

The role of personality differences in achieving organizational productivity

Lawrencia Irene Opare Darko¹, Anita Bans-Akutey^{2*}, John Kennedy Ugoh³, Harriet Ankomah⁴, Emelia Ohene Afriyie⁵

Department of Management and Public Administration, Accra Technical University, Accra, Ghana^{1,3,4&5}

Department of Business Administration, BlueCrest University College, Accra, Ghana²

anitabansofficial@gmail.com



Article History

Received on 17 July 2023

1st Revision on 11 August 2023

2nd Revision on 16 August 2023

3rd Revision on 20 August 2023

Accepted on 22 August 2023

Abstract

Purpose: This study examines the role of personality differences in organizational productivity. Specifically, the study examined the level of acceptance of individual differences, ascertained how individuals relate to each other to attain preset productivity levels and assessed how personality differences translate into organizational productivity.

Research methodology: Using a quantitative research approach and case study design, data were collected from 190 employees through simple random sampling. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics from IBM SPSS Statistics 24 and are presented in the tables.

Results: The results showed a high level of acceptance of individual differences, even though leaders mostly failed to adjust to employee differences. It was also found that, although leaders did not invest in employee relations programs, personality differences positively affected organizational productivity. The findings also reveal that employees are creative in managing resources and materials for production, explaining the significant influence of personality differences on productivity.

Limitations: The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics only. Therefore, no inferences can be made. This study was limited to the employees of the Ghana Meteorological Agency.

Contribution: Organizational leaders need to become more tolerant of individual employee differences, as this goes a long way to improve organizational productivity. Future studies should consider other industries in which the workforce is more diverse.

Novelty: This study highlighted the role of personality differences in achieving organizational productivity with evidence from the Ghana Meteorological Agency.

Keywords: *Personality, traits, productivity, acceptance, employee*

How to Cite: Opare Darko, L. I., Bans-Akutey, A., Ugoh, J. K., Ankomah, H., & Ohene Afriyie, E. (2022). The role of personality differences in achieving organizational productivity, *Annals of Management and Organization Research*, 4(2), 159-173.

1. Introduction

Every organization's main goal is to attain optimum productivity and achieve excellent performance in all operations. Therefore, management must establish an environment where people work productively to attain the organization's goals (Bans-Akutey & Ebem, 2022; Najam-us-Sahar, 2016). This suggests that a person's personality affects the productivity of a company. According to Ali (2019) and Bans-Akutey, Abdullahi, and Afriyie (2021), information about a person's personality is useful, from management's viewpoint, in determining how to communicate with them; and the kind of functions and tasks they are most suited for. Therefore, the importance of personality variations in an organization's efficiency cannot be overstated.

Personality differences provide an explanation for the variation between individuals in several crucial psychological traits, such as intelligence quotient (IQ), personality, interest, and aptitude. According to Najam-us-Sahar (2016), personality plays a role in how satisfied people are with their job. Certain personality traits are linked to particular employment choices, and those who lack these traits are more likely to report low work satisfaction, which eventually impacts work output (Dole & Schroeder, 2001). According to Gridwchai, Kulwanich, Piromkam, and Kwanmuangvanich (2020), the productivity and performance of most organizations, which have proven to be successful, rely on how well people are able to complete tasks assigned to them. As such, differences in connection to job tasks are key to productivity and performance. Erjavec, Popovič, and Trkman (2019) argue that individual decisions matter in improving an organization's performance. According to Nathanson (2020), the most important factor affecting a person's job is the ability to get along with others, which has a significant impact on productivity. Consequently, the best approach to fostering employee development in the workplace is to value individual differences.

The basic objective of every organization is to achieve ultimate performance and higher productivity (Bans-Akutey & Ebem, 2022; Bans-Akutey, Ohene Afriyie, & Tiimub, 2022; Prinhandaka, Rohman, & Wijaya, 2022). However, performance can be achieved when workers or employees accept their differences and work in teams (Gridwchai et al., 2020). It is crucial to comprehend how these differences affect productivity since the theory of personality characteristics (TPC) holds that individuals naturally respond to various circumstances and engage with their surroundings in various ways (Ali, 2019). Additionally, Najam-us-Sahar (2016) noted that well-built determinants of proper personality are sound predictors of a variety of occupational performance levels, which have positive effects on minority categories and can be affiliated with performance as calculated in relation to productivity. Nonetheless, it is not quite apparent how personality variations affect organizational efficiency and how personality differences and productivity connect to one another (Azimi, 2022; Yildiz Durak, 2023). Therefore, this study assessed how personality differences influence the productivity of an organization. Specifically, this study examined the level of acceptance of individual differences, determined how individuals relate to each other to attain pre-set productivity levels and assessed how personality differences translate into organizational productivity.

2. Literature review

The way individuals respond to the challenges of life determines their personality (Janjua, 2017). The physique, intellect, and interests of individuals as well as their attitudes, convictions, and way of life are all traits that makeup who they are as a whole. According to Marx (2012), personality refers to distinct ways of reasoning, feeling, and acting. When people interact with others, it is very easy to see their individual personalities, because they embrace tempers, mannerisms, and opinions. It incorporates individual behavioral patterns that distinguish one individual from another, which is evident in how people relate to their environment and social groups. These characteristics can be innate or acquired. Being dynamic, personality cannot be adequately represented using conventional scientific methods.

A living system that is capable of self-organization, self-maintenance, self-transcendence, and self-renewal is referred to as personality. Personality is a system that is open to input and communication. According to Bano (2008), heredity and environment have a significant impact on personality. The passage of characteristics generationally through reproduction is known as heredity. The environment, on the other hand, encompasses several inner and outer parts of the organism that affect the way it behaves, grows, develops, or performs life processes apart from genes.

2.1. Personality Differences

Personality differences are persistent and distinctive traits that can be altered depending on the circumstances (He, Wang, Zhu, & Harris, 2015). Generally, personality differences refer to traits that influence people's behavior. Identifying and measuring personality remained psychologists' primary areas of interest in the 20th century according to Cornwell, McCarthy, and Biro (2020), identifying and measuring personality remains the primary area of interest for psychologists. They carefully studied

and recorded personality traits that persisted over time and exerted the same influence on people in a variety of contexts (Neave, Costa, Weary, & Von Keyserlingk, 2020).

Between 1930 and 1960, various methods were developed that were useful for assessing personality traits and measuring personality differences. The psychological profession tried to explore new areas of personality assessment as it became more popular. To distinguish between the many personality domains, a statistical factor analysis technique was established. The 16-personality component inventory was developed by Cattell and Gibbons (1968). Eysenck (1987) introduced the two-factor personality model. He maintained that extraversion and neuroticism were the only two aspects of personality (Fernando, Jabbour, & Wah, 2019).

After a short while, he added psychoticism as a new personality attribute. In the 1960s, psychologists developed a new approach that provided everyone with a clear grasp of personality dimensions (Rammstedt, Goldberg, & Borg, 2010). The notion that individual behavioral variations in various circumstances could be a result of individual differences is supported by Blanken et al. (2019). Additionally, Li and Cao (2021) attempted to comprehend the “characteristics” and “upbringing” controversy. Cattell and Gibbons (1968) established the idea of personality testing, which could identify individual differences based on features by emphasizing the importance of attributes and considering them crucial for personality description. This implies that every person possesses second-order characteristics. These characteristics denote individual differences, which are mostly referred to as extroversion-introversion. Anxiety describes feelings of discomfort and tension. These evolved into the Big Five personality traits: extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, and openness.

2.1.1. Extraversion

When employees are characterized by high extraversion, they tend to be forceful, communicative, friendly, and zealous (Seddigh, 2015). Such specific traits enable people to build a cognitive bias and make use of the expertise they have gained to assist in job evaluation. Owing to the fact that they are more socially interactive than introverts, employees who are extraverted may create larger social networks (Van Hoya & Turban, 2015). It was anticipated that people with strong extraversion would build greater social networks with other businesses. Those with these personality traits have more options for available professions than introverts, which leads them to look for different jobs or employers when they believe that they would produce better results. It was discovered that extroverts are more driven to seek more advanced networking activities (Wihler, Meurs, Wiesmann, Troll, & Blickle, 2017). Employees with high extraversion always seek greater work opportunities and ways to stand out from the crowd. They are committed to and devoted to their current firm if there is an opportunity to develop themselves. Otherwise, they would seek another company with better prospects.

2.1.2 Conscientiousness

One of the most consistent personality traits is conscientiousness (Lounsbury, Sundstrom, Gibson, Loveland, & Drost, 2016). Conscientious individuals mostly endeavor to be noted for competence and accomplishment while also practicing self-discipline. Obeid, Salleh, and Nor (2017) indicated that when employees are rated highly conscientious, they tend to commit to their organizations because they desire to build a lasting relationship with the organization. Because they put in extra effort at work and push themselves to do better for their employers, conscientious workers are reliable and persistent (Terrier, Kim, & Fernandez, 2016).

According to Powell and Bourdage (2016), conscientiousness is substantially correlated with broad job participation tendency. Employees with high levels of conscientiousness typically participate in activities and connect with their organizations, making them more likely to be effectively devoted to their organizations (Farukh, Ying, & Mansori, 2017). Additionally, earlier researchers have discovered a favorable relationship between conscientiousness and affective commitment (Choi, Oh, & Colbert, 2015). People who are diligent, persistent, and goal-oriented exhibit conscientiousness among other qualities (Therasa & Vijayabanu, 2015). Therefore, the majority of conscientious employees tend to be more devoted to management and supportive of change initiatives in their organizations.

2.1.3 Agreeableness

Contrary to conscientiousness, agreeableness did not influence work performance across all jobs and tasks. This is due to the fact that while some disagreements are harmful to some professions, they are advantageous to others. In some situations, it may be necessary to disagree with unreasonable requests or demands to execute an assigned job effectively. According to a US study, agreeable participants were also more likely to communicate a sense of personal rapport in conversation and were much less likely to be at home in their flats (Colquitt, 2009). Agreeable employees are often kind to their coworkers (He et al., 2015).

Agreeable people prioritize cooperation and trust in their interpersonal relationships. These workers have a significant predisposition to be more compliant, cooperative, and charitable (Ayub, AlQurashi, Al-Yafi, & Jehn, 2017). Once they have confidence in their employers, agreeable employees are more likely to be loyal and meet their performance standards. Furthermore, this individual trait is strongly associated with high job performance, teamwork, and job satisfaction (Farrukh et al., 2017). According to Morrison (1997), there is a link between agreeableness and organizational commitment.

Similar to this, a study by Choi et al. (2015) found a link between affective commitment and agreeableness. Being kind, naturally forgiving, and adaptable when interacting with people are some aspects that have a high score on these traits. These people are good at maintaining the status quo, but they lack leadership skills and are unable to start change programs (Kim, del Carmen Triana, Chung, & Oh, 2016). These workers demand equitable treatment from their employers in accordance with their contributions, yet they find it difficult to adapt to changes in the workplace.

2.1.4. Neuroticism

According to earlier personality determinants by Costa and McCrae (1992), neuroticism is an important trait among other factors in personality psychology, similar to extraversion. These characteristics frequently lead to negative feelings, such as low self-esteem, anxiety, excessive worry, pessimism, and depression. Jalagat (2017) found that one of the main causes of bad relationships among employees was due to their negative behaviors and attitudes in the workplace. People with high neuroticism are unsettled, worried, and inherently dejected. People with neuroses typically make terrible performers for crowds, tend to be subversive, and have a negative attitude towards the need for change (Therasa & Vijayabanu, 2015).

Neuroticism has been negatively associated with professional paths, job performance, and inspiration when it comes to working outcomes. Typically, poor performance results from a lack of job satisfaction (Yakasai & Jan, 2015). When unfavorable situations occur in their current professions, employees with this personality trait may feel frightened to face the new workplace, which causes them to have difficult work experiences (Chirumbolo, 2015). These characteristics may also cause people to alter their environments in search of security. According to Ferreira and Nascimento (2016), neurotic people despise difficult circumstances that call for long-term commitment, trust, initiative, and social skills. It can be claimed that highly neurotic workers are probably viewed as uncommitted workers and would object to participating in transformation programs.

2.1.5. Openness

According to Harzer and Ruch (2015), employees that exhibit attributes of openness have an impact on the success of their varied teams. These individuals value autonomy, are adaptable, creative, supportive of change, and are likely eager to try new things (Costa & McCrae, 1992). They frequently form strong interpersonal bonds with their colleagues and actively participate in decision-making (Kluemper, McLarty, & Bing, 2015). However, because they are eager to try new things, employees who are open are less inclined to stay with their existing employer.

Nawaz, Afzal, and Shehzadi (2013) found that open employees are mainly concerned with the benefits from their new employers rather than the repercussions of leaving their current employer. Research has

demonstrated a significant relationship between openness to experience and turnover, work motivation, and career discovery (Ramli, 2018). They preferred obstacles at work that might have set them off. Open-minded people require participatory leadership and related conflict resolution. They perform well on the job and are enthusiastic about autonomy and new surroundings (Costa & McCrae, 1992); however, they are less inclined to commit to changing initiatives in their existing employment.

However, openness has not been demonstrated to strongly predict work performance. This may appear confusing because cognitive capacity, which is considered tied to intellect and receptivity to experience, is sometimes used interchangeably (Colquitt, 2009). Being open to new experiences is a sign of creativity and originality. Consequently, there may be a direct but indirect relationship between job performance and the creation of and willingness to try new things that may enhance one's productivity or even have a larger impact on overall productivity.

2.2. Productivity

According to Teklemariam (2014), productivity is a summary of the quantity and quality of work performance considering resource usage. It can be evaluated at an individual, group, or organizational level (Ayalew & Demissie, 2020; Chow & Singh, 2022; Virgiawan, Riyanto, & Endri, 2021). From the standpoint of management, productivity always indicates whether it was successful or unsuccessful in producing goods and services in sufficient quantities, of high quality, and with the efficient use of resources. In summary, this is the percentage of input-to-output value. It is possible to improve output without increasing productivity.

This indicates that the rate of increase in input costs may be higher, or the product quality may be lower. The idea of productivity is also becoming increasingly associated with the calibration of input, output, and process itself. If quality is defined as compliance with client requirements, then productivity declines as output quality declines (Ayalew & Demissie, 2020). According to Lawler and Boudreau (2012), organizational productivity is the ability of a company, institution, or organization to deliver desired results with the least amount of effort, time, money, staff, and supply. The productivity of all employees combined equals the productivity of the organization, and according to Goetsch and Davis (2014), highly productive organizations place more emphasis on this factor.

The efficient use of resources within a corporation also relates to Ayalew and Demissie's (2020) productivity and claims (Ayalew & Demissie, 2020). Its purpose is to use the fewest resources necessary to accomplish it the most. Manpower, materials, tools, spare parts, buildings, money, and time were resources. Effective management of these resources is key to generating increased productivity (Azimi, 2021; Naab & Bans-Akutey, 2021). Additionally, increased effort does not increase production. Even though the labor input increases, the output might or might not increase. The use of additional capital or other production elements does not always result in productivity gains. Smarter work leads to increased productivity. Adopting new production methods or technologies is what this means. The link between the results and the time taken to obtain them is another way to define productivity. If the system is more productive, then a faster target result is obtained. In general, productivity should be viewed as a thorough evaluation of how organizations meet the extent to which they are accomplished.

2.3. Personality Type and Productivity

Group comparisons showed that corporate environment and psychological traits were both significant predictors. Potential entrepreneurs' psychological traits have a greater influence than successful entrepreneurs' business environments (Houran & Lange, 2006). Organizational members' covert behaviors include job satisfaction, involvement, and other associated attitudes and beliefs (Najam-us-Sahar, 2016). Conversely, covert behaviors are those that are not directly observable, such as tardiness, absenteeism, and other types of on-the-job conduct. Organizational psychologists are responsible for identifying these behaviors and determining the precise cause that links them to productivity. Not everyone has the requisite technical expertise and personality traits for success. Teams that work well should have a variety of knowledge and skill sets as well as a good balance of personality types (Bans-Akutey, 2020; Bans-Akutey, 2021; Bans-Akutey & Tiimub, 2021a, 2021b; Taylor, 2020). Some

personality types are more tolerant of others and are open to hearing other people's opinions. The team should strive for a balance of personality types because each personality type can positively impact the team's overall effectiveness.

2.4. Job Performance, Productivity and Personality Difference

The two traits that most accurately predicted salary were extraversion and agreeableness. Extraversion was strongly correlated with reported career success, while emotional stability and a proactive personality were predictors of felt employment success (Rode, Arthaud-Day, Mooney, Near, & Baldwin, 2008). It was discovered that levels of vocal attractiveness fluctuate in a way connected to levels of agreeableness and conscientiousness, with both personality traits predicting performance more strongly for those with more appealing voices. According to Silvia and Christensen (2020), composites made using personality and job-experience measurements may be helpful for hiring. According to Mihalič (2015), openness to experience and core self-evaluations (CSE) are two personality differences consistently preferred for job quality. CSE also demonstrated incremental validity with regard to intrinsic work motivation factors such as experienced meaningfulness and autonomy.

The goal of every organization is to perform at its peak level, given the adjustments made (Chirumbolo, 2015). Employees' workplace performance plays the most crucial role in achieving organizational performance. In other words, work and administrative efficiency depend on how well a job is performed. The primary observable factor in managing employees is their work outputs. Job performance refers to what a person does while working (Seddigh, 2015). A mix of effort, skills, and working conditions represents a job's performance.

Organizational performance and personnel performance have become increasingly important in order to remain competitive in the world's rapidly changing economic and working environments (Sai & Bhatti, 2014). Therefore, it is crucial for every organization to analyze the variables that affect job performance. The effectiveness of an organization's plan is directly dependent on how well each individual performs. Every person employed by a company is expected to carry out their duties accurately. Employees are responsible for performing duties and tasks in accordance with employment laws and regulations.

When employees accept particular job assignments, they commit to reliably completing their work (Hettiararchchi & Jayarathna, 2014). The organization offers employees a variety of incentives, including raises in pay, bonuses, acknowledgment of certification for outstanding success by employees, and vacation benefits, in an effort to inspire them to deliver high performance and high job satisfaction (Altintas, Guerreiro, Piletsky, & Tothill, 2015). Employees are the most valuable resource for every company. The way employees feel about their jobs and the consequences that follow them have an impact on the effectiveness and stability of the organization. Employee satisfaction and happiness at work drive employees to work hard to achieve the organization's goals.

The organization should therefore be aware of its employees' needs beyond what is necessary for the job to meet the difficulties of the global market and achieve organizational goals. This could result in improved performance. Employees' performance matters in all aspects and circumstances at work (Altintas et al., 2015). According to Smith, Patmos, and Pitts (2018), a worker's desire to improve their performance at work may help to lessen tension there. The reason for this is that, when an employee is unhappy, their motivation to work will also suffer, which could cause the number of characteristics to keep rising. Altangerel, Ruimei, Elahi, and Dash (2015) stated that characteristics are ongoing issues faced by the majority of organizations that negatively affect the organization and employees. Traits have a detrimental effect on the state of one's mental health. A poor organizational atmosphere lowers employee productivity. Contrary to Zhao and Ghiselli (2016) analysis, these characteristics had both positive and negative effects on workplace performance.

It is obvious that traits can lower an organization's performance, regardless of whether it is large or small. Job performance is unquestionably an employee's objective, and it is up to each person to fulfill

it within the available time and resources. Employee unhappiness may lead to qualities that emerge from decreased job performance. Jalagat (2017) asserts that when qualities are described, the emphasis is primarily on the results and impacts. As a result, characteristics greatly influence an organization member's performance and activities. According to Patwary and Rashid (2016), the cost-cutting efforts of top management have a shrinking effect. Employees who remained in the company as a result of these factors were affected by personality differences and a sense of dissatisfaction. Such employees are unable to effectively accomplish their responsibilities and obligations in this environment.

According to Mathis, Jackson, and Valentine (2015), an employee's job performance is understood to be determined by their capacity to meet both personal and organizational goals and objectives. According to Islam and Patwary (2013), when a company decides not to prioritize employee well-being, it will ultimately have an impact on how well employees execute their jobs and cause them to feel a lot of pressure. From the perspective of an employee, job performance is essentially the path of behaviors and results (Patwary, Roy, Hoque, & Khandakar, 2019). Overall, a variety of daily actions are performed that impact how well a job is performed. According to Seng and Arumugam (2017), the major component of a work performance appraisal's outcome is more important to the employee than the activities that most strongly influence the results from the supervisor's perspective.

2.5 Acceptance of Personality Differences at the Workplace

Competent workers are expected in today's workplace. Personality characteristics are necessary to balance each other's deficiencies because introverts and extroverts have different strengths (Farrell, 2017). Many jobs require collaboration to perform increasingly complicated tasks (Stewart et al., 2014). Any team will potentially suffer stress and disagreement; thus, social skills are crucial (Farrell, 2017; Hvidsten, 2016). Therefore, the personalities of team members should be observed. People must understand how to live and cooperate (Riyanto, Endri, & Herlisha, 2021). The finest outcomes result from having the correct personality style in the correct role (Stewart et al., 2014). Organizations require a variety of personalities (Gordon, 2016) with a balance between extroversion and introversion (Farrell, 2017) in roles that fit their capabilities.

The impact of personality differences at work has been extensively studied (Sackett & Walmsley, 2014). Most people are more likely to be content in occupations that fit their personality type, and personal task agreement affects their job performance (Huang, Huang, Chou, & Teng, 2017; Stewart et al., 2014). Regardless of personality differences, leaders may build and strengthen their leadership skills because they set examples for an organization (Farrell, 2017; Harold & Holtz, 2015). To develop trust and garner support, leaders must be aware of the needs and emotions they experience (Kasriel-Alexander, 2016). Effective leaders can come from both introverts and extroverts (Dossey, 2016; P. R. Grant, 2017; R. M. Grant, 2014; Korn, 2016) and unfavorable leadership characteristics (Farrell, 2017). The leaders of different types of employees are different types of leaders (R. M. Grant, 2014; Kuofie, Stephens-Craig, & Dool, 2015), and effective leaders can modify their personalities to suit the needs of their workforce (Farrell, 2017). These leaders find solutions to fulfill requirements when a scenario calls for a certain ability or quality (Sackett & Walmsley, 2014).

2.6 Individual Work Relations at Workplace for Productivity Achievement

Good working relationships among employees provide a pleasant work environment that boosts employee engagement. Increased worker productivity can result from improved workforce morale (Brhane & Zewdie, 2018; Riyanto, Endri, & Hamid, 2021). Organizations looking at employee relations initiatives might see an improvement in performance, which would raise company profits (Kelchner et al., 2017). The employee relations techniques used in the organization have a direct impact on workers' productivity (Sequeira & Dhriti, 2015). Employees or workers who are more satisfied with the organization's current methods are more productive and less likely to want to see changes made. The study also showed that enhancing an organization's employee relations policies can increase overall employee productivity by raising employee performance. Similarly, Kuzu and Özilhan (2014) and Alkhozondar (2015) find a significant relationship between employee relations and performance.

3. Methodology

The research design is a technique used for investigation (Kothari, 2014). For this study, a descriptive research design was employed using a quantitative research approach. According to Kennedy et al. (2011), the population represents “the individual participant or item on which the measurement is taken; this is the unit of study. They further explained that the population constitutes the target of the study and must be clearly defined and identified”. For this study, the target population comprised employees of the Ghana Meteorological Agency. They comprised 362 employees.

A simple random sampling technique was used to select participants from the Ghana Meteorological Agency database. According to Simkus (2023), simple random sampling is a technique in which each member of a target population has an equal chance of being selected for study through an unbiased system.

Zikmund-Fisher et al. (2010) explained that if the sample size is large enough, it will reflect the population's key characteristics. The sample size of the study was 190 employees of the Ghana Meteorological Agency, according to Yamane (1967) formula. A closed-ended questionnaire was used for the data collection. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and are presented in tables.

4. Result and discussion

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics

	Frequency	Percentages (%)
Position		
Manager	8	4.2
Supervisor	129	67.9
Subordinate	53	27.9
Total	190	100.0
Department		
Administration	7	3.7
Finance/Accounts	18	9.5
Engineering	78	41.1
Forecast and Synoptic	72	37.9
Research	15	7.9
Total	190	100.0
Years of working		
Less than 5yrs	43	22.6
5 – 10yrs	79	41.6
10 – 15yrs	48	25.3
15yrs and more	20	10.5
Total	190	100.0

Source: Processed data by SPSS (2022)

Table 1 shows the demographics of the study participants. Of 190 respondents, 129(67.9%) were supervisors. Also, it was observed that 78(41.1%) representing the majority of the participants are from the engineering department. Most of the participants, 147(77.4%) had worked for at least five years.

Table 2. Level of acceptance of individual or personality differences

Variables	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Leaders have adjusted their differences to meet the needs of employees	190	1	5	2.95	1.16	1.34

Leaders accept the needs and feelings of employees	190	1	5	3.04	1.36	1.85
Firm employees have trust for each other and generate support toward work	190	1	5	3.36	1.14	1.29
There is an individual-task agreement in the organization	190	2	5	4.06	0.79	0.63
Firm employees have found the best way to coexist and work together	190	3	5	4.25	0.60	0.36
The firm accepts all kinds of personality traits or differences to undertake job activities	190	2	5	4.11	0.72	0.51

Source: Processed data by SPSS (2022)

Table 2 shows the results of the level of acceptance of individual differences in the organization. It was found that most leaders in the organization hardly adjust their differences to meet employees' needs; leaders in the organization respect the needs and feelings of employees, thereby indicating moderately high acceptance of personality differences in the organization. Furthermore, the study found that there is a high level of trust among employees and a high level of job task agreement in a way that enables employees to jointly work towards achieving organizational goals.

Table 3. How Individuals relate with each other for productivity achievement

Variables	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
There is increased motivation among employees for undertaking job activities	190	1	4	2.10	0.94	0.88
The firm has invested in employee relations programs	190	1	4	2.13	0.83	0.68
Firm employees are satisfied working with others to produce work output	190	2	5	3.82	0.78	0.61
There is high morale among workers and toward work	190	3	5	4.41	0.52	0.27
There is a serene and pleasant working environment for undertaking job activities	190	1	5	3.42	1.10	1.22
The firm accepts each other's opinions to produce work output	190	2	5	4.28	0.74	0.54

Source: Processed data by SPSS (2022)

From Table 3, it can be seen that productivity is low due to a lack of motivation among employees; there has not been much investment in employee relation programs; there is enough satisfaction among employees; there is high morale that exists among employees toward work and the achievement of

results; most of the employees enjoy the serene environment of the organization; and that employees accept each other's opinions for productive work.

Table 4. How personality differences translate into organization productivity

Variables	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Firm employees are sociable and energetic for quality work	190	3	5	4.59	0.54	0.30
Firm employees are competent and discharge job duty with less time	190	3	5	4.36	0.61	0.37
Firm employees cooperate and trust each other for less energy consumption at work	190	2	5	3.83	0.81	0.65
Employees are committed to job duties in order to achieve value for money	190	3	5	4.53	0.54	0.29
Employees are innovative and support change for quality work	190	3	5	4.31	0.55	0.30
Firm employees are creative in managing resources and materials for production	190	4	5	4.53	0.50	0.25

Source: Processed data by SPSS (2022)

Results from Table 4 indicate that employees exhibit energetic behavior and positive vibes towards work; most of the employees engaged are competent and discharge job duties accordingly; most of them cooperate and exhibit trust in job tasks; employees exhibit a commitment towards job duties; most employees are innovative and supportive towards job task performance; and employees exhibit positive attitudes towards work by managing resources and materials to enhance production.

4.1. Discussion

Objective one examined the level of acceptance of individual or personality differences in the organization. The results showed low adjustments in personality differences among leaders of the organization. This does not agree with the results of Farrell (2017), who found that to succeed, leaders can adjust their personality differences to meet the needs of employees towards productivity. The results indicated that leaders in the organization accept the feelings and needs of employees, thus generating trust, which agrees with the result of Kasriel-Alexander (2016), who found that a leader's job is to show empathy, build trust, and generate support.

In addition, the presence of individual task agreements in the organization explains the high level of personality difference acceptance among employees, which has a significant influence on job performance. This finding agrees with Stewart et al. (2014), who stated that individual-task agreement impacts job performance. Furthermore, employees have found the best way to coexist and work together, signifying a high level of acceptance of personality differences within the organization. These results agree with Taylor (2020), who mentioned that employees who find the need to coexist and work show an acceptance of personality differences. In summary, it can be deduced that there is a high level of acceptance of personality differences among employees; however, most leaders exhibit poor adjustment to personality differences.

The second objective was to determine how individuals relate to each other in order to achieve productivity. The results showed that employees are less motivated to undertake job activities and that

the organization has not invested in employee relation programs for productivity, which negatively affects the organization. According to Kelchner et al. (2017), organizations that research programs related to employee relations experience higher performance, resulting in an increase in profits for the business. It was found that employees are satisfied with others to produce work output, inferring a positive relationship with productivity achievement. This agrees with the results of Sequeira and Dhriti (2015), who found that employees or workers with higher satisfaction levels with their existing organizational practices exhibit high productivity and tend to resist changing the current organization. In addition, the result that there is high morale among workers towards work points to a high level of productivity achievement, which agrees with the findings of Brhane and Zewdie (2018), who found that increased employee morale can lead to increased worker productivity.

The third objective of this study was to identify how personality differences translate into organizational productivity. Employees are sociable and energetic for quality work, accounting for the positive influence of personality differences on productivity. This finding agrees with the results of Seddigh (2015), who found that sociable and energetic individuals grasp the experience they have received to help them evaluate their jobs. It was found that employees are competent and discharge job duties in less time, explaining the high influence of personality differences on productivity. Furthermore, employees cooperate and trust each other to reduce energy consumption at work, explaining the high influence of personality on productivity. Employees are committed to job duties to achieve value for money, agreeing with Obeid et al. (2017), who found that committed employees tend to attain high productivity levels. Employees were found to be innovative and support change for quality work, which explains the significant influence of personality differences on productivity. The results of the study agree with Colquitt's finding (Colquitt, 2009) that creative employees improve an organization's productivity. In summary, it can be deduced that personality differences significantly influence the productivity of the organization.

5. Conclusion

5.1. Conclusion

This study specifically investigates the role of personality differences in organizational productivity. It was concluded that personality differences influence productivity as employees are sociable and energetic for quality work; employees are competent and discharge job duties within less time; employees cooperate and trust each other to reduce energy consumption at work; employees are committed to job duties to achieve value for money; employees are innovative and support change for quality work; and employees are creative in managing resources and materials for production. Therefore, there is sufficient evidence to prove that personality difference positively affects productivity.

5.2. Limitation

The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Therefore, no inferences can be made. This study was limited to the employees of the Ghana Meteorological Agency.

5.3. Suggestion

Future studies should consider using inferential statistics to examine a more varied population.

References

- Ali, I. (2019). Personality traits, individual innovativeness and satisfaction with life. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 4(1), 38-46.
- Alkhozondar, N. (2015). Evaluation of an Existing Building to be oriented towards a Green Building: A Case Study. *International Journal of Advanced Renewable Energy Research*, 2(8).
- Altangerel, O., Ruimei, W., Elahi, E., & Dash, B. (2015). Investigating the effect of job stress on performance of employees. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 4(2), 276-280.
- Altintas, Z., Guerreiro, A., Piletsky, S. A., & Tothill, I. E. (2015). NanoMIP based optical sensor for pharmaceuticals monitoring. *Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical*, 213, 305-313.

- Ayalew, A., & Demissie, Y. (2020). The effect of occupational health and safety program on organizational productivity: in case of Bahirdar Tannery factory. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications (IJSRP)*, 10(2), 779-798.
- Ayub, N., AlQurashi, S. M., Al-Yafi, W. A., & Jehn, K. (2017). Personality traits and conflict management styles in predicting job performance and conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 28(5), 671-694.
- Azimi, H. (2021). Investigating the relationship between knowledge management and social capital. *Annals of Management and Organization Research*, 3(1), 53-67.
- Azimi, H. (2022). Evaluation of employees' experiences in the industrial training program in the polytechnic department of Iranian industries. *Annals of Management and Organization Research*, 3(4), 271-288.
- Bano, S. (2008). *A Text Book of Psychology Subjective And Objective*: She Publisher.
- Bans-Akutey, A. (2020). DIFFERENTIATING MICROMANAGEMENT FROM EFFECTIVE MANAGE-MENT: AMANAGER'S GUIDE. *GSJ*, 8(11).
- Bans-Akutey, A. (2021). The Path-Goal Theory of Leadership. *Academia Letters*, 2.
- Bans-Akutey, A., Abdullahi, A. M., & Afriyie, E. O. (2021). Effect of recruitment and selection practices on organisational strategic goals. *Annals of Management and Organization Research*, 3(1), 35-51.
- Bans-Akutey, A., & Ebem, D. (2022). E-leadership and adaptation to technological development of telecommunication businesses in Ghana. *Annals of Management and Organization Research*, 3(4), 259-269.
- Bans-Akutey, A., Ohene Afriyie, E., & Tiimub, B. (2022). Leadership Propositions for Team Success.
- Bans-Akutey, A., & Tiimub, B. (2021a). Assessing Transactional and Transformational Leadership on Workgroup Behaviour. *Academia Letters*, 2.
- Bans-Akutey, A., & Tiimub, B. (2021b). The Effect of Leadership Styles on the Dynamics of a Group. *Academia Letters*, 2.
- Blanken, T. F., Benjamins, J. S., Borsboom, D., Vermunt, J. K., Paquola, C., Ramautar, J., . . . Wei, Y. (2019). Insomnia disorder subtypes derived from life history and traits of affect and personality. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 6(2), 151-163.
- Brhane, H., & Zewdie, S. (2018). A literature review on the effects of employee relation on improving employee performance.
- Cattell, R. B., & Gibbons, B. (1968). Personality factor structure of the combined Guilford and Cattell personality questionnaires. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 9(1), 107.
- Chirumbolo, A. (2015). The impact of job insecurity on counterproductive work behaviors: The moderating role of honesty–humility personality trait. *The Journal of psychology*, 149(6), 554-569.
- Choi, D., Oh, I.-S., & Colbert, A. E. (2015). Understanding organizational commitment: A meta-analytic examination of the roles of the five-factor model of personality and culture. *Journal of applied psychology*, 100(5), 1542.
- Chow, T. W., & Singh, H. (2022). Cultivating emerging leadership competencies for individual and organizational success. *Annals of Management and Organization Research*, 4(2), 129-145.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2009). *Organisational Behavior; improving performance and commitment in the workplace*: Boston McGraw Hill
- Cornwell, T. O., McCarthy, I. D., & Biro, P. A. (2020). Integration of physiology, behaviour and life history traits: personality and pace of life in a marine gastropod. *Animal Behaviour*, 163, 155-162.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: The NEO Personality Inventory. *Psychological assessment*, 4(1), 5.
- Dole, C., & Schroeder, R. G. (2001). The impact of various factors on the personality, job satisfaction and turnover intentions of professional accountants. *Managerial auditing journal*, 16(4), 234-245.
- Dossey, L. (2016). Introverts: A defense. *Explore: The Journal of Science and Healing*, 12(3), 151-160.
- Erjavec, J., Popovič, A., & Trkman, P. (2019). The effect of personality traits and knowledge on the quality of decisions in supply chains. *Economic research-Ekonomska istraživanja*, 32(1), 2269-2292.

- Eysenck, H. J. (1987). Personality theory and the problem of criminality.
- Farrell, T. S. (2017). "[The problem] with reflective practice is that it often ends up in the teacher's head, not shared": Reflecting on TESOL Twitter Bytes.
- Farrukh, M., Ying, C. W., & Mansori, S. (2017). Organizational commitment: an empirical analysis of personality traits. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, 9(1), 18-34.
- Fernando, Y., Jabbour, C. J. C., & Wah, W.-X. (2019). Pursuing green growth in technology firms through the connections between environmental innovation and sustainable business performance: does service capability matter? *Resources, conservation and recycling*, 141, 8-20.
- Ferreira, M. F., & Nascimento, E. d. (2016). Relationship between personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors. *Psico-USF*, 21, 677-685.
- Goetsch, D. L., & Davis, S. (2014). *Quality Management for Organizational Excellence: Introduction to Total Quality* (7th ed.): Pearson Education Limited.
- Gordon, R. J. (2016). The Rise and Fall of American Growth: The US Standard of Living since the Civil War. *Economics Books*.
- Grant, P. R. (2017). Ecology and Evolution of Darwin's Finches (Princeton Science Library Edition) *Ecology and Evolution of Darwin's Finches (Princeton Science Library Edition)*: Princeton University Press.
- Grant, R. M. (2014). Dirección estratégica: concepto, técnicas y aplicaciones: Navarra: SL Civitas Ediciones.
- Gridwchai, P., Kulwanich, A., Piromkam, B., & Kwanmuangvanich, P. (2020). Role of Personality Traits on Employees Job Performance in Pharmaceutical Industry in Thailand. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(3).
- Harold, C. M., & Holtz, B. C. (2015). The effects of passive leadership on workplace incivility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(1), 16-38.
- Harzer, C., & Ruch, W. (2015). The relationships of character strengths with coping, work-related stress, and job satisfaction. *Frontiers in psychology*, 6, 165.
- He, H., Wang, W., Zhu, W., & Harris, L. (2015). Service workers' job performance: The roles of personality traits, organizational identification, and customer orientation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 49(11/12), 1751-1776.
- Hettiararchchi, H., & Jayarathna, S. (2014). The effect of employee work related attitudes on employee job performance: A study of tertiary and vocational education sector in Sri Lanka.
- Houran, J., & Lange, R. (2006). State-of-the-art measurement in human resource assessment. *HVS Journal*, 28, 4-6.
- Huang, H.-C., Huang, L.-S., Chou, Y.-J., & Teng, C.-I. (2017). Influence of temperament and character on online gamer loyalty: Perspectives from personality and flow theories. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 70, 398-406.
- Hvidsten, A. K. N. (2016). Is introversion an obstacle in tacit knowledge sharing through socialization? A study on how personality traits influence knowledge sharing behavior. *Dalhousie Journal of Interdisciplinary Management*, 12(1).
- Islam, R., & Patwary, A. K. (2013). Factors influencing to the policy and strategies used to disabled employment in hospitality industry. *Advances in Environmental Biology*, 2598-2606.
- Jalagat, R. (2017). Determinants of job stress and its relationship on employee job performance. *American Journal of Management Science and Engineering*, 2(1), 1-10.
- Janjua, Q. R. (2017). Service failures and consumer responses: exploring the antecedents of consumer dissatisfaction and propensity to complain. *Business & Economic Review*, 9(4), 23-48.
- Kasriel-Alexander, D. (2016). *Top 10 global consumer trends for 2015*: Euromonitor International.
- Kelchner, V. P., Evans, K., Brendell, K., Allen, D., Miller, C., & Cooper-Haber, K. (2017). The Effect of a School-Based Transitional Support Intervention Program on Alternative School Youth's Attitudes and Behaviors. *Professional Counselor*, 7(2), 169-184.
- Kennedy, H. P., Farrell, T., Paden, R., Hill, S., Jolivet, R. R., Cooper, B. A., & Schindler Rising, S. (2011). A randomized clinical trial of group prenatal care in two military settings. *Military medicine*, 176(10), 1169-1177.

- Kim, K., del Carmen Triana, M., Chung, K., & Oh, N. (2016). When do employees cyberloaf? An interactionist perspective examining personality, justice, and empowerment. *Human resource management*, 55(6), 1041-1058.
- Kluemper, D. H., McLarty, B. D., & Bing, M. N. (2015). Acquaintance ratings of the Big Five personality traits: Incremental validity beyond and interactive effects with self-reports in the prediction of workplace deviance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 100(1), 237.
- Korn, J. B. (2016). The dean as introvert. *U. Tol. L. Rev.*, 48, 297.
- Kothari, A. (2014). Radical ecological democracy: a path forward for India and beyond. *Development*, 57(1), 36-45.
- Kuofie, M., Stephens-Craig, D., & Dool, R. (2015). An overview perception of introverted leaders. *International Journal of Global Business*, 8(1).
- Kuzu, Ö. H., & Özilhan, D. (2014). The effect of employee relationships and knowledge sharing on employees' performance: An empirical research on service industry. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 109, 1370-1374.
- Lawler, E. E., & Boudreau, J. W. (2012). *Effective Human Resource Management: A Global Analysis*: Stanford University Press.
- Li, H., & Cao, Y. (2021). Facing the pandemic in the dark: Psychopathic personality traits and life history strategies during COVID-19 lockdown period in different areas of China. *Current Psychology*, 1-9.
- Lounsbury, J. W., Sundstrom, E. D., Gibson, L. W., Loveland, J. M., & Drost, A. W. (2016). Core personality traits of managers. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 31(2), 434-450.
- Marx, K. (2012). Encyclopedia britannica. *Encyclopaedia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite [M/CD]*. Chicago: Encyclopsedia Britannica.
- Mathis, R. L., Jackson, J. H., & Valentine, S. R. (2015). *Human resource management: Essential perspectives*: Cengage Learning.
- Mihalič, T. (2015). A portrait of Pauline Joy Sheldon. *Anatolia*, 26(1), 143-150.
- Morrison, K. A. (1997). How franchise job satisfaction and personality affects performance, organizational commitment, franchisor relations, and intention to remain. *Journal of small business management*, 35(3), 39.
- Naab, R., & Bans-Akutey, A. (2021). Assessing the use of e-business strategies by SMEs in Ghana during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Annals of Management and Organization Research*, 2(3), 145-160.
- Najam-us-Sahar, J. (2016). Impact of personality type on job productivity. *Journal of Hotel & Business Management*, 5(1), 1-9.
- Nathanson, A. (2020). Patrick Tomlinson Associates.
- Nawaz, M. A., Afzal, N., & Shehzadi, K. (2013). Problems of formally employed women: A case study of Bahawalnagar, Pakistan. *Asian Journal of Empirical Research*, 3(10), 1291-1299.
- Neave, H. W., Costa, J. H., Weary, D. M., & Von Keyserlingk, M. A. (2020). Long-term consistency of personality traits of cattle. *Royal Society open science*, 7(2), 191849.
- Obeid, M., Salleh, Z., & Nor, M. N. M. (2017). The mediating effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between personality traits and premature sign-off. *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal*, 21(2), 1-17.
- Patwary, A. K., & Rashid, B. (2016). The impacts of hospitality services on visit experience and future visit intention of student travelers. *International Journal of Business and Technopreneurship*, 6(8), 107-125.
- Patwary, A. K., Roy, B., Hoque, R., & Khandakar, M. S. A. (2019). Process of developing a community based tourism and identifying its economic and social impacts: An Empirical study on Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 1-13.
- Powell, D. M., & Bourdage, J. S. (2016). The detection of personality traits in employment interviews: Can "good judges" be trained? *Personality and individual differences*, 94, 194-199.
- Prinhandaka, D. J. P., Rohman, I. Z., & Wijaya, N. H. S. (2022). Supportive leadership and employee creativity: Will Leader-Member Exchange mediate the relationship? *Annals of Management and Organization Research*, 4(1), 35-45.
- Ramli, A. H. (2018). Manage of job stress and measure employee performance in health services. *Business and Entrepreneurial Review*, 18(1), 53-64.

- Rammstedt, B., Goldberg, L. R., & Borg, I. (2010). The measurement equivalence of Big-Five factor markers for persons with different levels of education. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44(1), 53-61.
- Riyanto, S., Endri, E., & Hamid, A. (2021). The Influence Of Transformational Leadership And The Work Environment On Employee Performance: Mediating Role Of. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 27(6), 1-11.
- Riyanto, S., Endri, E., & Herlisha, N. (2021). Effect of work motivation and job satisfaction on employee performance: Mediating role of employee engagement. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 19(3), 162.
- Rode, J. C., Arthaud - Day, M. L., Mooney, C. H., Near, J. P., & Baldwin, T. T. (2008). Ability and personality predictors of salary, perceived job success, and perceived career success in the initial career stage. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 16(3), 292-299.
- Sackett, P. R., & Walmsley, P. T. (2014). Which personality attributes are most important in the workplace? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 9(5), 538-551.
- Sai, M. L., & Bhatti, M. A. (2014). Work stress and job performance in Malaysia academic sector: Role of social support as moderator. *British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade*, 4(12), 1986-1998.
- Seddigh, A. (2015). *Office type, performance and well-being: A study of how personality and work tasks interact with contemporary office environments and ways of working*. Department of Psychology, Stockholm University.
- Seng, N. L., & Arumugam, T. (2017). Financial reward and motivation toward employee job performance in the hospitality industry in Klang Valley. *Electronic Journal of Business & Management*, 2(1), 51-60.
- Sequeira, A., & Dhriti, A. (2015). Employee relations and its impact on employee performance: A case study. *Retrieved from*.
- Silvia, P. J., & Christensen, A. P. (2020). Looking up at the curious personality: Individual differences in curiosity and openness to experience. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 35, 1-6.
- Simkus, J. (2023). Snowball Sampling Method: Definition, Techniques & Examples. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org/snowball-sampling.html>
- Smith, S. A., Patmos, A., & Pitts, M. J. (2018). Communication and teleworking: A study of communication channel satisfaction, personality, and job satisfaction for teleworking employees. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 55(1), 44-68.
- Stewart, A. M., Grossman, L., Nguyen, M., Maximino, C., Rosemberg, D. B., Echevarria, D. J., & Kalueff, A. V. (2014). Aquatic toxicology of fluoxetine: understanding the knowns and the unknowns. *Aquatic toxicology*, 156, 269-273.
- Taylor, M. (2020). Personality styles: Why they matter in the workplace. *Economic Alternatives*, 1, 148-163.
- Teklemariam, T. M. (2014). *The impact of international Potato Center's nutrition project on smallholder farmers' income and adoption of improved potato varieties: Tigray region, Northern Ethiopia*. Mekelle University.
- Terrier, L., Kim, S., & Fernandez, S. (2016). Who are the good organizational citizens for the environment? An examination of the predictive validity of personality traits. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 48, 185-190.
- Therasa, C., & Vijayabanu, C. (2015). The impact of Big Five personality traits and positive psychological strengths towards job satisfaction: A review. *Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences*, 23(2), 142-150.
- Van Hoyer, G., & Turban, D. B. (2015). Applicant - employee fit in personality: Testing predictions from similarity - attraction theory and trait activation theory. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 23(3), 210-223.
- Virgiawan, A. R., Riyanto, S., & Endri, E. (2021). Organizational culture as a mediator motivation and transformational leadership on employee performance. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 10(3), 67-79.

- Wihler, A., Meurs, J. A., Wiesmann, D., Troll, L., & Blickle, G. (2017). Extraversion and adaptive performance: Integrating trait activation and socioanalytic personality theories at work. *Personality and individual differences*, 116, 133-138.
- Yakasai, A. M., & Jan, M. T. (2015). The impact of big five personality traits on salespeople's performance: Exploring the moderating role of culture. *Kuwait Chapter of the Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 4(5), 11.
- Yamane, T. (1967). Elementary sampling theory prentice Inc. *Englewood Cliffs. NS, USA*, 1(1), 371-390.
- Yildiz Durak, H. (2023). Role of personality traits in collaborative group works at flipped classrooms. *Current Psychology*, 42(15), 13093-13113.
- Zhao, X., & Ghiselli, R. (2016). Why do you feel stressed in a “smile factory”? Hospitality job characteristics influence work–family conflict and job stress. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(2), 305-326.
- Zikmund-Fisher, B. J., Couper, M. P., Singer, E., Levin, C. A., Fowler Jr, F. J., Ziniel, S., . . . Fagerlin, A. (2010). The DECISIONS study: a nationwide survey of United States adults regarding 9 common medical decisions. *Medical Decision Making*, 30(5_suppl), 20-34.