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ABSTRACT

With the wide acceptance and credence to the significant role of non-task performance within the employee job performance (EJP) criterion, the within individual factors that contribute to the development of both non-task as well as task performance have become the focus of the research. These within individual factors that contribute to the development of performance behaviors among university teachers especially in developing countries is an ignored aspect in the employee job performance (EJP) research. This study examined those factors by taking a within individual approach by focusing on personality traits of core self-evaluations (CSE), acquired motivational needs (MN) and task and non-task performance behaviors of employees. The study tested the direct as well as indirect effects of CSE on EJP. Convenient sampling was used by administering standardized questionnaires personally to 650 university teachers in five major cities of Pakistan. Quantitative data were analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM) and AMOS 22 software. This study extended the existing body of knowledge by introducing a new relationship between CSE personality traits and acquired motivational needs. Besides that, the study verified for the first time in personality and performance literature that acquired motivational needs acted as a mediating mechanism for explaining the CSE influence on EJP. The findings can be used as guidelines for university teachers to make appropriate career choices as well as the university management to make suitable decisions regarding selection and placement of teachers.
ABSTRAK

Dengan penerimaan yang luas dan kepercayaan kepada peranan penting prestasi bukan tugas dalam kriteria prestasi kerja pekerja (EJP), faktor individu yang menyumbang kepada pembangunan kedua-dua prestasi bukan tugas dan prestasi tugas telah menjadi tumpuan penyelidikan. Faktor-faktor individu yang menyumbang kepada pembangunan prestasi, tingkah laku dalam kalangan pensyarah universiti, terutamanya di negara-negara membangun, menjadi satu aspek yang diabaikan dalam penyelidikan prestasi kerja pekerja (EJP). Kajian ini mengkaji faktor-faktor tersebut dengan mengambil pendekatan individu yang memberikan tumpuan kepada trait personaliti untuk penilaian teras kendiri (CSE), keperluan motivasi yang diperoleh (MN) dan prestasi tingkah laku tugas dan bukan tugas pekerja. Kajian ini menguji kesan langsung dan tidak langsung CSE ke atas EJP. Persampelan mudah telah digunakan untuk mentadbir soal selidik yang seragam secara peribadi kepada 650 orang pensyarah universiti di lima buah bandar utama di Pakistan. Data kuantitatif dianalisis menggunakan structural equation modeling (SEM) dan perisian AMOS 22. Kajian ini dapat menambahkan ilmu sedia ada dengan memperkenalkan hubungan baharu antara trait personaliti CSE dengan keperluan motivasi yang diperoleh. Selain itu, kajian ini buat kali pertama dalam literatur personaliti dan prestasi mengesahkan bahawa keperluan motivasi yang diperoleh bertindak sebagai mekanisme perantara untuk menjelaskan pengaruh CSE ke atas EJP. Dapatan kajian ini boleh digunakan sebagai garis panduan oleh pensyarah universiti untuk membuat pilihan kerjaya yang sesuai dan boleh digunakan oleh pengurusan universiti untuk membuat keputusan yang sesuai dalam pemilihan dan penempatan pensyarah.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction to the Study

The changing nature of jobs and organizational structures, along with unpredictable market conditions are instrumental in wide acceptance and equal credence to the employee non-task performance within employee job performance criterion (Howard, 1995; Barrick et al., 2001; Landy and Conte, 2010). This has redirected the focus of industrial-organization (I/O) research towards the within individual factors in employee personality (Judge et al., 1997; Seligman, 2002). A catalytical influence supporting and enhancing this trend came from Positive Psychology Movement (Seligman, 2002) which emphasizes understanding, harnessing and strengthening of the positive personality predictors of behavior (Seligman, 1998a) for beneficial behavioral outcomes.

Another important factor contributing to the increased interest in within individual predictors of employee non-task performance is linked with booming service industry where employees are required to go above and beyond the call of assigned job roles. The personal characteristics of employees due to their direct interaction with the customers greatly influence their job performance.
Another important factor contributing to the increased interest in within individual predictors of employee non-task performance is linked with booming service industry where employees are required to go above and beyond the call of assigned job roles. The personal characteristics of employees due to their direct interaction with the customers greatly influence their job performance. Additionally due to the unpredictable market conditions, the organizations are facing external and internal threats including economic and political factors, mergers, acquisitions, downsizing, rapidly changing customer needs and technological advancements. But the most crucial factor relates to the mounting occurrence and costs of counterproductive work behaviors such as fraud, theft, aggression, property and information misuse, disloyalty, absenteeism and turnover, challenging the organizational success but survival also (Levinson, 2010; Taylor, 2012).

In the face of such threats and challenges, organizations need human resources that are dependable and effective in normal as well as in difficult organizational phases to survive, keep pace with, and to compete effectively and efficiently in today’s rapidly changing and turbulent business world (Morrison, 1994; Niehoff, 2004). To deal with these issues organizations are required to adopt somewhat flexible, autonomous, and team-based functioning. Such functioning depends upon the inputs of increased individual initiative and acts of cooperation (Ilgen and Pulakos, 1999) to enhance organizational effectiveness and efficiency. Katz and Kahn (1978) suggest that “organizational effectiveness cannot be achieved with mere disbursement of task performance. It requires willingness and initiatives of employees to go above and beyond the call of duty and to consciously refrain from acts harmful to the organizational well-being” which in terms of Organ (1993) is commonly known as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB).

The enormous magnitude of benefits and costs attached to positive and negative deviant behaviors calls for attention towards the factors that are instrumental in shaping them (Appelbaum et al., 2005; Kidwell et al., 2005). Consequently increased interest and attention is witnessed in past few decades towards examining factors influencing employee non-task performance i.e.
organizational citizenship and counterproductive work behaviors besides task performance (Peterson, 2002a).

In their prominent book “The Social Psychology of Organizations” Katz and Kahn (1978) identifies two important roles of employees: in-role or task-performance and extra-role or non-task performance. The in-role performance relates to the assigned tasks while extra-role relates to that part of employee performance that is not assigned or explicitly rewarded by the organization but that contributes greatly to support organizational performance. Each set of performance is based on different factors: in-role on knowledge, competencies, skills and qualification specific for performing the assigned job, while extra-role performance is based on personal characteristics and voluntary choices of employees such as traits and motivation (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Niehoff, 2004). According to Katz and Kahn (1978) organizational efficiency and effectiveness cannot be achieved with mere disbursement of in-role performance. It requires employees’ willingness and initiatives to go above and beyond the call of duty (OCB) and to consciously refrain from acts that are harmful (CWB) to the organizational well-being”.

Therefore past few decades have witnessed a transition from organization-centered approaches towards more employee-centered approaches. This transition has further paved the way for greater attention to the understanding of employees’ personal characteristics that were considered basic contributors of the non-task performance (Barrick et al., 2001; Bono and Judge, 2003; Kacmar, 2009). According to the management theorists and gurus the non-task performance is as crucial and essential job performance component for achieving individual and organizational effectiveness and efficiency as is task performance (Katz and Kahn 1978; Morrison, 1994; Rotundo and Sackett, 2003; Niehoff, 2004; Dalal, 2005).
1.2 Background of the Study

The employee job-performance (EJP) is generally the extensively studied phenomena within the domain of I/O psychology (Boomer et al., 1995). Employee job performance is referred to the degree of effectiveness of employee behaviors in meeting organizational objectives (Campbell, 1990; Motowidlo, 2003). The literature indicates that various models exhibit multi-dimensionality of job performance, yet the task-jobs have always been central and generally been evaluated and considered as overall job performance; thus more or less ignoring the non-task dimensions of performance. However, with the changing nature of jobs and organizational structures along with boom of service industry, the non-task dimensions of employee performance (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002) are increasingly seen critical for effective organizational performance (Fox and Spector, 2007). The research in this domain indicates that non-task behaviors have profound effects on efficient and effective organizational performance (Podsakoff et al, 2000).

Therefore, a paradigm shift in the traditional model of employee job performance is witnessed that was only concerned with the mere disbursement of core task-jobs (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997). The new performance model developed by Rotundo and Sackett (2002) offers an integrated view of three dimensions of employee performance behaviors, giving equal importance to each. The I/O scholars and practitioners observe that the role of OCB in organizational performance is as crucial as task-behaviors (Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994; Robinson and Bennett, 1995; Rotundo and Sackett, 2002; Organ et al, 2006). Concurrently, CWB also has significant implications on organizational performance and success (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002).

Literature review has revealed that employee job performance: both task and non-task performance is investigated and debated comprehensively in the past decades; consequently the foci of employee job performance research is developed
from the interaction of various individual (Porter et al., 1973; Judge, Martocchio, and Thoresen, 1997; Hurtz and Donovan, 2000; Barrick, Stewart and Piotrowski, 2002; Mount, Harter, and Barrick, 2004; Egan, 2005), sociological (Lerner, Brush, and Hisrich, 1997), organizational, situational (Ferguson and Cheek, 2011) and environmental factors (Sadler and Barry, 1970; Child, 1972; Leblebici, 2012). Therefore, EJP behavior is typically viewed within the social/organizational framework or within the personality framework, while the integrated models view performance triggered by both factors. So the factors that influence EJP can be categorized into two general groups: external factors such as social, environmental, situational and organizational factors and the internal factors that relate to the within individual factors i.e. personality traits, attitudes and motivations etc.

With the changing nature of jobs and organizational structures and boom of service industry, the non-task performance is widely accepted as an integral part of employee job performance among organizational scholars and practitioners (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002). These new developments have created greater dependency upon employees requiring them to contribute beyond their prescribed job roles or to engage more in extra-role/non-task behaviors. The extra-role behaviors are voluntary in nature and involve numerous acts of employee’s cooperation, spontaneous inputs, loyalty, instant decision making and readiness to contribute to the organizational effectiveness in normal and in turbulent times as well (Katz and Kahn, 1978).

Katz and Kahn (1978) further asserted that the extra-role/non-task performance is based on different set of factors than those required for in-role/task performance and essentially involve employee personal traits and motivations. Other researchers like Borman and Motowidlo (1993) further supporting Katz and Kahn assertion noted that task performance requires knowledge, skills and competencies specifically needed to perform a particular job whereas non-task performance is based on the personal characteristics such as traits and motivations of an employee. They further add that external organizational factors or
interventions can only be effective when the employee’s personality traits, motivational needs and behavioral patterns are well examined and understood.

The literature suggests that personality traits influence job performance (Barrick et al., 2001). Extensive literature review also revealed that Big-Five personality traits model has been most commonly used by researchers to explain employee job performance (Blake and Pfeffer, 1989; Judge, Martocchio and Thoresen, 1997; Hurtz and Donovan, 2000; Barrick, Mount, and Judge, 2001; Barrick, Stewart and Piotrowski, 2002; Mount, Harter, and Barrick, 2004; Hogan, 2004; Niehoff, 2004; Egan, 2005; Barrick, Parks and Mount, 2005). A new construct of core self-evaluation (CSE) personality traits is prompted to be linked with performance mainly through motivation (Judge et al., 1998). Judge and colleagues assert that CSE traits predict job performance more dynamically than Big-Five model (Judge et al., 1997; Bono and Judge, 2003). However, despite recognizing the multi-dimensionality of employee job performance (EJP) the focus of personality-performance relationship remained on evaluating the task behaviors than any other dimension of job performance.

Another important issue in personality and performance research is highlighted by Barrick and colleagues (2001). They note that despite significant correlation between particular personality constructs and performance very few studies are dedicated to examine the comprehensive mechanism that links personality to performance. They further observe that most personality and performance research is focused on probing direct relationship while the process that explains how personality influences performance is largely not taken into consideration. Therefore they urged that process models for personality-performance association should be developed. A plausible link relates to an individual's motivation that has long been identified by various scholars as the proximal mechanism through which personality influences performance (Murray, 1938; Kanfer, 1991; Barrick et al., 1993; Mount and Barrick, 1995).
The above background of the study highlighted three areas of concern including relationship between: a) personality traits and motivations, b) motivations and employee job performance, and c) personality traits and employee job performance. The following paragraphs discuss those concerns in the light of literature for developing the problem statement of the study.

1.3 Problem statement

The relationship of personality traits with job performance is the most intensively studied and probably the most controversial topic in organizational research (Barrick et al., 2001). The personality influences on job performance are referred as illusive and misleading by Blake and Pfeffer (1989) declaring in their prominent article that “dispositions are likely to have only limited effects on attitudes and behaviors inside organizations and therefore should not be included in selection decisions”. The other scholars contradicting this view assert that people have steady dispositional traits to engage in specific behaviors (Shoda and Mischel, 1993) and Hogan and colleagues conclude that the root of controversy over the utility of personality traits in selection decisions lies in the ambiguity in choosing specific traits from the pool of thousands of traits (Hogan, Barrett, and Hogan, 2007).

Much of the controversy was resolved with the introduction of Big-Five personality traits model (Costa and McCrae, 1992). Thus the Big-five model became the most influential personality traits model used for examining employee job performance (Barrick and Mount, 1991). However, the quality of Big-Five traits for predicting job performance remained questionable across a number of studies (Locke and Hulin, 1962; Ghiselli, 1973; Schmitt et al, 1984; Barrick and Mount, 1991). Conscientiousness showed consistent relationship with task performance across studies, while other traits in big-five model showed
inconsistent relationship with employee job performance (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Salgado, 1997; Hough et al., 1998; Barrick et al., 2001; Judge and Ilies, 2002; Judge et al., 2003; Klang, 2012; Ferris et al., 2012; Pirooz et al., 2013).

Moreover most studies examined the relationship between big-five traits and task performance while studies examining it with non-task performance were very few (Dalal, 2005). Additionally Big-five model is also criticized among scholars for lacking theoretical groundings (Hough et al., 1998; Barrick et al., 2001; Judge and Ilies, 2002). Drawing on the inconsistent results of Big-five traits with job performance and lack of theoretical groundings, it is suggested by management theorists that employee job performance (i.e. task and non-task behaviors) should be examined with emerging new constructs of dispositional traits in a comprehensive manner beyond Big-Five traits model (Barrick et al., 2001; Judge and Ilies, 2002; Ferris et al., 2012).

Relatively a new dispositional construct: core self-evaluation (CSE) coined by Judge, Locke and Durham (1997) is gaining attention of the organizational scholars. Research shows CSE significantly relates with job-performance including task performance (Judge et al., 1997; Judge and Bono, 2001b; Bono and Judge, 2003; Kacmar, 2009; Rich, LePine and Crawford, 2010; Grant and Wrzesniewski, 2010), organizational citizenship behavior (Bowling and Wang, 2012) and counterproductive work behavior (Ferris et al, 2012). CSE is propagated to be more dynamically and comprehensively representing job performance than the Big Five model (Judge and Bono; 2001b). Indicated by four sub-traits of self-efficacy, locus of control, self-esteem, and emotional stability, CSE refers to employee’s subjective bottom-line judgment about their competencies, capabilities and overall organizational self-worth (Judge and Hurst, 2008). Each of the four traits constitutes a deeper level evaluative expression a person holds about oneself (Judge at al., 1997). These fundamental self-assessments that people hold about themselves and their role in the world profoundly influence their attitudes and behaviors at workplace (Judge and Larsen, 2001).
Though some overlapping of CSE traits with Big-Five traits led to the view that CSE is drawn from the Big-Five trait of neuroticism, however CSE theorists (Judge and Bono; 2001b) clarified that the Big-Five model neither incorporates self-esteem as a constituent of the model nor it relates self-esteem as a part of the various explanations of neuroticism construct. Parallel to the narrow conceptualization of neuroticism in Big-Five model, CSE offers a much broader and elaborate description of this trait. Apart from failing to measure self-esteem, the scales of neuroticism lack evaluative questions incorporating only descriptive questions (Judge et al., 1997; Bono and Judge., 2003). This lack of evaluative quality in Big-Five model does not correspond with the inclusion criterion set for CSE traits (Judge et al, 1997). As compared to CSE, Big-Five model lacks theoretical support. CSE also offers a greater scope than Big-Five model which just categorizes personality into five types whereby CSE represents an evaluative broader personality trait that describes the basic assessments of a person about his capabilities, strengths, and worth in the world that can be generalized to all personality types (Watson and Clark, 1984).

Despite advocating significant influences of CSE on EJP by CSE theorists (Judge et al., 1997; 1998; Judge and Bono, 2001), there is dearth of studies that examined this relationship, while CSE and non-task performance relationship is almost ignored. The emphasis till date remains on the task-behavior dimension of employee performance. The CSE-OCB (non-task performance) relationship has not been examined in past except one recently published study (Bowling et al., 2011), yet a number of studies suggest strong association between different sub-traits of CSE separately; self-esteem and OCB (Pierce and Gardner, 2004; Sekiguchi and Sablynski, 2008; Ferris et al., 2009; Ariani, 2012), self-esteem and CWB (Wells and Rankin, 1983; Salmivalli, 2001; Whelpley and Daniel, 2011) neuroticism and CWB (Slaughter and Kausel; 2009; Bowling et al., 2011), locus of control and CWB (Sprung and Jex, 2012), self-efficacy and OCB (Cooper, 2010; Mansor, Darus and Dali, 2013).
The studies examining CSE-EJP relationship are very few; therefore CSE theorists (Judge and Bono, 2001; Ferris et al., 2011) urge to examine it further in order to verify the findings of previous studies and also to explore new avenues regarding new cultural and sectoral contexts.

Organizations today are greatly relying on employee personal characteristics for effective job performance (Judge and Ilies, 2003). These characteristics also include employee personality traits and motivations which have been central to examine job performance phenomena (Judge and Bono, 2001; Ferris, 2008). The significance of these two factors has increased many folds with the emergence of non-task performance as an equally important component of job performance criterion. The non-task performance is linked with traits and motivations of individuals (Judge et al., 1997; Bono and Judge., 2003).

Basically employee performance is the function of traits and motivation (Judge et al., 2001). Employee motivation with regard to its influence on job performance is an important issue in I/O research (Judge and Bono; 2001; Minor, 2003; Redmond, 2010). Judge and Ilies (2002) assert that difference in performance levels may be found related to the difference in individual motivation that can be traced back to the dispositional traits. They further added that due to the countless number of traits associated with motivation, the accurate answer to the question that what trait will be related to some specific form of motivation and behavioral outcome still requires a great amount of empirical research (Austin and Klein, 1996).

The relationship between CSE personality traits and motivation is already established in previous literature indicating relationship between CSE traits and goal-setting motivation (Bono and Judge, 2001) and approach and avoidance motivation (Ferris, 2008). However, both motivational frameworks lack to explain CSE influence across all performance behaviors in a comprehensive manner (Ferris et al., 2012). For example goal-setting motivation can conceptually and
practically be related to task-performance while non-task performance falls out of its domain. Additionally challenging goals do motivate employees but only those who feel committed to them. Regarding CSE and approach and avoidance motivation relationship the results show that CSE is explained more significantly from the avoidance motivation whereas it is conceptually more close to approach motivation. The debate among CSE theorist is still on, whether to conceptualize CSE from approach orientation or avoidance orientation (Ferris et al., 2012). Subsequently exploring other motivational frameworks in examining CSE relationship with job performance is suggested by CSE scholars (Judge and Bono, 2001; Ferris, 2008). So far it has not been examined with acquired motivational needs framework (McClelland, 1961) and examining this relationship may fill the gap in CSE and motivation relationship.

Regarding relationship between CSE and acquired motivational needs, the literature indicates that though CSE as a single construct has not been examined with acquired motivational needs but four sub traits representing CSE have been individually examined with acquired motivational needs. For example self-esteem is examined with need for achievement as a single component of MNs construct (e.g. Covington and Omelich, 1984; Ajayi, 2002; Ferris et al., 2010), self-esteem with need for affiliation (Astra and Singg, 2000; Riketta, 2004) and self-esteem with need for power (Gecas, 1989). The second CSE sub-trait of self-efficacy is examined with need for achievement (Rotter, 1966; Bono and Judge, 2001; Bandura, 1997; 2006), need for power (Gecas, 1989) and need for affiliation (Lawrence, 1999). The locus of control is examined with need for achievement (Rotter, 1966; Bono and Judge, 2003), need for affiliation (Ang and Chang, 1999; Semykina and Linz, 2007), while relationship between locus of control and need for power is almost ignored. The literature indicates relationship between neuroticism and need for achievement (Ivan, 1984; McCrae and John, 1992), need for power (Barrick and Mount, 1991) while its relationship with need for affiliation is ignored. Although some of the CSE sub-traits are examined with individual motivational needs, but So far CSE as a single construct with acquired motivational needs is not examined together. Therefore examination of both
constructs in a comprehensive manner is expected to open new perspectives in the personality and motivation literature.

Though motivation has been extensively studied with employee job performance criterion (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Schmidt and Hunter, 1992; Kanfer et al, 1994; Austin and Klein, 1996; Fuhrmann and Kuhl, 1998) the focus however, remained on the relationship between motivation and task-performance (Judge and Bono, 2001) while the non-task performance behaviors (i.e. OCB and CWB) have been generally ignored.

Numerous dispositional and attitudinal antecedents and predictors of non-task behavior representing citizenship (Podsakoff et al., 2000), and counterproductive work behaviors (Robinson and Bennett, 2000) have been studied, however very few studies examined the relationship between motivation and non-task behaviors (O’Brien, 2004; Ferris, 2008). So far the relationship between acquired motivational needs and employee job performance is partially examined either with task behaviors (Redmond, 2010) or organizational citizenship behaviors (Niehoff, 1994), while its relationship with counterproductive work behavior is almost ignored. Therefore comprehensive application of motivational needs framework with integrated job continuum model is still not taken into consideration and may add new perspectives to the already partially examined relationship between the two variables.

Although the direct effects of personality traits on job performance (Task-behaviors) are extensively researched, very few studies looked into the mediating mechanism that can explain how personality traits influence performance (Ferris et al., 2012).

The literature indicates that there are theoretical groundings or conditions for a variable to be used as a mediator. Firstly that mediating variables must have
previously established relationship with independent variable; secondly it must have previously established relationship with dependent variable. The acquired motivational needs fulfill the above mentioned criteria to function as a mediator between CSE and EJP. In previous paragraphs it is already discussed that acquired motivational needs have been examined with different personality traits as single constructs as well as with employee job performance. However acquired motivational needs have not been examined with CSE as a personality trait and with job continuum model representing three job performance behaviors: task performance, organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. Especially relationship between acquired motivational needs and counterproductive behavior has been almost ignored.

The core self-evaluation theory posits that motivation acts as mediator between personality and performance relationship. The previous studies also verify the role of motivation as mediator between the two variables. For example the goal-setting motivation mediated the relationship between CSE personality traits and task performance (Judge and Bono, 2001). Similarly approach and avoidance motivations mediated between CSE personality traits and employee job performance (Ferris, 2008).

Summarizing the above discussion it is observed that literature shows that CSE personality traits are linked with goal-setting motivations (Erez and Judge, 2001), and approach and avoidance motivations (Ferris, 2008) but both motivational frameworks lacked to explain CSE influence across all performance behaviors in a comprehensive manner (Ferris et al., 2012). Subsequently exploring other motivational frameworks in examining CSE relationship with job performance is suggested by CSE scholars (Judge and Bono, 2001; Ferris, 2008). So far acquired motivational needs framework (McClelland, 1961) has never been used as a mediator between personality and performance relationship. Therefore, this gap needs to be addressed and the relationship between acquired motivational needs, CSE personality traits and job continuum model representing three job performance behaviors: task performance, organizational citizenship behavior and
counterproductive work behavior still needs to be simultaneously and comprehensively examined.

The discussion to this stage boils down to one central point; since the core self-evaluation theory suggests that CSE personality traits influence employee job performance through the channel of motivation (Judge et al., 1998), it is also expected that CSE as a personality trait influences employee task and non-task performance behaviors through the motivational mechanisms of acquired needs. This assumption is further supported by Organ et al., (2004) who claimed that OCB: a component of EJP may have its links with dispositional traits and motivational needs of the individuals. Similar support came from CSE theorist Judge et al., (1998) claiming that ‘personality influences behaviors through motivational factors. In addition, Ferris et al., (2012) highlighted the need to further examine CSE-performance link applying new motivational frameworks and new cultural contexts. So far CSE has not been examined with acquired motivational needs framework, hence this study is examining the correlation between the two variables but also intends to use it as an alternate motivational framework between personality traits and performance.

The above discussed gaps require further investigation and need to be examined together to clearly understand the relationship between CSE personality traits, acquired motivational needs and employee job performance. Secondly, whether the acquired motivational needs act as mediating mechanism in explaining the influence of CSE traits on the three job performance behaviors also needs further examination. Therefore, drawing support from the core self-evaluation theory and relying on the above discussion the study comes up with the following problem statement;

“To what extent do the core self-evaluations personality traits influence employee job performance either directly or indirectly through the process of acquired motivational needs in the context of university teachers in Pakistan”
1.4 Research Questions

On the basis of the above problem statement, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

i. Is there any relationship between CSE personality traits and acquired motivational needs in the context of university teachers in Pakistan?

ii. Is there any relationship between acquired motivational needs and job performance behaviors (i.e. task performance behavior, organizational citizenship behavior and counter-productive work behavior) in the context of university teachers in Pakistan?

iii. Do the acquired motivational needs act as a mediating mechanism between CSE personality traits and job performance behaviors (i.e. task performance behavior, organizational citizenship behavior and counter-productive work behavior) in the context of university teachers in Pakistan?

1.5 Aim of the Study

The aim of the study is to determine the role of personality traits and motivational needs in the development of different employee performance behaviors: for understanding, predicting and managing employee behavior especially in the context of university teachers in Pakistan.
1.6 Scope of the Study

The scope of the study includes a non-western, Asian, collectivist developing country: Pakistan. It focuses on the service industry of higher education in Pakistan. Population included male and female university level teachers in five major cities of Pakistan. These cities were the hub of universities and include Lahore, Peshawar, Karachi and Quetta, while the fifth city was the federal capital city of Islamabad. The current study besides examining the correlation between CSE traits and motivational needs also examines motivational needs theory (McClelland, 1961) as an alternate framework and mediating mechanism to examine CSE influence on employee job performance. The study took a within individual approach and examined the relationship between CSE personality traits, acquired motivational needs and task as well as non-task performance behaviors of university teachers in Pakistan.

1.7 Research Objectives

Subsequent to the research questions this study develops the following three core objectives:

i. To determine the relationship between CSE personality traits and acquired motivational needs in the context of university teachers in Pakistan.

ii. To determine the relationship between acquired motivational needs and job performance behaviors (i.e. task performance behavior, organizational citizenship behavior and counter-productive work behavior) in the context of university teachers in Pakistan.

iii. To determine whether acquired motivational needs act as a mediator between CSE personality traits and job performance behaviors (i.e. task
performance behavior, organizational citizenship behavior and counter-productive work behavior) in the context of university teachers in Pakistan.

1.8 Significance of the Study

The study has noteworthy contributions to offer to the organizational behavior literature. Literature indicates that there are three indicators of significance of a research. First it introduces a new variable, second it introduces new relationship and thirdly it develops new model or theory in a new context. The current study is the groundwork to introduce and establish need-based perspective in personality and performance literature. Although sub-traits of CSE as single constructs have been examined individually with motivational needs previously but to the knowledge of researcher CSE traits relationship with acquired motivational needs is comprehensively examined for the first time in the personality and performance literature in this study.

Whereas for the first time in the current study comprehensive application of McClelland’s theory of acquired motivational needs as a mediating process is applied to explain the influence of core self evaluations (CSE) personality traits simultaneously on three employee job performance (EJP) behaviors (task performance behavior, organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior).

The study also responds to the call of CSE theorists (Judge, and Bono, 2001b; Bono and Judge, 2003) urging researchers to develop process based model. They further emphasized to apply new framework and new context in the study of CSE-performance relationship above and beyond the goal setting motivation and
approach and avoidance motivation frameworks, generally referred for explaining CSE influence on job performance behaviors.

Referring to the first motivational framework in examining CSE and EJP relationship, the use of goal setting motivation framework is viewed theoretically more suitable in the context of task performance (Ferris et al, 2012). The findings show that not all specific and challenging goals motivate individuals except the ones they like to be committed to (Erez and Zidon, 1984; Locke and Latham, 1990). Similarly, use of Approach/Avoidance motivation framework in explaining CSE influence on job performance is being criticized pertaining to the ongoing debate to proximally conceptualize CSE through approach or through avoidance motive (Ferris et al, 2012).

Subsequently exploring other motivational frameworks in examining CSE relationship with job performance is suggested by CSE scholars (Judge et al., 2008). Thus for the first time this study offers an alternate framework of McClelland's theory to explain CSE influence on employee job performance on the basis of previous groundings as mediator.

CSE is prompted to robustly predict employee job performance (Judge and Bono, 2001; Bono and Judge, 2003), however, number of studies examining CSE-EJP relationship is quite limited. Most studies focused only on the task-performance dimension of EJP while CSE relationship with non-task behavior is almost ignored. CSE and OCB relationship in personality and performance literature has been ignored in the previous research except one recent published study by Bowling et al., (2011). The review of CSE literature by Ferris et al., (2012) shows inconclusive findings on CSE-CWB relationship. Most of the CSE-CWB studies examined only one sub-trait of CSE such as self-esteem and CWB relationship (Whelpley and McDaniel, 2011). Further research is called for by CSE scholars (Bono and Judge, 2003; Judge et al., 2008). The current study examines this relationship by applying the direct as well as indirect measures of CSE, hence
providing a broader and comparable view of CSE-CWB relationship. Thus this study contributes in extending research in this area and also verifying previous findings.

Additionally, an important contribution relates to the selection of a new context of this study. Based on research from various disciplines Judge et al. (1997) observed that persons’ appraisals of their external world are influenced by their desires and the characteristics of the objects as well as by the basic beliefs they hold concerning themselves, other persons and the world in general. Drawing on this observation, it is understood that one’s evaluation of external world comprising of one’s cultural, socio-economic and political environment significantly influence one’s self-evaluations. Hence, it is essential to take into consideration the specific context with regard to difference in cultural and geographical background, nature of jobs and type of industry (Piccolo et al, 2005) while examining CSE-job performance relationship. A difference in the context of those factors may influence the way individuals evaluate themselves, others and the world.

Most CSE-performance studies are conducted in western individualistic cultures mostly in USA or other developed western countries (Judge et al., 1998; Erez and Judge, 2001). The few studies conducted in Asian collectivist cultures were also chosen countries that were developed and stable economies such as Japan, China and Korea (Dickson, Hanges and Lord, 2001; Piccolo et al, 2005). Little attention is being paid in this domain to conduct research in developing or underdeveloped Asian countries that are relatively unstable economically and politically such as Pakistan. Most CSE and job performance studies have focused on the performance of services perspectives of employee such as sales persons, managers and university students (Erez and Judge, 2001; Piccolo et al, 2005; Kacmar, 2009; Rich, LePine and Crawford, 2010; Ferris et al, 2012) whereas job performance especially in the contexts of university teachers and higher education industry was generally ignored. CSE theorists (Judge et al., 2005) thus urge to conduct CSE research in diverse cultures in order to assess cultural impacts on
self-evaluations of individuals. To answer the call of CSE theorists, the study incorporates a non-western, collectivist, developing country Pakistan and its higher education service industry for examining the role of CSE traits and acquired motivational needs on the task and non-task performance behaviors of university teachers in Pakistan.

The task and non-task performances are essential components of EJP but in service industry the non-task performance becomes more important because an employee interaction with end user is direct and noticeably obvious (Karatepe and Demir, 2014). Therefore the personal characteristics such as traits and motivations of employees also directly influence the end user. The university teachers are directly responsible to equip and prepare the youth with knowledge, skills and competencies essential for advancement and progress of a country (HEC Report, 2010) especially in a developing country like Pakistan. They require knowledge, skills and competencies specific to their assigned jobs as well as initiative and motivation to exert beyond the call of their assigned duty. Thus non-task performance is essentially embedded in the teachers’ job.

Due to close interaction; the traits and motivations of teachers also directly influence their student. For example a teacher with high self-efficacy trait and achievement motivation is more likely to motivate his/her students by means of his/her performance than a teacher with low self-efficacy trait and achievement motivation. Therefore, examining predictors of non-task performance such as traits and motivations will be useful in various management decisions regarding selection, placement and promotion issues.
1.8.1 Theoretical Significance

The major contributions of this study to the existing literature are to:

i. Firmly establish and configure the need-based motivational perspective of task and non-task performance.

ii. Identify the importance of relationship between core self-evaluations personality traits and need-based motivational perspective.

iii. Authentication of significant relationship between CSE personality traits and employee job performance regarding task and non-task performance.

iv. Identify the measures of CSE traits as a whole construct and with reference of its four dimensions separately predicting the Job performance behaviors through motivational process.

1.8.2 Practical Significance

The findings of the study will contribute to the managers’ knowledge in understanding the process and associations between specific employee’s personality traits, motivational needs and performance behavior patterns. It will enable them to apply effective interventions to utilize employees’ specific traits and motivation for enhancing individual and organizational performance, encouraging organizational citizenship behaviors, and predicting and preventing counterproductive work behaviors.
1.9 Limitations

Due to the constraints of time and resources, this study is limited to the university level teachers. Only universities located in five major cities of Islamabad, Lahore, Karachi, Peshawar and Quetta in Pakistan are considered. The cross sectional and convenient sampling approach is applied to meet time and costs limitations. The use of self-report measures is another limitation. The relationship of CSE personality traits, acquired motivational needs and task and non-task performance of university teachers in Pakistan were the focus of the study.

1.10 Conceptual and Operational Definitions of the Selected Variables

1.10.1 Core Self-Evaluations (CSE)

Core self-evaluations are defined as “the fundamental bottom-line evaluations that people make about their self worth” (Judge et al., 1997). CSE is indicated by four self-evaluative sub-traits of self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control and neuroticism. According to Judge et al., (1997) these fundamental evaluations represent how people evaluate themselves, others and the world. These evaluations though subconsciously, affect an individual’s self-assessments and the assessment of others and world as a whole. CSE has important and essential implications on an individual’s job-satisfaction and overall performance (Judge et al., 1998). Research posits that study of CSE traits and its underlying psychological processes enable us to effectively appreciate and predict employee’s attitudes and behaviors at workplace (Bono and Judge; 2003). Thus an employee’s
evaluation of his work may be directly or indirectly influenced by his own self-evaluation, or his colleagues.

For the purpose of this study CSE is viewed as the basic assessments that employees make about their competence, skills, abilities and overall worth in a workplace. These basic assessments of employees profoundly effect their job performance behaviors. CSE is measured directly by using the 12-item scale developed by Judge et al., (2003) and indirectly by using the independent scales of its four sub-traits.

The sub-trait of self-esteem refers to the “approval of one’s self and the degree to which one sees oneself capable, significant, successful, and worthy” (Kirkpatrick and Ellis, 2001). For the purpose of this study it is viewed as an employee confidence and faith about his/her self-worthiness in his workplace. To measure it independently Rosenberg (1965) well established 10-items scale is used.

Generalized self-efficacy refers to one’s beliefs regarding one’s ability to carry out particular tasks (Bandura, 1997). For the purpose of this study it is viewed as an employee belief that he/she holds the essential skills and competence to perform the assigned tasks. To measure it independently Chen, Gully and Eden (2001) 8-item scale is used.

The locus of control (LOC) is defined as “one’s belief in one’s ability to control one’s environment” (Bono and Judge; 2003). For the purpose of this study it is viewed as an employee ability to be in control of his job related tasks and responsibilities. To measure it independently Rotter (1966) 8-item scale is used.

Neuroticism is defined as “the tendency to exhibit poor emotional adjustment and experience negative affects such as fear, hostility and depression
(Goldberg, 1990). It is also described as “an individual’s emotional sensitivity or over-responsiveness (Eysenck, 1994). For the purpose of this study it is viewed as an employee inability to emotionally adjust with his/her job, co-workers and organizational environment. To measure it independently Eysenck, Eysenck and Barrett (1985) 12-item scale is used.

1.10.2 Task Performance (TPB)

Task performance is defined as the “capability with which job incumbents perform activities that are formally recognized as part of their jobs; activities that contribute to the organization’s technical core” (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993). Task performance involves all those activities that an employee is hired to perform to transform raw materials into finished goods and services. Task performance behaviors have their bases upon factors such as job knowledge, formal training, past experience, and cognitive, perceptual and psycho-motor abilities of an employee (Hunter and Hunter, 1984).

For the purpose of this study task performance behaviors include all those activities that are prescribed in the job description of an employee or the assigned task for which an employee is hired for and being paid. Williams and Anderson (1991) 7-items scale was used for measuring task performance. This selection was based upon the nature of items that clearly explained and measured the given definition of task performance and does not overlap with contextual or citizenship performance behaviors. Moreover the scale was based on self-reporting that suits the within individual approach of the current study as compared to other scales that were other-reported (Welbourne, 1997; Eisenberger et al., 2001).
1.10.3 Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

The role theory (Katz, and Kahn, 1978) classifies employee roles into two types: the behaviors that are formally required to perform one’s job and are based upon one’s knowledge, ability, and skills to perform a specific assigned job, while the second type, the supra-role behaviors signify behaviors that are not formally required or mentioned in job-description and are based upon the discretionary choice of a person to indulge in or withhold; especially when there is no reward or retribution attached in either case by the organization. Developing on the concept of “Extra/Supra Role Behaviors”, Smith, Bateman and Dennis Organ (1983) presented the notion of “Organizational Citizenship Behavior” (OCB) and defined OCB as “Individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in aggregate, promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ et al, 2006).

OCB is a much broader aspect of job performance that is linked with the personal choice of an employee highlighting the role of individual characteristics such as personality traits and motivations (Smith et al, 1983). For the purpose of this study it is viewed as an employee discretionary choice to engage in activities that are above and beyond the call of duty and which ultimately results in organizational effectiveness. The current study is applying Smith et al., (1983) 9-items scale to measure OCB due to its precision and validity in measuring OCB.

1.10.4 Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB)

Counterproductive work behaviors are defined as “those voluntary employee behaviors that violates significant organizational norms and in doing so
threatens the well-being of organization and its members or both” (Robinson and Bennett, 1995).

For the purpose of the current study counter productive work behaviors are viewed as those employee behaviors that are harmful to the organization and its members. These behaviors can cause harm to other employees, to the products, property and management system of an organization. CWB is measured using the 10-items scale developed by Robinson and Bennett (1995).

1.10.5 Acquired Motivational Needs (MN)

Acquired needs theory is a pertinent theory representing three acquired motivational needs of achievement, affiliation and power. Theory promotes that difference in the level of three needs results in difference in performance (McClelland; 1965).

The need for achievement (NACH) is described by McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell (1958) as a desire to achieve success in competition with some standards of excellence⁸. To accomplish tasks, high achievers acquire necessary skills, deal with challenges, and conceive innovative strategies and procedures to perform their work (Chusmir and Azevedo, 1992). They also have an acute sense of timings and working well against the given time targets (Murray, 1938). The need for affiliation (NAFF) is characterized by a desire for social interaction and social approval. The people with need for affiliation are sensitive towards being socially accepted or rejected (Hill, 1991). They are more motivated to develop and maintain their social and interpersonal relationships (Heyns, Veroff, and Atkinson, 1958). In an organizational setting the people with high need for affiliation are more suitable for jobs that involve more social interaction. While need for power
(NPOW) is characterized by a desire to take control of people, situations and resources. This need drives people to challenge and confront others and to engage in competition where they anticipate winning (McClelland, 1961; 1985). Such individuals look for positions of authority and control over others (Murray, 1938).

McClelland and colleagues (1961, 1985) also developed "Thematic Apperception Test" to measure motivation generally known as TAT. The use of TAT in measuring motivation has been greatly criticized in research circles as it lacks predictive power in certain situations and requires lengthy processing (Barbuto and Scholl, 1998). For the purpose of this study Turner (1996) 15-item scale is used for two reasons: a) it is simple and quick to complete and administer which can be expected to enhance the response rate of the participants; and b) it has the highest reliability ratings .80-.83 using the Cronbach’s alpha scale as compared to the other instruments.
Table 1.1: Definitions of Variables and the Key Terms of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Terms</th>
<th>Abbreviations</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Authors / year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Self- Evaluation</td>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>“The fundamental bottom-line evaluations that people make about their competence, strengths, and abilities”.</td>
<td>Judge et al., (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>“One’s belief in one’s ability to control one’s environment”.</td>
<td>Bono and Judge; (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>“The approval of one’s self and the degree to which one sees oneself as capable, significant, successful, and worthy”.</td>
<td>Kirkpatrick and Ellis (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>SEF</td>
<td>“A person’s beliefs in his/her ability to succeed in a particular situation”.</td>
<td>Bandura (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>NUE</td>
<td>“Tendency to exhibit poor emotional adjustment and to experience negative affects such as fear, hostility and depression”</td>
<td>Goldberg (1990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Terms</th>
<th>Abbreviations</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Authors/ year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McClelland's need theory</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>A pertinent need theory representing three acquired motivational needs of achievement, affiliation and power. Theory promotes that difference in the level of three needs results in difference in performance.</td>
<td>McClelland (1965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Affiliation</td>
<td>NAFF</td>
<td>The affiliation need indicates a need to be associated with other people and desire for social approval.</td>
<td>Coon, (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for power</td>
<td>NPOW</td>
<td>The need for power is characterized by a desire to take control of people, situations, and resources. This need drives people to challenge and confront others and to engage in competition where they anticipate winning</td>
<td>McClelland, (1961; 1985)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The need for achievement refers to a desire to succeed against some standards of excellence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for Achievement</th>
<th>NACH</th>
<th>The degree to which employee behaviors fulfill requirements of the jobs they are hired for in effectively meeting organizational objectives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Job performance</td>
<td>EJP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Performance Behavior</th>
<th>TPB</th>
<th>The capability with which job incumbents perform activities that are formally recognized as part of their jobs; activities that contribute to the organization’s technical core either directly by implementing a part of technological process, or indirectly by providing it with needed materials or services.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>Individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in aggregate, promotes the effective functioning of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterproductive work behaviors</td>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>Voluntary behavior that violate significant organizational norms and in doing so threatens the well being of an organization, its members, or both.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell (1958)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borman and Motowidlo (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ et al., (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson and Bennett (1995)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.11 Organization and Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is organized into five chapters.

i. Chapter one includes the introduction, background and context of the study, problem statement, research questions, aim and scope of the study, research objectives, theoretical and practical significance of the study, limitations and conceptual and operational definitions of selected variables. It also includes the scope of the study and justification for selecting the research sector and definition of key constructs used in the study.

ii. Chapter Two is dedicated to the literature review. It also presents theoretical framework and the hypotheses of the study.

iii. Chapter Three presents the research design and methodology. The research approach, sampling design and questionnaire design, methods of administering questionnaires and the statistical tools used to evaluate the research hypotheses of the research.

iv. Chapter Four deals with analyses of data and presents results of the study. The sample characteristics, reliability measures with findings of hypotheses testing applying diverse statistical tools are also displayed.

v. Chapter 5 presents rationally derived explanations of the findings and analysis of some notable and interesting results of the current study. In addition to the plausible justifications for the key findings of relationship between the influences of personality traits of core self evaluations on employee job performance (task and non-task), an elaborate discussion on the limitations and implications of the study as well as the future recommendations and directions is also included. Accordingly, this chapter is structured into three sections presenting discussion on the findings, explanation of the results, limitations, implications and future recommendations.
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