

Personality Traits and Work Values as Predictors of Vocational Interests Among University Students

Anna VERES^{1,*}, Tünde PÓKA¹

ABSTRACT. Many organizations and career guidance professionals are curious about what personality traits can tell them about a person's potential, qualities and attitude to work.

This study assessed the personality traits, work values and vocational interests of university students. The relationships between these three constructs were investigated, and more specifically, the extent to which personality traits and work value can predict vocational interest. Vocational interest determines one's career development and work choice.

The study included 304 participants with a mean age of 25.4 years (SD=8.11). In our analysis, we used the HEXACO personality questionnaire, the Work Value Questionnaire measuring 15 subcategories and the RIASEC Vocational Interest Questionnaire. The aim of this study is to get a clearer picture of the relationship between personality traits, work values and vocational interests. The results show that personality traits are also predictive, but together with work value, they are stronger predictors of vocational interest. The results are presented in the light of career development.

Keywords: personality traits, vocational interest, work value, university students

INTRODUCTION

Success in the world of work depends to a large extent on the availability of human resources, where qualities such as skills, experience, expertise and commitment are displayed. In addition, an optimal personality trait is also

¹ Department of Applied Psychology, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

* Corresponding author: anna.veres@ubbcluj.ro



essential for certain jobs (Effron et al., 2003). We can use personality as well as values to characterize fundamental individual differences (Parks-Leduc et al., 2015).

Personality, work values and occupational interests play an important role in individual career development, as our individual differences and occupational choices are the pillars on which our career paths are based. When examining career development, there are a number of factors that can be targeted to examine in order to facilitate an individual's career or explain their behavior over the course of their life course. Most studies measure the personalities, values and interests of people already working in order to get a more accurate picture of their profile and to operate appropriately with groups of people in the institution or company (ex.: Kotler & Keller, 2016; Brouwer & Veldkamp, 2018)

The importance of personality and having the right skills in the selection process is not disputed (Mitev, 2016), so the earlier their interrelationships are examined, the more certain that both companies and job seekers can fill the right positions.

In what follows, we look at personality, work value and professional interest one by one, how important they are for career development, and then discuss their interaction.

An individual's personality is a complex arrangement of individual dispositions that are relatively stable. These complex and colorful arrangements or dispositions shape our experiences. These experiences are expressed in the perception, evaluation and interaction of objects and events. In addition, they are our inner thoughts, feelings and perceptions (Hogan, 1991).

In another definition, personality is the dynamic organization of psychophysical systems within a person that produces patterns of behavior, thought, and emotion characteristic of that person (Allport, 1961). More accurately personality traits themselves are distinctive ways in which we think, feel and behave. They are characteristics that predict or can predict our behavior. They are more clearly expressed in interactions with people and are determined not least by both biological and environmental factors (Allport, 1961, 1985).

Despite the fact that most research still uses the 5-factor personality models and that they work very well, Ashton et al. (2014) and Lee and Ashton (2007) consider the HEXACO model to be more robust. HEXACO may also prove to be more culturally and linguistically appropriate (Lee and Ashton, 2007, 2009).

The HEXACO is an acronym for the following factors: honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience (Lee & Ashton, 2014). The HEXACO introduces the honesty-humility factor, which can also be used to screen for anti-social manifestations and

behaviors, thus providing more than the 5-factor models (Lee, Ashton, Morrison, Cordery, & Dunlop, 2008; Lee, Gizzarone, & Ashton, 2003).

Special skills and abilities play a big role in coping with the difficulties of starting a career and staying on track, in addition to expectations and perceptions of work. D. E. Super has developed a complex model of professional personality development based on humanistic psychology and applying Rogers' theory of personality (Super, 1970).

Work values themselves can be defined as the set of qualities that people seek in their work, profession or career. Conversely, vocational interest can be defined as the activities through which work value is realized. For example, if someone values independence in their work, they have a strong interest in managerial activities.

In Super's view, the work value questionnaire should be used to help in the selection of occupations and jobs, but a single questionnaire alone may not provide enough information to help a person make the right decision or to help a counsellor make the right steps with the client information (Super, 1970, Zytowski, 1994).

Work values are essentially workplace characteristics that we perceive as important, as they also largely determine our individual career choices and career development. The work values that come to the fore at any given age can vary greatly, even across generations (Glass, 2007; Sullivan & Baruch, 2009; Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). In many cases, in order to get a clearer picture of an organization's values, it is worthwhile to assess work values, and of course, assessing personal needs is also extremely useful in individual career counselling.

Work value is a list of several values, which have the following elements (Szilágyi, 1987; Super, 1970):

Creativity: the work that allows you to invent new things, try out ideas, develop and design products.

Management: the work that allows us to plan, organize, delegate work.

Achievement: the work that makes us feel that we have achieved something, that we have accomplished our goal. The feeling that we are doing our job well.

Surroundings: work that takes place in conditions favorable to the individual.

Supervisory Relationships: work that takes place under supervision. A supervisor is fair and gets along well with you.

Way Of Life: work that enables the worker to live the life he or she chooses and to express him or herself as the person he or she wants to be.

Security: work which provides one with the certainty of having a job (work that is secure) even in difficult times.

Associates: work that brings you into contact with people you like and feel comfortable with.

Aesthetic: the work that allows us to create beautiful, aesthetic things and contribute to making the world a more beautiful place.

Prestige: work which gives one standing on the eyes of others and evokes respect.

Independence: work which allows the worker to work at his own pace and in his own way.

Variety: work which provides an opportunity to do different types of tasks.

Economic return: work that pays well and allows you to get the things you want.

Altruism: work that allows us to contribute to the well-being of other people.

Intellectual stimulation: work which provides opportunity for independent thinking and for learning how and why things work.

Studies have obtained the following results when examining the value of work: the preferred value of work reflects the development of students' professional identity, but also gives an idea of the training and the profession. Super (1970) found that social relationships were more important for lower skilled workers than for highly skilled workers, but Szilágyi (1987) found the opposite tendency among apprentices, with material values dominating. Work value is mostly considered in selection and profiling to provide more suitable staff for certain positions (Juhász, 2022). Super empirical research has shown that people with higher education do not consider human values important in their work, this tendency was proved in the German sample.

The main aim of our research is to get a clearer picture of the values that university students, in the absence of active work experience, currently consider important for them to be motivated and effective in their future work. In addition, we were also interested in how Super's work value questionnaire could be discussed in relation to HEXACO and RIASEC, as the importance of work value has been highlighted by several studies on these variables (Berings et al., 2004, Berings and Adriaenssens 2012).

According to Holland's career choice theory, our careers are determined by the interaction between our environment and our personality. The theorist maintains that in our careers, we want to work with or be surrounded by people who are similar to us. He argues that people want to be and work in an environment where they can use their skills, express their attitudes and values. Meanwhile, they enjoy problem solving and empowerment in the same environment. So behavior is determined by the interaction between personality and environment. It defines six personality types, professional interests: realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising, conventional.

Holland (1997) has consistently emphasized the need to delineate personality and occupational interest in his theory of RIASEC, where he defines the six types through the relationship between occupational personality and

work environment. Holland theorized that “what we have called ‘vocational interests’ are an important aspect of personality” and that “interest inventories are personality inventories” (1997, p. 8). Holland’s (1997) RIASEC personality types are characterized by a unique set of vocational preferences, or interests, as well as personality traits.

A brief description of the six types is given below by Holland (1973, 1997):

1) Realistic - For people with this interest, it is important that their work has a tangible, visible result within a foreseeable period of time. They are keen on solving practical problems. Activities of interest to them may require physical dexterity and effort. They are people of practical solutions. They enjoy working with tools or machines. They like to repair or produce various objects using specific methods. It is important for them to understand how certain objects and tools work. Associated fields: nature, environment (including agriculture), transport, transport, industry (small and large industry, manufacturing).

2) Investigative: People with this interest are exploring and investigating the connections and relationships between things in the world. They like to gather information and research. It is important for them to have enough time and opportunity to go deeper, to analyze problems in detail, to develop theoretical solutions. They like to work with abstract concepts and are interested in science, design, analysis and reasoning. In their work processes, they like to get to the bottom of things and to arrive at solutions to problems by theoretical or experimental means. Related careers: technical careers (development, applications, communications engineering), sciences (social sciences, life sciences, natural sciences, political science).

3) Artistic: People with this interest are attracted to activities where they can use their previously acquired knowledge, skills and abilities to invent new solutions to various situations, issues and problems, which may not yet be known to others. They may also feel that it is important to show their own personality in some creative activity. It is important for them to work independently and to be exposed to new experiences and varied tasks. In their work they like to use their imagination and feelings to create. Related fields: arts, crafts, entertainment, sport (leisure).

4) Social: People with these interests consider it important to be able to do something useful, important, helpful or service-oriented for others. They are happy to interact with others, whether for business or as a helper. They like to initiate conversations, to help identify the needs of others, to help solve their problems. They thrive in tasks where they can work in company, in a team or in a working group. They like jobs that require personal contact. Related fields: education, society, communication, human services, lifestyle.

5) Enterprising: people with this interest thrive in situations where there is always a task to be done and can take the initiative, lead and organize. They seek situations where they can be confronted with varied and constantly new challenges. They are quick to grasp the demands of different situations and are willing to act to solve them, mobilize others, inspire them and organize the solution. Above all, it is their ability to grasp the bigger picture of tasks that is their main source of pleasure at work. They prefer to think in broad terms, leaving the details to others. They like to organize their own and others' activities, and are independent and autonomous. Related careers: trade, marketing, tourism, catering.

6) Conventional: People with this interest find it important to work within a well-defined framework, following precise rules. They feel secure knowing what they are doing and reassured by knowing exactly how far their responsibilities extend. They are happy to work within well-defined limits on detailed tasks that require a high level of concentration, and they like well-organized work and logical solutions. Deadlines, rules and precise descriptions help them to work well. They seek secure, predictable tasks free from unexpected surprises. They are happy to work to instructions and accept direction and supervision from others. They like to finish the work they have started, and are disturbed if the work process has to be interrupted. They tend to use familiar solutions, preferring tasks that are predictable and predictable. Related fields: economics, finance, business/administration, administration, law, defense.

Of course, these types do not appear purely and simply in individuals. The presence of a combination of different types can often be a puzzle for the individual, especially if they lack career knowledge, and appropriate career counselling is key.

In the following, we will discuss the interrelationships of the constructs (personality, work value, vocational interest) discussed in detail above

There is much debate about the relationship between personality and professional interests, how they might be related or how they might overlap. Several studies have concluded that there is a meaningful relationship between the two variables (e.g., Larson, Rottinghaus, & Borgen, 2002), but from a conceptual point of view, we are talking about two different domains (Darley & Hagenah, 1955; Holland, 1997; Waller, Lykken, & Tellegen, 1995) Most comparative studies have focused on the five factor model despite the fact that the HEXACO model – that has demonstrated empirical advantages over the FFM by accounting for more variance in important criteria (Ashton & Lee, 2007).

In Berings et al. (2004) study as a result of stepwise hierarchical multiple regression analysis show that work values have incremental validity over and above the five factor personality model-traits to predict enterprising and social vocational interests. Another study found out similar results for the social vocational interests (Berrings & Adriaenssens, 2012).

So it can be seen that efforts are being made to define professional identity, how much it is predicted by personality traits and work value. Our study examines all six occupational interests, and we also use the six-factor dimension for personality traits, HEXACO, rather than the 5-factor dimension, which is an innovation.

Some studies support that both personality and values play an important role in determining individual differences (Parks-Leduc et. al, 2015; Roccas et.al, 2002). However, it is important to highlight that while personality is a pattern of our behavior, feelings and thoughts, values are a broader view and judgment about what is good or important in life (Bilsky & Schwartz, 1994). The question is, where do our personality traits and work values intersect?

It is also important to bear in mind that work value plays a prominent role in job satisfaction, motivation, organizational commitment, performance and, in turn, career development (Dose, 1997; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998; Roe & Ester, 1999). Satisfaction with life and work depends on the appropriate channels through which a person can assert his or her abilities, personality and values (Super, 1953), so work value can also play a crucial role in career interest. The role of personality and work value in career development is not disputed, however, previous studies have mostly used the 5-factor personality model (e.g.: Leuty & Hansen, 2012).

All in all one of the main purpose of this study is to revisit the association between vocational interests and personality by relating Holland's six RIASEC interest variables to the six personality dimensions of the HEXACO model.

Another aim of the study is to investigate the incremental validity of work values to predict vocational interest (RIASEC) over and above personality traits (HEXACO) among university students.

METHOD

Subjects: The study included 304 participants with a mean age of 25.4 years ($SD=8.11$); university students from Romania (UBB, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences). The students completed the questionnaires during seminars. The sample included 58 males (19,1%) and 246 females (80,9%).

INSTRUMENTS

The assessment battery included questions regarding personal data, inventories to assess personality traits (HEXACO-60), vocational interest (RIASEC) and work values.

HEXACO-60 – Personality test

Ashton and Lee (2009) developed a shorter version of the HECAXO-PI-R which would be suitable when the assessment time is short. HEXACO-60 has six scales, each scale contains 10 items. The personality test measures the following dimensions (Ashton & Lee, 2009; Ashton & Lee, 2007; Ashton, Lee, & De Vries, 2014): Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to experience. Each dimension has subscales, they are presented in Table 2. In our research we used the Hungarian version (Szirmák & De Raad, 1994). The Cronbach alpha estimates were in range of .73-.89.

Table 1. The facet-level scales of each dimension (Ashton & Lee, 2009)

Honesty-Humility	Sincerity, Fairness, Greed Avoidance, Modesty
Emotionality	Fearfulness, Anxiety, Dependence, Sentimentality
Extraversion	Social Self-Esteem, Social Boldness, Sociability, Liveliness
Agreeableness	Forgivingness, Gentleness, Flexibility, Patience
Conscientiousness	Organization, Diligence, Perfectionism, Prudence
Openness to experience	Aesthetic Appreciation, Inquisitiveness, Creativity, Unconventionality

HEXACO-60 (Ashton & Lee, 2009). This inventory consists of 60 self-report items measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

Vocational Interest

The most used model of vocational interest is Holland's Hexagonal framework (Holland 1997). This model includes six primary dimensions of interests; (1) Realistic; (2) Investigative; (3) Artistic; (4) Social; (5) Enterprising; and (6) Conventional. In this study we used a Hungarian adaptation is the inventory which consisted 24 items (Mező, 2015).

Work values

Super published the Work Value Questionnaire in 1962, and it was adapted to Hungarian in 1968/69, which measures the 15 value domains using 45 items. Each value category of the Super-questionnaire can take values ranging from 3 to 15 points.

RESULTS

First, the correlations between the different items were investigated

Table 2. Correlation between HEXACO and Work values

	H	E	X	A	C	O
Altruism	.26**	.15**	.12*	.18**	.16**	.10
Economic return	-.43**	-.03	-.00	-.10.	-.06	-.05
Aesthetic	.08	.07	.09	.11*	-.02	.44*
Surroundings	-.07	.10	.03	.00	.04	-.04.
Independence	-.05	-.10*	.13*	-.04	.05	.11*
Hierarchy	-.04	.02	-.01	.00	-.00	-.09
Management	-.26**	-.19**	.26**	-.15**	.09	-.06
Creativity	.03	-.08	.24**	.12*	.14**	.35**
Achievement	-.09	-.13**	.06	.02	.09	.00
Security	-.04	-.03	.08	.00	.12*	-.02
Way of life	-.02	.05	.18**	.00	.02	.20**
Prestige	-.27**	-.00	.17**	-.11*	.03	.00
Intellectual stimulation	.05	-.17*	.26**	.11*	.19**	.32**
Associates	-.09	.12*	.06	.11*	-.07	-.13**
Variety	.04	-.09	.19**	.10*	.01	.22**

N=304

* $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$.

Note: H: Honesty-Humility, E: Emotionality, X: Extraversion, A: Agreeableness, C: Conscientiousness, O: Openness to experience

The correlation between HEXACO personality traits and Work Values are low to moderate, and are maximally .44. Among personality traits, extraversion and agreeableness correlate with the highest number of work value, followed by openness to experience.

Table 3. Correlation between RIASEC and work values

	R	I	A	S	E	C
Altruism	-.28**	.08	-.01	.57**	-.02	-.08
Economic return	.10	-.03	-.00	-.19**	.13*	.16*
Aesthetic	-.05	-.04	.51**	.29**	-.13*	-.21**
Surroundings	.02	-.13*	-.05	.01	.02	.26**
Independence	.00	.08	.17**	.03	.07	-.07
Hierarchy	.06	-.09	-.12*	-.03	.10	.25**
Management	.06	-.15	-.09	-.05	.43	.14
Creativity	-.06	.07	.30**	.20**	.05	-.12*
Achievement	.13*	.04	-.09	-.07	.03	.24**
Security	.07	.03	-.10	-.03	-.00	.23**
Way of life	-.10	.00	.20**	.09	.03	-.10
Prestige	.06	-.02	-.13*	-.026	.16**	.18**
Intellectual stimulation	-.13*	.17**	.21**	.20**	.04	-.20**
Associates	.01	-.14*	-.11*	.05	.07	.08
Variety	-.06	.01	.076	.21**	.15**	-.05

$N=304$

* $P<0.05$; ** $P<0.01$; *** $P<0.001$.

Note: R: Realistic, I: Investigative, A: Artistic, S: Social, E: Enterprising, C: Conventional

The correlation between RIASEC vocational interest and Work Values are low to moderate, and are maximally .57. Among vocational interest, Artistic and Conventional correlate with the highest number of work value.

Table 4. Correlation between HEXACO and RIASEC

	H	E	X	A	C	O
R	-.14*	-.09	-.18**	.01	-.12*	-.15**
I	.00	-.08	.03	.10	.05	.08
A	-.01	-.06	.01	.10	-.03	.45**
S	.17**	.10	.32**	.10	.06	.17**
E	-.10	-.10	.29**	-.16**	.03	-.11*
C	-.02	.02	-.14*	-.01	.18**	-.22**

$N=304$

* $P<0.05$; ** $P<0.01$;

Note: H: Honesty-Humility, E: Emotionality, X: Extraversion, A: Agreeableness, C: Conscientiousness, O: Openness to experience, R: Realistic, I: Investigative, A: Artistic, S: Social, E: Enterprising, C: Conventional

PERSONALITY TRAITS AND WORK VALUES AS PREDICTORS OF VOCATIONAL
INTERESTS AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

The correlation between HEXACO personality traits and RIASEC vocational interests are low to moderate, and are maximally .45.

The results of the regression analysis, regressing the 5 RIASEC items on the 6 HEXACO personality traits, are reported in Table 5. Inspection of the R² shows that for 5 of the RIASEC vocational interests, except I (investigative), 13% or more if the variance is explained by the HEXACO traits. Realistic, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, Conventional interests are explained up to 14%, 24%, 26%, 17%, 13%, respectively. On average, near to 16% of the variance in vocational interest is explained by the HEXACO personality traits.

Table 5. Hierarchical multiple regressions predicting RIASEC interests from HEXACO personality variables

	R	I	A	S	E	C
H	-.13*	-.03	-.04	.15**	-.05*	-.05
E	-.14*	-.06	-.01	.20***	-.08	-.03
X	-.15**	-.03	-.07	.31***	.32	-.12*
A	.04	.09	.11*	.09	-.16	-.02
C	-.02	.02	-.10*	-.07	.04*	.27***
O	-.08	.05	.48***	.08	-.18	-.21***
R²	.14**	.04	.24***	.26***	.17***	.13***

N=304

* *P*<0.05; ** *P*<0.01; *** *P*<0.001.

Note: H: Honesty-Humility, E: Emotionality, X: Extraversion, A: Agreeableness, C: Conscientiousness, O: Openness to experience; R: Realistic, I: Investigative, A: Artistic, S: Social, E: Enterprising, C: Conventional

We did regression analysis for predicting each subscales of RIASEC (vocational interest). In total, six hierarchical regression analyses were performed, each subscale of RIASEC was defined as a dependent variable, while gender, age, academic achievement were inserted as independent variables in the first step. In the second step, six items of the HEXACO personality test were entered as independent variables, while in the third step, 15 items of work values were entered as independent variables. Thus, we were interested in the extent to which the subscales of vocational interest were predicted by the baseline data, personality and work values. And how much explanatory power the sum of these items has on the prediction of vocational interest.

Table 6. Summary of hierarchical multiple regression analysis for predicting *Realistic, Investigative and Artistic* vocational interest (from RIASEC)

	<i>Realistic</i>			<i>Investigative</i>			<i>Artistic</i>		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Constant	4.175**	13.61***	14.93**	12.06***	9.55	11.30	12.13***	-7.11	-.25
Gender	-2.31***	-1.75*	-1.93**	-.33	.17	-.27	-.42	-.50	-.24
Age	-.03	-.02	-.04	.03	.02	.00	.01	.04	-.00
Academic achievement	1.35***	1.11**	.48	-1.61*	-1.50*	-1.42*	-.91	-.19	-.24
Humility-honesty		-.07*	-.05		-.03	-.05		-.05	-.05
Emotionality		-.06	-.00		-.07	-.02		-.01	-.02
Extraversion		-.08*	-.06		-.03	.00		-.08	-.04
Agreeableness		.02	.05		.11	.11		.14*	.11
Conscientiousness		-.01	-.01		.02	-.05		-.12	-.01
Openness to experience		-.05	-.09		.06	.03		.60***	.28***
Altruism			-.38**			.09			-.42
Economic return			-.06			.00			.28
Aesthetic			.20			-.45*			1.19***
Surroundings			.01			-.30			-.21
Independence			.04			.31			.37
Hierarchy			-.02			-.17			.13
Management			-.02			-.62***			-.12
Creativity			-.00			.18			.02
Achievement			.28			.30			-.29
Security			.07			.36			-.19
Way of life			-.28			-.01			.25
Prestige			.09			.32			-.46*
Intellectual stimulation			-.12			.75**			.26
Associates			-.09			-.44			-.21
Variety			.17			-.36			-.32
R	.34	.40	.47	.17*	.21	.42**	.08	.49	.65
R ²	.11	.16	.22	.03*	.04	.17**	.00	.24***	.42***
Adjusted R ²	.11	.13	.15	.01**	.01	.10**	-.00	.21	.38

Note N=304. Standardized regression coefficients (β) are shown.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

PERSONALITY TRAITS AND WORK VALUES AS PREDICTORS OF VOCATIONAL INTERESTS AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Table 7. Summary of hierarchical multiple regression analysis for predicting *Social, Enterprising and Conventional* vocational interest (from RIASEC)

	<i>Social</i>			<i>Enterprising</i>			<i>Conventional</i>		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Constant	12.53***	-6.37	-2.71	14.64***	19.20***	10.24	7.09*	16.89**	9.68
Gender	2.43**	1.51	1.37	-1.08	-.22	.02	.65	.89	.30
Age	.02	.02	.04	-.08	-.10*	-.10*	-.02	-.06	-.05
Academic achievement	-2.29***	-1.82***	-.79	-.35	-.02	-.18	1.55*	1.14	.40
Humility-honesty		.12**	.01		-.05	.01		-.07	-.01
Emotionality		.14**	.04		-.09	-.06		-.05	-.02
Extraversion		.23***	.18***		.31***	.20***		-.13*	-.14*
Agreeableness		.08	.00		-.19**	-.16		-.03	.00
Conscientiousness		-.07	-.06		.04	.02		.31***	.24***
Openness to experience		.06	.02		-.21**	-.11		-.26***	-.12
Altruism			.97***			.16			-.00
Economic return			-.06			.20			-.03
Aesthetic			.24			-.29			-.30
Surroundings			-.02			-.12			.61**
Independence			-.02			-.11			-.33
Hierarchy			.00			.32			.15
Management			.05			.92***			.18
Creativity			.12			.15			.22
Achievement			-.18			-.29			.38
Security			.04			-.33			.20
Way of life			-.21			.01			-.49
Prestige			-.04			-.22			.26
Intellectual stimulation			-.29			-.24			-.85**
Associates			-.08			.14			-.21
Variety			.08			.29			.50*
R	.37	.51	.67	.10	.41	.56	.15	.37	.54
R ²	.14***	.26***	.45***	.01	.17**	.31**	.02	.13***	.29***
Adjusted R ²	.13	.24	.41	.00	.14	.25	.01	.11	.23

Note N=304. Standardized regression coefficients (β) are shown.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis indicate that the examined variables succeed in accounting for up 22 % of the total variance of *Realistic* vocational interest (Step 3, Table 6). Realistic vocational interest was significantly predicted in Step 3 by Altruism (as work value) ($\beta=-.38$, $p<.01$).

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis indicate that the examined variables succeed in accounting for up 17 % of the total variance of *Investigative* vocational interest (Step 3, Table 6). Investigative vocational interest was significantly predicted in Step 3 by Aesthetic (as work value) ($\beta=-.45$, $p<.05$) Management (as work value) ($\beta=-.62$, $p<.001$) and by Intellectual stimulation (as work value) ($\beta=.75$, $p<.01$).

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis indicate that the examined variables succeed in accounting for up 42 % of the total variance of *Artistic* vocational interest (Step 3, Table 6). Artistic vocational interest was significantly predicted in Step 3 by Openness to experience ($\beta=.28$, $p<.001$), Aesthetic (as work value) ($\beta=1.19$, $p<.001$), Prestige (as work value) ($\beta=-.46$, $p<.05$).

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis indicate that the examined variables succeed in accounting for up 45 % of the total variance of *Social* vocational interest (Step 3, Table 7). Social vocational interest was significantly predicted in Step 3 by Extraversion ($\beta=.18$, $p<.001$), Altruism (as work value) ($\beta=.97$, $p<.001$).

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis indicate that the examined variables succeed in accounting for up 31% of the total variance of *Enterprising* vocational interest (Step 3, Table 7). Enterprising vocational interest was significantly predicted in Step 3 by Extraversion ($\beta=.20$, $p<.001$), Management (as work value) ($\beta=.92$, $p<.001$).

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis indicate that the examined variables succeed in accounting for up 29% of the total variance of *Conventional* vocational interest (Step 3, Table 7). Conventional vocational interest was significantly predicted in Step 3 by Extraversion ($\beta=-.14$, $p<.05$), Conscientiousness ($\beta=.24$, $p<.001$), Surroundings (as work value) ($\beta=.61$, $p<.01$), Intellectual stimulation (as work value) ($\beta=-.85$, $p<.01$).

DISCUSSION

From the correlation results of HEXACO and work values, it is nicely outlined that all work values except surroundings and hierarchy are correlated with at least one personality factor. This also highlights the importance of the relationship between personality and values in the world of work (Berings et al., 2004). Despite the fact that Berings et al. (2004) only examined two items in more detail (Social and Enterprising), the correlation between RIASEC and work

values also seems to be vital, since here, with the exception of the Management work value, the other 14 work values correlate with at least one vocational interest for our sample.

Our results in examining the predictive power of HEXACO for RIASEC are encouraging, as each personality type predicts vocational interest to some extent, which is supported by the literature, although the extent of overlap between the two constructs is debated (Larson, Rottinghaus, & Borgen, 2002)

The results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis suggest that personality types together with work values have a very high percentage of predictive power for vocational interest, but when looking at the work values individually, we see that few work values individually predict vocational interest significantly.

In conjunction with personality traits only 7 of 15 work values (Altruism, Aesthetic, Management, Intellectual stimulation, Prestige, Surrounding and Variety) significantly predicts vocational interest, even though in terms of correlation, the relationship between work values, the personality traits and vocational interest is significant. One explanation could be that since the study population (university students) does not have sufficient work experience, they do not have the work values formulated in their minds to give them the exact importance they would like to attach to them. On the other hand, it could also be explained by the fact that the students belong to generation Y, whose work habits are also very different from those of generation Z and X, so it would be wise to use a different, more up-to-date type of work values questionnaire.

CONCLUSION

The correlation results of work value and personality traits are partially consistent with previous research, i.e. extroversion and openness are more strongly related to work value (Leuty & Hansen, 2012; Anglim et. al, 2017). When examining the correlations, a very interesting result emerged in our sample, as openness shows a strong correlation with the social interest and the enterprising variable. This may be explained by the fact that in our sample we studied university students in the helping professions, where openness is essential, as there are many large ranges of clients with whom they have to work, showing understanding and empathy towards them.

Regression analyses yielded similar results to those obtained in studies that examined the relationship between RIASEC and personality types in students (Berings and Adriaenssens, 2004, Berings et al. 2012, McKay and Tokar, 2012). When examining the separate elements of vocational interest, similar results were obtained for Enterprising and Social vocational interest as in previous

research where only these two factors were examined (Berings and Adriaenssens, 2004), but it is noteworthy that Artistic vocational interest also predicted in a very high percentage by personality and work value.

Our results suggest that HEXACO alone is predictive of RIASEC, since one or even three personality traits are significant predictors of all other professional interests except Investigative. This suggests that the 6-factor model is predictive of professional interest rather than being consistent with it. But despite this, it can be deduced from our results that vocational interest can be predicted in a much larger percentage with the combination of work values, thus confirming the fact that personality types in themselves may not be sufficient predictors.

In order to make a meaningful contribution to the career development of university students, it would be worthwhile to introduce other variables and see how predictive RIASEC is in that case. Several studies and comparisons have separately compared RIASEC and HEXACO with work values or personal values. For a more accurate picture, it is worth looking at these elements as well.

In addition, differences between university majors could be investigated, e.g. STEM and nonSTEM, or more specifically between certain majors e.g. engineering and helping professions.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. Holt, Reinhart & Winston.
- Allport, G. (ed.) (1985). *Psychology: The Briefer Course*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Anglim, J., Morse, G., De Vries, R. E., MacCann, C., & Marty, A. (2017). Comparing Job Applicants to Non-Applicants Using An Item-Level Bifactor Model on the Hexaco Personality Inventory. *European Journal of Personality*, 31(6), 669-684. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2120>
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11(2), 150-166. doi: 10.1177/1088868306294907
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91(4), 340-345. doi: 10.1080/00223890902935878
- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & de Vries, R. E. (2014). The HEXACO Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness, and Emotionality Factors: A review of research and theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 18, 139-152. DOI: 10.1177/1088868314523838
- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & de Vries, R. E. (2014). The HEXACO Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness, and Emotionality Factors: A Review of Research and Theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 18(2), 139-152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868314523838>

- Berings, D., & Adriaenssens, S. (2012). The Role of Business Ethics, Personality, Work Values and Gender in Vocational Interests from Adolescents. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 106(3), 325–335. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41426695>
- Berings, D., De Fruyt, F., & Bouwen, R. (2004). Work Values and personality traits as predictors of enterprising and social vocational interests. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26, 349–364.
- Bilsky, W., & Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Values and personality. *European Journal of Personality*, 8(3), 163–181. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2410080303>
- Brouwer, Arnold J. and Bernard P. Veldkamp. (2018). How Age Affects the Relation between Personality Facets and Work Values of Business and Private Bankers. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 181–193.
- Cennamo, L. and Gardner, D. (2008), "Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organisation values fit", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 23 No. 8, pp. 891–906. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810904385>
- Darley, J. G. & Hagenah, T. (1955). *Vocational Interest Measurement: Theory and Practice*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Dose, J.J. (1997) Work Values: An Integrative Framework and Illustrative Application to Organizational Socialization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70, 219–240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00645.x>
- Effron, M., Grandosy, R. and Goldsmith, M. (eds). (2003). "Chapter 3 - The 21st Century Workforce". *Human Resources in the 21st Century*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Glass, A. (2007). Understanding generational differences for competitive success, *Industrial and Commercial Training*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 98–103. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00197850710732424>
- Hansen, J.-I. C., & Leuty, M. E. (2012). Work values across generations. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 20(1), 34–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072711417163>
- Hogan, R. T. (1991). Personality and personality measurement. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 873–919). Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Holland, J. L. (1973). *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (3rd ed.). Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Juhász, I. (2022). Personality profile of financial sales staff based on Super's Work Values Inventory. *Hungarian Statistical Review*, 5 (1). pp. 48–74. ISSN 2630-9130
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing Management* (14th edition). Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House.
- Larson, L. M., Rottinghaus, P. J., & Borgen, F. H. (2002). Meta-analyses of Big Six interests and Big Five personality factors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(2), 217–239. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1854>
- Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., Morrison, D. L., Cordery, J., & Dunlop, P. D. (2008). Predicting integrity with the HEXACO personality model: Use of self- and observer reports. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 81(1), 147–167. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317907X195175>

- Lee, K., Gizzarone, M., & Ashton, M. C. (2003). Personality and the Likelihood to Sexually Harass. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 49(1-2), 59–69.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023961603479>
- McKay, D. A., & Tokar, D. M. (2012). The HEXACO and five-factor models of personality in relation to RIASEC vocational interests. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(2), 138–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.05.006>
- Meglino, B. M., & Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 351–389.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(99\)80065-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(99)80065-8)
- Mező, K. (2015). Career Orientation, Career Counseling for gifted people. *Magiszter* 13. évf. 2. sz. 57-69. (Original title: Pályaorientáció, pályatanácsadás tehetségeseknek)
- Mitev, A. Z. (2016): Toborzás és kiválasztás. In: Bauer, A. – Mitev, A. Z. (eds.): *Eladásmenedzsment*. Akadémiai Kiadó. Budapest. pp. 151–166.
<https://doi.org/10.1556/9789630597876>
- Parks-Leduc L, Feldman G, Bardi A. (2015). Personality traits and personal values: a meta-analysis. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev*. Feb;19(1):3-29.
 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868314538548>.
- Roccas, S., Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S. H., & Knafo, A. (2002). The Big Five Personality Factors and Personal Values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(6), 789–801. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202289008>
- Roe, R. A., & Ester, P. (1999). Values and work: Empirical findings and theoretical perspective. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48(1), 1–21.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1999.tb00046.x>
- Sullivan, S. E., & Baruch, Y. (2009). Advances in Career Theory and Research: A Critical Review and Agenda for Future Exploration. *Journal of Management*, 35(6), 1542–1571. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309350082>
- Super, D. E. (1953). A theory of vocational development. *American Psychologist*, 8(5), 185–190. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0056046>
- Super, D. E. (1970). *Manual, Work Values Inventory*. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Szilágyi, K. (1987). *Value and Work*. Budapest: Oktatókutató Intézet. (Original title: *Érték és Munka*)
- Szirmák, Z., & De Raad, B. (1994). Taxonomy and structure of Hungarian personality traits. *European Journal of Personality*, 8(2), 95–117.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2410080203>
- Waller, N. G., Lykken, D. T., & Tellegen, A. (1995). Occupational interests, leisure time interests, and personality: Three domains or one? Findings from the Minnesota Twin Registry. In D. J. Lubinski & R. V. Dawis (Eds.), *Assessing individual differences in human behavior: New concepts, methods, and findings* (pp. 233–259). Davies-Black Publishing.
- Zytowski, D.G. (1994). A super contribution to vocational theory: Work values. Special Issue: From vocational guidance to career counseling: Essays to honor Donald E. Super. *Career Development Quarterly* 43, 25–31