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ABSTRACT

The study pertains to relating the five factors of personality and individual level job performance of employees working in both the managerial and executive cadre in Indian organisations. A critical and pervasive variable like job performance has often been taken as a unitary construct which was predominantly related to Task Performance and contextual performance. This study has made an earnest attempt to identify and evaluate the other components of job performance like Adaptability, Employee productivity/efficiency, job stress and stability and its relationship with personality factors. The current study (Sample size N = 316) analyzed the predictive validity the Five factors of personality in both the manufacturing and service industries. It was found that the factors associated with the five factor model of personality Conscientiousness, extraversion and emotional stability were valid predictors of job performance and had variable impact upon the various components of job performance viz., task performance, adaptability, employee productivity/efficiency. Neuroticism had a significant relationship with job stress. In most of the occasions, the variables did not have any impact on the job stress and stability components of job performance.
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INTRODUCTION

Five Factor Model of Personality and Job Performance:

The objective of the study undertaken was to analyse the relationship between the Five factors of personality and Individual level job performance in the Indian corporate sector.
The five factor of personality (FFM) or the “Big Five” have been identified as the major factors underlying human individual differences in personality with its base in trait factor analytic psychology. The Big Five factors are conscientiousness, neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, and openness. The validity of the Big Five factors has been established across various nations. McCrae and Costa (1997) analysed samples from six diverse national groups namely Hebrew, Portuguese, German, Korean, Japanese, and Chinese and compared the same with a large American sample and found that the big five factors were valid across all the groups. The emergence of big five personality factors has provided a clear conceptual framework with a convincing measurement framework.

The five factor theory McCrae and Costa (2008) says that psychological individual differences are subdivided into adaptations and tendencies. Adaptations are context based concrete characteristics that are acquired in a particular time and situations. Tendencies represent the more basic and abstract ways of living found as a part of human nature in all cultures at all times. Five factor theory states that personality is a system situated between biological and socio-cultural inputs and that its major components are basic tendencies (especially the FFM) and the characteristic adaptations (habits, attitudes, roles, etc.) (Robert R.McCrae, 2010). The objective of the study is to analyze the nature of relationship between five factors of personality with Job Performance and the various components of job performance.

Five factors of Personality and its sub-factors:

**Neuroticism/ Emotional stability:** A dimension of personality defined by stability and low anxiety at one end as opposed to instability and high anxiety at the other end.

Facets: Anxiety, Anger/hostility, Depression, Self-conciousness, Impulsiveness and vulnerability.

**Extraversion:** This dimension measures one’s comfort level with relationships. Extraverts tend to be assertive and sociable. Introverts tend to be reserved and quiet.

Facets: Warmth, Gregariousness, Assertiveness, Activity, Excitement seeking and Positive emotions.

**Openness to experience:** This dimension refers to one’s range of interest and intellect.

Facets: Fantasy, Aesthetics, Feelings, Actions, Ideas and Values.

**Agreeableness:** This dimension refers to an individual’s propensity to defer to others.

Facets: Trust, Straightforwardness, Altruism, Compliance, Modesty, Tender mindedness.

**Conscientiousness:** Conscientiousness is a measure of dependability and persistence of a person.

Facets: Competence, Order, Dutifulness, Achievement striving, Self-discipline, deliberation.

Job Performance and its components:

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.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

In their meta-analytic study Barrick and Mount (1991) have investigated the validity of the five dimensions of Personality (Professionals, Police, Managers, Sales, and skilled / semi-skilled) and for three types of job criteria (Job Proficiency, Training Proficiency, and Personnel Data). Results indicated that Conscientiousness – a dimension of personality which refers to individuals who are purposeful, strong-willed, and determined emerged as the valid predictor variable across all occupational groups and job performance criteria like job proficiency, training proficiency and personnel data. Extraversion was a valid predictor for two occupations involving managers and sales personnel across criterion types. Openness was a valid predictor for one of the criterion variables – training proficiency.

Tett, Jackson, and Rothstein (1991) conducted a meta-analysis of 86 studies that were selected from 494 studies which had reported a positive relationship between the “Big” five factors and job performance. They separated those studies in which the personality measures used were selected on the basis of a job analysis and analysed the relationship between personality and job performance. They grouped the studies viz., a) incumbents vs recruits on the notion that incumbents could serve as better predictors b) based on age factor expecting that the performance of older worker’s performance would be more predictable c) based on length of tenure expecting employees with a longer tenure to have more predictability d) grouped jobs into civil vs military jobs. The estimated true score correlations between the Big five factors and job performance was found to be 0.24.

Agreeableness was found to be a valid predictor of job performance with the estimated true score correlations, of 0.33, Openness to experience (0.27) emotional stability (0.22) conscientiousness (0.18) and extraversion (0.16). Recruit performance had a score of r=0.30 whereas incumbent performance was relatively less r=0.21). They found that military job performance was more predictable than civilian job performance. Military job performance was found to have true score correlation of 0.30 with the Big five personality factors whereas civilian jobs had a true score correlation of 0.20. Also, comparatively the personality measures which were selected based on job analysis had an estimated average true score correlations of 0.38 whereas those without job analysis yielded 0.29.

They attributed the, larger validities to the use of confirmatory research strategies, and job analysis. The study confirmed the usefulness of using the “Big” five factors as predictors of on the job performance. Barrick and K. Mount (1993) analysed civil managerial personnel from different U.S. army installations (N = 146) correlated with eight different aspects of managerial performance and found that conscientiousness had a correlation of 0.25 and extraversion 0.14. Interestingly, agreeableness emerged as a strong predictor of performance when jobs were sorted as high or low with respect to managerial autonomy. It was also found that managers high on conscientiousness and extraversion performed better in jobs with a high degree of autonomy.

Mount, Barrick, and Strauss (1993) using “sales representative” samples, obtained ratings of job performance through self as well as supervisory ratings and obtained supervisor, co-worker, customer, and self-ratings on each of the “Big” five factors. Conscientiousness and extraversion were found to
be valid predictors of rated job performance. Agreeableness was also found to be a valid predictor of performance for supervisory and customer ratings and customer rating in particular yielding the highest validity coefficient. The self ratings by and large were significantly higher than supervisor, co-worker, and customer ratings.

Jesus F. Salgado (1997) replicated the study done by Barrick and Mount (1991) in the European community. The results indicated that Conscientiousness and emotional stability are valid predictors of performance across job criteria and occupational groups. Extraversion was a predictor for two occupations and openness to experience and agreeableness were valid predictors of training proficiency.

Hurtz and Donovan (2000) estimated the criterion-related validities of explicit Big-Five measures for predicting overall job performance and contextual performance. The results for Conscientiousness ($\rho = 0.22$) are consistent with those reported by Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. (1991) although true validities for Emotional Stability ($\rho = 0.14$) and Extraversion ($\rho = .09$) differed. Hurtz and Donovan (2000) examined the validity coefficient for “Big” five dimensions by occupational category. For sales jobs, they found the true operational validity to be $\rho_v=0.26$ for conscientiousness, 0.13 for emotional stability, 0.05 for agreeableness, 0.15 for extraversion, and 0.04 for openness to experience. Emotional stability and extraversion have been found to have low but stable true validities. Conscientiousness exhibited an estimated true validity across occupations ranging from $\rho = 0.15$ to 0.26. For customer service jobs, the true operational validity was found to be 0.25 for conscientiousness, 0.12 for emotional stability, 0.17 for agreeableness and 0.11 for extraversion and 0.15 for openness to experience.

The overall conclusion from this study is that conscientiousness dimension is the strongest predictor of job performance. Emotional stability showed a stable influence on performance and agreeableness has important implications for jobs that require cooperation and behavioural likeability and agreeableness has shown a consistent impact on performance even though the validity for such jobs is low. Extraversion had its influence in sales and managerial jobs whereas openness to experience had its influence in customer service jobs.

The Big-Five dimensions predicted overall performance somewhat better than contextual job performance. Other useful meta-analyses (e.g., Frei and McDanie (1998); Mount and Barrick (1995a); Ones, Hough, and Viswesvaran (1998); Ones and Viswesvaran and Schmidt (1993); Vinchur, Schippmann, Switzer, and Roth (1998); Viswesvaran and Ones (2000) focus on specific occupations or personality construct measures. Eric G. Harris and David E. Fleming (2007) have shown from the Five factors of personality do play an important role in Employee – service personality congruence and job outcome variables like service delivery and Job satisfaction. David V. Day, Stanley B. Silverman (1989) suggested that personality variables are significant predictors of job performance when carefully matched with the appropriate occupation and organization. They investigated the relationship between specific personality variables and job performance in a sample (N = 43) of accountants. The results indicate that even with the effects of cognitive ability taken into account, three personality scales (orientation towards work; degree of ascendancy; and degree and quality of interpersonal orientation) are significantly related to important aspects of job performance. It has been suggested that the overall validity of selection strategies might be improved with the addition of measures of relevant personality dimensions with appropriate matching to an occupation and organization.

Bouchard (1997a) has reviewed the research on genetic influences on a variety of work-related variables, including personality and job and work attitudes. He reported heritability coefficients (which indicate the proportion of variance due to genetic factors) of about 0.40 for the big five factors—in other words about 40% of the variance in personality is due to genetic factors.
The validity and robustness of the Five factor model of personality has got evidence across theoretical frameworks Goldberg (1981) in different cultures (Bond MH, Nakazato HS, Shiraishi D (1975) and with a variety of samples (Digman 1990). An important consideration for the field of Personnel Psychology is that these dimensions are also relatively independent measures of cognitive ability McCrae and Costa (1987).

Goldberg (1981) studied its importance across different theoretical frameworks. Bond, Nakazato, and Shirashi (1975); Noller, law and Comrey (1987) have shown its utility across different cultures. Digman (1990) has tested the validity of the five factors with a variety of samples. McCrae and Costa (1997) have demonstrated that the five factors have been identified across different languages and cultures and is universally applicable. The factor structure of the five factor model of personality has been replicated in Israeli, German, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, Hungarian, Belgium, Estonian, Finnish, Croatian, Czech, Chinese, Japanese languages apart from the English language.

The results of the meta-analysis done in the U.S. and the meta-analytic studies done in the European Union indicate that conscientiousness and emotional stability are valid predictors of job performance. The European results indicate that both conscientiousness and emotional stability have an incremental validity of around 10% to 11% over general mental ability.

Robie, Chet et al. (2005) examined the operation validity of the “Big” five personality factors from a psychometric perspective across countries with dissimilar cultures-U.S.A., and Japan. U.S.A., has predominantly an individualistic culture where as Japan has a moderately collectivistic culture. A work oriented measure of the “Big” five personality factors and their assessment ratings were collected from managers from U.S.A., and Japan. After conducting independent group t-test to examine the mean differences in “Big” five personality scores and factor analysis to analyse the factor structure of the “Big” five across samples, a relative importance analysis was conducted to find out whether assessors differentially weighted the big five in arriving at a overall assessment rating across samples. Extraversion emerged as the most valid predictor of job performance and conscientiousness was the least valid predictor of job performance. The studies confirmed the utility of five factor model of personality across cultures.

Conscientiousness and Job performance
Conscientiousness has an extensive history, from its beginning as 1 of 17,953 word descriptors of personality (Allport, G.W, & Odbert, H.S. 1936). Research has shown conscientiousness to be positively related to job performance with all job performance criteria for all occupational groups (Barrick and Mount, 1991). Norman (1963) was a pioneer in proposing conscientiousness as one of the important factors underlying personality. Behling (1998) has said that conscientiousness is one of the most valid predictors of performance for most jobs, second only to general intelligence. Managers perceive intelligence and conscientiousness as the most important aspects related to an applicant’s hirability (Dunn, Mount, and Barrick, and Ones, 1995).

Robertson and Kinder (1993) have demonstrated that personality and ability combine together to produce a unique variance in relation to work competencies, job success for many occupational areas. Barrick and Mount (1991) attained a validity coefficient of 0.13 for managers which were by and large consistent across other occupational groups (Police, professionals, sales personnel, skilled or semi-skilled). Tett et al. (1991) found a validity score of 0.12 for conscientiousness.

Conscientious individuals are naturally meticulous, thorough, neat, well-organized, able to hold the impulses in check, dedicated to their goals, persistent, dependable, trustworthy, industrious, and achievement striving (Digman, 1990; McCrae and John, 1992; Roberts, Chernyshenko, Stark, and Goldberg 2005); Employees who are conscientious are better performers in their respective jobs when compared with their less conscientious counterparts (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Hurtz and Donovan, 2000) they tend to have more positive attitudes (Conner and Abraham, 2001). They tend to be punctual (Fallon et al. 2000). Conscientiousness is the most frequently analyzed personality trait in
selection context. However, ambiguity is prevalent regarding the narrow traits underlying conscientiousness and the construct definition.

Rustin D. Meyer, Reeshad S. Dalal, and Silvia Bonaccio (2009) have analyzed the relationship between conscientiousness and performance with respect to three criteria namely overall performance, task performance, and contextual performance. They found in their meta-analysis that the mean uncorrected correlation between conscientiousness and overall performance to be 0.15, 0.13 for task performance, and 0.16 for contextual performance. The moderating effect of situational strength in occupations (refers to the idea that various characteristics of situations have the capability to restrict the expression and therefore, criterion-related validity of individual differences which are not based on ability alone (Mullins and Cummings (1999); Snyder and Ickes (1985); Weiss and Adler (1984) does play a significant role with respect to the conscientiousness - performance relationship. The results demonstrate that the criterion related validity of conscientiousness is higher in characteristically weak occupations (typical occupations associated with none to serious repercussions (eg., telemarketers) than in characteristically strong occupations (typical occupations associated with serious repercussions eg., surgeon).

**Extraversion and Job Performance**

Barrick and Mount, and Judge (2001) in their meta-analytic study have demonstrated that the average validity of extraversion with respect to job performance was 0.13 which has been perceived to be somewhat low. The validity of the trait has been found to be situations or job specific. For example, extraversion has been found to be a valid predictor of sales performance.

Eysenck (1957) interpreted extraversion based on two hypotheses – extraverts are characterized by strong, quickly developing and slowly dissipating inhibitions and extraverts condition themselves poorly. The inhibition hypothesis implies that extraverts have low levels of tolerance for jobs or tasks of routine nature for inhibition accumulates in their central nervous system leading to withdrawal behaviours from such inhibition inducing situations. But withdrawal from the workplace will be rather short than of long duration and inhibition is quickly induced in jobs which are predominantly simple and routine. The conditionability hypothesis is of the view that extraverts condition less well than introverts and hence develop weaker self control. Extraverts have a tendency to become socialized in a short span of time and therefore they are less influenced by social and institutional codes of behaviour. The propensity of extraverts to overlook norms in rigid organisations has been perceived to be some sort of deviation and in some cases can be labeled under counter productive performance by formal rigid organisations.

**Emotional Stability and Job Performance:**

According to Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) emotions are an integral and inseparable part of organisational life and more attention should be given to the employee’s experience. Emotions serve important functions in human behaviour like supporting cognition and execution. Mayer, et al. (2000) proposed that emotions are indicators of regular, identifiable meanings about relationships. From a sociological perspective, researchers feel that it can be termed as a social skill. Goleman (1995) stressed the importance of emotional intelligence in work settings and in day today life activities as well. Emotions can drive motives and dictate action.

The emotional quotient inventory was designed to measure one’s awareness, understanding and control over expressive emotions. The emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i) was found to have significant correlations with the neuroticism-stability scale of the Eysenck personality questionnaire (1975) and the anxiety scale of the personality assessment inventory. The emotional intelligence quotient inventory consists of five factors or dimensions namely intrapersonal, interpersonal, stress management, adaptability, and general mode. Correlations existed between the interpersonal factor of EQ-inventory and conscientiousness (0.36) and the intrapersonal dimension had correlations with extraversion factors like assertiveness (0.52) and -0.56 with worrisomeness which is associated with the neuroticism factor of FFM.
Boyatzis, Goleman, and Ree (2000) found that clusters of self management, self regulations and social skill had their impact on performance beyond the threshold limits that differentiates high performers from low performers. The self regulation cluster encompassing competencies like self control, conscient Agreeableness and Job Performance

Agreeableness (Digman, 1990) refers to traits such as co-operativeness, selflessness, tolerance, generosity, helpfulness, sympathy, flexibility and courtesy. Some researchers have suggested that agreeableness is the primary factor to be considered in the assessment of individual differences.

Agreeableness primarily captures an individual’s interpersonal strategies and motivation. Graziano and Eisenberg (1997) mentioned that individuals differ on the degree to which they are motivated to work and developing and maintaining pro-social relationships with others.

Witt et al. (2002) mentioned that an employee’s positive effect of conscientiousness on job performance depends on, or is conditioned by an employee’s level of agreeableness. Conscientiousness synergized with agreeableness can result in better performance because of the interpersonally sensitive facet of agreeableness. Disagreeable people may be perceived as micro managing, unreasonably demanding, inflexible, curt, and generally difficult to deal with.

Openness to Experience and Job Performance
McCrae and Costa (1986) defined openness to experience as a broad dimension of personality manifested in a rich fantasy life, aesthetic sensitivity, awareness of inner feelings, need for variety in actions, intellectual curiosity, liberal value system.

According to McCrae and Costa (1997) openness to experience factor includes components such as intellectance, absorption, emotional sensitivity, aesthetic interests, independent judgements, unusual thought processes, depth and intensity of attention and scope of awareness. Digman (1990) is of the view that openness to experience is the most controversial and debatable amongst the five factors of personality. However, it is being considered as an important construct despite its heterogeneity in communicating findings effectively. Dollinger, Leoung, and Ulicni (1996) have found that the people high on the trait of the openness to experience consistently hold the values of being broad minded and imaginative and give importance for a world of beauty.

Openness to experience is expected to be a valid predictor of one of the performance criteria namely training proficiency (Barrick and.Mount, 1991). Since, openness to experience encompasses personal characteristics like being curious, broad minded and intelligent it has its own positive impact on one’s attitude towards learning. Individuals with such a learning orientation tend to benefit from entering into training programmes.

Tett et al. (1991) meta-analysis suggested that openness may not be a valid predictor of job performance and perceived it to get moderated by organizational factors. A study by Hayes, Roehm, and Castellano (1994) has noted that successful employees had significantly lower levels of openness than unsuccessful employees. This can be attributed to the fact where openness to experience might be of varying importance to different organizations and contexts. Openness to experience might serve as an important trait in dynamic organizations where in being open to learning new things and adapting becomes mandatory for successful job performance. Openness to experience might also be a situation specific productive trait in organizational settings which can help the organisations to sustain or enhance its profitability by the facilitation of new ideas and innovations.

Mark N.Bing, John W.Lounsbury (2000) analysed the relationship between openness to experience and job performance in US based Japanese manufacturing companies and found that openness predicted unique variance in job performance for employees above and beyond both cognitive aptitude and the other four personality dimensions of “Big” five personality factors.
RESEARCH DESIGN

Survey study was used for the controlled testing of the causal processes i.e., to determine the effect of a variable/variables on the other. Statistical analysis of quantitative data of qualitative items with respect to all the variables on the proposed model was chosen.

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 crucial models / variables viz., five factor model of personality 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. NEO – PI – R - adult - (S)

NEO – FFI: The revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI - R) is a concise measure developed by Costa and McCrae (1992) of the five domains of personality. The five domains and the thirty facets of the NEO PI - R allow a comprehensive assessment of adult personality. Form S (for self–reports) has been used for the study. It consists of 60 items with a 5 point likert scale measurement 12 items each facilitate measurement of the five domains. Cronbach alpha (coefficient of reliability) was 0.622 for the sample size of 316 in the current study.

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.
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 administered 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: Table 1: Correlation matrix – Five factors of personality (NEOAC) – Job performance and its components

\[ N = 316 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>Task Performance</th>
<th>Adaptability</th>
<th>Employee Productivity/ Efficiency</th>
<th>Job Stress</th>
<th>Stability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.36**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to exp</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>0.193**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
<td>0.347**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-0.358**</td>
<td>0.513**</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.404**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.368**</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.437**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>0.369**</td>
<td>-0.173**</td>
<td>0.235**</td>
<td>0.365**</td>
<td>0.310**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.229**</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.262**</td>
<td>0.371**</td>
<td>0.244**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.229**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.287**</td>
<td>0.313**</td>
<td>0.235**</td>
<td>0.851**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.237**</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.272**</td>
<td>0.327**</td>
<td>-0.213**</td>
<td>-0.715**</td>
<td>0.545**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Productivity/ Efficiency</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.247**</td>
<td>0.137**</td>
<td>0.149**</td>
<td>0.326**</td>
<td>0.311**</td>
<td>0.288**</td>
<td>0.820**</td>
<td>0.681**</td>
<td>0.540**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>0.205**</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>-0.146**</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.166**</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.186**</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.193**</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>-0.147**</td>
<td>-0.129**</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.346**</td>
<td>0.121**</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.279**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
N - Neuroticism
E - Extraversion
O - Openness to exp
A - Agreeableness
C - Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness has a significant correlation with job performance \((r = 0.262, p < 0.01)\). It had relatively higher correlations with all of the components of job performance. With task performance it had a correlation of \((r = 0.287, p < 0.01)\) \((r = 0.272, p < 0.01)\) with adaptability \((r = 0.326, p < 0.01)\) with employee productivity/efficiency \((r = -0.166, p < 0.01)\) with job stress and \((r = -0.129, p < 0.05)\) with stability. The findings show that conscientiousness is a valid predictor of job performance and its components. Amongst the components of job performance, employee productivity had the highest correlation of 0.326.
There was negative correlation between conscientiousness and job stress (-0.129). Conscientiousness had a significant correlation (r = 0.437, p < 0.01) with motivation and (r = 0.365, p < 0.01) with organizational culture.

Extraversion has a significant correlation with job performance (r = 0.230, p < 0.01). It had relatively higher correlations with three of the components of job performance. With task performance it had a correlation of (r = 0.239, p < 0.01) (r = 0.237, p < 0.01) with adaptability (r = 0.247, p < 0.01) with employee productivity/efficiency. It had insignificant correlations with job stress and (r = -0.078, p < 0.168) and with stability (r = -0.108, p < 0.056). The findings show that extraversion is a valid predictor of job performance and some of its components. Amongst the components of job performance, employee productivity had the highest correlation of 0.247. Extraversion had a significant correlation (r = 0.366, p < 0.01) with motivation and (r = 0.309, p < 0.01) with culture.

Neuroticism did not have significant correlations with job performance and its components except with respect to job stress (r = -0.205, p < 0.01). The findings reinforce the earlier research findings that neuroticism has correlations with job stress. Neuroticism had negative correlation with motivation and culture as well.

Openness to experience did not have a significant correlation with job performance, task performance, adaptability and stability. However, the data showed a significant correlation between openness to experience and employee productivity/efficiency (r = 0.137, p < 0.01) and job stress (r = -0.146, p < 0.01). Openness to experience did not have a significant correlation with motivation but had a significant correlation with culture (r = 0.173, p < 0.01).

Agreeableness did not have a significant correlation with job performance, task performance, adaptability and job stress. However, it showed a significant correlation with employee productivity (r = 0.149, p < 0.01) and with stability (r = -0.147, p < 0.01). The negative correlation between agreeableness and stability does suggest that employees who happen to be mild and tender do not seem to have a stability of performance in the current study. The reasons could be because of certain organizational and other factors as well. Agreeableness did not have a significant correlation of motivation but had a significant correlation with culture (r = 0.235, p < 0.01).

Results: Regressions:

Table No.2: Multiple Regression – Stepwise Method: Five Factors of Personality (NEOAC) - 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>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>0.262&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>23.202</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>0.285&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A stepwise multiple regression showed that three variables conscientiousness, extraversion and neuroticism/ emotional stability had significant impact on job performance explaining a variance 6.9%, 1.2% and 1.4% respectively (Table 2). Collectively, all the three variables explained a variance of 9.5% with 0.01 level of significance. (Hypothesis 3 is supported).

Both openness to experience and agreeableness did not emerge as significant predictors of job performance. The emergence of the variables conscientiousness and emotional stability in influencing individual level job performance does match with the meta-analytic findings of Barrick and Mount; wherein they found that conscientiousness as a significant predictor of job performance. Jesus F. Salgodo has found that both conscientiousness and emotional stability had emerged as significant predictors of jobs in the European community. The findings suggest that in the Indian context also, the factors conscientiousness and emotional stability are valid predictors of job performance across jobs. Extraversion has also emerged as one of the significant predictors of job performance.

Table 3: Multiple Regression – Stepwise method - Five Factors of Personality (NEOAC) – Task Performance

<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>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>0.287a</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>28.145</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>0.306b</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>16.176</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor: Conscientiousness

Predictors: - b – Conscientiousness, Extraversion

A stepwise multiple regression showed that conscientiousness and extraversion are significant predictors of Task performance with conscientiousness explaining a higher variance of 8.2% (when compared to Job performance’s (6.9%)) and extraversion explaining a variance of 1.1 (Table 3). Collectively, both the variables account for a variance 9.4%
significant at 0.01 level. The remaining three variables did not show any impact on task performance. The results tend to show that conscientiousness is the predominant predictor of task performance in the study. The relatively higher impact of conscientiousness on task performance could be because of the fact that tasks are more precisely defined than jobs and the ability of the employees to relate themselves to the particular set of tasks rather than the macro level parameter of job could have resulted in the substantial difference in the coefficient of determination (R^2) values between the job performance factor and one of its vital components, task performance.

**Table No.: 4 : Multiple Regression- Stepwise Method -Five Factors of Personality (VNEOAC) – Adaptability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Independent / emerging variable(s)</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>R^2 Change</th>
<th>Std., β</th>
<th>F - Value</th>
<th>Sig.,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>0.272^a</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>25.008</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>0.297^b</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>15.121</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>0.328^c</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>12.512</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor: Conscientiousness

Predictors: - b – Conscientiousness, Neuroticism

Predictors: c – Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Extraversion

A step wise multiple regression showed that the three variables – Conscientiousness, neuroticism and extraversion emerged as significant predictors of adaptability explaining variances of 7.4 %, 1.4 % and 1.9 % respectively (Table 4). Collectively, they accounted for a variance of 10.7 %. All were significant at 0.01 level. The results show that Conscientiousness is the predominant predictor of adaptability. It shows that employees who are systematic and organized do have the propensity to adapt themselves to the job’s requirements and perform accordingly. The emergence of emotional stability as a significant predictor along with Conscientiousness does substantiate that employees who are emotionally stable are more effective in adapting themselves to the job’s requirements. The emergence of extraversion does show that the assertive and sociable trait of employees does play a significant role in adapting to the job’s requirements. The variables openness to experience and agreeableness were not significant predictors of adaptability.

**Table. 5 : Multiple Regression- Stepwise Method -Five Factors of Personality (NEOAC) – Employee Productivity/efficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Independent / emerging variable(s)</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>Std., β</th>
<th>F - Value</th>
<th>Sig.,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Employee Productivity/efficiency</td>
<td>0.326^a</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>37.43</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor: Conscientiousness
A step wise multiple regression showed that only Conscientiousness was a significant predictor of Employee productivity / efficiency explaining a variance of 10.7 % significant at 0.01 level (Table .5). All the other four factors – Neuroticism / emotional stability, extraversion, openness to experience and agreeableness did not have any impact on employee productivity.

**Table. 6 : Multiple Regression- Stepwise Method -Five Factors of Personality (NEOAC) – Job Stress**

( 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>Std., β</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Sig.,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>13.769</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor: - a – Neuroticism

A step wise multiple regression showed that only neuroticism has an influence on Job stress. It explained a variance of 4.2% significant at 0.01 level (Table .6). This does show that employees who are anxious, impulsive and insecure do experience job stress. The remaining four variables conscientiousness, extraversion, openness to experience and agreeableness did not have any impact on job stress.

**Table. 7 : Multiple Regression- Stepwise Method -Five Factors of Personality (NEOAC) – Stability**

( 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>Agreeableness</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>6.963</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor: - a – Agreeableness

A step wise multiple regression showed that only agreeableness was a significant predictor of stability of performance on the job. It explained a variance of 2.2 % significant at 0.01 level (Table .7). The results show that employees who are modest and who tend to be mild and tender do have a stability of performance on the job even though it was less significant. The remaining four variables did not have any impact on stability.

**The impact of the Personality models : Five factor model of personality and Job Performance.**

The impact of the Five factors of personality on Job performance and its components is quite difficult in the sense that it tries to analyze a complex set of predictor variables with a complex set of criterion variables. Moreover, the relatively small magnitude of coefficient of determination scores (R²) of personality variables on job performance is an area of concern to researchers. However, the importance and criticality of the magnitude of the personality
variables assume importance in organizational settings for they might have an overwhelming and hovering effect on other variables which can actually determine performance.

### Table 8: Multiple Regression – Enter Method - Five Factors of Personality (NEOAC) - Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>6.850</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows the collective impact of the five factors of personality on Job performance. In the multiple regression process (Enter method), the five factors neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness, collectively explain a variance of 9.9% (p<0.01) on Job performance. The effect of this 9.9% of variance is significant even though the magnitude of the same is quite less. The intriguing question is how effective this could be seen as a valid variable for predicting performance. However, the current study does not address this question. Instead, it tries to give a general understanding on the empirical front regarding the various impacts accounted for by the five factors of personality on job performance and its components by employing the step wise and direct regression methods to analyze the relative importance and significance of the five factors of personality with respect to the job performance criterion and its components—task performance, adaptability, employee productivity/efficiency, job stress and stabilization.

**Conscientiousness and Job Performance**

The most significant finding in the study relates to the factor—conscientiousness. It was found to be the foremost significant predictor of Job Performance. This aspect of personality does capture personality traits which are important for accomplishing a job in organizational settings. It shows that individuals who exhibit traits associated with competence, order, dutifulness and dependability with a strong sense of purpose and persistence perform Jobs better than those who do not exhibit such traits. Similar findings have emerged out in the meta-analytic regression method (Enter), Conscientiousness explained a variance of 6.9% at 0.01 level of significance. Conscientiousness explained slightly higher variances of 8.2% with task performance, 7.4% with adaptability, 10.7% with employee productivity, 2.8% with job stress and 1.7% percent with stability. The results suggest that conscientiousness is a significant variable in predicting not only job performance but it has its positive impact on the components of job performance—task performance, adaptability and employee productivity. Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 7 are supported. The results substantiate that traits associated with order, dutifulness and achievement orientation has a significant impact on job performance and its components.

**Extraversion and Job Performance and its components:**

In the regression method (direct) extraversion was found to be a valid predictor of job performance. It explained a variance of 5.3% with job performance. It explained variances of 5.7% with task performance, 5.6% with adaptability, 6.1% with employee productivity, 0.6%
with job stress and 1.2% with stability except in the case of job stress, extraversion was found to be valid predictor for all the components of job stress. The results demonstrate that traits associated with assertiveness, warmth and positive emotions have a significant impact on job performance and its components.

**Emotional Stability/ Neuroticism and Job Performance:**

Most of the correlations for emotional stability/neuroticism have been relatively low. Those individuals who are highly neurotic are unable to function effectively on their own. These cannot be a linear relationship between emotional stability and job performance beyond the “critically unstable” range. It implies that as long as an individual possesses adequate emotional stability, the predictive values of any differences are minimized.

**Neuroticism – job performance and its components**

The regression results show that neuroticism did not exhibit significant impact on job performance and its components except with job stress. The results reinforce the findings by researchers that people who tend to be anxious, insecure and impulsive tend to experience job stress. It explained a variance of 4.2% on job stress. The lack of significant impact of neuroticism on job performance, task performance and other components shows that anxiety prone and vulnerable people do not fare well in their jobs.

**Openness to experience and Job Performance:**

Openness to experience- Individuals who score high on this dimension (e.g., intelligent, curious, broad minded and cultured) are likely to have positive attitudes towards learning experiences in general. It has been recognized that this dimension of personality has the highest correlation ($r = 0.20$ to $0.30$ with the measures of cognitive ability (McCrae and Costa, 1987). In the study conducted, it was perceived that openness to experience will have significant correlation with the adaptability component of Job Performance. However, the results did not have show any significant correlation between the two ($r = 0.061$ at 0.279 significance level). This insignificance could be because of sample characteristics and data collection characteristics. Openness to experience influences one’s motivated levels in training programs attitudes and expectations of the trainees influence whether or not learning is likely to occur.

**Openness to Experience – job performance and its components**

Openness to experience did not explain significant variance with respect to job performance and its components except in the case of employee productivity and job stress. It explained a variance of 1.9% with employee productivity and 2.1% with job stress significant at 0.01 level. It did not have a significant impact on adaptability. Openness to experience is normal! The results for agreeableness suggest that it is not an important predictor of Job performance even in those jobs containing a large social component (e.g., sales). In the study conducted by the researcher, agreeableness did not have significant correlation with the Job Performance and the components of job performance. The various facets of the agreeableness domain- trust, straightforwardness, altruism and being soft-hearted did not have significant impact on Job performance on the sample studied (N=316).
Agreeableness – job performance and its components

Agreeableness was able to explain variances with respect to job performance but was negatively related (β = -0.047) and employee productivity. It explained variances of 2.2% in both the cases (Table 3.5). It had insignificant impact on the other components of job performance like task performance, adaptability, job stress and stability. Hypothesis 4 is rejected. The findings do reinforce the findings of earlier research that agreeableness is not a significant predictor of job performance.

A step wise multiple regression analysis of agreeableness on one of the components of job performance, stability in the service sector industry sample (n=201) did elicit a correlation coefficient of 0.181. It can be cautiously inferred that agreeableness does have a positive impact on the stability / consistency of job performance. Since service sectors business needs and models necessitate a relatively higher level of customer interaction across levels facets of agreeableness like compliance, modesty, trust can influence stability of performance to a certain extent since the customers’ attitude towards the study, an earnest attempt has been made to analyze the relationship between the personality model – Five factors of personality and job performance.

Most of the prior researches in Personality – performance researches have considered job performance as a unitary construct or a combination of task and contextual performance. Moreover, there were different approaches practiced when it came to measuring job performance. Predominantly, job performance was measured taking into consideration only the outcome or the results obtained after the job activity or the actions or behaviors of the individual which facilitate the performance should be given more important. Another approach was that job performance should be considered as a composite mix of both the actions or behaviors oriented towards performance and the outcome of those actions or behaviors. The current study has taken into consideration the second approach and has developed the job performance questionnaire by considering dimensions and their variables which according to the researcher inevitably have a mix of both. The factors conceptualized as measures of job performance included task performance, adaptability, employee productivity / efficiency, Job stress and stability.

In the current study, among the five factors of personality, Conscientiousness was the foremost and important variable which showed consistent relationships with job performance. The other variables which predicted job performance were extraversion and emotional stability / neuroticism. The results substantiate that conscientiousness is a valid predictor of job performance in the Indian context as well. More specifically, conscientiousness was found to be a better predictor. The variables agreeableness and openness to experience did not have a significant relationship with job performance across jobs and were valid for some select jobs or occupations. In the current study, agreeableness did have some relationship in the customer service department. One important finding is that the impact of the major personality variable conscientiousness was relatively high with respect to task performance when compared with the overall job performance component. Neuroticism was found to have a strong relationship with job stress both in the manufacturing and service sector and across managers and executives in the total sample studied (N=316).

With respect to the industry type, the impact of conscientiousness on job performance was found to be better and higher in the manufacturing industry when compared with the service industry. Moreover, managers were found to exhibit relatively higher levels of...
conscientiousness when compared to executives. Age and experience did not have significant impact on most of the personality factors except with consc this study, an earnest attempt has been made to explain how individual differences in personality traits lead to individual differences in specific dimensions of performance. It can explain how people with similar knowledge, cognitive ability, goals and desire or necessity to perform can differ in their level of performance. Further in-depth research relating specific personality constructs and the facets of those constructs to specific motivational and cultural components to specific job and their criteria will certainly add value to the personality – performance link.

To conclude … to quote from the Bible “I returned and saw under the sun that – the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, nor bread to the wise, nor riches to men of understanding, nor favour to men of skill: but time and chance happen to them all.

Ecclesiastes (Chapter 9:11) – New King James Version.

In organizational settings, above all one needs God’s grace and favour to perform in addition to the God given competencies and one’s own personality characteristics.
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