The relationship between big five personality with work motivation, competitiveness and job satisfaction

Azizi Yahaya[1], Noordin Yahaya[2], Abdul Talib Bon[3], Sharifuddin Ismail[2] and Norzana Mohamed Noor[1]

[1]Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
[2]Universiti Teknologi Mara (Melaka)
[3]Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia.

ABSTRACT

In spite of its popularity, the Big Five Personality has been criticized for being too descriptive to provide a theoretical model of personality. The current study aims to investigate the extent to which personality and demographic variables contribute to motivation, competitiveness and job satisfaction as defined by measuring their personality, work motivation and satisfaction. This paper shows that conscientiousness and job status were both significant predictors of job satisfaction. All acknowledgement that individual differences can affect the success of an intervention, may contribute to the design of effective work reorganisation schemes that are better suited to the employees they seek to benefit. Originality. The value of this paper was that it looked at how personality and demographic factors may influence work motivation, level of competitiveness and work satisfaction.

Introduction

Personality can be refers to cognitive and behavioural patterns that show stability over time and across situations (Cattell, 1965). Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that personality traits influence personal valued and attitudes, as most recent empirical research has demonstrated (Olver and Mooradian, 2003). Job satisfaction reflects attitudes and values towards a particular aspect of life and, hence, it must relate to personality traits, as earlier (Lawler and Hall, 1970).

The "big five" or five-factor model of personality represents a taxanomy to parsimoniously and comprehensively describe human personality, whose validity supported by empirical evidence (Digman, 1990;Goldberg, 1993;McCrae and Costa, 1996;O'Connor, 2002). The big five consists of the following traits: neuroticisms, extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness (Digman, 1990). Because of its validity and wide acceptance the big five has been extensively utilized in recent organisational and other applied research (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Hurtz and Donovan, 2000; Judge et al., 1999; Judge et al., 2002; Salgado, 1997). Therefore, it is important to establish the relationship between the big five and vital organisational behavior variables, including competitiveness, work motivation and job satisfaction.

Personality has been conceptualized from a variety of theoretical perspectives, and at various levels of abstractions or breadth (John, Hampson & Goldberg, 1991; Mc Adams, 1995). Each of these levels has made unique contributions to our understanding of individual difference in behavior and experience. However, the number of personality traits and scales designed to measure them, escalated without an end in sight scales from whht (Goldberg, 1971). Researchers, as well as practitioners in the field of personality assessment, were need with a bewildering array of personality scales from which to choose, with little guidance and no overall rationale at hand.

What made matters worse was that scales with the same name often measure concepts that are not the same, and scales with different names often measure concept that are quite similar. Although diversity and scientific pluralism are useful, the systematic accumulation of findings and the communication among researchers became difficult amidst the Babel of concepts and scales.

Personality psychology also were defined by expert opinion concerning by Block (1971), in a study involving 100 men and women respectively 25 years and has concluded that individual characteristics such as control of emotions, enthusiasm, patience and reliability has not changed much. Conley (1984), asserts that over time, we do not change much in terms of style, emotion and the way we interact with others. According to Mishel (1984), also states that we do not always behave consistently in a very different situation. For example, the behaviour of a person during a visit to a family at lost a loved one is very different from the behavior of one storey while in a wedding or birthday. According to Epstein (1983), also states that the characteristics of an individual is relatively stable and predictable.

In the 1930s, Murray coined the term *personality* to describe the branch of psychology that studies individual "human lives and the factors that influence their course". There are many different of personality. Each theorist defines personality by the particular concepts that he or she uses to describe or understand human behavior. A survey of the literature in the late 1930s found almost 50 different definitions in use (Allport, 1937).

Trying to list various definitions of personality would certainly be monotonous for the reader and is beyond the scope of this paper (see Hall, Lindzer, Loehlin & Manosevitz, 1985). However, Hogan (1991) contrast two categories of definitions of personality. He suggests that one category of definitions is concerned with a person's social reputation and has to do with

Tele:
E-mail addresses: talibon@gmail.com

the impression an individual makes on others. Personality from this perspective is public and relatively objective. It can be describe in trait terms. This might be expressed by a statement such as "Jeff is passive or "Jeff is considerate". In addition this usage tends to be highly descriptive and predictive in that we can forecast trends in a person's behavior.

A second category of definitions refers to a person's inner self. These may describe the structures, dynamics, processes and propensities inside a person that explain why he or she behaves in a certain way. This usage of the term personality tends to be explanatory. Conceptually these two catagories of definitions are very different, and Hogan (1991) philosophically combines the two perspectives by suggesting that we use the hypothesized inner structures to explain or account for the person's verifilable reputation. He suggests that it is the failure by theorists to keep these two definitions separate that has led to considerable confusion and is one reason why progress in personality psychology has been slow.

As known, manufacturing industry has begun to take the front seat in Malaysia is drive for development. However, the growth of the manufacturing industry has aroused concerns among practitioners and scholars about human resource management. For example, it is considered that the manufacturing industry is a technology and people oriented business to survive in such a competitive market, job satisfaction is an important attitude which organisation desire of their employees.

A few of the early studies were criticisms of approach (Cropanzano & James, 1990; Gerhart, 1987; Gutek & Winter, 1992), their criticisms appear to have subsided and few agrue with the basic conclusion that a significant part of the job satisfaction is rooted in individual's personalities.Though prior research on the dispositional source of job satisfaction, the big five (Goldberg, 1990) framework. Alternatively referred as the five-factor model of personality, provides a comprehensive taxonomy to organize traits relevevant to job satisfaction (Judge, Heller & Mount, 2002). The five-factor model comprises the dimensions of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Opennes to Experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness.

The need for big five personality dimensions

In psychology, the Big Five dimensions of personality traits found by empirical studies. It is more of adescriptive model of personality, not a theory, even a psychologist has given birth to the theories to explain the five major. According to Dr. John A. Jhonson, general characteristics of an individual's personality is divided in to five basic characteristics, within a concept known as OCEAN.5 properties mentioned above are as follows :

- (O) Openess to experience
- (C) Consciencetiousness
- (E) Extraversion
- (A) Agreeableness
- (N) Neuroticism

Openness

Those who are in this group have the attitude or mindset that is open to any ideas or opinions. In addition, the are very vulnerable to something about new experience. For the world is a "Places of Learning", and for each of these. They have a curiosity (intellectually curious) are so profound. They love the beautiful things and appreciate the arts. This group is also more sensitive to their emotions and love to compare themselves with those closest to them (Costa & McCrae 1985). They act and think in its own way (individualistic) and in a less

confrontational manner. People who lack capacity, who has the dominant power in this feature have a shallow perception and thinking ia a particular case. There prefer in a frank and less complex. They ass ume (prejudice) or anxiety (skepticism) is one of the matters relating to the arts an science. This group is more conservative and did not like the changes,especially drastic. Openness (openess to experience) is the view of many sociologists are healthier and more mature thinking and actions they. However, is useful in different situations or environments. The study also shows that closed-minded people who are more likely to enter occupations such as police officers, marketing and saled and very good in these areas,(Robbins, 2001).

Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness is also a widely researched trait from the Big Five personality taxonomy. It is associated with adjectives such as efficient, organized, reliable, planful, responsible, achievement oriented and productive (Goldberg, 1990;McCrae & Costa, 1989;McCrae & John, 1992). Conscientiousness has two major facets, achievement and dependability (Mount & Brick, 1995), and people with high conscientiousness are dependable , risk averese, high need achievers and ordered and they can delay gratification (McCrae & John, 1992;Goldberg,1990). Gellatly (1996) reported that cognitive structure, order and low impulsivity showed the highest loadings and conscientiousness.

Extraversion

Extraversion, like neuroticism and conscientiousness, it is a widely researched trait from the Big Five Taxanomy (Salgado, 1997). Ambition and sociability are the two primary components that characterize extraversion (Hogan, 1983). More recent research has, however, illustrated that is a multifacedted dimension comparing several other components (Goldberg, 1990;Watson & Clark, 1997). Extraverts are described as sociable, talkative, aggressive, energetic, enthusiastic, assertive and optimistic. They seek excitement (Costa & McCrae, 1992;Goldberg,1992). Extraversion is closely related to postive affectivity (Costa & McCrae, 1980 & Holland's 1973)

Agreeableness

Agreeableness are described as flexible, forgiving, cooperative, friendly, trusting, good natured, generous and altruistic (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Goldberg, 1990;McCrae & John, 1992). Openness to experience is described by adjectives such as imaginative, cultured, curious, original, broad-minded, intelligent and artistic (Goldberg, 1990). Although there is a good reason go expect a relationship of agreeableness with organizational citizenship behaviors, existing research has failed to support such a relationship (Organ & Ryan, 1995). To resolved the problem, by focusing on the relationship between agreeableness and the interpersonal dimension of citizenship behaviors. As agreeableness is considered a socially-based trait and people high on this trait are described as friendly, cooperative, altruistic, helping and generous (Costa & McCrae, 1992). So this agreeableness will be positively related to job satisfaction.

Neuroticism

Neuroticism is one of the Big Five personality traits (Costa & McCrae, 1987), which has also been labeled as emotional stability, emotionality and stability (Goldberg, 1990;Tellegan, 1985). Neuroticism is associated with negative emotions (Penly & Tomaka, 2002) and is inversely related to self-esteem (Judge *et al*., 1997). People with high neuroticism are self-pitying, anxious, less trusting, depressed, nervous, lacking positive

psychological adjustment and feeling helpness and vulnerable (Costa & McCrae, 1988; McCrae & John, 1992). Neuroticism is very closely related to negative effectivity (NA) (Watson & Tellegan, 1985). In fact on many occasions researchers have used NA and neuroticism interchangeable (Erez & Judge, 2001).

Neuroticism is socially expressed trait associated with poor social skills and lack of trust in others (Goldberg, 1992;McCrae & John, 1992). People with high neroticism are vulnerable to situations that demand high social skills (Judge et al., 1997). It is expected that the social aspect of job will further enhance or reduce the effects of job scope. A cognitively demanding situation (i.e., high scope) will be particularly threating to neutotic individuals if it also requires high social skills.

Job Satisfaction

According to Kovack (1997), job satisfaction is a component of organisational commitment. Spector (1997), states that job satisfaction can be considered as a global feeling about the job or as a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job.

Research (Strumpfer, Danana, Gouws & Viviers, 1998), indicates an encouraging but complex correlation between positive or negative dipositions and the various components of job satisfaction. When satisfaction is measured at a broader level, research has shown those organisation with more satisfied workers are more affective than those with less satisfied workers (Robbins, 1998).

Buitendach and Witte (2005) proffer the view that job satisfaction relates to an individual's perceptions and evaluations of a job, and this perception is in turn influenced by their circumstances, including needs, values and expectations. Individuals therefore evaluate their jobs on the basis of factors which they regard as being important to them (Sempane, & Roodt, 2002).

According to Neuman, Reichel and Saad (1988), job satisfaction among workers can be axpressed as their willingness and preparedness to stay in the industrial profession irrespective of the discomfort and the desire to leave industrial for a better job. Mwamwenda's (1995), research indivates that nearly 50% of rural workers are dissatisfied with their working conditions. The latter research revealed that industrial workersin thease areas indicated that they would not choose working again as a career if given a second chance.

Blood, Ridenour, Thomas, Qualls and Hammer (2002) found in their research on speech language pathologists working in industrial, that the longer they remained in their jobs, the more likely they were to report higher levels of jo satisfaction. Similarly, Rice and Schneider (1994), state that in Australia, workers reported that the level of participation in decision-making and autonomy are contributory factors in their levels of job satisfaction. Anderman, Belzer and Smith (1991) posit the view that a industy culture that emphasizes accomplishment, recognition and affiliation is related to workers satisfaction and commitment and the manager actions create distinct working environment within factory that are highly predictive of workers satisfaction and commitment.

Pay and benefits is important as how equitable of such reward. One could add fair promotion policies and practices concerning fair pay (Witt & Nye, 1992). As in promotion, the level of satisfaction will depend on the acceptability of the system in operation. The system of promotion can be based either on merit or seniority or a combination of both. Job would consist of skills variety. Skills variety is sifnified by the extent to which the job allows a worker to use a number of different skills and abilities in executing his or her duties (Glisson & Durick, 1988), interest and challenges derived from the job, in particular challenges and finally, the lack of role ambiguity which means how clearly the individual understands the job (Glisson & Durick, 1988).

The style of leadership in the organization will also determine the level of job satisfaction. There has been endorsement of people-centred or participative leadership as dereminant of job satisfaction (Miller & Monge, 1986). In work group, having a group of good working colleagues and a supportive one especially will certainly have value in not permitting job dissatisfaction to surface and can promote job satisfaction instead. Bishop and Scott (1997) have found that satisfaction with supervisor and co-workers was related to organisational commitment and team commitment. This resulted in higher productivity, lower intention to resign and higher willingness to assist.

Whereas for work conditions which are good, comfortable and safe would appear to be appropriate for reasonable job satisfaction though not necessarily promote high job satisfaction. The situation with regard to job satisfaction would be discouraged if working condition were in the state of dismay. Ismail *et al* (2010) have conducted a survey to investigate the relationship between environmental factors, job satisfaction that influence the workers discomfort n four automotive manufacturing in Malaysia. It has shown that work environment correlates with job satisfaction.

Relationship of the Big Five Personality With Job Satisfaction

The five-factor model is correlated with the overall level of job satisfaction experienced by employees. In general satisfied employees are more likely to remain in a position and to avoid absences than those that are not satisfied.

Initial research indicated that neuroticism is negatively correlated with job satisfaction while conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness are positively correlated. Opennes to experience had a negligible impact on job satisfaction. Additional research, however, has only been able to replicate correlations among the factors of neuroticism and extraversion being positively correlated with job satisfaction and neuroticism being negatively correlated. This could be due to the social nature of the workplace (Judge, 2002).

This is possibly due to the nominal level of arousal for extraverted individuals (Hebb's Theory). If the workplace is a social environment then extraverted employees are more likely to be at their nominal level of arousal while at work, whereas at their home there is a greater chance of few stimuli. Introverts, on the other hand, are more likely unsatisfied with the level of stimulation that they experience at their place of employment.

Factors influencing the big five personality of job satisfaction

Work is an important phenomenon in human life. Most people spend most of their lives working in certain jobs that paid. They have the value of the work likely to affect work they do. In almost all cultures, the work is an essential part of the wholes set of values. The value of work was defined by the Super and Sverko (1995) as a set of belief about what is good and desirable in connection with an employmentrole and is regarded as a stable. In addition, Isaacson and Brown (1997) states that the value is a standard of behavior that shape a person. The value of work is important in the life of every

employee. Studies conducted by Putti et al. (1989), for example, the value of work intrinsically have a significant relationship with commitment to the organization.

The challenges of today industries have become so competitive and challenging. Organization of various industries and services are continuously looking for way to sustain their existence. Many strategies are being employed and tested to keep them relevant to the industries world from cost cutting, reinvention, innovation, techonology, leadership, motivation and changing the attitudes of their employees, keeping their workforce happy and satistied and getting the employees to be committed to the organization.

There are some literatures that direct to the differentiation of job satisfactions among different nationals. Job Satisfaction levels not been found to be the same across countries. Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza (2000), in their study indicates that of 21 countries surveyed, employees in Denmark were the most satistied and UK was ranked 14th. In another study of 13,832 employees in 23 countries by FDA international (FDS, 2007), employee in the UK and Ireland had the highest levels of job satisfaction and Asia was considered among the lowest. The above are comparison between countries which showed difference in consistency from year to year.

A different study was conducted by Spector (2001), to compare job satisfaction levels among managers in 24 countries. It is ranked in order from highest to lowest satisfaction. Managers from Asian are placed relatively lower than European countries with the exception of Indian and midly, Taiwan.

In the mid eighties Costa and McCrae (1987) showed that five universal factors describing personality could be replicated across cultures and time. This taxonomy, labelled the Big Five model of personality (Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1990), was to a great extent responsible for the rebirth of research in this area. Researchers in both indusrial psychology and organizational behavior converged on the Big Five model comprising neuroticism (worried, anxious, tense and insecure), conscientiousness (reasonable, planful, dependable and achievement oriented), extraversion (socialble, talkative and assertive), agreeableness(good-natured, cooperative and trusting) and openness to experience (artistically sensitive and intellectual) as a widely accepted framework of personality (Digman, 1990), which allowed them to study meaningful relationships between personality traits and work behavior.

In the past 25 years, the big five model of personality has been investigated in relation to career success (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen & Barrick & Mount, 1999), job statisfaction (Judge, Heller & Mount, 2002), job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991), performance motivation (Judge & Ilies, 2002) and a variety of other important personal and oraganizational outcomes. Although the growing acceptance of the Big Five taxonomy of personality has resulted in huge body of literature, studies that investigate the relationship of the Big Five to different outcomes in a single study are rare. Another weekness is the lack of research exploring the combined effects of personality and situational factors of behaviours and attitudes (Stewart, 1996)

In the field of Industrial/Organizational psychology, one of the most researched areas is the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001). Landy (1989) described this relationship as the "Holy Grail" of Industrial psychology. Research linking job performance with satisfaction and other attitudes has been studied since at least 1939, with the Hawthorne studies (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). In Judge et al. (2001), it was found by Brayfield and Crockett (1955) that there is only a minimal relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. However, since 1955, Judge et al. (2001) cited that there are other studies by Locke (1970), Schwab & Cummings (1970), and Vroom (1964) that have shown that there is at least some relationship between those variables. Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) did an extensive analysis on the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. Across their many studies, they found a mean correlation of .17 (Iaffaldano &Muchinsky, 1985). There are also stronger relationships depending on specific circumstances such as mood and employee level within the company (Morrison, 1997). Organ (1988) also found that the job performance and job satisfaction relationship follows the social exchange theory; employees' performance is giving back to the organization from which they get their satisfaction.

One construct that has been used to predict job performance is personality. This is one area that is criticized by many people as something that may not be valid to use (Rothstein &Goffin, 2000). Despite these criticisms, most researchers feel that studying the relationship between personality and job performance is extremely useful (Goffin, Rothstein, & Johnston, 2000). Locus of control refers to people's beliefs about how much control they have over their job, life, or various other factors (Rotter, 1966). Locus of control has been correlated with job performance as well as job satisfaction (Spector, 1997). Scheider 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 was due to the satisfaction with their job, rather than other variables. Most studies dealing with job satisfaction in relation to personality are conducted in large organizations, however, very few have been done to view the impact on smaller organizations (Morrison, 1997). There are many different personality factors that have been correlated to job satisfaction, but overall, there seem to be two traits that have significant correlations: locus of control and negative affectivity (Spector, 1997).

Locus of control refers to people's beliefs about how much control they have over their job, life, or various other factors (Rotter, 1966). Locus of control has been correlated with job performance as well as job satisfaction (Spector, 1997). Negative affectivity is people's tendency to have negative emotions, independent of the situation (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). This is correlated to job dissatisfaction because if people feel negative overall, they will be negative about their job as well (Spector, 1997).

The value of work is important in the life of every employee. Studies conducted by Putti (1989), for example found that the intrinsic value of the work has ka significant relationship with commitment to the organization. One of the major challenges facing organization is how to attract, motivate and retain employees, especially woman worker may have different values than man workers (Loughlin and Barling 2001).

The increases of exchange of industrial workers in the work place today is not an unfamiliar phenomenon. Among the indicators which confirm these phenomenon are now aware of the difficulties organizations to 'bind' their industrial workers in a long time (McGovern, 1995). Furthermore, among the industrial workers find work that promises a more lucrative rewards rather than semothing that is difficult. This is because employment opportunities in the industrial sector is broader than

others. A lot of job opportunities are a result of the vision the former Prime Minister Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamad who wants to see Malaysia as an industrialized nation.

In jobs involving personal interactions, one study reported that the factors of conscientiousness, agreeableness, and adjustment were related to job performance. Not surprisingly, emotional stability and agreeableness were found to be especially important in job involving teamwork (Mount, Barrick & Stewart, 1998).

With workers manufacturing as subjects, Morrison (1997) examined the relationships between the Five-Factor Model and other psychological constructs (Self-Monitoring, Type A Behavior, Locus of Control, and Subjective Well-being). Result indicate that manufacturing workers tend to be Type A persons who are more sociable and conscientious than not. They are relatively more agreeable than not, slightly less open to new experiences than average. As a group, manufacturing workers tend to have an internal locus of control, which is also strongly associated with adjustment.

According to Zakaria Kasa (2005), indicate that the industrial workers, especially in the Hulu Langat, Selangor. Most of them are not high educate and receive a salary of RM 1000.00 and below, more interested in the job such as job security career development and economic rewards. They assume that working conditions, lifestyles and relationships between employees a vital medium, while the autonomy and prestige as less important. This findings clearly drawing done the reality of the lives of low incomes workers are more concerned about the revenue to support their lives behind to think about the autonomy or the power and prestige.

According to Buss (1992), the Big Five factors (which for this study are Cattell's five Global factors of extraversion, anxiety, tough-mindedness, independence, and self-control) have some influence on job performance. The original "big five" personality factors are emotional stability, extraversion, intellect/openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (Acton, 2002). Acton (2002) compared the "big five" to Cattell's global factors. He found that extraversion is the same in both, tough-mindedness was the "big five" version of agreeableness, anxiety was the version of emotional stability, independence was the version of openness to experience, and self-control the version of conscientiousness.

Management today's world is about management in times of rapid change (Robbins, 2003). In today's world, the biggest task of the human-resource manager is to motivate and retain employees. Motivation is company's life-blood (Sharma, 2006). A well managed companya can motivate and retain its employees and hence has the following competitive advantages: reduced turnover; an increase in productivity; reduced absenteeism; increased revenue, and improved performance.

As Malaysia is moving towards a knowledge based economy, the importance of having knowledge workers to deepen the industrial of firm, improve the productivity and attract foreign direct investment has been increasingly recognized (Fang Chan Ong 2006; Kanapathy, 1997; Tan & Gill, 2000). This circumstance points to the importance of human resource as factors of investment, economic development and as key element of competitiveness. Malaysia's is moving up the competitiveness rankings by seven spots to the 24th place in the Growth Competitiveness index in 2005 compared 2004. In terms of Business Competitiveness Index Malaysia's rankng unchanged at 24th place as shown in Table 1.2 . Malaysia also

places 26th in the World Economic Forum's (WEF) Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) rankings for 2006-2007. Currently Malaysia has moved up to the 19th place in World Competitiveness Yearbook 2008 published by the International Institute for Management Development (IMD) based is Switzerland (IMD, 2008)

A high quality of employees who possess a strong cognitive, functional and social competence in order to perform tasks efficiently and effectively is a crucial factor in company's competitiveness. There are several determinants of worker's competitiveness and among them are human caital variables. Rahmah (2002), showed that there were a significant positive relationship between worker's performance and their percentage with tertiary level of education and training attendace. Gerfin (2004), also found that training activities will increase worker's competitiveness and contribute 2.0 percent to wage increase. A study by Verner (2000) showed that there was a direct relationship between training and worker's experience on worker's productivity in Ghana. His study that worker's experience has higher impact on productivity as compared to its impact on wages. A study by Suharto Wijono (1997) in the central Jawa, Indonesia showed a significant relationship between worker's motivation and personality and worker's job satisfaction. Judith (2005), studied the personality of the graduates who will enter the labour market and found that human capital variables such as education, training and worker's training and graduate's personality have significantly affects graduates' ability to fulfil the labour market requirement.

Judge (2002), used the five-factor model to cumulate the results of previous studies that investigated relationships between personality trait and job satisfaction by means of meta-analysis. They found that four of the Big Five traits were related to job satisfaction. After classing 335 correlations between personality traits and job satisfaction reported in 135 research projects into catogories corresponding to the Big Five traits, the computed true-score correlations between each of the Big Five traits and job satisfaction. Though the traits vary in their relevance to job satisfaction (with openness being the least relevant), Judge *et al.,* (2002) concluded that organising personality traits according to the five-factor model leads to substantial support for the dispositional source of job satisfaction.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis presented in this paper, the paper draws its conclusion on the fact that Big Five Personality, competitive, motivation and organisation commitment can influence job satisfaction of the manufacturing workers. By defining the Big Five Personality dimensions as stable individual differences in people's motivational reactions to circumscribed classes of environmental stimuli, we hope to contribute to a renaissance of motivational approaches to explain human personality (Murray, 1938). In addition, we hope that our emphasis of traits as contextualized constructs helps to bridge the traditional divide between structure and process oriented approaches in personality psychology, which may inform research on how people observation of situationally contingent behavior to form trait judgments (Kammrath *et al.*, 2005). Job satisfaction and personality also are related, as are the five factors of the big five personality model are related as well. It would appear as though the relation between job satisfaction and the five factors is more a consequence of the social aspects of the workplace than actual ability. Level of worker's

competitiveness contributes to firms' performance, it is a must for the employers to provide training facilities to their workers. This paper shows that it is very important for the employers to provide a good working environment, to increases workers motivation and the same time to enhance job satisfaction. In this context, a comfortable workplace with good working condition and human relation is crucial to maintain workers' royalty to their employers and curbing them from moving away for other jobs. Another pertinent aspect is workers personality included in Big Five Personality. These variables can be enhanced through a good relationship between the employers and the employees and among the employees themselves.

References

Alport, G.W. (1937). Personality: *A psychological interpretation*. New York:Holt.

A.R. Ismail, M.Y.M. Yusof, N.K. Makhtar, B.M. Deros, M.R.A. Rani. 2010.

Optimization of Temperature Level to Enhance Worker Performance in Automotive Industry, American Journal of Applied Sciences 7(3):360-365

Barrick, M. R.; Mount, M. K. (1991). "The Big Five Personality Dimensions and JobPerformance: A Meta-Analysis". *Personnel Psychology* 44: 1–26.

Blood,G., Ridenour, J., Thomas, E., Qualls. C., Hammer, C. (2002). Predicting job Satisfaction among speech-language pathologists working in public schools.

Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools. 33, 282-290.

Buitendach,J., & de Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity, extrinsic and intrinsic job Satisfaction and affective organisational commitment of maintenanceWorkers in a parastatal. *South African of Business Management*, 36(2),27-37.Cattell,R.B. (1965), The Scientific Analysis of Personality, Penguin, Baltimore, MD.

Costa, P.T., & McCrae,R. R. 1980. Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on Subjective well being: Happy and unhappy people. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38:668-678.

Costa, P.T & McCrae, R.R. 1987. Validation of five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Pscychology*, 52: 81-90.

Costa, P.T & McCrae, R.R. 1988. Personality in adulthood: A six-year longitudinalStudy of self-reports and spouse ratings on the NEO Personality Inventory.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54: 853-863.

Costa, P.T & McCrae, R.R. 1992. *Revised NEO Personality Inventory and NEO Five-Factor Inventory professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resourcess.

Digman, J. M. (1990). "Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model",

Annual Review of Psychology, 41, 417-440.

Elloy,D.F. and Terpening, W.D. (1992), An empirical distinctionbetween job Involvement and work involvement: some additional evidence. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science,* Vol. 24, pp. 465-78.

Erez, A., & Judge, T. A. 2001. Relationship of core self-evaluation to goal setting, Motivation, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86:1270-1279.

Fong Chan Onn. (2005). Managing human capital in the globalised era. *11public Services conference,* 21 August, INTAN Bukit Kiara, Malaysia.

Gellatly, I.R. 1996. Conscientiousness and task performance: Test of a cognitive Process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 81:474-482.

Gerfin, M. (2004). *"Work-Related Training and Wages:An Empirical Analysis for Male Workers in Switzerland".*

http://papers.ssrn.com/So13/papers.cfm?abstract id=525923

Glisson C, Hemmmelgarn A. The effects of organizational climate and organizational coordination on the quality and outcomes of children's service systems. *Child abuse and Neglect* 1988:22:401-421.

Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality":The Big Five Factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59:1216-1229.

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*,4:26-42.

Goldberg, L. R. (1993). "The structure of phenotypic personality traits". *American Psychologist* 48 (1): 26–34.

Greenberg, J. 1990. Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The Hidden cost of pay cuts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75: 561-568.

Hogan., R. 1983. A socioanalytic theory of personality. In M.M. Page (Ed.),*Personality-current theory and research: Nebraska symposium on motivation*,1982, 30: 55-89, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Holland, J.L. 1973. *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers*. EnglewooodsCliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall., Vol. 85, pp. 869-79.

Hurtz, G.M. and Donovan, J.J. (2000), Personality and job performance: the big five Revisited, Journal of Applied Psychology

Judge, T. A. & Cable, D. M. 1997. Applicant personality, organizational culture, and Organization attraction. *Personal Psychology*, 50: 359-394.

Judge, T.A., Higgins, C.A., Thoresen, C.J. and Barrick, M.R. (1999), The big five Personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span, *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 52, pp.621-52.

Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality And job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 530-541.

Judge, T. A., and ilies, R. (2002), Relationship of personality of performance Motivation: a meta-analytic review, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87, pp. 765-807.

Judith Semejin, Christophe Boone, Rolf van der Velden, Arjen van Witteloostujin.(2005). *"Graduates' Personality Characteristics and Labor Market Entry and Empirical Study among Dutch Economics Graduates"*. Economic of Education Review 24 (2005). 67-83.

Kammrath, L. K., Mendoza-Denton, R., & Mischel, W. (2005). Incorporating if.then personality signatures in person perception: Beyond the person–situation dichotomy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 605-618.

Kanapathy, V. (1997). *Labour market issues and skills training: Recent development In Malaysia.* Pacific economic cooperation council human resource

Development fask force meeting, 30-31 May, Montreal, Canada.

Kovack, K.A (1977)*Organisation size, job satisfaction, absenteeism and turnover.*

Washington D.C. : University Press of America.

Lawler, E.E. III and Hall, D.T. (1970), Relationship of job characteristics to job Involvement satisfaction and intrinsic motivation*, Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 54, pp. 305012

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. (1989). The structure of interpersonal traits:Wiggin's circumplex and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 56: 586-595.

McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60 175-215.

McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. (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: Theoritical Perspectives, Guilford, New York, NY, pp. 51-87.

McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52, 509-516.

Mount, M.K., Barrick, R.M. (1995). The Big Five personality dimensions: Implications for research and practice in human resource management.

In Ferris, G. R. (Ed.), Research in personnel and human resource management,13: 153-200. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Mount, M.K., Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G.L.(1998). Five-Factor Model of Personality and performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions. *Human Performance*, 11, 145-165.

Morrison, K.A. (1997). How franchise job satisfaction and personality affects Performance, organisational commitment, franchisor relations, and ittention to remain . Journal of Small Business Management, 35 (3) 39-68.

Murray, H. (1938*). Explorations in personality.* New York: Oxford University Press. Mwamwenda. T.S. (1995). Job satisfaction among secondary schools teachers in Transkei. *South African Journal of Education*, 15 (2), 84-86.

O'Connor, B.P. (2002), A quantitative review of the comprehensiveness of the five-Factor model in relation to popular personality inventories, *Assessment,* Vol. 35, pp. 109-25.

Olver, J.M. and Mooradian, T.A (2003), Personality traits and personal values: a Conceptual and empirical investigation, *Personality and Individual Differences,* Vol. 35, pp. 109-25.

Organ, D. W. & Rayan, K. 1995. A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and Dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. Personnel Psychology, 48: 775-802.

Penley, J. A. & Tomaka, J. 2002. Associations among the Big Five, emotional Responses, and coping with acute stress. Personality and Individual Differences, 32: 1215-1228.

Salgado, J. F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the European Community. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 607-620.

Spector, P.E. (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause and Consequence. *Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications*, Inc.

Strumpfer, D.J.W., Danana, N., Gouws, J.F., & Vivier, M.R. (1998). Personality Dispositions and job satisfaction. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 28 (2), 92-100.

Suharto Wijono. (1997). *"Relationship between work motivation and personality and Organizational work performance".* PhD Thesis. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Tan, H.W., Gill, I.S. (2000). Malaysia. *In Vocational education and training reform,*Indermit S.Gill, Fluitman, F & Amit Dar (ed), 218-260. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tellegan, A. 1985. Structures of mood and personality and their relevance to Assessing anxiety with an emphasis on self-report. In A. Tuma & J. Maser (Eds.), Anxiety and the Anxiey Disorders: 681-706. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. 1997. Extraversion and its positive emotional core. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.)., Handbook of personality psychology:767-793.San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Watson, D., & Tellegen, A. 1985. Toward a consensual structure of mood. Psychological Bulletin, 98: 219-235.

TABLE 1

Big Five Dimensions	Facet (and correlated trait adjective)
(O) Openness vs closedness to experience	Ideas (curious) Fantasy (imaginative) Aesthetics (artistic) Actions (wide interests) Feelings (excitable) Values (unconventional)
(C) Conscientiousness vs lack of direction	Competence (efficient) Order (organized) Dutifulness (not careless) Achievement striving (thorough) Self-discipline (not lazy) Deliberation (not impulsive)
(E) Extraversion vs introversion	Gregariousness (sociable) Assertiveness (forceful) Activity (energetic) Excitement-seeking (adventurous) Positive emotions (enthusiastic) Warmth (outgoing
(A) Agreeableness vs antagonism	Trust (forgiving) Straightforwardness (not demanding) Altruism (warm) Compliance (not stubborn) Modesty (not show-off) Tender-mindedness (sympathetic)
(N) Neuroticism vs emotional stability	Anxiety (tense) Angry hostility (irritable) Depression (not contented) Self-consciousness (shy) Impulsiveness (moody) Vulnerability (not self-confident)

Table 1.1   Value of workers in the industrial Hulu Langat

Work Value

	MeanSt. Deviation
Employment Guarantee	3.47 0.49
Career Progress	3.41 0.41
Economic rewards	3.39 0.46
Workplace conditions	3.16 0.45
Creativity	3.15 0.49
Life style	3.08 0.48
Relationship between employees	3.07 0.49
Autonomy	2.96 0.57
Prestige	2.71 0.70
Overall Work Value	3.17 0.35

Values of Source: manufacturing workers, Zakaria Kasa, 2005

Table 1.2 : Comparative Overall of Malaysia's Competitiveness

Country	Growth Competitiveness Index 2005 (2004, 2003)	Business Competitiveness Index 2005 (2004)
Findland	1 (1,6)	2 (2)
Republik Korea	17 (29, 18)	24 (24)
Malaysia	24 (31,29)	23 (23)
Ireland	26 (30,30)	19 (22)
Thailand	36 (34,32)	37 (37)
China	49 (46,44)	57 (47)
India	50 (55,56)	31 (30)
Singapura	6 (7,6)	5 (10)
Filipina	77 (76,66)	69 (70)