

Self-Efficacy and Personality Factors and their Association with Work Motivation of Employees

K. Sindhura

MEASI Institute of Management, Chennai

The social learning theory believes that one's belief in their ability to complete a task is called Self-Efficacy. The personality theory predicts work performance across a range of dimensions. The multidimensional conceptualization of job motivation is emphasised by the self-determination theory. The organization anticipates that its personnel will fulfill their tasks and roles effectively. For the company, the employees are a huge investment and asset. The factors that affect an employee's motivation at work are numerous. Finding the elements will encourage the organization in investing in human capital. The opinions about human potential have changed significantly. The goal of human resource planning is to hone employees' skill sets for effective performance. The employees exhibit a variety of job behaviours, with some excelling and being devoted while other behaviours show less interest. It becomes important responsibility for the organisations to understand the factors which influence the employee's level of work motivation. In the present study author has examined whether Self-Efficacy and Personality of the employees associate their level of Work Motivation. The patterns of a person's externally organised habits, traits, attitudes, beliefs, motivation, etc., which interact internally and have an impact on their goals, are their personalities. 120 employees working for an IT company participated in the study. Standardized measures were used to obtain data on Self-Efficacy, Big Five Personality traits and Work Motivation. Cluster analysis was done in addition to the other descriptive data analysis. Findings showed that Cluster-1 had the following characteristics of conscientiousness, neuroticism, amotivation, extrinsic regulation-social and extrinsic regulation-material; Cluster-2 had the following characteristics of self-efficacy, extroversion, agreeableness, openness to new experience, introjected regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic motivation. The clusters were significant in self-efficacy, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, amotivation, introjected regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic motivation. The inference helped to cluster of the employees who would require differential intervention to enhance work motivation and perform well in their roles. High correlation was observed in the personality dimension - agreeableness with the work dimensions in introjected regulation and intrinsic motivation, followed by the personality dimension-extraversion with the work motivation in introjected regulation and intrinsic motivation. The findings could help to understand the characteristics of employees and develop appropriate strategy to execute intervention to improve their work motivation.

Keywords: Self-efficacy, Personality, Work Motivation, IT Employees

Companies hire employees with specific skill sets and also provide certain skill sets on job for ensuring smooth roll out of their work. During the recruitment process, the human resource department analyses the psychological strength of the employees with various tests. The individual employee after going through set of procedures starts to work for the company. It is common that the employing organisation

expects its employees to perform brilliantly in the positions and responsibilities assigned to them. The employees are the company's greatest investment because they are in charge of taking the business to new heights; their skill sets and work motivation help the companies to charter its business plans. It is common for the Human Resource Department to note that there is a difference in the style of work of the individual

employees which might be boarded as strength for the organisation or at times weakness for the organisation (Vinesh, 2014).

Different theories have been created by theorists in the realm of human behaviour. These theories can be used to comprehend the employees' work motivation, and other factors which can support the Human Resource Management to design specific interventions. The social cognitive theory, personality theory and self-determination theory can be applied and explored on the employees for right organizational development programmes. This investigation will assist the company to comprehend and internalise the reality about the factors influencing employee performance. Employee stress, whether it from the workplace or from other sources, will be reduced by this effort. The Social Cognitive theory states that self-efficacy of the individual, influences the work-related personality and motivation (Mensa & Lebbaeus, 2013). Employee self-efficacy is crucial to how employees approach their objectives, duties, obstacles, and potential solutions in the workplace (Therasa & Vijayabanu, 2015).

The individuals judge their capabilities for organizing and executing action to attain a designated type of performance (Niu, 2010; Lent et al., 1996). The concept of self-efficacy can be used to understand the work-related performance and organizational pursuits (Cherian & Jacob, 2013). Self-efficacy makes the individuals to believe in their ability and in turn motivates them to accomplish a task successfully. It is described as function of beliefs associated with increased performance. Employee beliefs are based more on motivation, affective states and actions (Bandura, 1977). The measurement of self-efficacy predicts behavioral outcomes (Graham & Weiner, 1996) as it plays vital role to change and affect the employees' behavior. According to Bandura (1977; 1997), self-efficacy is known as social cognitive theory or social learning theory and it is a person's belief which makes him capable of performing any assigned task successfully. An employee's sense of capability influences their perception, motivation, and performance. The theory of self-efficacy emphasizes that

employees judge their ability to be successful and cope with new challenges, thus developing the important field of belief system which they have to focus on (Raghuram et al., 2003).

Personality trait theory, which makes predictions about how someone would act in specific circumstances, refers to thought and behaviour patterns that are consistent through time and in many contexts (Cattell, 1966). The recent empirical research shows that personality traits influence personal values and attitudes (Olver & Mooradian, 2003). The big five or five-factor model of personality represents valid empirical evidence (Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1993; McCrae and Costa, 1996; O'Connor, 2002) though the concept has a variety of theoretical perspectives, (John, Hampson & Goldberg, 1991; McAdams, 1995). The Big five personality comprises the dimensions of neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness. Exploration on personality is an important effort for different applications in industry and organization. The personality models and their facets have a genetic basis (Digman, 1989) and are probably inherited (Jang et al., 1996).

Individuals with extraversion have high positive emotions and they develop good interpersonal relationship with others. The individuals with neuroticism are vulnerable to negative things and they exhibit fear, anger, depression, stress etc. Individuals with traits of agreeableness are helpful, cooperative, caring, nurturing and affectionate. They exhibit positive emotions in any social situations (Hayesa & Joseph, 2002). Individuals with conscientiousness have combination of achievement and dependability which has greater impact on behaviour (Barrick & Mount, 1993). The individuals with openness to experience have active imagination, aesthetic sensitivity, attentive to inner feelings and they prefer variety and intellectual curiosity. Very little research has examined that personality traits influence performance (Barrick et al., 2002). The self-determination theory emphasises a multifaceted perspective of motivation and describes how different types of drive in an individual can be supported or undermined. Three main categories

of motivation-Amotivation which means absence of motivation towards an activity, intrinsic motivation indicates doing an activity because it is interesting for the individual and extrinsic motivation refers to engaging in an activity as it gives rewards/ approval/avoid criticism/attain the personal valued goal (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The results will assist the company in determining what components of employee motivation can be fostered while also aiming to change their behaviour. The three theories perspectives on individual's social cognition, personality and work motivation were studied to understand the relation of the first two on work motivation of the employees. The results will assist the company in determining what components of employee motivation can be fostered while also aiming to change their behaviours.

The objectives of the Study

The two objectives of the study were

1. To measure the employees' Self-Efficacy, Big Five Personality and Multi-dimensional Work Motivation
2. To determine whether the Self-Efficacy and the Personality of the employees have significant relationship with work motivation

Method

The study chose standardised instruments for data production and employed a cross-sectional research methodology. Data were collected from a group of volunteers with various demographic and personal traits. The results of this type of study design can aid in the removal of presumptions and their replacement with actual data on the particular variables under examination at the time. It does not take much time or money to perform, contains data on many different factors, and may be utilised to generate a variety of research data that can be evaluated to support various theories. The company's human resources team worked closely with researcher to execute the study. The tools used were: 1. The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE) developed by Schwarzer & Jerusalem (1995), 2. The Big Five Personality Inventory

developed by Rammstedt & John (2007), and 3. The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale developed by Gagne et al., (2015). The method of random sampling was employed to choose the respondents. The population under study consisted of workers at an IT consulting company. The sample selection made sure that both male and female employees participated equally. 120 employees participated in the study. The scales and the inventory were administered using the company' online survey programme named "survey monkey." The online survey had mandatory fields to ensure completeness of the tools.

The description of the standardized tools used is presented below:

The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE):

The scale consists of 10 items which are mixed at random into a larger pool of items that have similar response format. The scale is self-administered and requires less than 5 minutes for answering the items. The responses will be made on a 5-point scale.

The Big Five Personality Inventory (BFP):

The inventory contains 10 items to capture the following personality factors. It measures extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience. The self-administered rating inventory is rated on a 5-point scale.

The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS): The scale consists of 19 items which are rated on a 5-point scale. It measures amotivation, extrinsic regulation-social, extrinsic regulation-material, introjected regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic motivation.

The titles of the scales and inventory were deleted to ensure non-bias response. Confidentiality was ensured to the employees. Specific demographic variables were also collected with the administration of the scales/ the inventory.

Analysis and Results

Analysis was performed by using SPSS, version-23. Other analysis which was done includes correlation and cluster analysis.

Table 1: Demographic background of the employees

S. No	Variable	Division	Percentage
1.	Age	<=25 year	28.33
		26-35	52.51
		36-40	13.33
		>=41	5.83
2	Gender	Male	50
		Female	50
3	Marital status	Single	49
		Married	51
4	Education	UG	46.67
		PG	51.67
		Diploma	1.66
5	Total work experience	<=4 years	45.84
		5-8 years	19.16
		>8 years	35
6	Experience in the company	<=4 years	75.83
		5-8 years	12.5
		>8 years	11.67
7	Total number of years in current role	<=4 years	56.67
		>4 years	43.33

Higher percentages (52.51%) of the employees were in the age group between 26 and 35. Quarter of the workforce, 28.3%, was in the age group lesser/equal to 25 years. 13.33% of the employees were in between 36 and 40 years, while 5.83 percent are more than or equal to 41. The male and female employees had equal percent (50%). In marital status, 49% were single and 51% were married.

46.67 % had educational qualification of under graduation and 52 % had post-graduation and 1.66% were diploma holders. 45.84% of employees had lesser/ equal to 4 years of work experience. 19.16 % of employees had work experience of 5 to 8 years. 35 % of employees had more than 8-year total work experience. 75.8 % had lesser/ equal to 4-years of work experience and 12.5 % had work experience of 5 to 8 years. 11.67 % had more than 8-year work

experience in the company. 56.67% had lesser/ equal to 4-year work experience and 43.33 had more than >4-year work experience in the current role of the company (Table 1).

The level of Self-Efficacy of the employees is high and both genders also have high levels of self-efficacy. The mean value of male is 41.3 and female is 41.2 (Table 2).

When it comes to the Personality dimensions, the higher mean values fall in the three Personality dimensions - Agreeableness (the mean value of male and female is 8.1 and 8.3 respectively), Extroversion (the mean value of male and female is 6.87 and 7.6 respectively), and Openness to experience (the mean value of male and female is 6.3 and 6.1 respectively). The employees have lesser mean values in the rest of the personality dimensions. Therefore, the three main personality dimensions in which the employees fall, include Agreeableness, Extraversion and Openness to Experience (Table 2).

In the multidimensional Work Motivation, the higher mean values fall in following three dimensions - a) introjected regulation (the mean value of male and female is 16.0 and 15.3 respectively), b) identified regulation (the mean value of male and female is 13.1 and 12.9 respectively) and c) intrinsic motivation (the mean value of male and female is 12.3 and 12.97 respectively). The other Work Motivation dimension had lesser means. In amotivation dimension, the mean value of male and female is 4.2 and 3.77 respectively (Table 2).

Therefore, the employees' Self-Efficacy level is high and the Personality dimensions of the employees are also high in agreeableness, extraversion and Openness to experience. In the Work dimensions, introjected regulation, identified regulation and openness to experience had high levels. Very few employees have amotivation in the Work Motivation dimension.

The Table 3 shows the correlation of Self-Efficacy of the employees and Personality of the employees with Work Motivation. It is found that Self-Efficacy was significant and it had positive correlation in the following four Work Motivation dimensions- a) extrinsic regulation-Social ($r = .417$), b) identified regulation ($r = .232$), c)

Table 2: Level of Self-Efficacy, Personality Dimensions and Multidimensional Work Motivation of Employees (Mean, SD and SE)

S. No	Variable	Gender	N	Mean	SD	S E
1	Self-Efficacy	Male	60	41.38	6.35	.82
		Female	60	41.20	7.22	.93
2	Extroversion	Male	60	6.87	1.91	.25
		Female	60	7.62	1.81	.23
3	Agreeableness	Male	60	8.10	1.60	.21
		Female	60	8.33	1.55	.20
4	Conscientiousness	Male	60	4.00	1.48	.19
		Female	60	3.88	1.65	.21
5	Neuroticism	Male	60	4.52	1.91	.25
		Female	60	5.38	2.22	.28
6	Openness to experience	Male	60	6.30	1.05	.14
		Female	60	6.1	1.25	.162
7	Amotivation	Male	60	4.23	1.89	.24
		Female	60	3.77	1.65	.21
8	Extrinsic Regulation-Social	Male	60	7.13	3.87	.50
		Female	60	5.72	3.13	.40
9	Extrinsic motivation-Material	Male	60	7.95	3.85	.50
		Female	60	6.98	4.053	.52
10	Introjected Regulation	Male	60	16.03	4.98	.64
		Female	60	15.27	4.01	.517
11	Identified Regulation	Male	60	13.05	3.19	.41
		Female	60	12.92	3.10	.40
12	Intrinsic Motivation	Male	60	12.25	3.55	.46
		Female	60	12.97	2.64	.34

introjected regulation ($r = .329$), and d) intrinsic motivation ($r = .329$).

In Personality dimension, Extraversion dimension was significant and it had positive correlation in the three motivation dimensions - a) identified regulation ($r = .265$), b) introjected regulation ($r = .213$) and c) intrinsic motivation ($r = .305$). Agreeableness dimension was significant and it had positive correlation in the four motivation dimensions- a) extrinsic regulation-social ($r = .265$), b) identified regulation ($r = .213$), c) introjected regulation ($r = .346$) and d) intrinsic motivation ($r = .346$). Conscientiousness dimension had negative correlation in the three work motivational dimensions – a) extrinsic

regulation-social ($r = -.311$), b) introjected regulation ($r = -.320$), and c) intrinsic motivation ($r = .320$). High correlation is observed in the Personality dimension agreeableness with the Work dimension introjected regulation and intrinsic motivation, followed by the Personality dimension extraversion with the Work Motivation - introjected regulation and intrinsic motivation (Table 3).

Cluster analysis was done to group the employees and two clusters were formed. Cluster-1 has the following characteristics of conscientiousness, neuroticism, amotivation and extrinsic regulation-social; cluster-2 has the following characteristics of Self-

Table 3: Correlation of Self- Efficacy, Personality and Multidimensional Work Motivation of the Employees

Scale/ dimenations		Amotiva- tion	Extrinsic motivation- Material	Extrinsic Regulation- Social	Identified Regulation	Introjected Regulation	Intrinsic Motivation	
1	Self-efficacy	r	-.043	-.152	.417**	.232*	.329**	
			.638	.096	.000	.011	.000	.000
2	Extraversion	r	.100	-.039	.142	.263**	.305**	.305**
			.276	.673	.121	.004	.001	.001
3	Agreeableness	r	.093	-.117	.265**	.213*	.346**	.346**
			.314	.205	.003	.020	.000	.000
4	Conscientious ness	r	-.114	.010	-.311**	-.158	-.320**	-.320**
			.217	.909	.001	.086	.000	.000
5	Neuroticism	r	.003	.074	-.162	-.048	-.075	-.075
			.976	.420	.077	.604	.413	.413
6	Openness	r	-.135	-.178	-.004	-.052	.095	.095
			.143	.052	.969	.572	.300	.300

Table 4: Cluster Classification of Employees based on Self-efficacy, Personality and Work Motivation

S.No	Variable	Cluster 1	Cluster 2
1	Self-Efficacy	31.21	43.81
2	Extraversion	6.63	7.40
	Agreeableness	7.29	8.45
	Conscientiousness	4.92	3.70
	Neuroticism	6.46	4.57
	Openness to experience	5.92	6.31
	3	Amotivation	4.75
Extrinsic Regulation-Social		7.54	6.15
Extrinsic motivation-Material		7.42	7.48
Introjected Regulation		12.13	16.53
Identified Regulation		9.63	13.82
Intrinsic Motivation		9.92	13.28

Table 5: Mean and SD of the two clusters among the employees

S.No	Cluster Number of Case	Amotivation	Extrinsic Regulation-Social	Extrinsic motivation-Material	Introjected Regulation	Identified Regulation	Intrinsic Motivation
A	Mean	4.75	7.55	7.42	12.13	9.63	9.92
	N	24	24	24	24	24	24
	S. D	2.048	4.27	4.16	4.88	4.06	3.76
B	Mean	3.81	6.15	7.48	16.53	13.83	13.28
	N	96	96	96	96	96	96
	S. D	1.66	3.35	3.94	3.99	2.18	2.57
Total	Mean	4.00	6.43	7.47	15.65	12.98	12.61
	N	120	120	120	120	120	120
	S. D	1.78	3.58	3.97	4.52	3.13	3.14

Table 6: Self-Efficacy, Personality Dimensions and Multi-Dimensional Work Motivation: Clusters-ANOVA

S. No	Variable	Cluster		Error		F	Sig.
		Mean Square	df	Mean Square	df		
Self-efficacy scale							
1	Self-Efficacy	3050.21	1	20.31	118	150.18	.000
Big Five Personality							
2	Extraversion	11.41	1	3.5	118	3.25	.074
3	Agreeableness	25.67	1	2.28	118	11.27	.001
4	Conscientiousness	28.52	1	2.22	118	12.84	.000
5	Neuroticism	68.25	1	3.90	118	17.53	.000
6	Openness to experience	3.008	1	1.31	118	2.30	.132
Multi- Dimensional work motivation							
7	Amotivation	16.88	1	3.04	118	5.55	.020
8	Extrinsic Regulation-Social	37.41	1	12.58	118	2.98	.087
9	Extrinsic motivation-Material	.075	1	15.86	118	.005	.945
10	Introjected Regulation	372.77	1	17.45	118	21.37	.000
11	Identified Regulation	338.35	1	7.03	118	48.13	.000
12	Intrinsic Motivation	217.35	1	8.10	118	26.85	.000

Efficacy, extroversion, agreeableness, extrinsic motivation-material, openness to new experience, introjected regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic motivation. The clusters are significant in Self-Efficacy, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, amotivation, introjected regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic motivation (Table 4).

Correlation was done for the clusters with the dimensions of Work Motivation. In the Cluster-1, the mean values for Work Motivation dimensions are as follows: amotivation is 4.75, extrinsic regulation-social is 7.55, extrinsic motivation-material is 7.42, introjected regulation is 12.13, identified regulation is 9.63 and intrinsic motivation is 9.92. In the Cluster-2, amotivation is 3.81, extrinsic regulation-social is 6.15, extrinsic motivation-material is 7.48, introjected regulation is 16.53, identified regulation is 13.83 and intrinsic regulation is 13.28. The cluster-2 has higher mean in introjected regulation (16.53) as compared to the mean of the cluster-1 in introjected regulation (12.13). In overall, both the clusters- 1 & 2 have mean of 15.65 in introjected regulation 7.47, in extrinsic motivation-material 6.43, in extrinsic regulation-social 7.47. In amotivation, the mean value is 4.0 (Table 5).

ANOVA was done for the clusters and the significant variables are presented in the table 6. It can be observed that the following variables of the scales are significant. Self-efficacy is significant at .05 levels with F value of 150.18. In Big Five Personality, the following variables were found significant in agreeableness (F value 11.27), conscientiousness (F value 12.84) and neuroticism (F Value 17.53). In multi-dimensional Work Motivation, the following variables were found significant in introjected regulation (F value 21.37), identified regulation (F value 48.13) and intrinsic motivation (F value 26.85) (Table 6)

Discussion

The study has examined the level of self-efficacy, personality dimensions of the employees and their multidimensional work motivation in a company and further it has tried to explore whether the first two levels (very high and high) of Self-Efficacy and the Personality dimensions have any relation with Work Motivation. It's interesting to note that both

genders of company personnel have quite high levels of Self-Efficacy. The individual's belief in his or her ability to accomplish the task is Self-Efficacy. This belief has a major role in the way the individual work towards the goals or tasks or the challenge faced. The three dominant Personality domains in which the employees fall, are agreeableness (the mean value of male and female is 8.1 and 8.3 respectively), extroversion (the mean value is 6.87 and 7.6 respectively), and openness to experience (the mean value of male and female is 6.3 and 6.1 respectively). The dominant work dimensions which the employees had, are in the three dimensions –a) introjected regulation (the mean value of male and female is 16.0 and 15.3 respectively), b) identified regulation (the mean value of male and female is 13.1 and 12.9 respectively) and c) intrinsic motivation (the mean value of male and female is 12.3 and 12.97 respectively).

In Personality, Extraversion dimension has positive correlation in the three motivation dimensions - identified regulation, introjected regulation and intrinsic motivation. Agreeableness dimension has positive correlation in the four motivation dimensions - extrinsic regulation-social, identified regulation, introjected regulation and intrinsic motivation. Conscientiousness dimension has negative correlation in the three Work Motivational dimensions - extrinsic regulation-social, introjected regulation, and intrinsic motivation. Other researchers (Kostas, Feldt, & Angelis, 2014; Cherian, & Jacob, 2013) had similar findings in their research.

Conclusion

The cluster-1 has the following characteristics of conscientiousness, neuroticism, amotivation, extrinsic regulation-social and extrinsic regulation material. The cluster-2 has the following characteristics of self-efficacy, extroversion, agreeableness, openness to new experience, introjected regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic motivation. The clusters are significant in Self-Efficacy, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, amotivation, introjected regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic motivation.

High correlation is observed in the Personality dimension - agreeableness with

the Work dimensions - introjected regulation and intrinsic motivation, followed by the Personality dimension-extraversion with the Work Motivation introjected regulation and intrinsic motivation. Employees' work motivation can be fostered for the correct organisational development initiatives and for employee behaviour change.

References

- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W.H. Freeman.
- Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., and Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 1-8.
- Barrick, M. R., and Mount, M. K. (1993). Autonomy as a moderator of the relationships between the Big Five personality dimensions and job performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (1), 111-118.
- Cattell, H. E. (1996). The original big five: A historical perspective, *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 46, 5-14.
- Cherian, J. and Jacob, J. (2013). Impact of Self Efficacy on Motivation and Performance of Employees, *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(14), 80-88.
- Digman, J.M. (1989). Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability, and utility. *Journal of Personality*, 57 (2), 195-214.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model, *Annual Review of Psychology*. 41(1), 417-440.
- Graham, S. and Weiner, B. (1996). Theories and principles of motivation. In D. C. Berliner and R. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 63-84). New York: Macmillan.
- Gagné, M., Forestb, J., Vansteenkestec, M., Crevier-Braudd, L., Van den Broecke, A., Aspelif, A.K., Belleroseg, J., C Benaboub, C., Chemollia, E., Güntherth, S.T., Halvarif, H., Laksmi Indiyastuti, D., Johnsonj, P.A., Molstadv, M.H., Naudink, M., Ndaol, A., Olafsenf, A. H., Rousselm, P., Wanga, Z. and Westbyef, C. (2015). The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale: Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(2), 178-196.
- Goldberg, L.R, and Rosolack, T.K. The Big Five factor structure as an integrative framework: An empirical comparison with Eysenck's P-E-N model. In: Halverson C.F., Kohnstamm, G.A., Martin, R.P, editors. *The developing structure of temperament and personality from infancy to adulthood*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1994. pp. 7-35.
- Hayes, N. and Joseph, S. (2002). Big Five correlate of three measures of subjective well-being, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34, 723-727.
- Jang, K. L., Livesley, W. J., and Vernon, P. A. (1996). Heritability of the big five personality dimensions and their facets: A twin study, *Journal of personality*, 64 (3), 577-591.
- John, O. P., Hampson, S. E., and Goldberg, L. R. (1991). Is there a basic level of personality description? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 348-361.
- Kostas, M.V. Feldt, R., and Angelis, L. (2014). Personality, emotional intelligence and work preferences in software engineering: An empirical study, *Information and Software Technology* 56 (8), 973-990.
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., and Hackett, G. (1996). Career development from a social cognitive perspective. In Brown and L. Brooks (Eds.), *Career choice and Development* (3rd ed., pp. 373-422), San Francisco.
- Mensa, A.O. and Lebbaeus, A. (2013). The Influence of Employees' Self-Efficacy on Their Quality of Work Life: The Case of Cape Coast, *Ghana*. 4(2), 195-205.
- McAdams, D. P. (1992). The five-factor model in personality: A critical appraisal, *Journal of Personality*, 60, 329-361.
- McCrae, R. R., and Costa, P. T. Jr. (1996). Toward a new generation of personality theories: Theoretical contexts for the five-factor model. In: Wiggins, J.S. (ed.): *The five-factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives*. New York: Guilford.
- McCrae, R.R. and Costa, P.T. Jr (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52 (1), 81-90.
- Niu, H. (2010) investigating the effects of self-efficacy on food service industry employees' career commitment, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29, 743-750.
- Olver, J. M., and Mooradian, T. A. (2003). Personality

- traits and personal values: A conceptual and empirical integration, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 109-125.
- O'Connor, B.P. (2002). A quantitative review of the comprehensiveness of the five-factor model in relation to popular personality inventories, *Assessment*, 9, 188-203.
- Rammstedt, B. and John, O.P. (2006), Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German, *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41 (2007) 203–212.
- Raghuram, S., Wiesenfeld, B., and Garud, R. (2003). Technology enabled work: the role of self-efficacy in determining telecommuter adjustment and Structuring behavior, *Journal vocational behavior*, 63, 180-198.
- Ryan, R. M., and Deci, E. L. (2002). An overview of Self-determination Theory: An organismic-dialectical perspective. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research*. 3-33. Rochester, NY: The University of Rochester Press.
- Therasa, C. and Vijayabanu, C. (2015). The Impact of Big Five Personality Traits and Positive Psychological Strengths towards Job Satisfaction: a Review, *Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences*, 23(2), 142-150.
- Vinesh, (2014). Role of Training & Development in an Organizational Development, *International Journal of Management and International Business Studies*, 4(2), 213-220.

Acknowledgment: The author thanks all the employees who participated in the study.

K. Sindhura, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, MEASI Institute of Management, Royapettah, Chennai - 600014.