Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education 32 (2023) 100435

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jhlste

Personality is no stranger to occupational choice among hospitality graduates

Sébastien Fernandez *, Lohyd Terrier, Sowon Kim

EHL Hospitality Business School, HES-SO, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Western Switzerland, Route de Cojonnex 18, 1000 Lausanne 25, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Personality
Big Five
RIASEC
Occupational choice
Hospitality industry
Person-environment fit

ABSTRACT

The hospitality industry is currently facing a labor shortage crisis, preventing hotels from operating effectively. This study focuses on understanding the career decisions of hospitality graduates to examine whether occupational choice can be predicted from personality traits. The current occupations of 523 hospitality graduates were coded in light of the RIASEC model and its six dimensions (*Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional*) were regressed on personality results collected during graduates' studies. We found that extraverted individuals chose occupations scoring high in the *Enterprising* and *Social* dimensions of the RIASEC model, and they also have occupations scoring lower in the *Investigative* dimension. People scoring higher in *Openness to experience* have occupations scoring lower in the *Realistic* dimension. Conscientious individuals have occupations scoring higher in the *Conventional* domain. Results demonstrate that personality traits do indeed predict occupational choice, reinforcing the significant role of person-environment fit in shaping hospitality graduates' occupational choices.

1. Introduction

COVID-19 has triggered the "Great Resignation": a record number of people leaving their jobs since the beginning of the pandemic. It is estimated that around 33 million individuals left their position in the U.S. in the first half of 2022 (Liu-Lastres et al., 2023), seeking fairer compensation, greater job fulfillment, and the ability to "be themselves" at work. As a result, the hospitality industry is facing a massive labor shortage. Businesses closed due to the pandemic and hospitality employees were furloughed and laid off. As the industry speeds into post-pandemic recovery, former hospitality employees have been reluctant to go back to their old jobs as they have discovered new opportunities with better work environments elsewhere.

The hospitality industry has always been characterized by high staff turnover. The reasons include long working hours, job pressure, insufficient training, poor fringe benefit packages, poor leadership, and better opportunities elsewhere (Brown, Thomas, & Bosselman, 2015; Fallon & Rotherford, 2010; Tracey & Hinkin, 2008). Unsurprisingly, these poor working conditions are among the most reliable predictors of employee turnover (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000).

Consequently, how to make the hospitality industry attractive has been a burning question for hospitality leaders. While one aspect of the solution might be transforming the broader structural factors in hospitality organizations (such as flexibility, compensation, and workplace culture) (Workhuman, 2022), another theme might be understanding individuals and their occupational choices in order to make hospitality careers more appealing. Research shows that students pursue hospitality studies because of perceptions related to

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: sebastien.fernandez@ehl.ch (S. Fernandez).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2023.100435
Received 9 January 2023; Received in revised form 4 April 2023; Accepted 6 April 2023
Available online 14 April 2023

self-actualization, job opportunity (high employability), field attractiveness, foreign experience, external influence (e.g., parents, teachers), and ease of study (compared to other fields) (Kim, Guo, Wang, & Agrusa, 2007; Lee, Olds, & Lee, 2010). However, the predictors of pursuing hospitality studies are not the same as the predictors of the actual occupation within hospitality.

Past studies have examined the association between personality (how people think, feel, and behave across situations) and vocational interests (enduring preferences for what people like to do). For example, "extraverted" individuals tend to select "enterprising" occupations characterized by a willingness to persuade and influence others in order to achieve private and professional goals (see, for example, the meta-analysis of Hurtado-Rúa, Stead, & Poklar, 2019; Larson, Rottinghaus, & Borgen, 2002). Yet, little is known about how personality traits affect the actual occupation within the hospitality industry. Past studies in this domain have used student samples to predict career aspirations rather than the actual job (Anthony, Mensah, & Amissah, 2021; Chuang & Dellmann-Jenkins, 2010; Teng, 2008). The current study addresses this gap by examining the personality traits of individuals who pursued undergraduate studies at a hospitality business school (graduating in 2015, 2016, and 2017) and are currently in the job market (based on their LinkedIn profiles as at 2022). We apply the five-factor model (FFM, also known also as the "Big Five"), which is the most widely used model of personality (McCrae & John, 1992). The FFM comprises *Openness to experience*, *Conscientiousness*, *Extraversion*, *Agreeableness*, and *Neuroticism* (OCEAN). We use the O*Net tool (www.onetonline.org) to standardize the roles stated on LinkedIn profiles and assess the characteristics of an occupation based on Holland's vocational personality types (1997): *Realistic*, *Investigative*, *Artistic*, *Social*, *Enterprising*, and *Conventional* (RIASEC).

2. Literature review

2.1. The RIASEC model

According to Holland (1997), both jobs and vocational interests can be grouped into six categories: *Realistic*, *Investigative*, *Artistic*, *Social*, *Enterprising*, and *Conventional*. In *Realistic* jobs, employees tend to perform manual tasks that require energy and dexterity (e.g., cook, dishwasher, or housekeeping manager). *Realistic* interests refer to activities requiring the use of physical resources, technical skills, or motor coordination, which can be found in jobs that aim at realizing concrete actions to obtain specific and tangible results (e.g., mechanic). In *Investigative* occupations, employees must analyze information and find solutions to abstract problems (e.g., management consultant, financial analyst, or scientist). *Investigative* interests are characterized by the preference for thought over action. This interest is found among individuals who have an abstract and complex vision of their environment. In *Artistic* occupations, employees work without explicit rules and express ideas in a creative manner (e.g., actor, floral designer, and photographer). The professional environments linked to these interests are characterized by substantial freedom and a strong desire to create something new In *Social* occupations, employees help and care for customers or patients (e.g., waiter, flight attendant, and nurse). *Social* interests are found in individuals who place a high value on others, whether through care, development, or training. In *Enterprising* occupations, individuals oversee projects or teams, make decisions, and are involved in business operations (e.g., food service manager, sales manager, or lodging manager). *Enterprising* interests are characterized by a willingness to persuade and influence others to achieve private and professional goals. These interests are strongly linked to status and power values. Finally, in *Conventional* occupations, employees are required to be detail-oriented as they follow set procedures (e.g., receptionist, financial controller, or copy-editor). *Conventional* interests correspond to valuing order and stability. The rational and controlled use of data to establish work routines helps satisfy these interests.

Individuals who have interests suited to certain categories of jobs (e.g., *Enterprising*) are more likely to occupy those jobs in the future (Holland, 1997; see Hanna & Rounds, 2020, for recent evidence of this assertion). This relates to the notion of Person-Vocation fit ("P–V fit," Kristof, 1996), which can be defined as the congruence between individuals' occupation and their self-concept. Recent studies have shown that P–V fit plays an essential role in employees' job satisfaction and performance (Hoff, Song, Wee, Phan, & Rounds, 2020; Van Iddekinge, Roth, Putka, & Lanivich, 2011).

In order to explain the links between personality profiles and job profiles, Viswesvaran (2003) proposes using the *Attraction-Selection-Attrition* model ("ASA model," Schneider, 1987). The ASA model proposes that the perception of a good fit between an individual and an occupation will motivate the individual to become interested and invested in that occupation. Thus, certain individuals might find more interest (*Attraction*) in certain professional activities than others (e.g., an extraverted individual might be more attracted to a sales position, involving regular contact with customers, than an introvert). Subsequently, individuals who possess personality traits seemed relevant for the job (*Selection*) might be more likely to be hired (e.g., the assertiveness of an extravert could facilitate their appointment as a salesperson). Finally, individuals with certain personality characteristics will be more satisfied by certain types of activities (*Attrition*), which will lead them to stay in the long-term (e.g., sales activity mobilizing contact and persuasion will generate more satisfaction among extraverts, because it corresponds to their expectations, which will motivate them to stay with the company).

2.2. Personality and occupational choice

The FFM (or OCEAN) model is the most widely used model to describe personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992). This model proposes to define personality using five factors—*Openness to experience*, *Conscientiousness*, *Extraversion*, *Agreeableness*, and *Neuroticism*—representing the main drivers of individuals' behaviors and thoughts (Holman & Hughes, 2021). *Openness to experience* refers to being curious and seeking new experiences. People who are open to experience tend to be original and creative. *Conscientiousness* refers to being organized and responsible. Conscientious people tend to have good time management skills and are detail-oriented.

Conscientiousness has a significant and positive relationship with job performance across domains (Barrick & Mount, 1991). *Extraversion* refers to being outwardly oriented, active, and sociable. Extraverted people tend to be assertive and seek stimulation. *Agreeableness* refers to being altruistic and valuing others' well-being. Agreeable individuals tend to be sympathetic and compliant. Finally, *Neuroticism* refers to emotional instability and leads to a greater propensity to experience negative emotions. Numerous studies demonstrate the predictive power of the five-factor model to predict consequential outcomes in organizations, such as job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991), job satisfaction (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002), or leadership (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002).

Personality also predicts individuals' occupational choice. Three streams of research have attempted to clarify the relationship between personality and occupational choice. First, studies have attempted to compare the personality traits of people working in different occupational groups. For instance, studies found that politicians tend to be more extraverted and less neurotic than the rest of the population (Schumacher & Zettler, 2019), nurses tend to be more agreeable (Baldacchino & Galea, 2012), and professional actors tend to score higher on *Extraversion*, *Openness to experience*, and *Agreeableness* (Nettle, 2006). However, this stream of research has suffered from a lack of theoretical integration between occupations and models of vocational interests and environments (Holland, 1997). Moreover, this methodology cannot ascertain that personality differences are the cause of occupational differences. For instance, it is just as likely that nurses become more agreeable because their job requires a kind demeanor, than people choosing a nursing occupation because they are agreeable themselves.

A second stream of research has explored the relationship between personality traits and vocational interests. Two meta-analyses have demonstrated significant relationships between the two domains (Barrick, Mount, & Gupta, 2003; Larson et al., 2002; see also Mount, Barrick, Scullen, & Rounds, 2005). These meta-analyses have identified relationships between *Extraversion* and both *Enterprising* and *Social* interests and between *Openness to experience* and both *Artistic* and *Investigative* interests. The relationships between *Agreeableness* and *Social* interests and between *Conscientiousness* and *Conventional* interests, however, were of lesser magnitude. More importantly, these studies do not provide a definitive answer to the question of whether personality predicts occupational choice, even if vocational interests constitute a good predictor of occupational choice (Hanna & Rounds, 2020).

Finally, a third stream of research has examined whether personality predicts future occupational choice (De Fruyt & Mervielde, 1999; Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999; Woods & Hampson, 2010). For instance, Woods and Hampson (2010) demonstrated that the Big Five, measured during childhood, predicted occupational choice 40 years later. *Openness to experience* was related to the *Artistic* rating of individuals' chosen occupation (Judge et al., 1999; Woods & Hampson, 2010), but there were also many inconsistent findings regarding *Agreeableness* and *Extraversion* (Woods & Hampson, 2010).

Our understanding of why people choose to stay in or leave the hospitality industry is hampered by three factors. First, very few studies (just three, to the authors' knowledge) have examined the relationship between personality and occupational choice (excluding those that have examined vocational interests rather than occupational choice). Second, results have been mixed, and have not mirrored those that have been observed more consistently in the second stream of research described above. Third, studies within the third stream of research have looked at samples that were very diverse, which precludes any generalizations being made to more restricted samples such as hospitality graduates (who have all studied in the same environment and are suspected to have very similar vocational interests). To our knowledge, only one study has examined whether personality reliably predicts occupational specialty (Woods, Patterson, Wille, & Koczwara, 2016). Woods et al. (2016) found that doctors who were agreeable would be more likely to specialize in a career where they were in direct contact with patients and less likely to specialize in domains such as histopathology or microbiology that score lower in the *Social* interest domain. The trait of *Neuroticism* was negatively related to the specialty's rating on the *Realistic* dimension. Doctors who were neurotic were more likely to pursue a specialization such as psychiatry, in which they do not need to perform invasive treatments that could put patients at risk. Woods et al.'s (2016) study is insightful in two ways. First, it shows that personality still matters to predict occupational choice in very restricted samples such as physicians. Second, it demonstrates that the nature of the relationship between personality and specialty choice might be different from those observed between personality and occupational choice. Hence, the purpose of this study is to examine how personality predicts occupational choice among hospitality management graduates. This question is highly relevant for this industry, knowing that many employees who work there later decide to move to other industries (e.g., O'Leary & Deegan, 2005), and has become more important than ever due to the labor shortage crisis affecting the field.

2.3. Hypothesis development

Extraverts prefer situations in which they can use their social skills (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Characterized by a strong need for activity and high levels of assertiveness, they are looking for situations in which they can use their persuasive skills to achieve their professional goals.

Hospitality graduates have chosen to invest in a sector that strongly values customer orientation and social skills (Weber, Crawford, Lee, & Dennison, 2013). This sector seems particularly suitable for extraverted, sociable, and people-oriented individuals (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Past studies conducted in the hospitality industry have shown that extraverted students are more likely to report having an interest in pursuing a career in hospitality (Anthony et al., 2021), but also that a low level of extraversion was one of the factors behind people dropping out of the industry (Cheng & Tung, 2021). In addition, past research has shown that *Extraversion* correlates positively with *Enterprising* and *Social* interests (Barrick et al., 2003; Larson et al., 2002). Therefore, we hypothesize:

H1. *Extraversion* is positively related to occupations' ratings on the *Enterprising* and *Social* dimensions of the RIASEC model.

Openness to experience is related both to *Artistic* and *Investigative* interests (Larson et al., 2002). Individuals scoring high in *Openness to experience* are interested in activities that require analyzing information, finding solutions to problems, and expressing new ideas.

Table 1
RIASEC Scores for the 72 job categories in the study.

O*NET description	n	Code	R	I	A	S	E	C
Sales managers	80	EC	33	17	17	45	**100**	61
Financial quantitative analysts	49	IC	22	**95**	45	6	33	78
Chief executives/founders	44	EC	6	17	28	45	**100**	72
Marketing managers	43	EC	0	22	45	28	**100**	72
Food service managers	29	ECR	56	11	11	56	**100**	72
Management analysts	23	IEC	6	**89**	11	22	83	56
General and operations managers	22	ECS	6	6	0	39	**100**	45
Human resources specialists	20	ECS	0	28	28	50	**83**	61
Lodging managers	17	ECS	33	11	6	50	**100**	72
Search marketing strategists	16	EIC	6	56	28	11	**72**	56
Meeting, convention, and event planners	15	ECS	11	6	22	56	**100**	67
Project management specialists	14							
Market research analysts	11	IEC	6	**95**	11	6	67	50
Executive secretaries and executive administrative assistants	10	CE	28	28	6	39	61	**100**
Property, real estate, and community association managers	8	EC	33	0	6	45	**100**	78
Public relations specialists	8	EAS	0	17	67	61	**100**	33
Business intelligence analysts	7	IEC	11	**78**	22	11	72	50
Sustainability specialists	7	EIA	11	56	45	22	**78**	33
Human resources managers	5	ESC	6	22	22	78	**100**	67
Personal financial advisors	5	ECS	0	33	6	45	**95**	78
Writers and authors	5	EAC	11	33	89	22	**95**	33
Accountants and auditors	4	CEI	8	39	0	14	64	**100**
First-line supervisors of non-retail sales workers	4	ECS	22	17	11	56	**100**	72
Web developer	4	CIR	56	67	50	0	39	**72**
Software quality assurance analysts and testers	4	ICR	56	**89**	17	0	11	83
Administrative service managers	3	EC	17	22	0	28	**100**	72
Education administrators, postsecondary	3	ECS	0	33	33	61	**100**	67
Investment fund managers	3	EC	0	11	0	28	**100**	61
Bank tellers	2	CE	28	6	0	17	61	**95**
Credit analysts	2	CE	28	33	0	33	72	**100**
First-line supervisors of office and admin. Support workers	2	ECS	11	6	11	56	**95**	78
Graphic designers	2	ARE	56	11	**100**	17	56	22
Interior designers	2	AE	33	11	**95**	33	72	6
Spa managers	2	ECS	39	0	17	56	**100**	67
IT project managers	2	EC	11	33	17	17	**95**	39
Lawyers	2	EI	6	61	50	39	**100**	45
Mental health counsellors	2	SIA	6	61	50	**100**	22	22
Purchasing managers	2	EC	28	17	6	28	**100**	72
Real estate brokers	2	EC	39	0	6	39	**100**	78
Real estate sales agents	2	EC	39	6	11	45	**100**	72
Teaching assistants	2	SC	6	17	39	**89**	33	50
Training and development specialists	2	SAC	6	22	61	**95**	50	61
Transportation, storage, and distribution managers	2	EC	33	11	6	15	**100**	70
Treasurers and controllers	2	CE	11	28	0	28	83	**100**
Appraisers and assessors of real estate	1	ECR	39	31	0	14	**78**	78
Housekeeping managers	1	ECR	67	6	6	28	**100**	72
Maintenance managers	1	ECR	61	22	0	28	**100**	78
Surveyors	1	RCI	**95**	67	39	6	17	67
Securities, commodities, and financial services sales agents	1	ECS	7	14	8	33	**99**	65
Audio and video technicians	1	RIC	**100**	67	39	0	11	61
Baristas	1	ECR	61	0	39	45	**61**	61
Chefs	1	ERA	78	6	61	39	**100**	28
Commercial and industrial designers	1	AER	50	17	**95**	17	61	11
Concierges	1	SE	28	0	28	**78**	72	39
Conservation scientists	1	RIE	**72**	72	17	17	72	28
Customer service representatives	1	ESC	11	6	0	56	**89**	56
Fitness and wellness coordinators	1	ES	45	28	22	61	**95**	39
Flight attendants	1	ESC	39	6	22	72	**83**	61
Farmers, ranchers, and other agricultural managers	1	ERC	87	32	15	17	**100**	63
Human resource assistants	1	CES	6	11	0	39	61	**100**
Logistic analysts	1	CEI	28	39	6	6	56	**83**
Paralegals and legal assistants	1	CIE	0	67	11	17	56	**78**
Procurement clerks	1	CE	17	11	0	0	56	**100**
Producers and directors	1	EAS	11	6	83	39	**95**	39
Production, planning, and expediting clerks	1	CE	28	11	0	11	72	**95**
Purchasing agents	1	CE	45	28	0	17	89	**95**
Quality control specialists	1	CIR	61	72	6	0	28	**89**
Supply chain managers	1	EC	28	17	11	22	**100**	61

(*continued on next page*)

Table 1 (*continued*)

O*NET description	n	Code	R	I	A	S	E	C
Talent directors	1	EA	11	6	78	39	**100**	45
Training and development managers	1	ES	6	17	45	83	**100**	50
Video game designers	1	AE	17	33	**83**	11	61	39
Web administrators	1	CEI	50	56	17	0	61	**89**
M			28	30	26	34	**78**	63
Sd			25	26	27	24	25	22

Note. E = enterprising; I = investigative; S = social; C = conventional; R = realistic; A = artistic. n = 72 jobs; 523 participants. No data was available on the occupation of project management specialist.

Very often, they major in academic areas such as the humanities, the arts, psychology, and political sciences, which require them to learn theories and develop their own analyses (Vedel, 2016). *Openness to experience* leads individuals to look for domains in which art, in all its forms, plays a leading role (Larson et al., 2002). We observe that individuals who are open to experience preferentially choose artistic fields of study (Vedel, 2016) and also select occupational choices linked to the imaginative and creative dimension (Judge et al., 1999; Woods & Hampson, 2010). Therefore, we hypothesize:

H2. *Openness to experience* is positively related to occupations' ratings on the *Investigative* and *Artistic* dimensions of the RIASEC model.

Agreeable individuals place particular importance on the well-being of others and look for environments and situations that allow them to demonstrate their altruism and empathy (Barrick & Mount, 2003). As such, they typically gravitate towards work environments with a strong social dimension (Larson et al., 2002) that matches their interests (Baldacchino & Galea, 2012). Careers in hospitality embody a strong need for human-centricity (Weber et al., 2013). Thus, it is expected that the most agreeable individuals will look for positions that allow them to grow through a solid social dimension (Deary, Watson, & Hogston, 2003). Therefore, we hypothesize:

H3. *Agreeableness* is positively related to occupations' ratings on the *Social* dimension of the RIASEC model.

Conscientious individuals naturally thrive in environments that require them to conform to established frameworks and work rules. Thus, conscientious individuals strongly value conventional interests (Larson et al., 2002). Therefore, it is expected that conscientiousness among hospitality graduates is positively related to the conventional dimension of their occupational choice. Therefore, we hypothesize:

H4. *Conscientiousness* is positively related to occupations' ratings on the *Conventional* dimension of the RIASEC model.

No hypothesis was formulated in regard to *Neuroticism* because this trait is not related to any of the six vocational interests (e.g., Larson et al., 2002).

3. Method

3.1. Procedure and participants

In 2013 and 2014, bachelor students in a hospitality management school completed a personality questionnaire as a course requirement. They were informed that their results would remain anonymous, and they were asked if these results could be used for research. They were also informed that they had the right to refuse without any consequence for their grades. A total of 556 students explicitly consented that their results could be used for future research. In April 2022, we analyzed the LinkedIn profiles of these graduates and identified their most recent occupation. We discarded 33 respondents because: 10 lacked a LinkedIn profile, 20 had not updated their profile in the last 12 months, and three profiles lacked enough details to code the occupational choice according to O*NET.

3.2. Measures

Big Five. The International Personality Item Pool 300-item version of the NEO-PI facet scales (IPIP NEO-PI, International Personality Item Pool, n.d.) was used to measure the Big Five traits. Participants used a five-point scale ranging from 1 (very inaccurate) to 5 (very accurate) to respond to the items. Alpha coefficients for the five traits range from 0.87 to 0.94, which is in line with values reported in other studies (Goldberg, 1999; Goldberg et al., 2006).

Occupational choice. Each participant's latest job title was retrieved from LinkedIn and entered as a search term into the O*NET database (O*O*NET Resource Center, 2022), which is a public database containing details for all occupational categories. This was done independently by two coders. Each coder identified the most relevant occupational category found on the O*NET database. Initially, there was exact agreement on 57.2% of the occupational choices. For each inconsistency, the LinkedIn profile was re-examined to determine the most appropriate occupational category on O*NET until perfect agreement was reached. The occupational choice was assigned six RIASEC scores according to the information available on the O*NET database (O*O*NET Resource

Center, 2022). RIASEC occupation scores represent subject experts' ratings regarding the extent to which an occupation is represented by the interest (0 = highly uncharacteristic of this job; 100 = highly characteristic of this job). The validity of these ratings has been supported in past studies (e.g., Eggerth, Bowles, Tunick, & Andrew, 2005) and this method has been used in prior research on the relationship between personality and occupational choice (Woods et al., 2016; Woods & Hampson, 2010). Table 1 provides a list of all the occupations analyzed. As shown in this table, RIASEC scores for occupational choices are highest on the *Enterprising* dimension. The standard deviations are similar across interest dimensions. Table 2 indicates that most participants hold a job in which the *Enterprising* domain is considered as the most characteristic.

4. Results

We conducted correlations and regression analyses with SPSS 27 to determine the association between participants' personality traits and the RIASEC scores of their occupational choice. As shown in Table 3, *Openness to experience* and its facet, aesthetics, were negatively correlated with the *Realistic* dimension of the occupation. *Extraversion* (and the facets of warmth, gregariousness, and excitement-seeking) was negatively related with the *Investigative* dimension. None of the five personality traits were significantly related to the *Artistic* or *Social* dimensions. *Extraversion* (and the facets of gregariousness, excitement-seeking, and positive emotions) was positively related with the *Enterprising* dimension. Finally, *Openness to experience* and *Aesthetics* were negatively related to the *Conventional* dimension, and *Conscientiousness* (and achievement-striving and deliberation) was positively related to the same dimension.

To test our hypotheses, we conducted multivariate regression analyses. First, we entered gender and the five personality traits into a regression model to predict each of the six RIASEC dimensions separately. All participants were considered in this analysis (Model 1 in Table 4). Second, to test the robustness of the findings (Model 2 in Table 4), the same analyses were conducted without participants who had occupations that were idiosyncratic (i.e., held by only one participant in the sample—for instance, chef, barista, or talent director; see Table 1).

We describe below only the results that are significant across the two models. The *Realistic* dimension was predicted by gender and *Openness*. Women and individuals scoring high on *Openness* were less likely to have an occupation characterized as being *Realistic*. The *Investigative* dimension was predicted by *Extraversion*. The most extraverted individuals were less likely to occupy a job scoring high on the *Investigative* dimension. Women were more likely to have an occupation with a higher rating on the *Artistic* dimension. In the two models, *Extraversion* did positively predict the rating on the *Social* and *Enterprising* dimensions. Finally, *Conscientiousness* was positively related to the *Conventional* dimension.

5. Discussion

This study aimed to test the following hypotheses: *Extraversion* relates positively to the *Enterprising* and *Social* ratings of individuals' occupation (*H1*); *Openness to experience* relates positively to the *Artistic* and *Investigative* ratings of individuals' occupation (*H2*); *Agreeableness* relates positively to the *Social* rating of their occupation (*H3*); and *Conscientiousness* relates positively to the *Conventional* rating of their occupation (*H4*). *H1* was supported by our results. We observed that extraverted individuals were more likely to gravitate towards jobs that were high on the *Enterprising* and *Social* dimensions. On the other hand, introverted individuals were more likely to gravitate towards jobs that were lower on these dimensions. These individuals were also more likely to gravitate towards jobs that were higher on the *Investigative* dimension. These results point to the conclusion that extraverted hospitality management graduates are more likely to occupy positions such as sales manager, food service manager, or lodging manager, whereas introverted individuals could prefer positions such as financial quantitative analyst or market research analyst.

Table 2
Representation of letter codes in the study.

First letter in job letter-code	% Jobs (n)	% Participants (n)
E	57.7% (41)	70.2% (367)
C	19.7% (14)	6.5% (33)
I	7% (5)	18.5% (94)
S	5.6% (4)	1.2% (6)
A	5.6% (4)	1.8% (6)
R	4.2% (3)	0.6% (3)
Letter-code		
EC	16.9% (12)	37.7% (192)
ECS	14.1% (10)	17.9% (91)
ECR	7% (5)	6.5% (33)
EI	4.2% (3)	4.9% (25)
ER	2.8% (2)	0.4% (2)
EA	5.6% (4)	2.9% (15)
ES	7% (5)	1.8% (9)

Note. E = enterprising; I = investigative; S = social; C = conventional; R = realistic; A = artistic. N = 71 jobs; 509 participants.

Table 3
Intercorrelations between personality and RIASEC scores.

Personality	M(SD)	α	R	I	A	S	E	C
Openness to experience	3.69 (.35)	.87	−.10*	.00	.06	−.02	.04	−.10*
O1: Fantasy	3.70 (.62)	.79	−.01	.03	.03	−.04	.00	−.06
O2: Aesthetics	4.04 (.58)	.77	−.10*	.06	.12**	−.06	−.02	−.12**
O3: Feelings	3.79 (.52)	.71	−.04	−.02	.05	.02	.04	−.07
O4: Actions	3.80 (.58)	.81	−.06	−.12**	−.04	−.05	.13**	−.03
O5: Ideas	3.63 (.57)	.77	−.06	.07	.04	−.08	−.04	−.03
O6: Values	3.18 (.49)	.54	−.09	−.02	.02	.03	.05	−.06
Conscientiousness	3.64 (.45)	.94	.01	.02	.01	−.02	−.06	.10*
C1: Competence	3.85 (.44)	.76	−.04	.06	.01	−.03	−.03	.06
C2: Order	3.55 (.74)	.84	.10*	−.01	−.02	−.03	−.01	.07
C3: Dutifulness	4.03 (.50)	.75	−.01	.01	.03	.01	−.04	.02
C4: Achievement-striving	3.97 (.51)	.78	.01	−.02	−.01	−.01	−.03	.11*
C5: Self-discipline	3.26 (.71)	.87	.00	−.02	−.03	.01	−.03	.08
C6: Deliberation	3.19 (.65)	.81	−.04	.09*	.06	−.06	−.15**	.09*
Extraversion	3.65 (.38)	.91	.01	−.13**	−.05	.08	.14**	.01
E1: Warmth	3.92 (.56)	.83	.04	−.09*	−.02	.07	.09	.01
E2: Gregariousness	3.57 (.63)	.80	.05	−.16**	−.09*	.10*	.15**	−.02
E3: Assertiveness	3.65 (.55)	.80	−.06	−.03	.00	−.01	.04	.03
E4: Activity level	3.18 (.47)	.67	−.03	−.03	−.03	.02	.02	.09*
E5: Excitement-seeking	3.56 (.61)	.76	.02	−.12**	−.05	.06	.14**	−.03
E6: Positive emotions	4.02 (.51)	.76	.00	−.08	.01	.05	.11*	−.03
Agreeableness	3.54 (.37)	.89	.01	−.03	.06	.05	−.01	−.06
A1: Trust	3.46 (.60)	.81	.06	−.06	−.01	.06	.05	−.04
A2: Straightforwardness	3.63 (.57)	.77	−.04	.01	.07	−.01	−.05	−.04
A3: Altruism	4.16 (.46)	.77	.04	−.05	.04	.05	.02	−.01
A4: Compliance	3.49 (.50)	.58	.01	−.03	.05	.04	.01	−.04
A5: Modesty	3.06 (.59)	.77	.00	.04	.02	.00	−.06	−.02
A6: Tender-mindedness	3.43 (.54)	.69	−.03	.02	.07	.06	.02	−.09*
Neuroticism	2.76 (.49)	.93	.07	−.01	.05	−.01	−.02	−.02
N1: Anxiety	2.98 (.67)	.81	.06	.02	.06	−01	−.06	.02
N2: Anger	2.65 (.76)	.87	.03	−.06	.02	.02	.02	.03
N3: Depression	2.34 (.66)	.82	.07	.05	.03	−.04	−.05	−.06
N4: Self-consciousness	2.74 (.61)	.77	.08	.05	.05	−.04	−.08	.00
N5: Immoderation	3.16 (.57)	.68	.05	−.08	.04	.01	.08	−.09
N6: Vulnerability	2.67 (.62)	.79	.03	−.03	.02	.02	−.01	.02

Note. N = 509, *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$. E = enterprising; I = investigative; S = social; C = conventional; R = realistic; A = artistic.

No support was found for *H2* or *H3*. There were no relationships between *Openness to experience* and the occupation's rating on the *Investigative* and *Artistic* dimensions, nor between *Agreeableness* and the *Social* dimension. These results demonstrate that the relationships between personality traits and occupational choice in specific fields do not precisely mirror those observed between personality and vocational interests. For instance, there is ample evidence that agreeable people tend to express interest in social positions, or that openness is related to investigative and artistic interests (Larson et al., 2002), but the present study demonstrates that the same relationships do not hold for predicting individuals' occupational choice. Finally, *H4* was supported in this study. *Conscientiousness* was related to occupations higher in the *Conventional* dimension. Overall, these results give credence to P–V fit theory (Kristof, 1996). To a certain extent, individuals are looking for occupations that correspond to their personality.

It is noteworthy that personality best predicted the RIASEC dimensions that were the most prevalent in the sample. For instance, hypotheses were mainly supported for the *Enterprising* and *Conventional* dimensions. However, we found no support for the hypotheses related to the *Investigative* or *Artistic* dimensions. In contrast, *Extraversion* was found to be inversely related to the *Investigative* dimension. These results indicate that individuals whose personality profile differs from the industry in which most of their peers are working tend to find occupations that are more compatible with their personality. As most jobs were enterprising (and, to a lesser extent, conventional), the most introverted individuals chose occupations where the *Enterprising* component was less important. The most introverted individuals chose occupations such as management analyst, business analyst, or financial quantitative analyst, which are primarily investigative but less enterprising than other occupations analyzed in the current study. Jobs that were conventional (accountant & auditor or executive assistant) are sought by individuals who are conscientious. The present study challenges results and propositions advanced by other scholars (Woods et al., 2016). Woods et al. (2016) argued that individuals who work in the same environment are more likely to be alike on the personality trait that relates to the most important RIASEC dimension corresponding to their occupation (e.g., *Openness to experience* as it relates to the *Investigative* dimension of their occupation). Therefore, they expected no relationship between *Openness to experience* and the medical specialty's rating on the *Investigative* dimension. If we apply this reasoning

Table 4
Regression analysis predicting RIASEC dimensions.

	R	I	A	S	E	C
Model 1						
Gender	−.12*	.06	.12*	−.05	−.09	−.06
Openness	−.12*	.07	.08	−.08	−.01	−.11*
Conscientiousness	.04	.03	.00	−.05	−.08	.14**
Extraversion	.10	−.19***	−.07	.12*	.16**	.05
Agreeableness	.06	−.07	.01	.10	.04	−.07
Neuroticism	.14**	−.08	.01	.03	.03	.04
R^2	.02**	.02*	.01*	.01	.02*	.02*
Model 2						
Gender	−.13*	.07	.12*	−.08	−.10*	−.05
Openness	−.15**	.08	.07	−.09	−.02	−.08
Conscientiousness	−.01	.02	−.01	−.03	−.05	.15**
Extraversion	.09	−.21***	−.10	.16**	.17**	.07
Agreeableness	.03	−.06	.01	.10	.04	−.06
Neuroticism	.06	−.10	−.02	.08	.07	.05
R^2	.04**	.04*	.03	.03*	.03*	.03*

Note. Model 1 (N = 509); Model 2 (N = 481); *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$. R = realistic; I = investigative; A = artistic; S = social; E = enterprising; C = conventional.

to our study, *Extraversion* should have low predictive power in occupational choice among hospitality graduates, because the occupations they hold are rated as high in the *Enterprising* dimension. In fact, *Extraversion* is the trait that best predicted occupational choice among hospitality graduates in the present study. These results may have important theoretical implications, as they suggest that people not only choose jobs that match up with their personality, but adjust over time to escape from occupational trajectories that represent a mismatch for them. For instance, no relationship was observed between *Openness to experience* and the occupation's ratings on the *Artistic* and *Investigative* dimensions of the RIASEC model. *Extraversion*, on the other hand, was negatively related to these dimensions. The most introverted individuals were those working in an occupation rated as lower on the *Enterprising* dimension and higher on the others. These results imply that personality could explain occupational choice better over long timespans than over shorter ones. Over time, individuals switch from one job to another, gravitating towards new jobs that offer a better fit with their personality.

5.1. Implications for practice and research

Personality does predict occupational choice. As such, personality questionnaires might prove valuable tools to determine job candidates' person-environment fit. As many of the hospitality management roles observed in this study tend to be high on the *Enterprising*, *Conventional*, and *Realistic* dimensions, the relationships observed in our study indicate that individuals who are extraverted, conscientious, and less open are more likely to hold positions compatible with the demands of the hospitality industry. As a consequence, recruiters are advised to select candidates possessing this personality profile for roles in hospitality. This is particularly relevant because recruiters in the hospitality industry seem less inclined to use personality tests than those in other industries (e.g., Paraskevas, 2000).

One noticeable finding was that women were less likely to gravitate towards occupations scoring high in the *Realistic* dimension, which underlines a preference to work with things more than with people. This result has been consistently observed in past research (Su, Rounds, & Armstrong, 2009). In the present context, it demonstrates that women are less likely to occupy a position in hospitality management operations, such as food-and-beverage roles (Woods & Viehland, 2000). This is not surprising, since operations roles in the hospitality industry demand long working hours in a 24/7 business, hindering people (women in particular) from balancing the demands of work and family (see, for example, Brownell, 1998). The hospitality sector is notorious for its lack of work flexibility—that is, employees' freedom to organize themselves through part-time work, remote work, flexible scheduling, and compressed workweeks (Davidson, McPhail, & Barry, 2011; Shockley & Allen, 2007).

To our knowledge, this study is the first of its kind to have measured occupational choice with LinkedIn. In previous research, data on occupational choice was obtained through self-reports. In this study, information about the present job was obtained by analyzing LinkedIn profiles. This method is more time-consuming than relying on self-reported information, but is less likely to suffer from the phenomenon of research mortality. As an example, De Fruyt and Mervielde (1999) had collected personality data from 934 college students, and when they contacted these participants again one year after graduation, only 620 of them responded. In other words, one-third of participants did not continue the study after just one year. In comparison, only 33 profiles (out of 556) in the present study were discarded, either because the LinkedIn profiles could not be retrieved or because they had not been updated in the last 12 months. However, it should be mentioned that rates of LinkedIn adoption likely differ across industries. Recent research in the hospitality

industry has already used LinkedIn profiles successfully to examine the early career path of hospitality alumni (Smith, Clement, & Pitts, 2018) or their geographical mobility (Tolkach & Tung, 2019). The current study adds to this stream of research by showing that personality can predict occupations held by hospitality graduates.

Considering the massive labor shortage in the hospitality industry, it is interesting to identify that managerial jobs in hotels are characterized by being enterprising, conventional, and realistic. According to our results, this kind of position might attract individuals who are extraverted, conscientious, and less open. This indicates that people who are sociable, but also meticulous and traditionalist, are more likely to occupy a position in hospitality operations. Having conscientious and extraverted employees or managers is advantageous for hotels, as these two traits are predictors of job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991). However, individuals who score low in *Openness to experience* tend to struggle more in regard to innovative work behaviors (Hammond, Neff, Farr, Schwall, & Zhao, 2011) or effective leadership (Judge et al., 2002). Considering the importance of innovation in the current era for hotels and restaurants to survive and thrive (Breier et al., 2021), the present findings suggest that the hospitality industry is neither attracting nor retaining the individuals who are the most capable of disrupting the status quo. Two reasons can explain this result. First, individuals who score high on openness may be more interested in working in jobs where they must analyze information or innovate than in managing people and ensuring the faultless delivery of service operations. Second, the hospitality industry is often described as having a top-down and autocratic management style (Deery & Jago, 2001; Kusluvan, Kusluvan, Ilhan, & Buyruk, 2010), which might not fit with open-minded individuals' values of self-direction (Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz, & Knafo, 2002).

There are a few limitations to note in our study. First, we only considered the current occupation in our analysis. Hence, the results might change slightly over time, as individuals tend to change positions. Future studies might be conducted to examine whether personality can predict the occupation held over longer timeframes (10 or 20 years after graduation, for instance). Second, LinkedIn profiles were analyzed in April 2022, just after the pandemic, and we do not know whether some of our conclusions might have been influenced by the pandemic. For instance, we observed that introverted individuals were less likely to gravitate towards occupations that were higher in the *Enterprising* dimension, but it is also possible that introverted individuals might have been the first to be laid off during the pandemic because they tend to be less visible. Our data do not offer enough information on whether holding a position was the result of a voluntary decision or determined by macro changes occurring during the pandemic. Future studies should also consider the collection of self-reported information to get a fuller picture of the phenomena studied. Despite this limitation, our interpretation of our results—namely, that individuals change job to find occupations that better match their personality and interests—is in line with recent work related to P-E fit (Hanna, Briley, Einarsdóttir, Hoff, & Rounds, 2021). Indeed, the type of job does not predict changes in individuals' vocational interests, but individuals' vocational interests do predict changes of jobs. Third, we used the RIASEC model to classify jobs (Holland, 1997). This model has been recently criticized on the basis that it was developed a long time ago and might not accurately represent jobs created in more recent decades (Su, Tay, Liao, Zhang, & Rounds, 2019). Future studies could use, for instance, the SETPOINT model (Su et al., 2019) to examine how personality can predict occupational choice according to its eight dimensions (health *Science*, creative *Expression*, *Technology*, *People*, *Organization*, *Influence*, *Nature*, and *Things*). Finally, only personality traits were measured in the present study, which limits our understanding of the determinants of occupational choice in the hospitality industry. In addition to personality, future studies might attempt to uncover how vocational interests predict occupational choice above and beyond personality traits (see Hanna & Rounds, 2020).

6. Conclusion

This study fills an important gap in the literature by demonstrating that personality plays a key role in determining hospitality graduates' occupational choice. First, extraversion was positively related to gravitation towards jobs that are enterprising and social, and negatively to gravitation to jobs that are investigative. Second, conscientiousness was positively related to gravitation to jobs that are conventional. Finally, openness was negatively related to gravitation to jobs that are realistic. These results have important implications both for hospitality organizations that aim to reduce staff turnover and for individuals who wish to enhance their own person-environment fit.

Author statement

Sébastien Fernandez: Conceptualization; data analysis; writing; review and editing.
Lohyd Terrier: Conceptualization; writing; review and editing.
Sowon Kim: Conceptualization; writing; review and editing.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Lorraine Van Nijen, Flavien Brand, and Marie Gillet for their help with data collection. We would also like to thank Tom Albrighton for copy-editing the paper.

References

Anthony, G., Mensah, I., & Amissah, E. F. (2021). Factors influencing undergraduate hospitality students' intentions to choose careers in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2021.1963754

Baldacchino, D. R., & Galea, P. (2012). Student nurses' personality traits and the nursing profession: Part 2. *British Journal of Nursing, 21*(9), 530–535. https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2012.21.9.530
Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x
Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Gupta, R. (2003). Meta-analysis of the relationship between the five-factor model of personality and Holland's occupational types. *Personnel Psychology, 56*, 45–74.
Breier, M., Kallmuenzer, A., Clauss, T., Gast, J., Kraus, S., & Tiberius, V. (2021). The role of business model innovation in the hospitality industry during the COVID-19 crisis. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 92*, Article 102723. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102723
Brownell, J. (1998). Striking a balance: The future of work and family issues in the hospitality industry. *Marriage & Family Review, 28*(1–2), 109–123. https://doi.org/10.1300/J002v28n01_06
Brown, E. A., Thomas, N. J., & Bosselman, R. H. (2015). Are they leaving or staying: A qualitative analysis of turnover issues for generation Y hospitality employees with a hospitality education. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 46*, 130–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.01.011
Cheng, T. Y., & Tung, V. W. S. (2021). Dropping out of the hospitality industry after frontline work experience: An investigation into the personal changes of hospitality employees. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 22*(2), 213–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2019.1598911
Chuang, N. K., & Dellmann-Jenkins, M. (2010). Career decision making and intention: A study of hospitality undergraduate students. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 34*(4), 512–530. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348010370867
Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and Individual Differences, 13*(6), 653–665. https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(92)90236-I
Davidson, M. C., McPhail, R., & Barry, S. (2011). Hospitality HRM: Past, present and the future. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 23*(4), 498–516. https://doi.org/10.1108/09596111111130001
De Fruyt, F., & Mervielde, I. (1999). RIASEC types and Big Five traits as predictors of employment status and nature of employment. *Personnel Psychology, 52*(3), 701–727. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1999.tb00177.x
Deary, I. J., Watson, R., & Hogston, R. (2003). A longitudinal cohort study of burnout and attrition in nursing students. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 43*(1), 71–81. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02674.x
Deery, M., & Jago, L. K. (2001). Hotel management style: A study of employee perceptions and preferences. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 20*(4), 325–338. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4319(01)00020-2
Eggerth, D. E., Bowles, S. M., Tunick, R. H., & Andrew, M. E. (2005). Convergent validity of O* NET Holland code classifications. *Journal of Career Assessment, 13*(2), 150–168. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072704273124
Fallon, M. J., & Rotherford, D. E. (2010). *Hotel management and operations* (5th ed.). New Jersey: John Willey & Sons Inc.
Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality Psychology in europe, 7* pp. 7–28). Tilburg, the Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., et al. (2006). The international personality item pool and the future of public domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*(1), 84–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2005.08.007
Hammond, M. M., Neff, N. L., Farr, J. L., Schwall, A. R., & Zhao, X. (2011). Predictors of individual-level innovation at work: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 5*(1), 90–105. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018556
Hanna, A., Briley, D., Einarsdóttir, S., Hoff, K., & Rounds, J. (2021). Fit gets better: A longitudinal study of changes in interest fit in educational and work environments. *European Journal of Personality, 35*(4), 557–580. https://doi.org/10.1177/08902070211014022
Hanna, A., & Rounds, J. (2020). How accurate are interest inventories? A quantitative review of career choice hit rates. *Psychological Bulletin, 146*(9), 765–796. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000269
Hoff, K. A., Song, Q. C., Wee, C. J., Phan, W. M. J., & Rounds, J. (2020). Interest fit and job satisfaction: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 123*, Article 103503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103503
Holland, J. L. (1997). Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments. *Psychological Assessment Resources*.
Holman, D. J., & Hughes, D. J. (2021). Transactions between Big-5 personality traits and job characteristics across 20 years. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 94*(3), 762–788. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12332
Hurtado-Rúa, S. M., Stead, G. B., & Poklar, A. E. (2019). Five-factor personality traits and RIASEC interest types: A multivariate meta-analysis. *Journal of Career Assessment, 27*(3), 527–543. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072718780447
Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 765–780. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765
Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 530–541. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.530
Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J., & Barrick, M. R. (1999). The Big Five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology, 52*(3), 621–652. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1999.tb00174.x
Kim, S. S., Guo, Y., Wang, K. C., & Agrusa, J. (2007). The study motivations and study preferences of student groups from Asian nations majoring in hospitality and tourism management programs. *Tourism Management, 28*(1), 140–151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.11.003
Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*(1), 1–49. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x
Kusluvan, S., Kusluvan, Z., Ilhan, I., & Buyruk, L. (2010). The human dimension: A review of human resources management issues in the tourism and hospitality industry. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 51*(2), 171–214. https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965510362871
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, M. J., Olds, D. A., & Lee, C. (2010). Why students choose a hospitality and tourism program: A pilot study of US undergraduate students. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education, 22*(3), 20–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2010.10696981
Liu-Lastres, B., Wen, H., & Huang, W. J. (2023). A reflection on the Great Resignation in the hospitality and tourism industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-05-2022-0551
Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., Scullen, S. M., & Rounds, J. (2005). Higher-order dimensions of the big five personality traits and the big six vocational interest types. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(2), 447–478. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00468.x
Nettle, D. (2006). Psychological profiles of professional actors. *Personality and Individual Differences, 40*(2), 375–383. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.07.008
O*NET Resource Center. (2022). The O*NET 26.2 analyst database. available at: www.onetcenter.org/db_analyst.html. (Accessed 5 May 2022).
O'Leary, S., & Deegan, J. (2005). Career progression of Irish tourism and hospitality management graduates. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 17*(5), 421–432. https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110510604841
Paraskevas, A. J. (2000). Management selection practices in Greece: Are hospitality recruiters any different? *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 19*(3), 241–259. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4319(00)00024-4
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
Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*(3), 437–453. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00609.x
Schumacher, G., & Zettler, I. (2019). House of cards or west wing? Self-Reported HEXACO traits of Danish politicians. *Personality and Individual Differences, 141*, 173–181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.12.028
Shockley, K. M., & Allen, T. D. (2007). When flexibility helps: Another look at the availability of flexible work arrangements and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 71*(3), 479–493. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.08.006

Smith, W. W., Clement, J. C., & Pitts, R. E. (2018). Oh the places they'll go. Examining the early career path of hospitality alumni. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 18*(2), 109–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220.2017.1416726

Su, R., Rounds, J., & Armstrong, P. I. (2009). Men and things, women and people: A meta-analysis of sex differences in interests. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*(6), 859–884. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017364

Su, R., Tay, L., Liao, H.-Y., Zhang, Q., & Rounds, J. (2019). Toward a dimensional model of vocational interests. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 104*(5), 690–714. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000373

Teng, C. C. (2008). The effects of personality traits and attitudes on student uptake in hospitality employment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 27*(1), 76–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2007.07.007

Tolkach, D., & Tung, V. W. S. (2019). Tracing hospitality and tourism graduates' career mobility. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 31*(10), 4170–4187. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-10-2018-0857

Tracey, J. B., & Hinkin, T. R. (2008). Contextual factors and cost profiles associated with employee turnover. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 49*(1), 12–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010880407310191

Van Iddekinge, C. H., Roth, P. L., Putka, D. J., & Lanivich, S. E. (2011). Are you interested? A meta-analysis of relations between vocational interests and employee performance and turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(6), 1167–1194. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024343

Vedel, A. (2016). Big five personality group differences across academic majors: A systematic review. *Personality and Individual Differences, 92*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.12.011

Weber, M. R., Crawford, A., Lee, J., & Dennison, D. (2013). An exploratory analysis of soft skill competencies needed for the hospitality industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 12*(4), 313–332. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2013.790245

Woods, S. A., & Hampson, S. E. (2010). Predicting adult occupational environments from gender and childhood personality traits. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(6), 1045–1057. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020600

Woods, S. A., Patterson, F. C., Wille, B., & Koczwara, A. (2016). Personality and occupational specialty: An examination of medical specialties using Holland's RIASEC model. *Career Development International, 21*(3), 262–278. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-10-2015-0130

Woods, R. H., & Viehland, D. (2000). Women in hotel management: Gradual progress, uncertain prospects. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 41*(5), 51–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/001088040004100534

Sébastien Fernandez, PhD, is an Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior at EHL Business School since 2011. He received his BSc and MSc in Psychology from the University of Lausanne and his PhD in Differential Psychology from the University of Geneva. His research focuses on the measurement and assessment of personality and the impact of individual differences in business contexts.

Loyhd Terrier, PhD is an Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior at EHL Business School. He received a MSc in Work and Organizational Psychology and a PhD in Social Psychology from the University of Provence. His research interests include social influence, persuasion, and environmental psychology.

Sowon Kim,PhD, is an Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior and a Founder of Women in Leadership at EHL Hospitality Business School. She holds a PhD in Management from the Uni. of Geneva, Switzerland and pursued her post-doc studies at IESE Business School in Spain. Her research focuses on personality, networking, work-family, and leadership diversity. She has published in diverse outlets such as the Journal of Vocational Behavior, Personality & Individual Differences, and Journal of Environmental Psychology.