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ABSTRACT

This study has made an earnest attempt to explore the relationship between Core self evaluations (Bottom line Evaluations individuals hold about themselves), its lower order traits – Self esteem, locus of control, generalized Self efficacy and job performance and its components – Task performance, Adaptability, employee productivity, Job stress and stability. Core self-evaluations was found to be a valid predictor of job performance and its components. Among the Core self– evaluations traits, generalized self efficacy emerged as the predominant variable having a vital impact on Job performance followed by locus of control. The broad trait of Core – self evaluations were found to have a relatively lower effect on Job performance when compared with its lower order traits – generalized self efficacy and locus of control. The study was conducted amongst both executives and managers in Indian manufacturing and service industries. The sample size was N =316.
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INTRODUCTION

The primary objective of the study was to analyse the relationship between Core self evaluations and its lower traits with Job performance and its components.

In 1997, Judge, Locke and Durham published a conceptual paper linking an integrative personality trait termed core self – evaluations to job satisfaction. Judge’s research article drew from eight diverse literatures (Philosophy, clinical psychology research, clinical psychology practice, job satisfaction research, stress research, child development theory, personality theory, and social psychology) to introduce the concept of “core evaluations” as an integrating principle for understanding the personological bases of job satisfaction.
Judge et al. (1997) suggest that Core self-evaluations are fundamental, bottom-line evaluations that individuals hold about themselves, the world, and others. According to Judge et al. core evaluations influence people’s appraisal of themselves, the world and others, and do so subconsciously. Thus, situation specific appraisals (for example the evaluation of one’s work or one’s colleagues) are affected by these deeper and more fundamental self-appraisals, even though most people are not aware of the influence their self-evaluations have on their perceptions or behaviour as they occur. Although individuals may have core evaluations in multiple domains (e.g., evaluations of self, evaluations of others, evaluations of the world) early work on core evaluations (Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger, 1998) demonstrated that core self-evaluations were the most important.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

In their initial formulation of the core self-evaluation concept, Judge et al. (1997) searched the literature for traits that met three criteria: self-evaluative (core traits should involve self-evaluation as opposed to description of oneself or others) fundamentality (core traits should be fundamental as opposed to surface traits; Cattell, 1965) and scope (core traits should be wide in scope of cardinal traits; Allport, 1961).

Judge and colleagues identified three traits that clearly met these criteria: self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, and neuroticism. Additionally, they suggested that locus of control might also qualify. Subsequent core self-evaluations research has focused mostly on these four traits. However, Judge et al. (1997) also discussed the possibility that other traits might be considered as indicators of core self-evaluations. Specifically, they discussed dispositional optimism and positive and negative affectivity. There is some evidence that dispositional optimism (Judge et al. 1998b) and negative affectivity (Judge and Heller, 2002) are indicators of the core self-evaluations concept.

Core self-evaluations theory has its origins from the writings of clinical psychologist Packer who suggested that individuals make general, metaphysical evaluations of themselves which subconsciously affect specific appraisals of people and events. Judge, Lock et al. (1998) reinforced these views by saying that subconscious conclusion that individuals reach about themselves influence all other appraisals of the self, others, and the world. The theory of Core self-evaluations has facilitated scholars with the framework for describing disposition based effects on work attitudes and behaviors. (Russell E. Johnson, Christopher C. Rosen and Paul E. Levy 2008). Judge et al. (1997) defined Core self-evaluations as basic conclusions or bottom-line evaluation that individuals hold about themselves. This higher order construct is a broad dispositional trait which is latent and is represented by core specific and well established traits in personality psychology literature and is being represented by self esteem, locus of control, emotional stability, and generalized self efficacy. The degree to which dispositional traits impact work related attitudes is determined by three criteria: evaluation focus, fundamentality, and scope. Evaluation focus refers to the extent to which traits involved evaluations rather than descriptions. Evaluation traits directly impact the perceptions and attitudes of one’s self and the environment. Fundamentality refers to traits that are most central to one’s self concept. These fundamental traits have the tendency to affect one’s evaluations of one’s job because of the influence of peripheral traits and attitudes. The last criterion scope refers to how broad or how narrow a trait is.

In industrial and organizational psychology research, various combinations of self esteem, locus of control, neuroticism and generalized self efficacy have been studied in the relation with job performance (Judge et al. 1998; Judge, Bono, J.E., and Locke, 2000; Judge, Erez, and Bono, 1998; Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger, 1998). It has been found in that the four core traits load on a single higher order latent factor. Timothy A. Judge et al. (2003) have proposed that the four traits have conceptual similarities. An individual who scores high on Core self-evaluations is considered to
be an individual who is high on confidence levels and has a positive orientation towards life which gets manifested in high levels of self esteem, emotional stability, generalized self efficacy, and internal locus of control.

Tharenou’s (1979) study found inconsistent results in relating self esteem to job performance with more findings with non significant relationships being on the higher side. Joel Brockner (1988) found that there was correlation between self esteem and job performance only in certain situations. Several theories of motivation support a link between Core self - evaluations traits and job performance. Korman (1970) stated that individuals tend to behave in a manner which is consistent to their self image implying that individuals with high self esteem will perform better to maintain their positive self image. Also individuals with positive, optimistic orientation tend to increase the efforts when faced with unfavorable circumstances whereas individuals with pessimistic orientation tend to either lower their effort, show withdrawal symptoms and display symptoms of learned helplessness. Weiss and Sherman (1973) stated that individuals with internal locus of control tend to increase their efforts to match their actual standard performance. People, who have low self esteem, lower their standards or tend to completely withdraw from the task when they are given a negative feedback.

The results demonstrated that the traits self esteem, generalized self efficacy had corrected correlation with job performance ($\rho =0.23$) internal locus of control ($\rho =0.22$) self esteem ($s= 0.26$) almost matching with generalized self efficacy exactly matching with the conscientiousness score obtained by Barrick et al. (1991) with respect to Job performance in their meta analysis ($p =0.23$). Even though self esteem showed the highest average correlation with job performance the correlations varied significantly from study to study and in some cases it was zero. It can be inferred that there could be factors across studies that moderate the impact of self esteem on job performance.

Law, Wong, and Mobley (1998) have mentioned that Core self - evaluations is a latent psychological construct because it is the latent commonality underlying the other four dimensions. Judge and Bono (2001b) in a meta-analysis showed that the relationship of four core traits generalized across studies. Further they investigated the relationships of the four core traits and job performance. They found that three of the four core traits generalized across studies. Judge et al. (2000) found that individuals with positive self evaluations perceived the job as providing more intrinsic job characteristics which helped them to attain jobs with higher level of complexity and challenge. Judge (2001a) showed that Core self - evaluations were related to task activity or performance and productivity with respect to sales volume.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., & Bono, J. E. (1998) have observed that individuals with high Core self - evaluations have more motivational levels when it comes to performing their jobs. People with more positive self evaluations are perceived to be more effective in handling challenges and overcoming obstacles. Judge et al. (1999) found that the ability to cope with organizational change was higher in managers who scored high on Core self - evaluations. Judge et al. (2002) analyzed the relationship between the Core self - evaluations and job stress and found a weighted average correlation of 0.23.

In a meta-analytic review of self esteem, generalized self efficacy, locus of control and emotional stability, Judge and Bono (2001) demonstrated that all the four traits displayed positive non zero correlations with job satisfaction inferring that people with high scores on positive self evaluations were relatively happier and reported higher levels of job and life satisfaction. The Core self - evaluations concept as a unitary construct displayed stronger correlations with work outcomes rather than the lower order traits underlying the same. The beta coefficient values of the core traits were considerably higher when compared with the individual traits. When evaluated as a single independent predictor, the Core self - evaluations trait explained 27% of the variance in life satisfaction. Research results in Japan indicate that a positive self concept is fundamental to the formation of job and life attitudes.

J.K.Sager, H.D.Strutton, D.A.Johnson (2006) analyzed the utility of two Core self - evaluations traits-internal locus of control and self efficacy as discriminators of job satisfaction, burn out, role conflict,
withdrawal, satisfaction with manager, and performance. The sample size was 452 sales people 
employed by an international manufacturer and distributor of branded lines of industrial maintenance 
chemicals and specialty lubricants. The results indicated that people with higher self efficacy belief 
had more positive feelings towards sales jobs. Internal locus of control in combination with higher 
confidence in selling skills effectively served as a counter against negativity caused by role stress in 
sales job. They have further inferred that higher levels of internal locus of control has a desensitizing 
effect on the emotionally exhausting effect associated with low self efficacy beliefs. It also found that 
sales people high on internal locus of control are more prone to continue in a job for longer time 
regardless of their beliefs in self efficacy.

Judge et al. (2005) proposed that individuals with positive Core self - evaluations or positive self 
concept tend to successfully cope with external constraints because these traits facilitate successful 
self regulatory behaviour. These traits have been known to foster successful self regulation since they 
have positive relationship with satisfaction, coping and task performance (Blau, 1993, Judge and 
Bono, 2001a, Spector, 1982). On the other hand, individuals with poor self evaluations were less 
successful in coping with external constraints because of the relative unbelief in themselves to 
encounter such situations. Employees with high score evaluations were able to set self-concordant 
goals which paved the way for greater job satisfaction.

Joyce E.Bono, and Timothy A.Judge (2003) in a meta- analysis of the relationships between Core self 
- evaluations and its role in job satisfaction and job performance found a correlation of r = 0.41 for job 
satisfaction and r =0.23 for job performance. It is being perceived that Core self - evaluations might 
represent a piece or portion of the personality domain or facet that has not been adequately 
represented by the “Big” five factors and researchers in this regard refer to the trait of self esteem 
which has been perceived to have not been represented explicitly by “Big” five. The relationships 
between “Big” five personality traits and the self esteem trait of Core self - evaluations has not been 
well established.

Thorsten Stumpp et.al (2009) tested which of the job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task 
significance, autonomy and feedback) mediated the relationship between Core self - evaluations and 
job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The results of the sample of 199 employees 
demonstrated that Core self - evaluations were related to job satisfaction and organizational 
commitment. The job characteristic of task significance was found to mediate this relationship. Zeki 
Simsek, Ciaran Heavey and John (Jack) F.Veiga (2010) studies suggest that CEOs whose personality 
reflecting higher scores on Core self - evaluations have a strong positive influence on their firms 
entrepreneurial orientation and this influence is strong in organizations facing dynamic environments 
but quite negligible in stable environments.

Thomas et al. (2006) have observed that locus of control as a personality trait atleast has the same 
predictive power for work outcomes comparable with the predictive power of “Big” five personality 
traits. Hurtz and Donovan’s (2000) meta-analysis revealed that the “Big” five traits had lessor 
predictive power when compared with the predictive power of locus of control with task performance. 
(r = 0.17). Erez and Judge (2001) found that Core self - evaluations is related to goal setting 
motivation which facilitates effective job performance. Amongst the four traits, locus of control had 
the strongest correlations with task motivation and with goal setting motivation. Joyce E.Bono and 
Judge (2003) has suggested that the four traits of Core self - evaluations can collectively represent a 
broader, more construct valid measure of emotional stability.

Self Esteem
Self esteem represents an individual’s overall belief about his or her self-worth and competency. 
Harter (1990) has defined self esteem as the overall value that one places on oneself as a person. 
Greenwald, Bellezza, and Banaji (1988) have proposed that self esteem is the single most important 
indicator of positive self concept. Costa and McCrae (1994) have demonstrated that self esteem is a 
relatively sable trait over time despite its propensity to have short term fluctuations.
Rosenberg et al. (1995) have said that self esteem is conceptually a hierarchical construct and that individuals may have different self perceptions of their work and competence across different roles. The emphasis on higher order needs began with Abraham Maslow’s need hierarchy hypothesis. A body of literature has investigated the genetic and environmental architectures that lies beneath self esteem suggesting that genetic influences on self esteem ranges approximately between 30% to 40%.

Coopersmith (1967) has defined self esteem as a particular kind of personal construct that refers to the manner in which individuals attribute an inferred dispositions in themselves. It includes both cognitive and affective psychological processes to enable the person to perform, to identify and understand his self worth. Korman (1970, 1974) has identified three kinds of self esteem namely chronic self esteem, task specific self esteem and socially influenced self esteem. Chronic self esteem refers to a relatively persistent personality trait that has relatively consistent occurrence across different situations. Task specific self esteem has its origin in past experience in particular tasks and is a reflection of one’s perceived degree of competence in doing a task. Socially influenced self esteem is a function of another’s expectations for one’s behaviour implying that behaviour is predominantly controlled by another person’s perception of one’s competence.

Joel Brockner (1988) has said that individuals who have low self esteem level are more reactive to external variables there by exhibiting malleability. According to behavioral plasticity theory, high self esteem can act as active buffer against negative conditions thereby reducing the negative impact. Individuals with low self esteem do not have such a buffer and therefore are adversely affected by negative circumstances. High levels of self esteem tend to weaken the relationship between roles stressors and their outcomes. Using the behavioral plasticity theory framework, researchers have analyzed the impact of self esteem level as a moderator of roles stressors on factors like job satisfaction, job strain and job depression. However, researchers have found only mixed or no support for the predictions of behavioral plasticity theory.

Recent researchers have suggested that focusing simply on self esteem level cannot provide a comprehensive picture of the effects of self esteem on job performance since there could be unmeasured moderators in addition to self esteem which might impact performance. They extent to which and self esteem based on performance has been found to acts as a boundary condition for both self consistency and behavioural plasticity theory prediction.

Self esteem plays an important role in predicting employee attitudes and behaviours. Pierce and Gardner (2004) have said that individuals who believe themselves to be worthy and valuable in general are likely to believe that they are worthy and valuable in specific settings like workplace. In workplace settings, an individuals’ level of general self esteem exists prior to employment.

Nathan A.Bowling et al. (2010) have found evidence for the mediating role of organisation based self esteem between general self esteem and work related to criteria like job satisfaction, organisational commitment, affective commitment and job performance. On the pragmatic front, they have suggested that if an organization is attempting to influence employees’ attitude towards themselves, the intervention should measure an attempt to change an employees’ context specific self esteem rather than general self esteem.

Joel Brockner and Ted Hess (1986) conducted a study on self esteem and task performance in quality circles. Quality circles represent small groups of employees for the same department who voluntarily and regularly interact to identify, analyse and solve problems related to work group settings. Wood et al. (1983) have said that employees in quality circles have to believe that their support and participation will benefit themselves as well as the organisation and they must be well trained in the group dynamics and problem solving methods which are part of the quality control technology. Self esteem is positively related to both the above two factors said by Wood et al. (1983) for a quality circle’s success.
Kernis (2003) has differentiated between high self esteem and optimal self esteem. High self esteem is perceived to be fragile or secure depending upon the extent to which it is defensive or genuine, stable or unstable true or contingent and congruent or discrepant with non conscious feelings of self worth. Optimal self esteem is characterised by qualities associated with genuine, true, stable and congruent with unconscious self esteem.

John D. Kammeyer-Mueller and Timothy A. Judge, Ronald F. Piccolo (2008) analysed whether self esteem will be affected by extrinsic career success and found that self esteem increased occupational prestige and income and career outcomes did not affect self esteem.

**Locus of Control**

Locus of control refers to an individual’s perception that the events that happened to one are contingent upon one’s behavior. Rotter (1966) conceptualized locus of control as a generalized construct with internality and externality being opposite ends of a continuum. People with internal locus of control are those who firmly believe that they are the masters of their fate and are confident, alert and well directed in their attempts to control their external environments. They perceive a strong link between their actions and consequences. People with external locus of control believe that they do not have direct control over their fate and are often receptive to the dictates of the external environment. They tend to attribute outcomes to luck or external factors.

Locus of control plays an important role in work or job performance. It is related to various importance work outcomes like job performance and job satisfaction (Judge and Bono, 2001). Perceived control has been examined in the psychology literature in a variety of forms. Psychologists have identified more than 100 constructs like action control, mastery, helplessness, causal attributions, etc., The concept of control has relationship with a multitude of cognitive, affective, behavioral, and physiological outcomes.

Spector (1982) says that internals have higher level of job motivation, job performance, job satisfaction, and leadership than people with external locus of control. Also internals are more or less likely to leave their employers depending on the situation. However, Spector’s research is primarily qualitative by nature and researchers do question the validity of his claims since it is more than two decades old.

Judge and Bono (2001, 2003) have proposed that locus of control is one of the core components along with generalised self efficacy, self esteem, and emotional stability of the higher order construct - Core self evaluations . They found out the internal locus of control is related to job satisfaction \( (r=0.32) \) and job performance \( (r=0.22) \). Locus of control is also being conceptualized as a proximal predictor of an “individuals” well being with internal locus of control being a relatively strong factor. Lack of control can result in lower self worth and excessive stress. It is being believed that people with better internal locus of control have a positive rudimentary evaluation of self worth whereas the reverse is true with externals. Internals are more sensitive to information that directly or indirectly gives a connotation of their self worth.

Research has demonstrated that people with high external locus of control have close relationship with the aspects of psychopathology such as depression and other personality orders. Locus of control has correlation with both personal and professional work related outcomes like life satisfaction, physical health and job satisfaction. Internals are perceived to be psychologically more healthier than externals. Internal locus of control is related to global job satisfaction and specific facets of job satisfaction like pay and promotions. It does reflect the employees’ commitments to their organization in terms of punctuality, performance and productivity. Working for hours and higher attendance is normally seen with employees having a positive evaluation of their work roles and the environments. Even though internals have more turnover intentions in jobs in which they don’t have satisfaction, they exhibit higher levels of job satisfactions in roles they tend to fit in.
Yukl and Latham (1978) found that internals have a tendency to set more difficult goals and have stronger need for achievements. Phares (1976) is of the view that internals are more prone to defer gratification to satisfy their need for achievements. Research has suggested that those employees who perceived greater control have higher work motivational levels and it propels them to exert greater effort on work tasks. Mudrack (1990) while analyzing machiavellianism and locus of control in a meta analytic study has said that internals rely more on their efforts to obtain desired results rather than using manipulation and deception as tools.

Internals have stronger faith in both the effort – performance and performance reward relationships. Internals perceived that they can obtain more desirable work outcomes then externals. Locus of control can be considered as a personality trait that predicts one’s internal motivation and the belief in his ability to achieve desirable goals more. Optimistic people show higher involvement in jobs and exhibit greater engagements in developmental activities. They have a strong sense of empowerment because of their belief that they are able to take control and make choices indicating their power potential (Liden and Arad, 1996). Internals’ motivation is manifested in high task performance because they see the rewards for working hard. Previous research has shown a positive relationship between job motivation and performance on core task. Internals have a tendency to seek situations wherein there is a high probability for exercising control over environments. Kahle (1980) found that internals showed preference for tasks requiring skills whereas external preferred tasks requiring luck.

Thomas et al. (2006) have found that locus of control was related to job satisfaction (r=0.33) task performance (r=0.17) and self efficacy (r=0.28). Locus of control has demonstrated comparable predictive power compared to the Big five personality traits. They also found that people with high internal locus of control perceived a high probability of attaining their desired outcomes by virtue of their efforts whereas individuals with external locus of control had less control over the desired outcomes.

Avtgis (1998) in a meta analysis have found that internal locus of control was negatively related to susceptibility to persuasion implying that they may be more stubborn and hard to influence. The person-organisational fit theory (Judge and Cable, 1997) suggests that employees with an internal locus of control will function better when they are working in cultures that has harmony with their attributes. Lack of synergy between one’s locus of control and cultures might inhibit performance and its outcome. Managerial and leadership effectiveness can be increased by understanding the potential power of subordinates’ control belief. The personality power of locus of control helps in predicting employees’ work place attitudes and behavior.

Rebecca P. Ang and Weinning C Chang (1999) while analyzing the impact of domain specific locus of control on need for achievement and affiliation have found out domain specific measures of locus of control are better predictors of behavior for respective domain relevant goals than for goals in the non related view. Schleit (1986) examined upward influencing capabilities of 60 managers regarding a variety of strategic decisions. The results indicated that managers who had a high need of achievement and an internal locus of control were more influential in strategic decisions than managers having an external locus of control and a lower need for achievement. Organ and Green (1974) studying a sample of scientists and engineers found external locus of control to be positively associated with role ambiguity and negatively associated with work satisfaction.

The most commonly measure of locus of control is Rotter’s (1996) which has a reliability of 0.70 and the Spector’s (1998) work locus of control scale with a reliability of 0.78. Ng, Sorensen, and Eby (2006) in a meta-analysis demonstrated locus of control as a predictor of burn-out.

Miller (1983) studied the impact of locus of control and strategy variables from top executives belonging to various industries in 52 medium and large firms. Factors like risk taking, innovations and pro -activeness of simple and planning firms were predicted by locus of control of top executives. Miller and Toulouse (1986 b ) found that internal locus of control correlated with relative performance within dynamic environments. There was substantial increase in actual sales growth and
net income growth in all environments. Govindarajan (1989) by studying a sample of 105 general managers from strategic business units found that internal locus of control was positively related to effectiveness for strategic business units with differentiation strategy but negatively related to effectiveness for strategic business units with a low cost strategy. Wally and Baum (1994) conducted a study on the pace of decision making and locus of control on 151 CEOs from the manufacturing sector and found that locus of control was not related to decision making, cognitive complexity, centralisation or experience. It rather related to increased formalisation, risk propensity and use of

**Generalized self efficacy**

Generalized self efficacy refers to a judgment of how well an individual can perform across a variety of situations. Bandura (1997) observed that self efficacy makes a difference to how people feel, think, and act. Bandura (1982) has defined self efficacy as judgment of how well one can perform behaviors necessary to deal with prospective situations. In short, it reflects self confidence. People with high self efficacy choose to set themselves higher goals and perform challenging tasks. Highly self-efficacious people invest more effort and exhibit perseverance when compared to people low in self efficacy. Even in the midst of setbacks they recover more quickly. High self efficacy enables actions to be pre-shaped in thought, and makes people action oriented. It is of a prospective and operative nature. Bandura (1997) mentions that perceived self efficacy can be characterized as being competence based, prospective, and action related, as opposed to similar constructs that share only part of this portrayal. General self efficacy is associated with a broad and stable sense of personal competence to deal effectively with a variety of stressful situations. Self efficacy beliefs influence motivational processes and behaviors and achievements.

Persons with low self efficacy have low self esteem and have a tendency to have pessimistic thoughts. Persons with high self regulations are expected to be high on generalized self efficacy for self regulation refers to any effort by an individual to alter their own responses by controlling impulses.

Generalized self efficacy beliefs are expected to be negatively related or unrelated to the tendency to make social comparison. According to Gibbons and Buunk (1999) social comparison orientation is a tendency to compare oneself to others in different areas of life and comparison oriented people assess their own ability on the basis of other people’s judgment but not on their beliefs. Jerusalem and Schwarzer (1992) mentioned that people with strong efficacy perceived stressful situations as more challenging and overcame obstacles. Bandura (1997) mentions that self efficacy determines the cognitive appraisal of stressful situations. A low sense of self efficacy is normally associated with negative emotions and helplessness. Those who are high in self efficacy have been found to be more successful in solving conceptual problems at work.

Marisa Salanova, et al. (2002) tested the moderating the role of self efficacy in terms of generalized self efficacy and computer self efficacy in the job demand control model and its effect on burn-out. Based on data collected from 405 employees using information technology as a vital tool, the researchers found that more specific level of self efficacy moderated the relationship between job demands and controls and levels of burn-out dimension.

Generalised self efficacy has strong correlations with self esteem since, it refers to an individuals’ judgment or perceptions of this capabilities to handle challenges in life effectively. However, self efficacy cannot serve as a substitute for self esteem since what an individual masters across situations (self efficacy) may not be rudimental to what is being valued by the individuals in expressing his self worth. Research indicates that self efficacy is related to task effort and performance, persistence, resilience in the face of failure, effective problem solving, and self control. Thus, high generalised self efficacy can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy with respect to success rate (Hysong and Quinones, 1997).

Research Design: Survey study was used for the controlled testing of the causal processes i.e., to determine the effect of Variable/ variables on the other
The study was designed to analyze both the significance of relationship between the variables and the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable. The Non – probability sampling method (Purposive sampling) was used. Primary data collection pertaining to the variables under study was done by administering the research questionnaires to the willing respondents in person. The study was done in two phases. A pilot study was done to test the reliability and validity of the questionnaires and then the main study was conducted.

Sampling

The respondents were primarily chosen from well – established and reputed organizations. Most of the companies chosen were in the top segments of their respective businesses and product domains. Both the manufacturing and services sector were considered and taken up for the study.

The sample included working individual’s right from the trainee level to senior management professionals in the executive cadre. The individual employees who answered the questionnaires were those who were either chosen by the company or who voluntarily agreed to fill up the questionnaires upon request. The Non – probability sampling method of purposive sampling was used in the selection of departments and individuals.

All the variables Core self evaluations and Job performance were aimed at capturing self perceived personality and job performance. On the job performance index, self perceived job performance was accepted since the organizations are disinclined to share the performance ratings of their employees to outsiders as a policy to maintain confidentiality.

The questionnaire was administered to respondents individually or in groups after elaborating them about the research objectives and the significance of each of the sections in the study. The sample size was N = 316.

Measurement

The following instruments were used for measuring the variables

1. Core self - evaluations scale (CSES).

Core self - evaluations scale (CSES) : The Core self - evaluations scale developed by Timothy A.Judge, Amir Erez, Joyce E.Bono, Carl E.Thoresen (2003) is a direct and relatively brief measure of the trait “Core self - evaluations”. Out of the 12 items given by them, only 10 items have been taken up. The items which were excluded were from the neuroticism domain. This was done to exclude the items from the CSES scale but also to test its reliability and validity of CSES as a personality measure minus the factor of neuroticism. The cronbach alpha (coefficient of reliability) for the instrument was 0.705 for the sample size of 316 in the current study.

Job Performance : Job- Performance: The researcher constructed a concise 26 item scale of Job performance to measure five main factors (Task Performance, Adaptability, Employee Efficiency/Productivity, Job stress and stability) associated with the performance of a job. The Cronbach alpha (Coefficient consistency) for this scale was 0.832 for the sample studied
Job performance refers to actions that contribute to organizational goals and that are under the individual’s control. After reviewing taxonomies of job performance, researchers have felt the need to broaden the scope of job performance by not restricting it to duties and responsibilities alone (Task performance). The various other factors which account for performance with respect to a job viz., adaptability, job stress, employee productivity/efficiency, stability have been taken as components to measure the macro factor of Job performance.

Task performance: The proficiency with which job incumbents perform activities that are formally recognized as part of their jobs; activities that contribute to the organization's technical core either directly or by implementing a part of its technological process, or indirectly by providing it with needed materials or services.

Adaptive Performance: Proficiency with which a person alters his or her behavior to meet the demands of the environment.

Employee Productivity/efficiency: measures how the output of the employee has changed over time with respect to” human resources efforts input “ignoring the constitutions from other factors.

Job stress: a dynamic condition in which an individual is confronted with an opportunity, constraint or demand related to his job for which the outcome is perceived to be both uncertain and important. Stability of Performance: An individual’s consistency in performing jobs over time

Data Collection

Data collection was done in a systematic manner. In the first phase, a pilot study was undertaken to test the reliability and validity of the questionnaire developed. The number of respondents envisaged for the pilot study was 60. After getting convincing results for the reliability and validity measures, the data collection process was taken up for the sample size estimated. The questionnaires were administrated to each of the individuals in person after briefly explaining to them the objectives of the study. In some of the organization, the data was collected by organizing the members in groups of 20- 30 in batches and then administered

Results and Discussion

Correlation matrix – Core self - evaluations (CSES) – Job performance and its components:

Core self - evaluations had significant correlations with its lower order traits – self esteem (r = 0.741, p < 0.01) locus of control (r = 0.678, p < 0.01) and generalized self efficacy (r = 0.375, p < 0.01). The finding reinforces the established fact in CSES research (Judge and Bono, 2002) that the lower order traits have correlations with the latent underlying broad trait of Core self - evaluations.

Core self - evaluations had significant relationships with job performance and its components. With job performance it had a correlation of (r = 0.210, p < 0.01). It had correlations of (r = 0.267, p < 0.01) with task performance (r = 0.253, p < 0.01) with
adaptability \( (r = 0.303, p < 0.01) \) with employee productivity/efficiency. It had negative
correlations with job stress \( (r = -0.253, p < 0.01) \) and with stability \( (r = -0.167, p < 0.01) \).
The negative correlation of Core self - evaluations with job stress does substantiate that
employees with a positive self concept (the other name for Core self - evaluations) have the
ability to handle stress.

Table 1: Correlation matrix – Core self - evaluations (CSES) – Job performance and its
components

| N=316 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CSES | Self Esteem | Locus of Control | Generalised Self Efficacy | Job Performance | Task Performance | Adaptability | Employee Productivity/Efficiency | Job Stress | Stability |
| CSES | 1 |
| Self Esteem | 0.741** | 1 |
| Significance | 0.01 |
| Locus of Control | 0.678** | 0.308** | 1 |
| Significance | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Generalised Self Efficacy | 0.735** | 0.221** | 0.316** | 1 |
| Significance | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Job Performance | 0.210** | -0.013 | 0.149** | 0.322** | 1 |
| Significance | 0.01 | 0.817 | 0.008 | 0.01 |
| Task Performance | 0.267** | 0.081 | 0.153** | 0.337** | 0.851** | 1 |
| Significance | 0.01 | 0.153 | 0.007 | 0.01 |
| Adaptability | 0.253** | 0.1 | 0.151** | 0.290** | 0.715** | 0.545** | 1 |
| Significance | 0.01 | 0.075 | 0.007 | 0.01 |
| Employee Productivity/ Efficiency | 0.303** | 0.125* | 0.194** | 0.333** | 0.820** | 0.681** | 0.540** | 1 |
| Significance | 0.01 | 0.027 | 0.001 | 0.01 |
| Job Stress | -0.253** | -0.340** | -0.106 | -0.077 | 0.186** | -0.103 | -0.193** | -0.058 | 1 |
| Significance | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.061 | 0.17 | 0.001 | 0.068 |
| Stability | -0.167** | -0.199** | -0.035 | -0.101 | 0.346** | 0.121* | 0.059 | 0.106 | 0.279** | 1 |
| Significance | 0.003 | 0.01 | 0.53 | 0.073 | 0.01 |

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Self esteem did not have significant correlation with job performance, task performance, and
adaptability. However, the data showed that it had significant correlations with employee
productivity/efficiency \( (r = 0.135, p < 0.01) \). It had comparatively higher negative
correlations with job stress \( (r = -0.340, p < 0.01) \) and with stability \( (r = 0.199, p < 0.01) \).
Locus of control and generalized self efficacy had significant positive correlations with job
performance, task performance, and adaptability and employee productivity. They did not
have significant relationship with either job stress or stability. Generalized self efficacy had a
significant positive correlation \( (r = 0.322, p < 0.01) \) with job performance \( (r = 0.337, p < 0.01) \) with task performance
\( (r = 0.290, p < 0.01) \) with adaptability \( (r = 0.33, p < 0.01) \) with employee productivity/efficiency. Locus of control had relatively lesser correlation with job
performance and its components when compared with generalized self efficacy. Locus of
control had a correlation of \( (r = 0.149, p < 0.01) \) with job performance \( (r = 0.153, p < 0.01) \) with task performance
\( (r = 0.151, p < 0.01) \) with adaptability and \( (r = 0.194, p < 0.01) \) with employee productivity/efficiency.
Table 2 Multiple Regression - Enter Method - Core-Self Evaluation (Self Esteem, Locus of Control, Generalized Self Efficacy) - Job Performance

(N = 316)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Independent / emerging variable(s)</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Sig.,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>16.257</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Generalized Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>16.257</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A multiple regression analysis showed that the traits of Core self-evaluations – Self esteem, locus of control and generalized self efficacy collectively have an impact of 13.5% significant at 0.01 level. This is over and above the 9.9% variance influenced by the big five factors of personality. In this study, the results show that the Core self-evaluations traits are able to predict more variance when compared with the predictive ability of Big five factors of personality with respect to job performance.

Table 3: Multiple Regression – Stepwise Method Core-Self Evaluation (Self Esteem, Locus of Control, Generalized Self Efficacy) - Job Performance

(N = 316)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Independent / emerging variable(s)</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Std., β</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Sig.,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Generalized Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>36.33</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor: - a – Generalized Self-Efficacy
Predictors: - b – Generalized Self-Efficacy, Locus of Control
Predictors: - c – Generalized Self Efficacy, Locus of Control, Self Esteem.

A stepwise multiple regression showed that all the three variables considered under the broad trait of Core self-evaluations were significant predictors of job performance. Generalised self efficacy emerged as the significant and predominant predictor of job performance among the three traits accounting for a variance of 10.4% significant at 0.01 level (Table .25). The variable locus of control explained an additive variance of 2% taking the collective impact to 12.4% (Hypothesis 8 is supported). Self esteem explained an additive variance of 1.1% taking the collective impact to 13.5%. It can be seen that the variables self esteem, locus of control and generalized self efficacy explained together 13.5% of variance on job performance. The broad trait core self-evaluations as an individual variable explained only 4.4% of variance showing that the individual traits collectively are more powerful predictors of job performance when compared Core self-evaluations and Job Performance.
In the correlation matrix, Core self - evaluations (the composite score of self –esteem, locus of control and generalized self- efficacy) had significant correlations with Job performance ($r = 0.210$) and the components of Task Performance ($r = 0.267$), Adaptability ($r = 0.253$), Employee efficiency/ Productivity ($r = 0.0303$), Job stress ($r = -0.167$). In the study conducted by Timothy Judge and Joyce Bono (2003) the correlation between Core self - evaluations and Job performance was 0.23. The results of our study do closely match with the scores obtained by Judge and Bono (2003).

Table : 4 Regression – Enter Method -Core self - evaluations – Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Std. β</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Sig.,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Core self - evaluations</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>14.461</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table : 5 Regression – Enter Method -Core self - evaluations – Components of Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Std. β</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Sig.,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Core self - evaluations</td>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>24.156</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Core self - evaluations</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>21.523</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Core self - evaluations</td>
<td>Employee efficiency / Productivity</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>31.726</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Core self - evaluations</td>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Core self - evaluations</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>9.042</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core self - evaluations, the broad, latent underlying characteristic of variables like self – esteem, locus of control and generalized self efficacy did have a significant impact on job performance explaining a variance of 4.4 % significant at 0.01 level(Table . 36). It explained significant variance with the all the components of job performance explaining variances of 7.1 % with task performance,6.4% with adaptability,9.2% with employee efficiency or productivity, 6.4 % with job stress and 2.8 % with stability. The results demonstrate that Core self - evaluations or positive self – concept does have a significant impact on job performance and its components implying that as a personality variable, it has its own predictive validity with respect to job performance like the other personality model - five factor model of personality.
CONCLUSION

One important aspect of Core self-evaluations research has been its focus on the relationships among several important personality traits like self-esteem, locus of control and generalized self-efficacy which have been largely considered in isolation. Although personality psychologists may have differing views with respect to practical or theoretical utility of the broad trait of Core self-evaluations and the lower order or narrow traits associated with the same, it is critical for the advancement of psychology to understand and explain redundancies between related traits. It is imperative on the part of psychologists and practitioners to analyze the conditions or industrial settings under which either the Core self-evaluations can be used as an unitary construct across industries and jobs in determining job performance or it has to be customized based on industry type or jobs to increase its predictive validity with respect to job performance. Future research should focus on whether mediating variables like job characteristics should be mandatorily included as a major intervening variable when studying the relationship between Core self-evaluations and job performance to enhance its practical applicability. Moreover, the issue of when to use the narrow traits of Core self-evaluations and when to use the broad trait of Core self-evaluations in organizational settings needs to be studied in detail. Core self-evaluations does throw light on the positive self-concept index and the self-awareness level of individuals. It can be directly applied towards understanding workplace attitudes and behaviors. Among the Core self-evaluations traits, generalized self-efficacy emerged as the predominant variable having a vital impact on job performance followed by locus of control. The broad trait of Core self-evaluations were found to have a relatively lower effect on job performance when compared with its lower order traits, generalized self-efficacy and locus of control.
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