even, age differences. Different aspects of personality contribute to the prediction of various results within the organization, personality being a decisive factor also to the development of certain

*Corresponding author: Lavinia Țânculescu*

*E-mail address: [lavinia.tanculescu@thewings.ro](mailto:lavinia.tanculescu@thewings.ro)*

---

<sup>1</sup> Part of the current paper is based on the research included in Țânculescu, L. (2015), Chapter 2.

types of behaviours which are on the focus and heading the lines on the companies' HR agenda, in their need to secure their talent and attract the best resources still available on the market. Personality had proven to be connected with behaviours such as organizational commitment (Erdheim, Wang & Zickar, 2006), performance at work and work satisfaction (Judge, Heller & Mount, 2002; Judge, Klinger, Simon, & Yang, 2008; Barrick & Mount, 1991; Brief, Butcher & Roberson, 1995). Organizational results that could be seen as rather negative in the work environment, such as stress and organizational burnout, were also proved to be connected with the personality factors (Bakker, van der Zee, Lewig & Dollard, 2006).

Still, most of the authors are conducting their studies taking in consideration the personality structure limited at the factor level only, rarely approaching the sub-factors, or facets level. The logistics involved, time consumed and other resources, normally, limited, in the data collection phase of a study, could justify the lack to depth in the research, even if it was observable that that personality was usually measured by simple off-the-shelf measures of convenience (Hogan, 1990) and that the literature still did not provide, at least, until few years ago, a coherent picture of the relationship between personality and burnout (Bakker, 2008).

One of the potential benefits to involve in the study the elements of the personality factors is connected with the practical interventions that the studies could suggest, such as tailoring certain development programmes in the organizations to meet the employees' expectations, but most of all, to be suitable to their personality structure.

Another very important aspect to be underlined was confirmed in a study conducted by Judge, Rodell, Klinger, Simon & Crawford (2013), which argue that the personality features, at the level of personality facet, predict with the high accuracy the behaviours at work (for instance, performance with workload, contextual performance) as against the personality features at factor level.

It has been confirmed, for instance, that 41% of the variance of the affective commitment was represented by a model including all personality factors, with the exception of Neuroticism. The latter, as factor along with its facets (except for the Impulsivity facet), negatively correlated with the affective commitment (Țânculescu, 2017). Also, as stated above, in other studies, (N) has proven to have a negative correlation with important results at organizational level, such as performance at work and work satisfaction (Judge et al., 2002; Barrick & Mount, 1991; Brief et al., 1995).

If we consider the implications personality have in maintain and promote certain healthy behaviours in the organization or, on the contrary, in fighting against negative implications such as burnout, occupational stress and intention to leave, there are also several studies presenting significant correlations. As noted, Schaufeli & Enzmann (1998) counted more than one hundred burnout studies in the literature that included one or two constructs from a long list of lower level

personality variables. Examples of these personality variables are hardiness, locus of control; Type A behavior, self-esteem, and achievement motivation (Bakker et al, 2008).

In the current study we considered personality as described, in the five factor model (Costa & McCrae, 1984, 2008; McCrae, 1992), as long with the thirty facets of those five factors, six for each of the factors. The factors are best understandable in terms of five opposite pairs or continuum intervals between: (I) *Extraversion (E) opposite to Introversion*, (II) *Agreeableness (A) opposite to Hostility*, (III) *Conscientiousness (C) opposite to Lack of Conscientiousness*, (IV) *Emotional Stability opposite to Neuroticism (N) and (V) Openness to Experience (O) or Intellect/Autonomy opposite to Lack of Openness to Experience or Lack of to Intellect/ Autonomy*.

Also, we take into consideration, in the current study, when discussing about occupational burnout, or burnout at work, we refer to the psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, cynicism /depersonalization and reduced personal/professional accomplishment (Maslach, 1993). By *Exhaustion (or, sometimes, found as Emotional Exhaustion) (EXH)* it is understood a state of overextension, both emotionally and physically, draining, the feeling of being used up and unable to unwind and recover (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). *Cynicism (CYN)* is a cold, distant attitude toward work (for the purpose of the current research, we referred at it as *Cynicism*) and toward people on the job (we referred at it as *Depersonalization) (DEP)*. Finally, *Ineffectiveness or Lack of /Reduced Professional Accomplishment (RPA)*, is encountered when people feel a growing sense of inadequacy, losing confidence in their ability to make a difference, finally, losing confidence in themselves and losing the others' credit regarding confidence in them (Maslach & Leiter, 1997).

It was found that out of the Big Five personality dimensions only (N) significantly predicted EXH, as well as negative correlation between (E) and DEP (Zellars, Perrewe & Hochwarter, 2000, Bakker, 2008). On the other hand, there are several studies shown that (E) is negatively associated with EXH (Michielsen, Willemsen, Croon, De Vries & Van Heck, 2004; Eastburg, Williamson, Gorsuch & Ridley, 1994). Also, Lingard (2003) reported social extraversion and action extraversion to be negatively associated with CYN and Bakker et al. (2008) demonstrated that (E) was negatively related to EXH and DEP and positively related to personal accomplishment.

For us, it was important to understand how much variance can be found explaining the burnout from the person (personality) side, since it was argued that more than the person's individual features (including personality, we presumed), the burnout was the result of a certain *social environment* in which people work (Maslach & Leiter, 1997).

Also, it was said that burnout is thriving in the workplace because there is a major mismatch between the nature of the job and the nature of the person who

does the job, one of the most obvious indication of this mismatch being the *work overload*. Among other important indicators for this mismatch we saw the lack of control over one's work, the lack of reward for contributions on the job and a value conflict, when employees experience a clash with their personal values (Maslach & Leiter, 1997).

Later on the paper we are going to come back to these potential causes of burnout, especially when mentioned in the relationship with some of the participants demographical information.

For now, we underline the importance of assessing the personality at the facets' level, since the importance of aspects like self-discipline, openness to discussing /negotiating values, trust and impulsivity (to name just four out of potentially thirty) that we found in the literature connected with burnout, could not be assessed since we would only talk about the larger factors that include them, such as (C), (O), (A) or (N).

## 2. STUDY OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTESIS

### 2.1. OBJECTIVES

Building on the assumption of a study exploring the relationship between (a) the Big Five factors of personality and (b) burnout in volunteers, that the risk of burnout may differ not only across situations but also across individuals (Bakker et. al, 2008), the present study aims to understand how could the individuals that have chosen to have a second job be impacted by burnout.

Therefore, we would determine the individual contribution of the personality factors and sub-factors (facets) on each of the four burnout dimensions, in the case of people choosing to have an additional, second job.

### 2.2. HYPOTHESES

Taking into account the above theoretical considerations we formulate the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 1:* (E) will be negatively related to EXH, DEP and CYN as well as negatively related to RPA.

*Hypothesis 2:* (A) will be negatively associated with burnout (EXH, CYN, DEP, and RPA).

*Hypothesis 3:* There will be a negative relationship between (C) and RPA.

*Hypothesis 4:* Negative relationships will exist between (N) and all four burnout dimensions.

*Hypothesis 5:* There will be a negative relationship between (O) and both CYN and DEP, as well as (O) and RPA.

## 3. THE METHOD

### 3.1. PARTICIPANTS

The present study used a total of 181 subjects from Romania (60.2% women; age between 22 and 66 years old,  $M = 41.96$ ,  $SD = 9.82$ ). The data were collected among the insurance brokers of a company activating in insurance sector. The respondents have completed an online survey, using a virtual testing platform.

The recruitment and inclusion of the online subjects were made on a voluntary basis, under confidentiality assurance. Self-declared level of income of the participants is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Level of income (N=181)

	%
Level of income	
We have more than enough, we could even save up (%)	7.2
We have enough so we can manage our daily life (%)	57.5
We don't have enough and we face difficulties in our daily life (%)	33.1
We have serious financial difficulties and we barely can manage (%)	.6

### 3.2. MEASURES

All measures were Romanian versions translated according to recommended testing guidelines (Hambleton, 2005).

*Personality.* We used the NEO-PIR Personality Questionnaire (Costa & McCrae, 1992), the revised form for Romania (Iliescu, Minulescu, Nedelcea & Ispas, 2009). The participants completed Form S of the questionnaire (for self-assessment), containing 240 items, to which the answer was collected on a 5-point scale. The questionnaire has 30 sub-scales (facets), each served by eight items and five large factors, each of six sub-scales, respectively: (N) ( $\alpha = .86$ ), (E) ( $\alpha = .82$ ), (O) ( $\alpha = .77$ ), Agreeability ( $\alpha = .67$ ) and (C) ( $\alpha = .86$ ). Respondents could give their answers on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Totally Agree.

*Organizational Burnout.* We used Maslach Burnout Inventory, namely two versions of the instrument: MBI-General Survey (Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach, & Jackson, 1996), from which we scored the three scales: EXH ( $\alpha = .89$ ), CYN ( $\alpha = .66$ ) and Professional inefficacy ( $\alpha = .82$ ) and MBI- Human Services Survey (HSS, Maslach & Jackson, 1981), from which, we scored DEP ( $\alpha = .82$ ). When using MBI-GS, positively framed items on the professional efficacy subscale were rephrased negatively, so that we measured professional inefficacy.

#### DATA ANALYSIS

The hypotheses were tested using the SPSS program. Each of the four dimension of burnout was analyzed separately. Based on the correlation matrix included in table 2 we have eliminated, for the prediction of each burnout dimension, the value scales that did not correlate with the respective type of burnout dimension. The facets that did remain in the analysis were introduced as predictors in the regression procedure, using the stepwise method, and the four dimensions of burnout were introduced as dependent variables.

To test Hypotheses 1–5, we conducted a series of stepwise regression analyses with the personality factors as predictors and the burnout dimensions as the criterion variables. To eliminate as much as possible the eventual biases in creating and testing the determined models by using the stepwise method, we analyzed the residual values, we verified the data base to identify the outlier values. All obtained values have met the necessary conditions in order to avoid multicollinearity.

## 4. RESULTS

### 4.1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Table 2 shows (a) the means and standard deviations of the burnout variables and (b) the correlations between burnout and personality factors and sub-factors. For layout purposes and easiness to consult the results, we placed the dependent variables on the columns and the independent variables on the rows.

### 4.2. REGRESSION ANALYSES OF BURNOUT ON PERSONALITY FACTORS AND SUB-FACTORS (FACETS)

We predicted relationships between the five factors, along with their facets significantly correlated with each of the four burnout dimensions (Hypotheses 1, 2, 4 and 5). Also, we stated, in Hypothesis 3, that (C) (with its facets) would be negatively related to RPA. To test these hypotheses, we regressed the burnout dimensions on the personality factors and sub-factors.

*Emotional Exhaustion (EXH)*: To assess the relationship between personality and burnout, we first run a stepwise regression analysis in two steps.

First, we considered the three personality factors, that had significant correlations to this burnout dimension, namely, (N), (A) and (C) and consider them as predictor variables and EXH, as the criterion variable. The results showed that (A) was, in a first model, the main but weak predictor of EXH,  $\beta = -.29$ ,  $p < .001$ , explaining 8,6% from this feeling of exhaustion. In a second prediction model, (A) along with (N) explain a total of 13,1% from this feeling of EXH, (N) adding a positive  $\beta = .22$ ,  $p < .001$  to the model. This model was highly significant,  $F(2, 180) = 13.40$ ,  $p < .001$ .

Secondly, we've included only the facets of (A) and (N) that significantly correlated to the EXH (as shown in Table 2), and considered them as predictors and EXH, as in the first step, the criterion. Three models resulted. Model 1 explained 9.4% from EXH, through an unique predictor, (N)'s facet – Vulnerability (N6),  $\beta = .31$ ,  $p < .001$ . In Model 2, model that explained 15.3% of EXH, the (A)'s facet – Compliance (A4),  $\beta = -.26$ ,  $p < .001$ , added an additional of 6.9% to the prediction. In Model 3, another facet of (N), Self-Consciousness (N4),  $\beta = -.21$ ,  $p < .001$ , contributed with 2.9% to increasing the best prediction model level, explaining 17.8% of the presence of feeling exhausted. This model was highly significant,  $F(3, 180) = 13.40$ ,  $p < .001$ .

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations and Intercorrelations of the four Burnout dimensions and Personality Factors and Facets, N=181

FACTORS and Facets of Personality		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	EXH	CYN	DEP	RPA
NEUROTICISM (N)		2.61	.34	.29**	.21**	.19*	.14
1	Anxiety	2.71	.54	.09	.13	.03	-.03
2	Angry Hostility	2.61	.40	.29**	.19*	.18*	.13
3	Depression	2.55	.48	.17*	.12	.16*	.08
4	Self-Consciousness	2.77	.51	.27**	.21**	.18*	.11
5	Impulsiveness	2.81	.41	.17*	.11	.09	.07
6	Vulnerability	2.20	.46	.31**	.18*	.21**	.28**
EXTRAVERSION (E)		3.40	.34	-.07	-.11	-.15*	-.28**
1	Warmth	3.79	.44	-.09	-.16*	-.25**	-.31**
2	Gregariousness	3.46	.61	-.11	-.28**	-.26**	-.21**
3	Assertiveness	3.12	.50	.00	.04	.03	-.17*
4	Activity	3.65	.45	-.07	-.01	-.08	-.32**
5	Excitement Seeking	2.85	.50	.10	.07	.03	-.01
6	Positive Emotions	3.53	.47	-.11	-.07	-.09	-.17*
OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE (O)		3.34	.28	-.09	-.22**	-.17*	-.27**
1	Fantasy	3.06	.41	.03	.02	.07	.03
2	Aesthetics	3.64	.55	-.11	-.22**	-.22**	-.30**
3	Feelings	3.48	.42	.03	-.06	-.12	-.25**
4	Actions	3.05	.39	-.02	-.23**	-.13	-.13
5	Ideas	3.46	.52	-.08	-.19*	-.10	-.18*
6	Values	3.37	.32	-.19*	-.17*	-.14	-.17*
AGREEABLENESS (A)		3.49	.27	-.29**	-.29**	-.39**	-.24**
1	Trust	3.30	.49	-.22**	-.24**	-.19*	-.14
2	Straightforwardness	3.77	.50	-.16*	-.20**	-.30**	-.15*
3	Altruism	3.85	.38	-.27**	-.27**	-.40**	-.41**
4	Compliance	3.19	.44	-.28**	-.12	-.17*	.04
5	Modesty	3.15	.33	-.10	-.15*	-.15*	.12
6	Tender-Mindedness	3.68	.40	-.05	-.11	-.27**	-.37**
CONSCIENTIOUSNESS (C)		3.73	.33	-.23**	-.16*	-.22**	-.39**
1	Competence	3.71	.42	-.24**	-.12	-.14	-.34**
2	Order	3.65	.43	-.07	-.08	-.20**	-.24**
3	Dutifulness	3.95	.37	-.14	-.18*	-.24**	-.39**
4	Achievement Striving	3.59	.42	-.11	-.08	-.09	-.31**
5	Self-Discipline	3.90	.43	-.25**	-.19*	-.20**	-.46**
6	Deliberation	3.57	.50	-.24**	-.11	-.16*	-.11

Note. EXH = Exhaustion; CYN = Cynicism; DEP = Depersonalization; RPA = Reduced Professional Accomplishment; \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

**Cynicism (CYN):** For the rest of the burnout dimensions, we applied the same strategy of analyses, in a first step including in the regression analysis, four factors of personality ((E) was excluded for not being significantly correlated to CYN) as predictors and CYN as criterion and two models resulted. The first model had as unique predictor, (A),  $\beta = -.29, p < .001$ , explaining 8.5% from the CYN. In the second model, that explained 10.3% of the variance of the CYN, the (O) factor,  $\beta = -.17, p < .05$ , contributed with 2,8% to increasing the prediction value. This last model was highly significant,  $F(2, 180) = 11.28, p < .001$ .

We run also the secondary level regression analysis, with the sub-factors of (A) and (O) as predictors and CYN as criterion and three models resulted. The best resulted model, explained 11.7% from the variance in the outcome, including Altruism (A3)  $\beta = -.23, p < .001$  (the initial component of the first model, explaining 6.6% of the variance), Openness to Action (O4),  $\beta = -.19, p < .01$  and Modesty (A5),  $\beta = -.17, p < .05$ . This last model was highly significant,  $F(3, 180) = 8.93, p < .001$ .

**Depersonalization (DEP).** As in the previous analyses, we included in the stepwise regression analysis, in the first step, all the five personality factors, all being significantly correlated with DEP and considered them predictor variables and DEP was considered the outcome variable, the criterion. The results showed that (A) was the sole predictor of DEP,  $\beta = -.39, p < .001$ . This predictor accounted for 15.2% of the variance in feeling depersonalized, model which was highly significant,  $F(1, 180) = 31.98, p < .001$ .

As previously, we included in the stepwise regression analysis also the sub-factors of (A) that were found to be significantly correlated to DEP. There were two prediction models resulting, but the main contributor to explaining the state of DEP was Altruism (A3), contributing with 15.9% at explaining the outcome,  $\beta = -.40, p < .001$  and a second model, having a small amount of increase due to joining of Straightforwardness (A2) facet,  $\beta = -.17, p < .05$ , that bring the second model to explaining a total of 18.5% of variance in DEP. This model was also highly significant,  $F(2, 180) = 20.21, p < .001$ .

**Reduced Professional Accomplishment (Inefficiency) (RPA).** For the regression analysis in the case of the last burnout dimension, we included, in the first stage, four of the five personality factors ((N) was excluded, being not significantly correlated to the outcome variable). There was only one model generated, with (C) as the unique predictor,  $\beta = -.40, p < .001$ , explaining 15.2% from the burnout dimension of professional inefficiency, the model being highly significant,  $F(1, 180) = 31.97, p < .001$ . As in the previous case, in the second phase of the analysis, we've included the sub-factors of (C) that significantly correlated with RPA and one model resulted. The sub-factor included in this unique generated model was Self-Discipline (C5),  $\beta = -.46, p < .001$ , that explained 20.8% variance in occurrence of RPA. The model was highly significant,  $F(1, 180) = 46.90, p < .001$ .



## 5. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

One of the main conclusions of this research is that we need, at all times, to consider, is that the context and the characteristics of the population tested are crucial. A similar research found, for instance, that in case of voluntary care takers, (N) was the sole predictor of feelings of EXH, predicting 13% of the occurrence of the outcome (Bakker et. al, 2008), whereas, in our case, were, for our population the main behavior used, as insurance brokers is not the emotional stability, as in the case of volunteer counselors who cared for terminally ill patients, but (A), being crucial to the activity to be kind and trusting (Costa & McCrae, 2008).

It is important to note that our hypotheses were, mostly, validated, with few exceptions that are discussed below.

Considering our first formulated Hypothesis, the results showed that (E) was negatively related to EXH, DEP and CYN as well as negatively related to RPA, but statistically strongly significant only in the case of RPA ( $r = -.28$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and with a lower significance in the case of DEP ( $r = -.15$ ,  $p < .05$ ). With no statistically significant sub-factor out of six, the EXH is not connected with (E) factor, in case of our participants group. Out of the entire (E) factor, important negative correlation to Burnout has the Activity (E4) sub-factor that has the most important correlation level with RPA ( $r = -.32$ ,  $p < .001$ ), the Warmth (E1) sub-factor, that negatively correlates with DEP ( $r = -.25$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and RPA ( $r = -.31$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and Gregariousness, that negatively correlates with CYN, DEP and RPA, with correlation indices of  $r = -.28$ ,  $r = -.26$  and  $r = -.21$ , and a significance of  $p < .001$  for all three cases. Somehow surprising, the Excitement Seeking sub-factor does not correlate significantly with none of the Burnout dimensions, with correlation indices ranging from  $-.01$  to  $.10$  the highest.

Related to Hypothesis 2, we found (A) to be negatively highly significantly ( $p < .001$ ) associated with all burnout dimensions, the most important correlation indices being with the DEP ( $r = -.39$ ), EXH ( $r = -.29$ ), CYN ( $r = -.29$ ) and RPA ( $r = -.24$ ). From the sub-factors, the most elevated negative correlations with Burnout dimensions are of the sub-factor Altruism (A3) with RPA ( $r = -.41$ ), DEP ( $r = -.40$ ), EXH ( $r = -.27$ ), CYN ( $r = -.27$ ) and RPA ( $r = -.24$ ). Also, elevated levels of correlation has Tender-Mindedness in relation to RPA ( $r = -.37$ ), as well as Compliance in relation to EXH, hence the role of the regulations in the field of action of the participants ( $r = -.28$ ).

*Hypothesis 3* was validated through finding that there was a negative relationship between (C) and RPA ( $r = -.39$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Important correlation indices record, in relation to RPA, all the sub-facets of (C), with the exception of Deliberation (C6). Still, it is important to underline the importance of Self-Discipline (C5) facet that proved to be the highest, among all the sub-facets, predictor of RPA ( $r = -.46$ ,  $p < .001$ ), with important elevation related to EXH ( $r = -.25$ ,  $p < .001$ ), DEP ( $r = -.20$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and CYN ( $r = -.19$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

Partially, was proved to be validated *Hypothesis 4*, meaning that we found negative relationships between (N) and only three of the Burnout dimensions. Exception was made by RPA that was found to be statistically not significant ( $r=.14$ ,  $p=.07$ ). Vulnerability (N6) found the highest most important sub-factor from (N), highly significantly correlated to all four dimensions of Burnout: EXH ( $r=.31$ ), RPA ( $r=.28$ ), DEP ( $r=.21$ ) and CYN ( $r=.18$ ).

We found ourselves living different times comparing with just twenty years ago, when Christina Maslach, one of the main voices in studying burnout called this phenomenon as being “an index of the dislocation between what people are and what they have to do”, discussing about “the erosion of the soul, an erosion in values, dignity, spirit and will” (Maslach, 1997). With this idea in mind, we try to understand if values are, for example, still important, and we formulated *Hypothesis 5* to investigate this reality. The results showed that there is a negative correlation, significant, but not as strong as expected, with only three dimension of burnout: EXH,  $r = -.19$ ,  $p < .05$ ; CYN,  $r = -.17$ ,  $p < .05$  and RPA,  $r = -.17$ ,  $p < .05$ . As well, Dutifulness (C3) sub-factor, have important significant correlations with RPA ( $r = -.39$ ,  $p < .001$ ), as well as with the DEP ( $r = -.24$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Therefore, this Value facets of (O) factor is not one of the main contributors of having the entire factor negatively and significantly correlated with CYN, as initially presumed in the *Hypothesis 5*, but the Openness to Aesthetics (indicating also the lack of time invested in paying attention at the details that reality, being internal or external reality is proposing us),  $r = -.22$ ,  $p < .001$  and Openness to Actions,  $r = -.23$ ,  $p < .001$ , not surprising result if we take into consideration how much dynamic we found ourselves to be in the world of the “easy chair” and “smart phones”. Concluding, we found the *Hypothesis 5* to be validated, one of the most important personality sub-factor for the respondents in this field, with two jobs instead of one, remaining the lack of Openness to Aesthetics, along with lack of Openness to one’s Feelings ( $r = -.25$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and lack of Openness to Actions.

## 6. LIMITATIONS

To the specific of this group of participants, is their need to work more (see the implication derived from low levels of (C) on the RPA), need that, at least in case of 64% of the participants, based on self-evaluation is not caused by financial difficulties. Another specific element that can be constituted in a limitation as well, is the reduced literature on this type of group of persons, the ones “forced” to take a second job and of studies on their reasons for doing so.

One important limitation of the current research is constituted by the lack of comparison with other kind of participants (the ones that have one full-time job). We admit that the main limit of this study could be seen in the volatile political, legislative and social scenery of today’s Romania, which makes the results obtained here sensitive to modifications in light of further modification of our frame of reference and other studies worth to be included in the literature review.

Received at: 21.02.2019, Accepted for publication on: 27.02.2019

## REFERENCES

- Bakker, A.B., van der Zee, I.K., Lewig, K.A., Dollard, M.F. (2006). The Relationship Between the Big Five Personality Factors and Burnout: A Study Among Volunteer Counselors *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(1), 31–50.
- Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance. A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
- Bresó, E., Salanova, M. & Schaufeli, W.B (2007). In search of the ‘third dimension’ of burnout: Efficacy or inefficacy? *Applied Psychology: An International review*, 56, 460-478.
- Costa, P.T. Jr., McCrae, R.R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO PI-FFI). Odessa, FL, USA: *Psychological Assessment Resources*.
- Costa, P.T. Jr., McCrae, R.R. (2008). Chapter 9: The Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) In: *The SAGE Handbook of Personality Theory and Assessment: Volume 2 — Personality Measurement and Testing*.
- Eastburg, M. C., Williamson, M., Gorsuch, R., & Ridley, C. (1994). Social support, personality and burnout in nurses. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 1233–1250.
- Erdheim, J., Wang, M. & Zickar, M. J. (2006). Linking the Big Five personality constructs to Org. Commitment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41, 959–970.
- Hambleton, R. K. (2005). Issues, Designs and Technical Guidelines for Adapting Tests Into Multiple Languages and Cultures. In Hambleton, R. K. Merenda, P. F. and Spielberger, C.D. (Eds.). *Adapting Psychological and Educational Tests for Cross-Cultural Assessment*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hogan, R. (1990). Personality and personality measurement. In Dunette, M.D. & Hough, L. M. (Eds.). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 873–919). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Iliescu, D., Minulescu, M., Nedelcea, C., Ispas, D. (2009) *NEO-PIR . Manual Tehnic. Inventarul de personalitate NEO, Revizuit (NEO-PIR), Inventarul NEO-FFI, Revizuit (NEO-FFI)* (pp. 41-53). Cluj Napoca: Sinapsis
- Judge, T. A., Heller, D. & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-Factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A metaanalysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 530–541.
- Judge, T. A., Klinger, R., Simon, L. S., Yang, I. W. F. (2008). The contributions of personality to organizational behavior and psychology: Findings, criticisms, and future research directions. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 1982–2000.
- Judge, T. A., Rodell, J. B., Klinger, R. L., Simon, L. S., Crawford, E. R. (2013). Hierarchical representations of the five-factor model of personality in predicting job performance: Integrating three organizing frameworks with two theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(6), 875-925.
- Lingard, H. (2003). The impact of individual and job characteristics on ‘burnout’ among civil engineers in Australia and the implications for employee turnover. *Construction Management and Economics*, 21, 69–80.
- Maslach, C. (1993). Burnout: A multidimensional perspective. In Schaufeli, W. B. Maslach, C. & Marek, T. (Eds.). *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 19–32). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory manual* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Maslach, C. & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The truth about burnout: how organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it.* (pp. 17-60) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Maslach, C., & Schaufeli, W. B. (1993). Historical and conceptual development of burnout. In Schaufeli, W. B. Maslach, C. & Marek, T. (Eds.). *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 1–16). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Matzler, K., Renzl, B. (2007). Personality Traits, Employee Satisfaction and Affective Commitment. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 18,(5), 589-598.

Michielsen, H. J., Willemsen, T. M., Croon, M. A., De Vries, J., & Van Heck, G. L. (2004). Determinants of general fatigue and emotional exhaustion: A prospective study. *Psychology and Health*, 19, 223–235.

Smith, M.A., Canger, J.M. (2004). Effects of supervisor “Big Five” Personality on subordinates attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18, (4).

Schaufeli, W. B., & Enzmann, D. (1998). *The burnout companion to study and practice: A critical analysis.* London: Taylor & Francis.

Țănculescu, L. (2015). *Impactul factorilor de personalitate înțeleși în cheia teoriei celor cinci mari factori de personalitate asupra angajamentului organizațional.* PhD Thesis (unpublished). Cluj-Napoca.

Țănculescu, L. (2017). Mediating variables in the relationship between personality traits and types of commitment to an organization. A meta-analytic study. *Romanian Journal of Psychological Studies*, 5(1), 9 – 20.

Zellars, K. L., Perrewe, P. L., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2000). Burnout in health care: The role of the 5 factors of personality. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(8), 1570–1598.

**Copyright:** Submission of a manuscript implies that the work described has not except in the form of an abstract or as part of a published lecture, been published before (or thesis) and it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere; that when the manuscript is accepted for publication, the authors agree to automatic transfer of the copyright to the publisher.

---