CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Interest in the role of personality in work and organizational behaviour has increased over recent years. To a large extent, this is due to the emergence of the ‘Big Five’ taxonomy for personality structure. A particular focus has been on discovering the role of personality testing in employee selection and applying a variety of personality assessments in the workplace (Sears & Rowe, 2003). Within the last 20 years, the big five framework or five-factor model of personality has emerged as possibly the most extensively established structure used to describe the most salient aspects of an individual’s personality (Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1993; Judge et al., 2002). Its validity is strongly supported by empirical evidence across different theoretical frameworks, measures, occupations, cultures, and sources of ratings (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991; De Raad & Doddema-Winsemius, 1999; Liao & Chuang, 2004; Matzler & Renzl, 2007). Earlier Norman (1963) attempted to find adequate taxonomy of personality attributes to explain personality traits. About Big-Five, it was said that “rapid progress has been made towards a consensus on personality structure” (Digman, 1990; Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & John, 1992). Consensus emerged that five-factor model of personality, often termed the ‘Big Five’ (Goldberg, 1990), can be used to describe many salient aspects of personality. The five-factor approach (FFA) has achieved appreciable popularity as the Big Five can be found in virtually any measures of personality (e.g., McCrae & John, 1992), including the analysis of trait adjectives in many languages, and decisions made by expert judges based on existing measures (Mount & Barrick,
Evidence indicated that the Big Five is fairly heritable and stable over time (Costa & McCrae, 1988), although the environment undoubtedly plays a role. McCrae & John (1992) claimed that “we believe its long history, cross-cultural replication, and empirical validation across many methods and instruments that make the five-factor model a basic discovery of personality psychology-core knowledge upon which other findings can be built”. The big five model suggests that virtually all personality measures can be reduced to five broad factors, which are usually labelled as extraversion (sociable vs. introverted), agreeableness (cooperative vs. competitive), conscientiousness (organized and conscientious vs. disorganized and careless), neuroticism (emotional stability vs. instability), and openness (intellectual curiosity vs. preference for routine) (Costa & McCrae, 1989; Judge et al., 1999). As stated by Smith and Canger (2004), the model is important for following reasons: “(1) it permits the sorting of personality characteristics into meaningful categories, (2) it provides a common framework and vernacular for doing research, and (3) it is supposed to cover virtually all of the personality space.

A large amount of research has shown that the Big Five personality traits are strongly related to job-related attitudes and behaviours (e.g. Barrick & Mount, 1991; Tett et al., 1991; Judge, et al., 2002). Barrick and Mount (1991) found that extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness correlated with job performance, and conscientiousness was the most valid and robust predictor across all work groups and job-related criteria. Helton & Street (1992) in their research on “the five-factor personality model and naval aviation candidates” conducted a joint factor analysis on the Pilot Personality Questionnaire (PPO) and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) taken by Navy and Marine Corps student aviators. Although investigations of personality in pilot selection have yielded mixed results, their
findings suggest that the five-factor personality model may be useful in personality testing in aviation selection decisions. Schuerger and Ekeberg (1994) in their study found correlations between performance and extraversion, anxiety, tough-mindedness, independence, and self-control. Further, Morrison (1997) found neuroticism to be significantly associated with an individual’s intention to remain in an organization. Extraversion, conscientiousness and neuroticism have been found to be related to career success (Judge et al., 1999). Goffin et al. (2000) cited that personality is related to job performance. Goffin et al. noted that both extroversion and dominance were correlated with job performance. Various researches have been conducted to guaze the relationship of personality with a number of work place variables. Review of existing literature regarding the relationship of personality and the Big Five framework with all the study variables is discussed below:

2.2 PERSONALITY AND JOB SATISFACTION

A longstanding debate exists between psychologists that believe structural characteristics of the job are the primary determinants of job satisfaction (Kulik, Oldham & Hackman, 1987; O'Reilly & Roberts, 1975) and those that believe that personal attributes of the worker are most important (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Pervin, 1968). However thousands of traits have been invented in the history of personality research, and scores of traits have been studied in relation to job satisfaction. Although the five-factor model has been researched in many areas of industrial-organizational psychology, there was a virtual dearth of research that has linked the complete taxonomy to job satisfaction until recently when few researchers focussed on this relationship.
Schneider and Dachler (1978) found that, over time, satisfaction with a job remains unusually stable, which made them believe that it was people’s personality that affected their satisfaction with their job, rather than other variables. Staw et al. (1986) studied people’s job satisfaction over a span of decades and found that personality assessed in adolescents predicted job satisfaction up to 50 years later. Furnham and Zacherl (1986) in a study examining the relationship between Eysenck’s personality traits and job satisfaction found that extraversion correlated positively with overall job satisfaction, whereas neuroticism showed negative correlations with some aspects of job satisfaction. Hulin (1991) argued that personality affects job satisfaction but through the mediation of working conditions. Job satisfaction is basically a reaction to working conditions. Working conditions could be improved to increase job satisfaction without manipulating the personality variables (Cook et al., 1995). Tokar and Subich (1997) found that the block of the Big-Five personality dimensions contributed significantly to the prediction of job satisfaction, where higher extraversion and lower neuroticism were unique predictors to higher job satisfaction. Hart (1999) examined a theoretical model that linked neuroticism, extraversion, job satisfaction and non-work satisfaction to overall life satisfaction. Structure equation modelling determined that life satisfaction was affected by neuroticism, job satisfaction and extraversion. Tanoff (1999) examined the relationship between personality and job satisfaction in a major international corporation. Personality features were specifically defined by the Five-Factor Model. He concluded that all the factors of the Big Five with the exception of culture were related to job satisfaction. The results indicated that the variable neuroticism played a decisive role and portrayed inverse relation with job satisfaction in all but one job category. Neuroticism has been described as the primary source of Negative
Affectivity, and the link between Negative Affectivity and job satisfaction was also acknowledged in Connolly and Viswesvaran’s (2000) meta-analysis. Seibert and Kraimer (2001) ascribe the Big Five factors in connection with the variable job satisfaction a prognostic validity as well but the effects are rather minor. Similarly, the results of meta analysis of stabilities in job satisfaction done by Dormann and Zapf (2001) also concluded that personality factors play an important role in job satisfaction. Heller et al. (2002) in their study found correlations of the personality traits with self-rated job satisfaction to be moderate and significant, especially for neuroticism. They further noted that the essentially negative nature of neurotic individuals, the predisposition of extraverts to the experience of positive emotions and the general work-involvement tendency that characterizes conscientious individuals suggest links between these factors and job satisfaction. Judge et al. (2002) observed with the help of a meta-analysis that “neuroticism” was significant correlate of job satisfaction followed closely by Conscientiousness and Extraversion. Finally, the other two traits - Agreeableness and Openness to Experience displayed relatively weak correlations with job satisfaction. Nikolaou and Robertson (2001) in their study found Neuroticism to be negatively correlated to job satisfaction, whereas agreeableness showed no relationship to job satisfaction, and extraversion had a statistically significant relationship. The remaining two dimensions of the Big-Five were also correlated to job satisfaction to a statistically significant level. Conscientiousness correlated positively to job satisfaction and openness to experience negatively. Furnham et al. (2002) in two studies investigating the relationships between personality traits and aspects of job satisfaction, found that in both the studies personality accounted for a small percentage of the total variance both in importance ratings and in levels of job satisfaction. They concluded that personality
does not have a strong or consistent influence either on what individuals perceive as important in their work environment or on their levels of job satisfaction. Thomas et al. (2004) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between job characteristics, personality, and job satisfaction. They concluded that personality had neither a direct effect on satisfaction nor a moderating effect on the job characteristics-job satisfaction relation. Najafkhani (2007) in his research on relation between personality traits and job satisfaction noted that there is a relationship between job satisfaction and personality dimensions. Although this relation is negative for openness variable, it is positive for extraversion. However no relationship was reported between job satisfaction and neuroticism, agreeableness or conscientiousness. Lounsbury et al. (2007) examined personality traits in relation to job satisfaction. They found openness and extraversion to be significantly related to job satisfaction. In a research by Matzler & Renzl (2007), negative relationship was revealed between neuroticism and job satisfaction, and agreeableness was positively associated with job satisfaction. A study by Acuna et al. (2009) analysed the relationships between personality, team processes, task characteristics, product quality and satisfaction in software development teams. They found that the teams with the highest job satisfaction were precisely the ones whose members scored highest for the personality factors agreeableness and conscientiousness. Patrick (2010) found significant positive relationship between extraversion and satisfaction. Significant negative relationship was found between neuroticism and job satisfaction. No significant relationship was found between agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness and job satisfaction. Husin (2011) in his research studied the correlation effects between the big five personality traits and employee's job satisfaction. The results indicated small, positive and significant relationship between the big five
personality traits as a whole on employee's job satisfaction. Openness to experience and extroversion portrayed a significant positive relationship on employee's job satisfaction. In a recent research conducted by Zhai et al. (2012) to examine the effect of the Big Five personality traits on job satisfaction and subjective wellbeing (SWB), extraversion was found to be the strongest predictor of job satisfaction. The study conducted by Kappagoda (2013) indicated that the personality types of extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness of non-academic employees had significant positive relationships with their job satisfaction. Results further indicated that neuroticism had significant negative association with job satisfaction. Insignificant relationships was reported between openness to experience and job satisfaction. Further a brief review of relationship of each of the Big Five traits with job satisfaction is discussed below.

2.2.1 Extraversion and Job Satisfaction

The review of literature on Big Five and job satisfaction truly make us understand that the personality factors extraversion and especially neuroticism have an indirect as well as a direct influence on job satisfaction. DeNeve & Cooper (1998) noted that Extravert individuals are emotionally firm and sure that’s why they possess contented personality. Meta-analysis by Connolly and Viswesvaran (2000) demonstrated that extroverts are more likely to experience positive emotions and these emotions will then lead to higher level of job satisfaction. The research by Judge et al. (2002) indicated that individuals who are extroverted possess blissful personality, seem to perform well in sale, customer service and managerial jobs; tend to do better in training programs; and usually have higher levels of job and life satisfaction Berg and Feij (2003) noted that extroverted employees have better utilisation of their competencies than those with low extroversion, hence enabling
them to achieve better work efficacy. Soni (2003) noted that the employees who are more stable and introverted tend to be more satisfied with achievement, independence as well as human and technical supervision at the work place. It has also been established that extraverted and sociable individuals in the organization are less satisfied with human supervision. Apart from few results, most of the researchers noted significant positive relationship between extraversion and job satisfaction (Tokar and Subich, 1997; Day et al., 1998; Nikolaou and Robertson (2001); Judge et al., 2002; Najafkhani, 2007; Lounsbury et al., 2007; Patrick, 2010; Husin, 2011; Zhai et al., 2012; Kappagoda, 2013). In a recent research, Shahamiri and Namdari (2013) found significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and introversion personality types but between extraversion personality types and job satisfaction, the relationship was negative and significant.

2.2.2 Neuroticism and Job Satisfaction

As Magnus et al. (1993) noted that Neurotic individuals experience more negative life events than other individuals, they would lead to diminished levels of job satisfaction. Brief et al. (1995) found neuroticism to be the strongest negative correlate of job satisfaction. Judge et al. (2002) also noted neuroticism to be the strongest and most consistent correlate of job satisfaction. Most researchers have found neuroticism to be significantly negatively correlated with job satisfaction. (Tokar and Subich, 1997; Connolly & Viswesvaran, 2000; Nikolaou and Robertson, 2001; Heller et al., 2002; Judge et al., 2002; Bowling et al., 2006; Matzler & Renzl, 2007; Patrick, 2010 & Kappagoda, 2013).
2.2.3 Conscientiousness and Job Satisfaction

Conscientiousness seems to be another correlate (though weaker) of job satisfaction. Organ and Lingl (1995) argued that conscientiousness should be related to job satisfaction because it represents a general work involvement tendency and thus leads to a greater likelihood of obtaining satisfying work rewards, both formal (e.g., pay, promotions) and informal (e.g., recognition, respect, feelings of personal accomplishment). Indirectly, the subjective well-being literature also suggests a positive relationship between conscientiousness and job satisfaction (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998). Judge and Ilies’s (2002) research indicates that conscientious individuals exhibit a higher level of motivation and job satisfaction. Few empirical researchers reported a relationship between conscientiousness and job satisfaction. (e.g., Judge et al. (2002); Nikolaou and Robertson (2009); Acuna et al. (2009); Kappagoda (2013).

2.2.4 Agreeableness and Job Satisfaction

McCrae and Costa (1991) argued that agreeableness should be related to happiness because agreeable individuals have greater motivation to achieve interpersonal intimacy, which should lead to greater levels of well-being. Agreeableness individuals get along with co-workers in enjoyable ways (Organ and Lingl, 1995) which should lead to higher levels of job satisfaction. Rhodes & Hammer (2000) stated that agreeableness is a reliable predictor of job satisfaction. However very few researchers have found relationship between agreeableness and job satisfaction (Acuna et al., 2009; Kappagoda, 2013).
2.2.5 Openness to Experience and Job Satisfaction

Openness to experience seems to be least associated with job satisfaction among other Big-Five traits. Openness to experience is related to scientific and artistic creativity (Feist, 1998), divergent thinking, low religiosity, and political liberalism. None of these psychological states seem to be closely related to job satisfaction. Furthermore, DeNeve and Cooper (1998) noted that “openness to experience is a ‘double-edged sword’ that predisposes individuals to feel both the good and the bad more deeply” rendering its directional influence on affective reactions like subjective well-being or job satisfaction unclear. Not much empirical research establishes this relationship.

2.3 PERSONALITY AND JOB INVOLVEMENT

In their study, Rabinowitz et al. (1977) referred personal and environmental variables to determine job involvement, whereas McKelvey and Sekaran (1977) considered personal attributes to better predict job involvement (as cited in Liao and Lee, 2009). Sekaran and Mowday (1981) believed that job involvement is greatly influenced by human psychological factors. Individual is thought to own a certain amount of desire or value, and hence they tend to work harder or more involved in their jobs in order to fulfill their demand or values. Any changes in individual’s possession of certain values or personal characteristics will drive their level of job involvement to vary. Diefendorff et al. (2002) noted that job involvement and employee happiness are positively correlated. According to the study by Mudrack (2004), most of the researches assume level of job involvement to be highly dependent on the attribute of employee. Freund (as cited in Hung, 2008) viewed the job involvement as a fixed variable which critically control the employees’ working
attitude, such as job satisfaction, tendency to resignation, and organisational commitment. Hung (2008) stated that job involvement is one’s cognitive needs’ fulfilment, which assists him or her to work harder and boost up his or her performance. Liao and Lee (2009) noted that a higher degree of job involvement among the members of an organisation is essential to enhance the organisational effectiveness.

Job involvement has been of immense interest to researchers and has been related to various workplace variables. There are numerous researchers across various time periods who found that job involvement keeps the employees motivated (Blau, 1986; Blau, and Boal, 1987; Bashaw and Grant, 1994; McElroy et al., 1995; Hackett et al., 2001). There are several studies in which Job Involvement is linked to absenteeism (Blau, 1985; Farrell & Stamm, 1988; Shore et al., 1990; Scott & McClellan, 1990), and to turnover or intention to leave (Baba & Jamal, 1991; Huselid & Day, 1991). One of the most well presented correlations of job involvement is job satisfaction (Shore et al., 1990; Baba & Jamal, 1991), which states that a person with high job involvement would exhibit a strong level of job satisfaction.

As regards the relationship of personality with job involvement is concerned, not much empirical evidence establishing relationship between Big Five personality framework and job involvement is available. Liao and Lee (2009) research established the relationship between personality traits and job involvement. They found that neuroticism relates negatively to employee job involvement, whereas extroversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness relate positively to it. Eswaran and Islam (2011) examined the relationship between the Big Five Personality Dimensions and job involvement. They found extroversion and
agreeableness to be significantly positively related to job involvement. Neuroticism, conscientiousness and openness to experience were not found to be significantly related to job involvement in their study. Overall, the findings established the existence of a relationship between the Big Five personality dimensions and job involvement, although they were not very strong or extensive. Agbor et al. (2013) investigated the relationship between Big Five personality traits and job involvement of university lecturers in south east, Nigeria. The findings revealed that, high scores on conscientiousness and low scores on neuroticism were significant predictors of job involvement. The relationship of each of the Big Five traits and job involvement can be best understood from the review of existing literature as under:

2.3.1 Extraversion and Job Involvement

Extraversion is a prominent factor in personality psychology, as evidenced by its appearance in most personality measures and its significant role in the major taxonomies of personality (Judge et al., 1999). According to Berg and Feij (2003), extroverts make better use of their competencies than do employees with low extraversion, which enables them to increase their self-efficacy, which in turn leads to better work efficacy and job involvement. Smithikrai (2007) found a positive relationship between extraversion and job success, especially in jobs that require interpersonal contacts. Also Eswaran and Islam (2011) found that extraversion is positively related to job involvement. Considering these past and recent analyses and research results, extroversion should be viewed as one of the crucial factors in Big Five personality model in identifying employees’ level of job involvement.
2.3.2 Neuroticism and Job Involvement

According to Barrick and Mount (1991), neurotic employees tend to create negative opinions as they experience anxiety, depression, anger, insecurity, and worry which tend to create negative opinions. Individual with high neuroticism may lack confidence and optimism, hence probably will not perform his or her job with positive attitudes. In a study conducted by Suls, Green & Hillis (1998), 48 healthy adult males were asked to keep detailed diaries of their problems and mood over their job for an 8-day period. The result showed that those (males) who score high in neuroticism reported having more frequent daily problems with their involvement in their job and finding them to be more distressing than did men who scored low in neuroticism. Liao and Lee (2009) found a negative correlation between neuroticism and psychoticism and job involvement. However study by Eswaran and Islam (2011) established that neuroticism was not related to job involvement. All in all, researchers believed that neuroticism appears consistently negatively correlated with job involvement.

2.3.3 Conscientiousness and Job Involvement

According to Barrick and Mount (1991), conscientiousness is the ability of individual to work hard and motivation to pursue goal accomplishment. According to Costa and McCrae (1991), conscientiousness personality dimension is constituted by competence, order, self-discipline, dutifulness, achievement striving, and deliberation. These descriptors are similar to the component of work commitment, thus conscientiousness has been found to be associated with work commitment. Meta-analytic studies suggest that conscientiousness is the most potent and consistent correlate of job performance across all types of jobs and occupations (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Salgado, 1997). Judge and Ilies (2002) research reveals that
Conscientiousness is instrumental to people’s work success, as well as their motivation to get along and their desire to be productive. Li, Lin and Chen (2007) noted that employees scoring high on conscientiousness are more likely to believe that their work has special meaning, and thus, they experience greater psychological attachment to their jobs. Liao & Lee (2009) & Agbor et al. (2013) reported positive significant relationship between conscientiousness and job involvement.

2.3.4 Agreeableness and Job Involvement

Individuals with high agreeableness prefer to maintain positive interpersonal relationships and cooperate with others. On the other hand, according to Digman (1990) and Costa and McCrae (1992), individual with low agreeableness can be described as manipulative, self-centered, suspicious, and ruthless (as cited in Zhao, 2006). Barrick and Mount (1991) and Salgado (1997) noted that a high level of agreeableness has a positive relationship with job involvement. Bozionelos (2004) believed that agreeableness is associated with altruism, friendliness and modesty, while low agreeableness includes antagonism, impression management and selfishness. Hence, individuals who score low on agreeableness must be more involved in their work because of their antagonistic and impression seeking nature, which must direct them towards seeking advancement and acknowledgment in their work environment. On the other hand, because of their altruism, modesty and good nature, individuals who score high on agreeableness prioritize relationships with others over work and career success, hence they are less likely to report high involvement in their work. However they further concluded that individuals who score low on agreeableness may demonstrate the type of involvement in their work that is detrimental to work performance such as, they may be primarily involved in informal network building as a means to advance their careers at the expense of
engaging in productive activities. On the other hand, because of their altruism and modesty, those who score high on agreeableness are probably less likely to view their work as a means to satisfy ambitious needs and, hence, they are less involved in their work. However Liao & Lee (2009) found a positive correlation between agreeable personality and job involvement. Also, Eswaran, Islam and Yusuf (2011) found that agreeableness is positively related to job involvement.

2.3.5 Openness to Experience and Job Involvement

Openness, one of the least studied of the Big Five personality dimensions in terms of job behaviour, includes the ability to be imaginative, unconventional, curious, broadminded, and cultured (Clarke and Robertson, 2005). Most research studies did not find any relationship between openness and job involvement. However, Liao and Lee (2009) in their research noted positive relationship between openness and job involvement.

2.4 PERSONALITY AND ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Organizational commitment is one of the most investigated constructs in organizational research. It has become a highly researched job attitude in recent years including several meta-analyses (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002; Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005) of commitment constructs. However, despite being so well studied, several aspects of this construct are underrepresented in the body of research. One deficiency in the research is the potential role of personality characteristics as antecedents of commitment. Studies of personality as it relates to commitment are few, and the results are mixed. There are even fewer studies that deal directly with the relation between the Big Five traits and commitment. In the past decade, several researchers have pointed out the correlation between each dimensions
of five factor personality model and organizational commitment (Erdheim et al., 2006; Kumar & Bakhshi, 2010 and Chandel et al., 2011). Lots of researchers have only considered the affective component of the commitment because affective commitment has been considered as the best predictor of individual performance. In a study conducted by Naquin & Holton (2002), the variables neuroticism, conscientiousness as well as agreeableness show a relation to the variable affective commitment. Generally it can be said that the personality factors extraversion and especially neuroticism have an indirect as well as a direct influence on affective commitment. In elaborating upon their three-component model of OC, Meyer et al. (2002) denoted a variable labelled “Personal Characteristics” as the only variable that influences all three OC sub-components. Personal Characteristics are understood to include personality as a disposition variable. Camilleri (2002) in his research on “some antecedents of organisational commitment” noted that degree of OC is dependent on the personality of the individual. Erdheim et al. (2006) explored the linkages between the five-factor model of personality and organizational commitment using a field sample. Results indicated that Extraversion was significantly related to affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience were all significantly related to continuance commitment. Lastly, Agreeableness was significantly related to normative commitment. The findings of Barbara Hoffmann et al. (2007) study support the relationship between personality and affective commitment. Chandel et al. (2011) noted significant relationship between personality traits and organisational commitment. Extraversion was found to be negatively associated with continuance commitment and positively associated with normative commitment. Correlation between Neuroticism and organizational commitment varied for three components of
organizational commitment. Correlation between Neuroticism and Affective Commitment was found to be significantly negative and correlation between Neuroticism and continuance commitment was reported to be significantly positive while with normative commitment it was found negative (non significant). Further, conscientiousness displayed positive significant relationship with continuance commitment while non significant relations with affective and normative commitments. Panaccio & Vandenberghe (2012) also conducted a study to explore the relationship between personality variables and commitment. Extraversion and agreeableness were positively related to affective, normative, and continuance commitment via enhanced positive affect. Agreeableness was also positively linked to affective commitment and negatively associated with continuance-alternatives commitment through reduced negative affect. Finally, neuroticism was negatively linked to affective commitment, and positively related to continuance-alternatives commitment, through increased negative affect. The research conducted by Daneshfard (2012) on relation between personality characteristics and organisational commitment observed significant correlation between agreeableness and neuroticism characteristics of managers and employees’ organizational commitment. No significant correlation was found between extraversion and responsibility characteristics of managers and employees’ organizational commitment. Further, reverse correlation between flexibility characteristics of managers and organizational commitment of employees was found. In a recent study, Kappagoda (2013) explored the relationship of Big Five and organisational commitment among school teachers. The results of the study indicated that extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness had a significant positive relationship with organizational commitment. Results further indicated that neuroticism and openness to experience.
had insignificant negative association with organizational commitment. Next section provides overview of relationships of each of Big Five traits with organisational commitment.

2.4.1 Extraversion and Organisational Commitment

Watson and Clark (1997) stated that those high in extraversion experience higher affective commitment than those who are less extraverted because extroverts exhibit positive emotionality. As a result, they strongly identify the goals of the organization and desire to remain in the organization. They further noted that Extravert individuals tend to express themselves in positive emotions. In general, extraverts have better relations with peers than introverts which may result into better career options. Extraverts believe that their extraordinary service by providing congenial social environment may enhance the psychological contract with the organization (Erdheim et al. 2006). Researches by Erdheim et al., 2006 and Gelade et al., 2006 further support the reasoning that those high in extraversion should have higher affective commitment than those who are less extraverted. Zimmerman (2008) stated that due to their tendency to be more socially active, individuals high in extraversion may develop more social contacts than those low in this dimension. They tend to build more networks of contacts at other organizations. These social networks in turn could help extraverts to develop more alternate employment opportunities than introverts. Since continuance commitment will be related to an employee’s perceptions of viable alternatives, once employees find they have more employment alternatives, the continuance commitment of such employees to their organization will be weaker. Empirical researches support the relationship between Extraversion and Organisational Commitment (Naquin and Holton, 2002; Erdheim, Wang &
2.4.2 Neuroticism and Organisational Commitment

Neuroticism is a prominent trait in personality psychology, as evidenced by its appearance in nearly every measure of personality (Costa & McCrae, 1988b; Judge, et al., 1999). Magnus et al. (1993) noted that neurotic individuals have a tendency to experience more negative life events than other individuals. Meyer & Allen (1997) stated that neuroticism associates with continuance commitment, which may develop out of an employee’s fear of the costs linked with leaving his or her current position. According to Furnham et al. (1999), neurotics are more powerfully motivated by and attracted to hygiene factors, such as job security (permanent job), benefits (good vacation, sick leave etc.), pay (the amount of money that is paid), and work conditions (comfortable and clean). They reasoned that employees will stay with the organization because of the “side bet” they have invested in the organization which could be in the form of remuneration, specificity of skills, work security and work friends and would be lost if they decided to leave. Naquin and Holton (2002) found neuroticism to be significantly and negatively associated with affective commitment. Bozionelos (2004) noted that neuroticism entails attributes such as pessimism, excessive worry, low confidence, and tendencies to experience negative emotions. He stated that because of their essentially negative nature, neurotic individuals are more likely to develop negative attitudes and behaviours towards their work. Similarly, Gelade et al. (2006) found that affective commitment was higher in nations where neuroticism was lower. Also employees who score high in neuroticism are expected to have higher continuance commitment. Erdheim et al. (2006) and Chandel et al.
reported significant correlation between neuroticism and continuous commitment.

2.4.3 Conscientiousness and Organisational Commitment

Wiener (1982) believed that normative commitment is a natural tendency for conscientious people. Deci & Ryan (2000) stated that Conscientiousness could be related to the development of affective commitment through achievement orientation. Conscientious people tend to be achievement oriented which is consistently rewarded in the workplace. Further highly conscientious people are careful, responsible and thorough, and hence would be more hesitant to leave a job because of perceived costs and thus more likely to develop continuance commitment. According to Ciavarella et al. (2004), the dimensions of conscientiousness (dependability, industriousness and efficiency) are the predictors of persevering, hardworking and achievement oriented people. Hence, conscientiousness may enhance the level to which employees are involved in their organization by engaging with their job; thus they would be more affectively committed to organization. Empirical findings by Naquin & Holton (2002); Erdheim et al. (2006); Matzler & Renzl (2007) also established a positive relationship between conscientiousness and affective component of organisational commitment.

2.4.4 Agreeableness and Organisational Commitment

Theoretical as well as empirical findings suggest a positive relationship between agreeableness and affective commitment. Morrison (1997) reported agreeableness to be significantly correlated with overall organizational commitment. Similar to this, Naquin and Holton (2002) found a modest relationship between agreeableness and affective commitment. Interestingly, in a research conducted by
Chu Cui (2010) on Chinese employees, among Big Five traits only agreeableness was found to be significantly related to employees’ affective commitment. The researcher further mentioned that agreeableness is viewed as an interpersonal factor that focuses on the quality of relationships through cooperation and trust. As agreeableness helps to build pleasant and satisfying relationship with other employees, it links to emotional warmth and may encourage an employee’s social identity with their work environment, encourages their sense of belongingness and identification with values and goals. Erdheim et al. (2006); Panaccio & Vandenberghe (2012); Daneshfard (2012) and Kappagoda (2013) reported a significant relationship between agreeableness and organisational commitment.

2.4.5 Openness to Experience and Organisational Commitment

Previous studies have not revealed encouraging or definitive evidence on the relationship between openness and work-related attitudes. Openness has been found to show a very weak correlation with occupational outcomes, (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Matzler & Renzl, 2007, Abu Elanain, 2008). According to McCrae & John (1992), individuals who are high in openness to experience have a need for variety, aesthetic sensitivity, and unconventional values. They could be disposed to seek out work experiences that foster creativity and imagination. When a workplace allows for this opportunity, these individuals could develop both affective and normative commitment because of these conditions. Individuals who are high in openness to experience would not theoretically be likely to develop continuance commitment because of the conformist nature of this construct. DeNeve and Cooper (1998) explained that “openness is a double-edged sword that predisposes an individual to feel both the good and the bad more deeply, leaving its directional influence on affective reactions like affective commitment unclear”. However openness has been
found to be positively related to career search (Boudreau et al., 2001) and turnover (Salgado, 2002). These negative behaviours seem to have effect on employee’s continuance commitment. Lounsbury, et al. (2003) found that openness to experience individuals are more likely to expend time and effort to finish projects, meet deadlines and are more productive. Therefore it is reasonable to predict that openness is likely to influence the employees’ affective commitment. Maertz and Griffeth (2004) argued that individuals high in openness would value changing jobs and thereby are more likely to leave an organization. Erdheim et al. (2006) found that such employees are normally average in affective commitment. Zimmerman (2008) reasoned that an open individual may approach turnover from a positive perspective, such as obtaining more experience and personal growth. Thus, if employees believe that more alternatives are available, their continuance commitment will be decreased. However little empirical evidence on the existence of this relationship could be found.

2.5 PERSONALITY AND WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT

The studies by Frone et al. (1992); Hughes & Galinsky (1994); Thomas & Ganster (1995); Kinnunen & Mauno (1998); Kossek & Oseki (1998); Perrewe et al. (1999) have indicated that work–family conflicts are associated with diminished satisfactions and lower levels of psychological well-being. Adams et al. (1996) found that WFC negatively impacts family, marital, and life satisfaction. Though some researchers have tended to focus on work variables (e.g., job involvement, number of hours worked, job stress), the influence of individual differences have been neglected in the literature. Even fewer is the research on role of personality in predicting WFC. Carlson (1999) noted that dispositional variables, such as personality, do indeed have a significant effect on WFC, above and beyond situational variables. Two people may
experience the same objective work or family situation (e.g., same number of hours at work, same level of job involvement) yet differ in their experience of WFC. That is, though their objective experience is the same, one’s personality may influence how he or she perceives the situation, resulting in different experiences of WFC. **Noor (2003)** reported that while work-related variables explained for the most variance in WIF conflict, personality variables accounted for the most variance in FIW conflict. Also those with high neuroticism scores and low extraversion scores appear to be less able to prevent family matters intruding into the workplace. **Bruck and Allen (2003)** conducted a study on working employees at a university. The results demonstrated that different aspects of WFC related to different personality indicators. Negative affectivity was the dispositional variable that was most consistently related to the various types of conflict. Additionally, agreeableness related to time-based conflict and conscientiousness related to family interfering with work conflict. **Wayne et al. (2004)** used a national random sample (N= 2130) to investigate the relationship between each of the big five personality traits and conflict and facilitation between work and family roles. They found that Conscientiousness was related to lower levels of WFC, Neuroticism was related to higher levels of WFC and extraversion was not significantly related to WFC. **Smoot (2005)** conducted a study to explore a model of work-family conflict that included personality and coping with a sample of university faculty. Several personality traits were significantly correlated with various other variables in the study. There was a significant and positive relationship between extraversion and problem-focused coping and a negative relationship between extraversion and WFC. There was a significant negative relationship between conscientiousness and WFC, whereas both neuroticism and openness to experience were found to be positively related to WFC. **Malekiha et al. (2012)** examined the
relationship between work-family conflict and Big Five personality traits. Results showed that extraversion was not related to both directions of conflict whereas neuroticism was related to both directions of conflict. Conscientiousness was the only other personality trait related to both directions of conflict such that person higher in conscientiousness experienced less WFC and FWC despite the fact that conscientiousness individuals are likely to work hard to achieve their goals in both domains which could increase the opportunity for conflict. No other personality traits besides conscientiousness and neuroticism were related to FWC. Despite this limited amount of research, several predictions can be made based on what is known about relationship of each of traits and WFC separately.

2.5.1 Extraversion and Work Family Conflict

**Rusting & Larsen (1998)** stated that Individuals scoring high on Extraversion have been shown to experience more positive affect in their lives than introverts do, and therefore may perceive the influences of their work and family roles more positively than negatively. **Mischel & Shoda (1999)** mentioned that the positivity and energy of extraverts likely results in less strain and fewer time pressures and are hence predicted to experience less conflict. People high on Extraversion may perceive these situations as less conflicting than someone who scores lower on extraversion does. Extraversion has also been related to the use of social support, indicating that individuals high on Extraversion may have more social support networks, helping to buffer conflict between roles. **Bruck and Allen (2003)** reported null findings among their sample of 164 university employees. They did not found any significant correlation between extraversion and WFC. **Smoot (2005)** reported a negative relationship between extraversion and a general measure of WFC. Though certain researchers could not establish relationship between extraversion and WFC, overall
the literature supports the notion that individuals high on extraversion tend to report lower levels of work-family conflict. Moreover, by focusing on the positive aspects of situations, they may perceive situations as less stressful.

2.5.2 Neuroticism and Work Family Conflict

As noted by Rusting & Larsen (1998), people who score higher on neuroticism are more likely to experience negative affect in general than the people scoring lower on neuroticism.

Zellars et al. (1999) stated that when a person high on neuroticism experiences time constraints, strain in a role, or behaviour changes, they are more likely to exaggerate these conflicts. Various empirical researches also support the existence of relationship between neuroticism and work family conflict. Stoeva et al. (2002) stated that characteristics of neurotic individuals such as anxiety, insecurity, defensiveness, tension and worry may lead them to experience more job and family stress which in turn increases the degree of conflict experienced. Neurotics spend time worrying or focusing on negative affect and may be left with less time available to accomplish work and family tasks. They experience more stress and are bad at efficient utilisation of time which might be another reason for such individuals to experience high degree of conflict. Bruck & Allen (2003) found neuroticism to be significantly positively correlative with WFC whole, WIF, FIW, time-based WFC and stress-based WFC. Noor (2003) found that neuroticism had a direct positive effect on distress, it also influenced well-being indirectly via work–family conflict. Study conducted by Wayne et al (2004) also indicated that neuroticism is significantly positively correlative with WIF and FIW. As stated by Smoot (2005), individuals high on neuroticism are more likely to perceive their life situations negatively and then behave accordingly. Because negative affectivity is positively related to WFC, it
is likely that neuroticism will be also. The negative perceptions that individuals high on Neuroticism experience should lead them to experience higher levels of WFC because of their sensitivities to conflicts. Andreassi (2006) found out that the relation of neuroticism and WIF is higher than that of neuroticism and FIW. Blanch and Aluja (2009) noted that neuroticism was the most predictive variables of work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW).

2.5.3 Conscientiousness and Work Family Conflict

As far as the relationship between conscientiousness and WFC is concerned, Goldberg (1992) stated that careful planning, effective organization and efficient time management on the part of conscientious individuals may allow an individual to accomplish more in the time available, which should reduce incompatible time pressures, and also possibly reduce stress and strain, thereby reducing conflict. In a study conducted by Kinnunen et al. (2003), FIW and conscientiousness were found to be negatively related. However that study also did not found a significant relationship between WIF and conscientiousness as was in case of study conducted by Bruck & Allen (2003). They conducted a systematic study to gauze this relationship and found that conscientiousness is not significantly correlative with the three types of WFC. And the same time, they also found that conscientious people experience less FIW. Probably conscientiousness-related plan and organization skill could help them to avoid FIW. Shafiro’s (2004) research showed that conscientiousness is correlated with the following four types of conflict: time-based FIW, stress-based FIW, behavior-based WIF and FIW. Conscientiousness has been proposed to lead to high involvement in both work and family roles, due to the fact that it involves being thorough, persevering, and efficient. Although people who are conscientious are more involved in their roles, they are also more organized and better at planning. They may
be better than non-conscientious people at balancing the time and energy they have to spend in their work and family roles. Therefore, it seems that highly conscientious people will experience less WFC. This prediction is consistent with Wayne et al. (2004) findings. Wayne (2004) claimed that highly conscientious people experience comparatively low WIF and FIW. They found that conscientiousness was negatively related to both WIF and FIW using a national, random sample (N=2,130). Although the correlation between FIW and conscientiousness was slightly higher than that of WIF and conscientiousness, they were both significant. Additionally, Smoot (2005) reported a negative relationship between a general measure of WFC and conscientiousness. We can thus note that researchers examining conscientiousness as an antecedent to work-family conflict have generally reported a negative relationship.

2.5.4 Agreeableness and Work Family Conflict

Bruck and Allen (2003) noticed that agreeableness has significantly negative correlation with WFC whole, WIF, FIW, time-based WFC and stress-based WFC. Wayne et al (2004) also found that agreeableness has significantly negative correlation with WIF, but not significant with FIW. Smoot (2005) stated that agreeable people may be so intent on pleasing others that they place a lot of importance on all the roles in their lives, trying to please both people at work (supervisors, co-workers) as well as their family. Thus, more importance placed on all roles makes it less likely that they will be able to accomplish all goals and responsibilities associated with each role. Because they are not able to fulfil responsibilities, agreeable people may experience more strain associated with their roles. They may be trying to please others associated with their roles and spend more time on those roles, thus enhancing the time-based conflict they experience as well.
Not much of the empirical researches supported a significant relationship between Agreeableness and WFC.

2.5.5 Openness to Experience and Work Family Conflict

Openness to experience is characterized by intelligence, unconventionality, imagination, curiosity, creativity, and originality (Mischel & Shoda, 1999). Much less is known about the relationship of openness with conflict. Bruck and Allen (2003), Wayne et al. (2004), Malekiha et al. (2012) and many others did not report any significant correlation between openness to experience and work family conflict. However Smoot (2005) found that Individuals who scored high on Openness also experienced higher levels of WFC than those who scored low on Openness. Smoot further stated that the characteristics of open to experience people like imagination, being unconventional and intelligent could perhaps lead them to be more involved in their careers, and therefore less available for their family role which may increase Work Family Conflict.

Frone et al. (1992), Hammer et al. (1997) and Lundberg et al. (1994) found that although both men and women may experience work–family conflict, women have reported more conflict than men due to women spending more combined time on work and family activities. Among other personality traits, the relationship between neuroticism and WFC has received the most support (e.g., Bruck & Allen, 2003; Smoot, 2005; Wayne et al., 2004; Andreassi, 2007; Bryant, 2009). Despite some inconsistencies in the literature, several researchers have reported significant associations between conscientiousness, extraversion, and work-family conflict (e.g., Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Kinnunen et al., 2003; Bruck & Allen, 2003; Wayne et al., 2004; Andreassi, 2007; Andreassi & Thompson, 2007)
2.6 PERSONALITY AND OCCUPATIONAL STRESS

Stress is an important psychological concept that can affect health, well-being and job performance in negative dimensions (Mojoyinola, 1984 & Olaleye, 2002). Lazarus (1966) conceived stress to be a threat of anticipation of future harm, either physical or psychological events that lower an individual’s self-esteem. Several researchers have examined a link between pilot personality and stress and accidents (Reinhardt, 1966; Christy, 1975; Green, 1977). Personality inadequacies in coping with stress seem to result in some form of flying impairment, especially when coupled with affective stress (Yanowitch, 1977). Ursano (1980) noted that personality differences are important determinants of how an individual reacts to role conflict. The typical personality of a pilot may not be an optimum one for handling emotional problems since he/she is a person who typically denies his/ her emotional life and may possess inadequate strategies for coping with emotional situations. Researchers offer a range of frameworks linked to personality and the stress that a person experience.

Bolger and Zuckerman (1995) framework pictures illustrate how personality affects both the display and reactivity to stress, health and physiological results. Edwards (1992) suggested a cybernetic framework that links personality with other variables to understand the work stress. This framework specifies that individual characteristics (such as, age), personality factors and environment all play a role, each interacting systemically. Studies by Wilson et al. (1990), Cooper et al. (1994) and Davey (1994) have provided evidence that individual personality traits play substantial roles in occupational stress. The negative effects of occupational stress include impaired performance or a reduction in productivity, diminishing levels of customer service, health problems, absenteeism, turnover, industrial accidents, alcohol and drug use and purposefully destructive behaviours (Wright & Smye, 1996, Quick et al., 1997).


**Hart (1999)** developed a model for relation between personality and work, non work and life satisfaction. It was found that job satisfaction and non-work satisfaction made independent contributions to overall life satisfaction, but there was no significant relationship between work experiences and non-work satisfaction, nor between non-work experiences and job satisfaction. These findings support a segregation model rather than a spill-over model of the links between the work and non-work domains of employees' lives. Moreover, the total effects showed that life satisfaction was determined, in order of importance, by non-work satisfaction, neuroticism, non-work hassles, job satisfaction, non-work uplifts, extraversion, work hassles, and work uplifts. As stated by **Jones and Bright (2001)**, Occupational stress is associated with increases in negative work-related outcomes, such as job dissatisfaction, ill-health, absenteeism, higher turnover and lower productivity. **Flaa et al. (2007)** stated that Stress reactivity is dependent on different personality traits, without any single trait being clearly dominant. Though several researchers have linked personality with burnout and stress coping strategies, very few studies have investigated the role of Big Five factors in work stress, and even fewer studies have examined the independent effects of each of the five factors individually on work stress.

In the occupational stress literature, among other Big Five traits, there has been considerable interest in the role of neuroticism (also known as dispositional negative affectivity) and to a lesser extent, extraversion, but there has been very little interest in the role of openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. **Fontana & Abouserie (1993)** used Eysenck model to examine this relationship and found high degree of correlation between stress and neuroticism, introversion, and psychoticism. **Jamal and Preena (1998)** conducted study on job stress and employee well-being.
among airline personnel in an asian developing country. They found Job stress to be significantly related to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Cano-Garcia et al. (2005) research reveals the role of personality and contextual variable in stress. Grant & Langan-Fox (2007) investigated the role of the big five traits in the occupational stressor-strain relationship. Direct, mediated, and moderated effect models were used to investigate whether the big five affect strain directly (independently of stress), indirectly (via stress and coping), or interactively with stress. Personality, stress, coping, and strain variables were measured and analyzed with path analysis and hierarchical regression. The neuroticism-physical strain relationship was partially mediated by perceived role conflict and substance use, and the neuroticism-psychological strain relationship was mediated by perceived stress. Extraversion had a direct, positive effect on physical and psychological strain, and there was preliminary support for a moderating role of conscientiousness in the perceived stressor-strain relationship. Agreeableness and openness were unrelated to strain. Leo Jeeva and Chandramohan (2008) in their study on stressors and stress coping strategies among civil pilots found most of the pilots under study to be suffering from mild to moderate level of stress. Ozutku and Altindis (2011) investigated the effect of personality and other elements on work stress among Turkish health care professionals. The results of correlation analysis showed that extraversion was negatively linked with work stress, and neuroticism was positively linked with work stress. The results of regression analysis revealed that neuroticism as a personality factor, gender as a personal characteristic; and position variables as a work environment, were the predictors of work stress. In a recent study on “Big Five Personality traits - a tool for managing stress” conducted by Subburaj et al. (2012), personality traits were found to predict occupational stress. Occupational stress was
found to be significantly correlated with extraversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness and neuroticism. The researchers further noted that personality traits have more predicted power than any other contextual variables. **Rai and Kumar (2012)** investigated the relationship between five factor model of personality and role stress (role overload, role ambiguity and role conflict) among middle level managers working in public and private manufacturing organizations. They found neuroticism to be positively correlated with all dimensions of role stress i.e. role overload, role ambiguity and role conflict. Agreeableness was negatively correlated with role ambiguity and overall stress. Conscientiousness was negatively correlated with role ambiguity, role conflict and overall stress. Results of hierarchical regression analysis concluded neuroticism to be the significant predictor of role stress along with its dimensions. **Garbarino et al. (2013)** studied the relationship of big five traits with work related stress in special force police officers. The results indicated that some personality traits of the five-factor model were associated with stress levels and stress reactivity. Neuroticism (low emotional stability) showed the strongest associations with job strain and was associated with most of the stress variables. High agreeableness was associated with low effort/reward imbalance.

Because of the paucity of research in this area, it is difficult to make prediction regarding the relationship of each of big five traits and occupational stress. However from the above discussion, it seems that neuroticism is the strongest correlate of occupational stress. As neuroticism has been referred to as a mood-dispositional dimension that reflects a person’s tendency to experience negative emotions, it is not surprising, therefore that strong relationships have also been found between neuroticism and other variables, such as coping, negative work experiences (i.e., stressors), and various indices of psycho- logical distress (e.g., Hart et al., 1995).
Ozutku & Altindis (2011), Subburaj et al. (2012), Rai & Kumar (2012) observed significant positive relationship between neuroticism and stress. Further research has shown that extraversion is significantly related to occupational stress (Fontana & Abouserie, 1993; Hart et al., 1995; George, 1996; Mills & Huebner, 1998; Hart, 1999; Cano-Garcia et al., 2005; Ozutku and Altindis, 2011; Subburaj et al., 2012). Very few researches support the relationship between agreeableness and stress (Subburaj et al (2012); Rai & Kumar 2012). The role of openness to experience and conscientiousness in determining employee job stress is less clear. It is possible to theorize about potential relationships, but the paucity of empirical evidence makes it is difficult to argue a firm statement.
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