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In order to study the impact of human and environmental matching on the unsafe behavior of employees in high-risk positions, explore the intermediary role of work satisfaction and the adjustment role of hardy personality, and improve the safety management level of employees in high-risk positions. The data collected from 501 employees in high-risk positions were empirically analyzed from an individual personality perspective with the help of AMOS 26.0 and SPSS 25.0. The research results showed that staff matching and human-organization matching have significant negative effects on unsafe behavior; job satisfaction plays a complete intermediary role in the negative relationship between human-organization matching and unsafe behavior; hardy personality can adjust the relationship between job satisfaction and unsafe behavior.

1. Introduction

Employees in high-risk positions have been in high pressure for a long time, and the “three violations” behaviors and unsafe accidents occur one after another, but most of the accidents are rooted in human factors [1]. However, existing safety management systems and policies in China are generally effective in preventing unsafe actions and behaviors of workers in high-risk positions. How to reduce the incidence of safety accidents from the perspective of matching individual workers in high-risk positions with their environment has become an urgent problem to be studied and solved [2].

Individual-environment matching refers to a stable state between the individual’s own characteristics and all environmental factors that can interact with it [3]. Human-organization matching and human-post matching, as two important indicators in the matching of human body and environment, are the direct factors that drive individuals to exert their own creativity and improve safety performance [4]. The degree of matching between the individual and the environment is reflected by the employee’s job performance, job behavior, job satisfaction, and other behaviors. Zhao had empirically tested that the value matching and demand matching of enterprise employees have a significant impact on job satisfaction [5]; Zhang et al. showed that factors such as emotional experience, material exchange, value matching, and fair distribution can predict the teachers’ job satisfaction [6]; Huang took hotel employees as the object and found that organizational matching would have a positive impact on employees’ job satisfaction [7]. Therefore, when the person-organization matching and the matching degree between people and positions are high, the job satisfaction of employees will be improved [8]. The values of individuals and the organization will tend to be consistent, and it will be more conducive to good communication and communication among employees. This way the employees can be corrected for unsafe behavior.

As a subjective controllable factor, job satisfaction is affected by individual factors such as personal values [9], individual characteristics [10], and personality traits [11]. Judge explored the relationship between the Big Five and job satisfaction through meta-analysis, and also found that high-level agreeable personality is more likely to obtain satisfaction and face the stress in life [12], in addition to the direct effect of personal characteristics, but also through the form of moderator variables on job performance or outcome [13], on the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover.
intention [1]. To sum up, personality, as an individual characteristic variable, is likely to have an effect on job satisfaction in the form of a moderator variable rather than a main effect [14]. Therefore, personality as a variable to explore the relationship between employee satisfaction and behavior has important research value. It can be seen that most of the current research on employee behavior is from the perspective of job requirements-ability matching and other individual levels, but few scholars have combined personality traits and job satisfaction to study the impact of employee behavior in high-risk positions such as coal and construction.

To sum up, based on the individual-environment fit theory and cognitive toughness theory, this paper established a model of factors influencing unsafe behaviors of employees in high-risk positions with job satisfaction as the mediating variable and hardiness personality as the moderating variable. The effect mechanism of job matching on the unsafe behavior of employees in high-risk positions is researched, and the moderating effect of individual hardiness personality on job satisfaction and unsafe behavior is further studied.

2. Theoretical Analysis and Research Hypothesis

2.1. Person-Post Matching and Person-Organization Matching. Person-post matching and person-organization matching were first used in corporate HR operations, and both have received much attention from scholars since Winston proposed them as indicators of job and organizational characteristics and individual fit. Social cognitive theory suggests that there is a certain functional relationship between human behavior and the individual and the environment, and thus human behavior is influenced by individual and environmental differences [15]. Person-position matching reflects the consistency of individual's own experience, knowledge, skills, and job requirements, etc.; person-organization matching reflects the consistency and compatibility of goals and values between individuals and organizations. Person-organization matching is a balanced state between individuals and organizations, and person-position matching is a harmonious state between individuals and positions, and matching organizations and positions help improve employees' job satisfaction and help employees regulate their own behavior.

Numerous scholars had shown through empirical studies that matching has significant effects on job performance and job satisfaction, as shown in Table 1, but most of the literature directly considers the role of matching on the influenced factors. However, very few scholars consider the role of moderating and mediating variables.

2.2. Job Satisfaction and Its Influencing Factors. Job satisfaction is a subjective attitude of workers towards their work environment and work experience, and is a “detector” for enterprise or organization management. When individual job satisfaction is low, the tendency of unsafe behavioral intentions such as unfocused and perfunctory work is easy to occur. Domestic and international scholars developed job satisfaction survey scales from multiple dimensions, such as the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale MSQ, and combine different assessment methods to quantitatively measure employee job satisfaction and prevent turnover and the occurrence of behaviors inconsistent with the organizational goals. From the perspective of value matching, different scholars extracted the factors influencing job satisfaction varying as shown in Table 2.

Safety material culture and safety institutional culture can all exert a significant influence on employees' safety behavior through job satisfaction [27]. From organizational identity theory, job satisfaction plays a mediating role between individual and organizational value matching and work engagement [28]. When the job satisfaction of employees in high-risk positions is improved, the individual's ability to work can be recognized by the organization, which is conducive to the individual's sense of responsibility for work and makes the unsafe actions and behaviors such as irregular action operation and inattention improved and corrected.

2.3. Hardy Personality and Its Regulatory Role. Personality traits, as one of the indicators that distinguish individuals from each other, are widely used in studies to regulate work attitudes, job satisfaction, and individual behavior, as shown in Table 3. Hardy, as one of the personality traits, refers to an individual's attitude towards dealing with daily unexpected or stressful events, and is a measure of the size of an individual's ability to regulate himself after a setback [35, 36]. Individuals in the same scenario have different attitudes toward difficulties, frustrations, and stress. Individuals with higher hardy view setbacks as a prerequisite for success and a necessary path to progress, even in low job satisfaction environments, by adhering to strict rules and regulations. Hardy personality is mostly used in human resource management to study its moderating effect on employees' intention to leave. An increase in the level of hardiness personality can buffer the effect of lower job satisfaction on employees' intention to leave [37–40].

2.4. Unsafe Behavior. The study of unsafe behavior, a hot topic of current research in the field of management, does not have a clear and uniform definition. This article refers to unsafe behavior that is caused by the human dynamic factors of violations and accidents. In high-risk industries, employees with low job satisfaction are prone to actions that violate the work safety regulations and lead to unsafe behaviors, but improving employee job satisfaction can have a corrective effect on the unsafe behaviors of construction workers [41].

In addition to the influence of employees' own emotions, welfare benefits, organizational safety, and various indicators of performance appraisal are significantly associated with employees' unsafe behaviors [42]. According to Kristof's classification, the impact of person-organization match on safety behavior was explored in three dimensions: value
match, demand-supply match, and requirement-competency match, and there was a negative relationship between competency, job conditions, job rewards, and interpersonal relationships in the person-post match dimension and the occurrence of employee insecure behavior [1]. Therefore, the positive effects of person-organization matching and person-post matching on safety compliance behavior and safety participation behavior are significant; and the positive effects played by person-post matching and person-organization matching are different in different contexts [43].

Based on the above analysis, this paper proposes the following hypothesis.

H1: Person-post matching positively affects the job satisfaction of employees in high-risk positions;

H2: Person-organization matching positively affects the job satisfaction of employees in high-risk positions;

H3: Person-organization matching negatively affects the unsafe behavior of employees in high-risk positions;

H4: Person-post matching negatively affects unsafe behaviors of employees in high-risk positions.

H5: Job satisfaction negatively affects the unsafe behavior of employees in high-risk positions.

H6: Job satisfaction plays an intermediary role between person-post matching, person-organization matching, and unsafe behaviors.

H7: Hardy personality plays a moderating role between job satisfaction and unsafe behavior.

2.5. Theoretical Model. Based on the above-mentioned theoretical analysis and hypothesis, a theoretical research model of influencing factors of unsafe behaviors of employees in high-risk positions with job satisfaction as the mediating variable and hardy personality as the moderating variable is constructed, as shown in Figure 1.

3. Research Methods

3.1. Data Collection. Taking high-risk workers such as construction workers and coal mine workers in Shaanxi Province, Sichuan Province, Shanxi Province, and other provinces as the survey subjects, the questionnaires were distributed and collected through online methods such as WeChat based on the principle of random sampling.
Questionnaires were issued from March 6 to June 30, 2021. A total of 580 questionnaires were distributed during the survey, and 530 questionnaires were returned. After excluding invalid questionnaires, 501 valid questionnaires were finally obtained, with an effective rate of 86%. See the basic information in Table 4.

### Table 4: Basic information statistics of the survey sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 25 years old</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26–36 years old</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36–45 years old</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 46 years old</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Junior high school or below</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school or technical secondary school</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior college</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate and above</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>5 years and below</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6–10 years</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11–20 years</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Theoretical hypothesis model.

### 3.2. Variable Measurement

There are 39 items in this questionnaire, including 3 items for basic information, and the other variables are measured using the maturity scale of previous research. Using SPSS25.0 to test the reliability and validity of the scale, the overall Cronbach reliability coefficient of this questionnaire is 0.857, and the combined reliability coefficient is 0.952, indicating that the questionnaire is suitable for exploratory analysis. The reliability and validity test results of each dimension are as follows:

1. **Person-post matching.** Using Wu [44] to develop the scale of the human-post matching measurement table, it contains 10 items, such as "I think I adapt to the labor load of my position.". The Cronbach reliability coefficient is 0.937, and the combined reliability coefficient is 0.966.

2. **People-organization matching.** Using the Cable and DeRue scale [45], it contains 9 items, such as "My values are very similar to the organization’s values.". The Cronbach reliability coefficient is 0.930, and the combined reliability coefficient is 0.956.

3. **Job Satisfaction.** Using the scale of Chinese scholar Zhang Huifeng, it contains 6 items, such as “Are you satisfied with your salary?”. The Cronbach reliability coefficient is 0.873, and the combined reliability coefficient is 0.887.

4. **Hardy personality.** Using the scale compiled by Lu Guohua and Liang Baoyong in 2008, it contains 4 items, such as "work and study will bring me fun.". The Cronbach reliability coefficient is 0.850, and the combined reliability coefficient is 0.808.

5. **Unsafe behavior.** According to the occupational characteristics of high-risk positions in China, the scale was adjusted to include 7 items, such as "I occasionally dismantle machinery and equipment and other safety devices.” The Cronbach reliability coefficient is 0.888, and the combined reliability coefficient is 0.910.

### 4. Research Result

#### 4.1. Descriptive Statistics and Related Analysis

In this study, SPSS25.0 was used for descriptive statistical analysis, and the results of the mean, standard deviation, and correlation coefficient of each variable are shown in Table 5. Person-post matching and job satisfaction \((r = 0.522, P < 0.01)\), person-organization matching and job satisfaction \((r = 0.567, P < 0.01)\) are all significantly positively correlated; person-post matching and unsafe behavior \((r = -0.355, P < 0.01)\), person-organization matching and unsafe behavior \((r = -0.4777, P < 0.01)\), job satisfaction and unsafe behavior \((r = -0.701, P < 0.01)\) are significantly negatively correlated, and the relevant assumptions are obtained after initial verification.

#### 4.2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis

In this study, AMOS26.0 software was used to carry out a confirmatory factor analysis and test of related variables to examine the discriminative validity of five constructs: hardy personality, person-post match, person-organization match, job satisfaction, and unsafe behavior. The analysis results are shown in Table 6. According to the results of confirmatory factor analysis, it is found that the five-factor model fits the actual data best \((\chi^2/df = 1.295, CFI = 0.986, AGFI = 0.922, IFI = 0.986, NFI = 0.942, RMSEA = 0.024)\). The five study variables of the theoretical hypothesis distinguished good validity.
4.3. Hypothetical Test. After confirming that the measurement model has a good degree of fit, this paper further verifies all the research hypotheses. The analysis result of the structural equation model is shown in Figure 2 (P-P indicates person-job match; P-O indicates person-organization match; JS indicates job satisfaction; and UB indicates unsafe behavior).

Table 5: Variable description statistical analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Age</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Education level</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Length of service</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.417</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Hardy personality</td>
<td>3.4576</td>
<td>0.6624</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Person-post matching</td>
<td>4.0816</td>
<td>0.8630</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.385**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Person organization match</td>
<td>4.2861</td>
<td>0.7668</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.426**</td>
<td>0.439**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Job satisfaction</td>
<td>4.2139</td>
<td>0.8271</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.577**</td>
<td>0.522**</td>
<td>0.567**</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Unsafe behavior</td>
<td>4.0853</td>
<td>0.8249</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>-0.569**</td>
<td>-0.355**</td>
<td>-0.477**</td>
<td>-0.710**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *, P < 0.05; **, P < 0.01; ***, P < 0.001.

Table 6: Model fit test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judgment criteria</td>
<td>The smaller, the better</td>
<td>&lt;3.0</td>
<td>&gt;0.9</td>
<td>&gt;0.8</td>
<td>&lt;0.08</td>
<td>&gt;0.9</td>
<td>&gt;0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-factor model</td>
<td>593.272</td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-factor model</td>
<td>1585.827</td>
<td>2.697</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-factor model</td>
<td>3658.808</td>
<td>6.191</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-factor model</td>
<td>4513.207</td>
<td>7.611</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-factor model</td>
<td>5569.040</td>
<td>9.375</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Five-factor model: hardy personality, person-post match, person-organization match, job satisfaction, and insecure behavior; four-factor model: hardy personality and person-organization match combined into one factor, person-post match, job satisfaction, and insecure behavior; three-factor model: hardy personality, person-post match, and person-organization match combined into one factor, job satisfaction, and insecure behavior; two-factor model: hardy personality, person-post match, person-organization match, and job satisfaction combined into one factor and insecure behavior; one-factor model: all variables aggregated into one factor.
4.4. Test of the Moderating Effect of Hardy Personality. This paper uses SPSS25.0 to test the moderating effect of hardy personality. The test results are shown in Table 7. It shows that the interaction item of hardy personality and job satisfaction have significant negative regulation of unsafe behaviors \( r = -0.113, p < 0.001 \). Hypothesis 7 has been verified.

To further confirm the moderating role of hardy personality between job satisfaction and unsafe behaviors, the hardy personality level was divided into high and low groups, and subjects with scores above 1 standard deviation were regarded as the high hardy personality group, and vice versa as the low hardy personality group. And then do a regression analysis of job satisfaction on unsafe behaviors. The results are shown in Figure 3. High hardy personality level and high job satisfaction level have the lowest impact on unsafe behaviors, that is, high hardy personality can weaken the impact of unsafe behaviors on high-risk employees when job satisfaction is low.

4.5. Mediation Test and Adjusted Mediation Test. This paper used the Bootstrap method on the structural model to test the total effect and the mediating effect of job satisfaction between person-post matching and unsafe behavior, and person-organization matching and unsafe behavior. The Bootstrap sampling frequency is set to 5000, the confidence level is set to 95%, and the confidence interval estimation method of deviation correction is used to estimate the interval. The test results of the mediation effect of job satisfaction are shown in Table 8.

It can be seen from the table that job satisfaction plays a complete mediating effect in the relationship between person-post matching affecting unsafe behaviors and person-organization matching affecting unsafe behaviors. The lower limit and upper limit of the confidence interval do not include a value of 0, indicating a complete mediation of job satisfaction. The effect is significant, and Hypothesis 6 is verified. Therefore, the improvement of the person-post matching degree and the person-organization matching degree of high-risk employees can improve the individual job satisfaction of employees, thereby reducing the occurrence of unsafe behaviors and reducing the incidence of accidents.

This paper again used the bootstrap method to verify the significance of the moderated mediation effect model. The test results showed that hardy personality can adjust job satisfaction and has a significant indirect effect on the unsafe behavior of employees in high-risk positions (indirect effect value is \(-0.253, 95\% \) confidence interval level is \([-0.293, -0.166]\)). In addition, the interaction item (cognitive hardiness * job satisfaction) has a path coefficient of \(-0.253\) for unsafe behaviors of employees in high-risk positions, \( p = 0.005 \), indicating that the higher the level of hardy personality, the person-post match and the person-organization match respond through job satisfaction. The weaker the effect of unsafe behavior, the stronger the opposite.

5. Management Enlightenment

Based on the matching perspective and individual personality perspective, this paper constructed the role model of human-job matching and human-organization matching on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Without adjustment</th>
<th>With adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Unsafe behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.179**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>0.103*</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-post matching</td>
<td>0.344***</td>
<td>-0.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-organization matching</td>
<td>0.258***</td>
<td>-0.209***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.034*</td>
<td>-0.491***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality * job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta R^2 )</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F )</td>
<td>35.249***</td>
<td>47.336***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001.\)
the influence mechanism of unsafe behavior of employees in high-risk positions, and found that employee satisfaction and hardiness personality of employees in high-risk positions have a significant negative influence on unsafe behavior. Therefore, this paper provides management suggestions on how to improve the job satisfaction of employees in high-risk positions and enhance the psychological hardiness of individual employees for the safety management of employees in high-risk positions.

1. Improving the match between employees in high-risk positions and their jobs. Managers of high-risk positions should not only train employees with job-related knowledge and skills, but also focus on providing employees with positions that match their abilities, fully mobilize employees’ initiative and enthusiasm, and thus enable employees to effectively improve their level of safety behavior skills.

2. Improving the match between individual employees in high-risk positions and the organization. Managers should communicate and communicate with employees promptly on time to provide emotional care and spiritual support and encouragement for employees in high-risk positions, so that the employees can quickly integrate with the organization and establish safety values and goals consistent with the organization, which can eliminate employees’ psychological isolation, cultivate employees’ initiative to participate in safety activities and awareness of safety management, and improve employees’ ability to independently solve hidden safety problems.

3. Focus on employee job satisfaction and fulfillment. Due to the special nature of the industry of high-risk jobs, managers should pay great attention to the job satisfaction of employees, and can create a harmonious working atmosphere by improving wages, vocational training, and welfare.

4. Strengthen the level of resilience of trained employees. A high level of hardness can weaken the negative impact of job satisfaction on unsafe behavior, so managers should take reasonable measures to continuously strengthen the training of the hardness level of employees in high-risk positions and improve their ability to withstand and resist stress in the face of work difficulties. When employees are faced with an unsafe accident, they can face the danger and effectively mitigate the adverse effects of negative events on individual employees and reduce the incidence of unsafe behavior accidents.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, the empirical test found that person-post matching and person-organization matching have a significant negative influence on employee insecurity in high-risk positions; job satisfaction plays a fully mediating role between man-position matching and insecurity in high-risk positions, and the fully mediating role of job satisfaction is regulated by the hardy personality, the higher the level of the hardy personality of employees whose job satisfaction has a negative influence on insecurity will be weakened. The above findings provide a reference value for the management of employees in high-risk positions in order to weaken the damage of safety accidents [46–49].
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