

1 **THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY TRAITS AND REMOTE WORK**  
2 **PRODUCTIVITY AMONG HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY.**

3  
4 **ABSTRACT**

5 Personality traits refer to relatively stable patterns of thoughts, feelings, and  
6 behaviours that influence how individuals respond to situations and perform their work roles.  
7 Remote work productivity refers to the level of efficiency and effectiveness with which  
8 individuals complete their work tasks while working outside the traditional workplace  
9 environment. With remote and hybrid work arrangements becoming more of a ubiquitous  
10 thing in higher education faculty, it is changing the nature of workplaces. These shifts have  
11 been more concerned with the factors that determine productivity. The influence of personal  
12 personality traits on productivity, especially in remote work settings, is one of the areas that  
13 has been explored. This research attempts to learn how personality factors, or specifically the  
14 Big Five model of personality, relate to the productivity of remote higher education faculty.  
15 The data will be gathered and presented as per a standardised Big Five Inventory-2 (BFI-2  
16 short form) and Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWQP- short version) to the  
17 members of the faculty in the higher institutions of learning. We will employ a quantitative  
18 correlational research design because we can examine the relationship between personality  
19 and productivity attributed to remote work among 240 samples collected using purposive  
20 sampling. The analysis is done using differentiae statistics, Student's t-test, and ANOVA.  
21 Through such relationships, we believe that we will add meaningful contributions to the ever-  
22 increasing body of literature on the psychology of work in the academic field. Finally, our  
23 results are expected to inform educational establishments to take measures to ensure that the  
24 systems of working remotely are effective to improve the satisfaction of the faculty and their  
25 productivity.

26 **Keywords:** Personality Traits, Remote Work Productivity, Higher Education Faculty, Work  
27 Performance, Higher Education.

28  
29 **1. INTRODUCTION**

30 With the rise in digital technology and adoption of flexible work models across the  
31 globe, different sectors in the industries, with higher education particularly, have redefined  
32 their work model radically. Remote work (or telework, or virtual work) is now a ubiquitous  
33 phenomenon in this post-COVID-19 world. Faculty interaction on campus has changed

34 dramatically, with more remote instruction, online interaction, and electronic administrative  
35 duties taking place, which has left a rich area of research on the effectiveness of remote  
36 working (Allen, Golden, and Shockley, 2015). Remote work has both advantages and  
37 disadvantages. These issues are connected with time management, interaction between  
38 individuals in the workplace, and work efficiency. Employee disparities play a big role in  
39 influencing the performance of employees in remote working environments. Among other  
40 psychological attributes, personality traits have been found to be influential in the  
41 determination of work behaviour and performance. One of the most popular personality  
42 models with wide acceptance among organisational research works is the Big Five model of  
43 personality and its five major facets, such as extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness,  
44 neuroticism, and openness to experience (Soto and John, 2017; McCrae and Costa, 2008).  
45 These personalities enable people to work effectively or poorly in the workplace; they  
46 socialize to a certain degree with their co-workers and act upon requests. Past studies have  
47 indicated that personality traits are good predictors of job performance and work results in  
48 various work situations (Barrick and Mount, 1991). However, the research that particularly  
49 examines remote work and productivity in relation to personality traits in higher education  
50 faculty is limited. Digital and remote teaching in higher education is more likely to be the  
51 intersection of the digital and the remote, which makes the role of personality in productivity  
52 all the more crucial. This research question focuses on the relationship between personality  
53 factors and productivity of higher education faculty working remotely. This result may be  
54 useful in the context of the increased impact of workplace psychology in the academic  
55 community.

## 56 **2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION**

### 57 **2.1 TRAIT THEORY OF PERSONALITY**

58 The Trait Theory of Personality is useful in explaining the difference in the way  
59 individuals think and act. One of the most prominent representatives of this area, Gordon W.  
60 Allport, defined personality as those constant features which precondition how we think, feel,  
61 and behave in different situations. Personality traits are important in the way we undertake  
62 our duties, interact with others and how we handle difficult situations at work place. In a  
63 telecommuting environment, where the level of supervision is low and there is minimal  
64 external structure, employees tend to rely more on their own qualities to find their way  
65 through this new environment. Such traits as self-discipline, motivation, and emotion control

66 gain a particular significance. Consequently, some personality traits may have a strong impact  
67 on the effectiveness of the adaptation and productivity of individuals to remote work. By  
68 learning these characteristics, the employees and employers can develop a better and more  
69 favourable working environment.

## 70 **2.2 PERSON-ENVIRONMENT FIT THEORY**

71 According to Person-Environment (P-E) Fit Theory, the positive working results are  
72 realised when there is a positive fit between the personal attributes and the work environment  
73 requirements. When it comes to theory, it can be summarised that jobs will be more  
74 productive, workers will be happier and more well off with personality traits that would  
75 benefit them in the line of work. People who are independent, self-regulated, and flexible in  
76 the work environment that is based on remote working, could adapt better to the workspace.  
77 Conversely, mismatch of personal attributes and anticipation of remote work can lead to  
78 stress, disengagement and poor performance.

## 79 **WHY THIS THEORY IS IMPORTANT**

80 The current research is based on the theories of trait and person-environment fit. The  
81 trait theory suggests that such consistent personality traits will affect the way we think, act  
82 and perform (in every situation, but especially in the workplace). These are the trait  
83 characteristics which influence the way we cope with work responsibilities, related to others,  
84 and reaction to work demands. Person-Environment Fit Theory also conjectures that when  
85 there is good fit between the attributes of a person and the work circumstances, this leads to  
86 favourable work outcomes. In the age of remote work, employees must be self-reliant,  
87 flexible and have self-control. Combined, these theories can be used to understand how the  
88 personality dispositions and the fit between individuals and their work environments might  
89 influence performance during remote work among college academics.

90

91

92

## 93 **3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### 94 **3.1 REVIEW OF LITERATURE BASED ON REMOTE WORK PRODUCTIVITY**

95           **Wilczynski (2023)** investigated the connection between remote work, productivity,  
96 work engagement, and job satisfaction in Malta, where the financial industry employs 137  
97 employees. The study indicated the productivity and engagement were positively correlated  
98 with remote work, but not directly with job satisfaction, as measured with a structural  
99 equation modelling (SEM). The findings have suggested that remote work and job  
100 satisfaction may not be related identically across personality types. This implies that  
101 psychological aspects would have to be taken into consideration when assessing the results of  
102 remote work.

103           **Olsen et al. (2023)** designed a two-wave longitudinal study to test the hypothesis that  
104 remote work has an impact on the Big Five personality traits and the connection between  
105 work performance and personality in 801 Norwegian employees, to address their research  
106 question: How does remote work influence the Big Five personality traits and the work  
107 performance-personality relationship? According to structural equation modelling, the  
108 conditions of remote working had a huge functional impact on predicting the personality  
109 differences in relation to performance. Extraversion was also a good predictor of engagement  
110 and innovations in traditional work locations, but weaker when working at home on a full-  
111 time basis. This research article proposes that personality-performance relationship is  
112 influenced by the working environment.

113           **Ruvimova et al. (2022)** did an eight-week field experiment with 60 knowledge  
114 workers who examined the links between remote communication, personality, productivity,  
115 and well-being. It was determined in the study that introverts performed well in task-focused  
116 communication and extraverts depended on social interactions. Although several meetings  
117 boosted productivity, it reduced well-being since cognitive overload set in. The findings  
118 suggest that the personality traits and communication style in remote work can have influence  
119 on the work performance.

### 120 **3.2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE BASED ON PERSONALITY TRAITS**

121           **Kipe (2025)** explored how extraversion can promote the well-being and job  
122 satisfaction of project managers working through both remote and onsite. The researchers  
123 reported that in a correlational study of 82 project managers, with the help of standard scales,  
124 such as IPIP, Job Satisfaction Survey, and PERMA-Profiler, extraversion was positively  
125 correlated with job satisfaction in on-site working conditions. The findings suggest that

126 personality characteristics, particularly extraversion, influence satisfaction at work in various  
127 work situations.

128 **Shimura et al. (2022)** studied the relationships between remote work, psychological  
129 stressfulness, and presenteeism in 3,123 office employees in Japan during the COVID-19  
130 pandemic. The results indicated that moderate remote work decreased the level of  
131 psychological and physical stress, whereas full remote work enhanced presenteeism. These  
132 results indicate that the working arrangements of remote work could influence the welfare of  
133 employees.

134 **Kawakubo and Arata (2022)** discussed relations between work conditions at home,  
135 personality traits and productivity at work among 190 remote workers in Japan. The findings  
136 revealed that the workspace quality and thermal comfort were good predictors of  
137 productivity. Personality factors were also involved, including the qualities of openness and  
138 persistence, which had a positive relationship with performance at work.

#### 139 **4. RESEARCH GAP**

140 However, there are still numerous gaps in the literature regarding remote working,  
141 personality traits, and the outcomes of employees. Most studies following the Big Five model  
142 rarely take into consideration extraversion, which is especially crucial in remote working  
143 scenarios due to social restrictions. Moreover, most of the work has been done in corporate or  
144 technology industries, with little consideration being given to universities as an area where  
145 work is very interactive and psychologically stressful. Furthermore, a substantial number of  
146 research studies were also carried out in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, and thus, it  
147 was hard to see the long-term dynamics of remote employment. Therefore, additional  
148 research is required to investigate how personality factors, namely extraversion, affect job  
149 satisfaction and well-being among faculty members of higher education institutions working  
150 remotely.

#### 151 **5. NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

152 Remote and hybrid work models emerge as a more common practice, and it is  
153 necessary to know what factors can affect the productivity of faculty. Remote work brings a  
154 great level of flexibility, but it does not suit all people equally, and here the personality type  
155 may play a crucial role. The majority of studies on the subject have been conducted in the  
156 corporate world, and there is still a gap in our knowledge of how these dynamics apply in the

157 academic field. The proposed study seeks to address the existing gap by investigating the  
158 relationship between various personality traits and the productivity of higher education  
159 faculty working remotely. By examining these psychological drivers, we will be in a better  
160 position to understand more about what motivates performance in an educational  
161 environment that is changing very fast. So, the researcher started investigation on “the  
162 relationship between personality traits and remote work productivity among higher education  
163 faculty”.

## 164 **6. OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESIS**

### 165 **6.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

- 166 1. To study the level of personality traits and their dimensions among higher education  
167 faculty.
- 168 2. To study the level of remote work productivity among higher education faculty.
- 169 3. To find out whether there is any significant difference in the personality traits and their  
170 dimensions, and remote work productivity with respect to their:

171 - Gender

172 - Age

- 173 4. To find out whether there is any significant relationship between personality traits and  
174 remote work productivity.

### 175 **6.2 HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY**

- 176 1. There is a significant difference in the personality traits and their dimensions, and remote  
177 work productivity with respect to their:

178 - Gender

179 - Age

- 180 2. There is a significant relationship between the personality traits and remote work  
181 productivity.

## 182 **7.METHODOLOGY**

### 183 **7.1 RESEARCH METHOD**

184 The researcher has used a quantitative correlational research approach in the current study.

### 185 **7.2 SAMPLE**

186 The participants were higher education faculty. The sample size will be 240 samples from  
187 different institutions and designations within and around Chennai. The purposive sampling  
188 was used to recruit the participants. This study included faculty members who were working  
189 remotely. All the people and individuals involved, including data collection participants, were  
190 subject to voluntary participation and informed consent.

### 191 **7.3 TOOLS USED IN THE STUDY**

192 The instruments of the current investigation are discussed below.

- 193 • Christopher J. Soto (2017) Big Five Inventory-2 (BFI-2 short form).
- 194 • Individual work performance questionnaire (IWQP- short version) created by Linda  
195 Koopmans et al. (2014).

### 196 **7.4 SCORING PROCEDURE**

197 The Big Five Inventory-2 Short Form (BFI-2-S; Soto and John, 2017) is a 10-item  
198 assessment of five personality dimensions: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness,  
199 Negative Emotionality, and Open-Mindedness. All items will be rated on a 5-point Likert  
200 scale (1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree)). For each trait, one determines the score by  
201 counting the number of times an individual responds to the two items corresponding to that  
202 dimension; the higher the score, the higher the level of that personality trait.

203 The Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWPQ), developed by Linda Koopmans et  
204 al. (2014), contains 18 items that assess task performance, contextual performance, and  
205 counterproductive work behaviour. Responses are rated using a 5-point Likert scale  
206 (1=Strongly Disagree; 5=Strongly Agree). The counterproductive work behaviour items are  
207 reverse-scored, and the total work performance score is obtained by adding these responses,  
208 with higher scores indicating an improved work performance and productivity.

### 209 **7.5 ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA**

210 The obtained data were handled and analysed with the help of adequate statistical analysis  
211 and interpretation of the study. The statistical methods used to analyse the data and test the  
212 hypotheses were one-way ANOVA, correlation, t-tests of students and measures of central  
213 tendency.

214

215

216

217 **8. TESTING OF OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES**

218 **Objective 1:** To study the level of personality traits and their dimensions among higher  
219 education faculty

<b>PERSONALITY TRAITS</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>MAXIMUM SCORE</b>	<b>MEAN</b>	<b>STANDARD DEVIATION</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF MEAN</b>
EXTRAVERSION	240	10	7.72	1.424	77.2%
AGREEABLENESS	240	10	8.45	1.337	84.5%
CONSCIENTIOUSNESS	240	10	8.20	1.372	82%
NEGATIVE EMOTIONALITY	240	10	6.38	1.926	63.8%
OPEN MINDEDNESS	240	10	7.98	1.423	79.8%
PERSONALITY TRAIT TOTAL	240	50	38.72	4.860	77.44%

220 **Table 1: Level of personality traits among higher education faculty**

221 The mean and standard deviation of the level of extraversion personality traits among higher  
222 education faculty are presented in the table 1. The maximum possible score in the level of  
223 extraversion personality trait is 10. The mean score for the level of extraversion personality  
224 trait is 7.72, and the percentage is 77.2%. Hence, from the mean score and its percentage, it is  
225 clear that the higher education faculty have a high level of extraversion personality traits.

226 The mean and standard deviation of the level of agreeableness personality traits among  
227 higher education faculty are presented in the table 1. The maximum possible score in the  
228 level of agreeableness personality trait is 10. The mean score for the level of agreeableness  
229 personality trait is 8.45, and the percentage is 84.5%. Hence, from the mean score and its  
230 percentage, it is clear that the higher education faculty have a high level of agreeableness  
231 personality traits.

232 The mean and standard deviation of the level of conscientiousness personality traits among  
233 higher education faculty are presented in the table 1. The maximum possible score in the level  
234 of conscientiousness personality trait is 10. The mean score for the level of the  
235 conscientiousness personality trait is 8.20, and the percentage is 82%. Hence, from the mean  
236 score and its percentage, it is clear that the higher education faculty have a high level of  
237 conscientiousness personality traits.

238 The mean and standard deviation of the level of negative emotionality personality traits  
 239 among higher education faculty are presented in the table 1. The maximum possible score in  
 240 the level of the negative emotional personality trait is 10. The mean score for the level of the  
 241 negatively emotional personality trait is 6.38, and the percentage is 63.8%. Hence, from the  
 242 mean score and its percentage, it is clear that the higher education faculty have a moderate  
 243 level of negative emotional personality traits.

244 The mean and standard deviation of the level of open-mindedness personality traits among  
 245 higher education faculty are presented in the table 1. The maximum possible score in the  
 246 level of open-mindedness personality trait is 10. The mean score for the level of the open-  
 247 mindedness personality trait is 7.98, and the percentage is 79.8%. Hence, from the mean  
 248 score and its percentage, it is clear that the higher education faculty have a high level of open-  
 249 mindedness personality traits.

250 The mean and standard deviation of the level of personality traits among higher education  
 251 faculty are presented in the table 1. The maximum possible score in the level of personality  
 252 trait is 50. The mean score for the level of personality trait is 38.72, and the percentage is  
 253 77.44%. Hence, from the mean score and its percentage, it is clear that the higher education  
 254 faculty have a high level of personality traits.

255 **Objective 2: To study the level of remote work productivity among higher education**  
 256 **faculty**

VARIABLE	N	MAXIMUM SCORE	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	PERCENTAGE OF MEAN
REMOTE WORK PRODUCTIVITY	240	40	29.97	4.129	74.92%

257 **Table 2: Level of remote work productivity among higher education faculty**

258 The mean and standard deviation of the level of remote work productivity among higher  
 259 education faculty are presented in the table 2. The maximum possible score in the level of  
 260 personality trait is 40. The mean score for the level of personality trait is 29.97, and the  
 261 percentage is 74.92%. Hence, from the mean score and its percentage, it is clear that the  
 262 higher education faculty have a moderate level of remote work productivity.

263

264

265

266 **Hypothesis1(a):** There is a significant difference in the personality traits and their  
267 dimensions, and remote work productivity with respect to gender

268 **Table 3: Showing significant difference in the personality traits and their dimensions,**  
269 **and remote work productivity with respect to gender**

Sl. No.	Dimensions of Personality Trait	Gender	N	Mean	SD	't' Value	Significance
1	Extraversion trait	Male	91	7.69	<b>1.644</b>	0.207	<b>Not Significant</b>
		Female	149	7.73	<b>1.277</b>		
2	Agreeableness trait	Male	91	8.26	<b>1.397</b>	1.731	<b>Not Significant</b>
		Female	149	8.57	<b>1.291</b>		
3	Conscientiousness trait	Male	91	8.14	<b>1.488</b>	0.467	<b>Not Significant</b>
		Female	149	8.23	<b>1.300</b>		
4	Open- mindedness trait	Male	91	8.22	<b>1.381</b>	2.025	<b>0.05 Significant</b>
		Female	149	7.84	<b>1.434</b>		
5	Negative Emotionality trait	Male	91	6.19	<b>2.201</b>	1.237	<b>Not Significant</b>
		Female	149	6.50	<b>1.734</b>		
<b>Personality Trait Total Score</b>		Male	<b>91</b>	<b>38.46</b>	<b>5.193</b>	<b>0.635</b>	<b>Not Significant</b>
		Female	<b>149</b>	<b>38.87</b>	<b>4.656</b>		
<b>Remote Work Productivity</b>		Male	<b>91</b>	<b>30.25</b>	<b>4.162</b>	<b>0.826</b>	<b>Not Significant</b>
		Female	<b>149</b>	<b>29.80</b>	<b>4.113</b>		

270 From Table 3, it is inferred that the calculated 't' value (0.635& 0.826) for the personality  
271 trait and remote work productivity among higher education faculty is less than the table value  
272 (1.96). It is concluded that there is no significant difference in the personality traits and their  
273 dimensions, and remote work productivity with respect to gender, namely, extraversion  
274 (0.207< 1.96), agreeableness (1.731< 1.96), conscientiousness (0.467< 1.96), and negative  
275 emotionality (1.237< 1.96). But there is a significant difference in the personality traits and  
276 their dimensions, and remote work productivity with respect to gender through its dimension  
277 open- mindedness (2.025> 1.96) at 0.05 significance. Hence, the formulated hypothesis 1(a)  
278 is not accepted.

279

280

281

282

283

284

285 **Hypothesis 1(b):** There is a significant difference in the personality traits and their  
286 dimensions, and remote work productivity with respect to their Age

287 **Table 4: Showing significant difference in the personality traits and their dimensions,**  
288 **and remote work productivity with respect to their Age**

Sl. No.	Variables	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
1	Personality trait	Between Groups	212.358	4	53.089	2.297	<b>Not Significant</b>
		Within Groups	5432.376	235	23.116		
		Total	5644.733	239			
2	Remote work productivity	Between Groups	128.279	4	32.070	1.910	<b>Not Significant</b>
		Within Groups	3946.517	235	16.794		
		Total	4074.796	239			

289 From the table 4, it is inferred that the calculated ‘F’ value (2.297 & 1.910) is less than the  
290 table value (3.84) at a 0.05 level of significance. It is concluded that there is no significant  
291 difference among Higher education Faculty based on their age groups (20-25 years, 26-30  
292 years, 31-35 years, 36-40 years and 41 & above) in their personality traits and remote work  
293 productivity. Hence, the formulated hypothesis that “There is a significant difference in the  
294 personality traits and remote work productivity with respect to their age” is not accepted.

295 **Hypothesis 2: There is a significant relationship between the personality traits and**  
296 **remote work productivity**

297 **Table 5: Showing Correlation Coefficient Values for Personality Traits and Remote**  
298 **Work Productivity**

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	Significance
<b>Personality traits and Remote work Productivity</b>	0.704	<b>0.01 Significance</b>

299 From the above table 5, it is inferred that the value of correlation between Personality Traits  
300 and Remote Work Productivity (0.704) is higher than the table value 0.081, to be significant  
301 at a 0.01 level of significance. The correlation between these two variables is positive and  
302 significant. Therefore, it is found that there is a significant and positive relationship between

303 Personality Traits and Remote Work Productivity, and hence, the formulated hypothesis is  
304 accepted.

305

## 306 **9. EDUCATION IMPLICATION**

- 307 • The research can assist institutions of higher learning to know how personality factors  
308 affect the productivity of the faculty when working remotely.
- 309 • The results can help administrators to develop efficient remote and hybrid instruction  
310 practices for faculty members.
- 311 • The findings can be used to construct training programs to enable faculty to work in  
312 more digital teaching conditions.
- 313 • The research can assist organisations in developing favourable policies to enhance  
314 faculty welfare and work productivity under the remote working environment.
- 315 • The results can be used to enhance faculty performance and general effectiveness in  
316 higher education institutions.

## 317 **10. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 318 • Faculty need to be provided with training and professional development courses to  
319 assist them in acclimating to using remote and hybrid campus setups.
- 320 • To ensure that faculty handle the remote education duties, universities can put up  
321 buttress systems within their colleges, as well as staff working directives.
- 322 • In the university, technology tools like communication mechanisms and online  
323 learning systems should be encouraged to facilitate the collaboration and effective  
324 teaching of the faculty.
- 325 • Remote or hybrid work-life balance and staff well-being can be achieved through  
326 colleges. Administrators could take the diversity of faculty into account in developing  
327 both policies and teaching plans that equip them to work outside of campus.
- 328 • Further research must focus on a bigger sample of the overeducated faculty, which  
329 will also evaluate such aspects of remote work as work-life balance, job satisfaction,  
330 and teaching engagement.

## 331 **11. SUGGESTIONS**

- 332 • The faculty should be trained in the educational institutions so that they can acquire  
333 effective skills in online teaching as well as remote teaching.
- 334 • The institutions ought to ensure that the infrastructures ought to be digital and  
335 technical to enhance the effectiveness of remote and online teaching.
- 336 • The facilities need to promote effective communication between the members of the  
337 faculty to ensure there is a professional interaction within the virtual work setup.
- 338 • The remote work teaching should be evaluated periodically, and this will assist in  
339 enhancing the effectiveness and productivity of the teaching.

## 340 12. CONCLUSION

341 It is actually significant to identify the variables that are affecting faculty productivity under  
342 remote working environments. Personality traits become extremely significant when people  
343 have to overcome professional responsibilities and adjust to various working conditions.  
344 Knowing the relationship between higher education faculty and personality traits and  
345 productivity in a remote environment, it sheds some light on how the peculiar differences in  
346 individuals influence work performance in both online and offline environments. By  
347 considering these connections into account in an academic work setting, the educational  
348 institutions can make changes and improve their environment to enhance the productivity,  
349 interaction and communication among the faculty members in an educational institution.

## 350 13. REFERENCES

- 351 • Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is  
352 telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science*  
353 *in the Public Interest*, 16(2), 40–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273>
- 354 • Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job  
355 performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1–26.  
356 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x>
- 357 • McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2008). The five-factor theory of personality. In O. P.  
358 John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and*  
359 *research* (3rd ed., pp. 159–181). Guilford Press.
- 360 • Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). The next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2): Developing  
361 and assessing a hierarchical model with 15 facets to enhance bandwidth, fidelity, and  
362 predictive power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113(1), 117–143.  
363 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000096>

- 364 • Gordon W. Allport. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. Holt, Rinehart &  
365 Winston.
- 366 • Amy L. Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences  
367 of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization,  
368 person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281–342.  
369 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x>
- 370 • Olsen, E., et al. (2023). Remote work as a moderator of Big Five personality–  
371 performance relationships. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*.
- 372 • Ruvimova, A., et al. (2022). Remote workplace interactions, productivity, and well-  
373 being moderated by extraversion. *Computers in Human Behavior*.
- 374 • Wilczyński, P. (2023). Remote work, productivity and engagement: Implications for  
375 job satisfaction. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*.
- 376 • Kawakubo, S., & Arata, J. (2022). Residential environment, personality traits, and  
377 productivity while working from home. *Building and Environment*, 222, 109393.  
378 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2022.109393>
- 379 • Shimura, A., Yokoi, K., Ishibashi, Y., Akatsuka, Y., Matsuda, Y., & Tanimoto, Y.  
380 (2022). Remote work and psychological stress among Japanese workers during the  
381 COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 64(1), e12328.  
382 <https://doi.org/10.1002/1348-9585.12328>
- 383 • Kipe, D. (2025). The effects of extraversion personality on project managers' well-  
384 being and workplace satisfaction in remote workspaces. *Journal of Organizational*  
385 *Psychology*.
- 386 • Christopher J. Soto, C. J., & Oliver P. John, O. P. (2017). The next Big Five Inventory  
387 (BFI-2): Developing and assessing a hierarchical model with 15 facets to enhance  
388 bandwidth, fidelity, and predictive power. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
389 *Psychology*, 113(1), 117–143. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000096>
- 390 • Linda Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., van Buuren, S., van der  
391 Beek, A. J., & de Vet, H. C. W. (2014). Construct validity of the Individual Work  
392 Performance Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*,  
393 56(3), 331–337. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.000000000000113>
- 394 • Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is  
395 telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science*  
396 *in the Public Interest*, 16(2), 40–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273>

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR