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Abstract: Performance Appraisal has been viewed with critical interest by academicians and scholars for decades. Several variables and constructs influence the research domain of performance appraisal and its various uses. Perceived Fairness of Performance Appraisal in the global scenario is an issue of discussion in the scholarly as well as industrial space. There is however, minimal research to establish a relationship between Personality Traits, Personal Variables and Perceived Satisfaction of Employee Performance Appraisal Systems. The focus of this paper is to bridge this gap and attempt to establish a conceptual connect between Personality and Performance Appraisal Perceptions. The conceptual debate aims to unearth, through a theoretical perspective the influence that the the Big 5 Personality Traits and Job Satisfaction have with the PA construct.

I. Introduction

Effective human resource management is essential for organisations to achieve their work aims (Inayet et al, 2008). Work organisation, personnel selection, training, promotion, career planning, performance appraisal, pay, and motivation define the scope of human resources management as determinants in developing harmonious relationships between the organisation and its employees (Bernardin and Russell, 1998). The issue of employees’ performance in furtherance of organizational objectives has occupied management attention for long. Differences in levels of performance have been attributed to differences in skills and abilities on the one hand, and to different theories of money on the other. (Frank et al., 2011)

One of the essential elements in employee related decision making for an organisation is Performance Appraisal. Performance Appraisal is one of the most commonly used tools in the Indian scenario. Specific to the Indian IT Sector, Performance Appraisal is a cyclical/ yearly event which is the evaluation methodology to determine an employee’s reward and growth for the said accounting year, with respect to his/her performance.

Performance appraisal is one of the most widely researched areas in industrial/organizational psychology (Murphy & Cleveland, 1993). The traditional research agenda has however, contributed minimally to highlight the utility of performance appraisal as an organizational and managerial tool. (Walsh, 2003).

In his comprehensive definition of Performance Appraisal, Walsh (2003) states , “Performance appraisal is a process by which a superior evaluates and judges the work performance of a subordinate. Performance appraisal systems include the processes and procedures involved in implementing, managing, and communicating the events involved in performance appraisal. In many cases it is a formal process and is a part of the personnel management policy.”

Research on performance appraisals (PA) spans an entire range of aspects and constructs that include psychometric issues, rater/ratee characteristics, cognitive processes, rater training, and appraisal fairness (Bretz, MIlkovich, and Read, 1992). PA and its usage has been a topic of research interest to authors who link usage to behavioural and organizational outcomes. How PAs are used has proven to influence rating behavior and results (e.g., Williams, DeNisi, Blencoe, & Cafferty, 1985; Zedeck & Cascio, 1982) and be an important predictor of employee attitudes and perceptions of their appraiser, the job, and the performance appraisal system as such (Meyer, Kay, & French, 1965; Prince & Lawler, 1989).

Research has investigated several constructs that can be correlated to appraisal perceptions. However, there is scarcity in literature pertinent to Personality and Appraisal opinions. This research paper aims to bridge that gap and conceptually correlate Employee Performance Appraisal Perceptions from the viewpoint of the Personality and Job Satisfaction levels of an individual.

II. Personal Factors and Performance Appraisal Perceptions

This research attempts at bringing forth and establishing a relationship between Individual Personality, perceptions and related Perceptions of Performance Appraisal Systems. The constructs that we examine herein are the Big 5 Personality Traits and Job Satisfaction.
A. Big 5 Personality Traits

The history of the study of personality is considered as ancient as the subject of psychology itself. Scholars have, however, shown contradictory opinions with respect to the influence of individual characteristics on behavior (Epstein & O’Brien, 1985). Although there was indepth research centered around traits such as need for achievement (McClelland, 1961), self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965), and growth need strength (Hackman & Oldham, 1975,1980), from time to time, there was a lack of a universal model or taxonomy to define personality, creating a “Babel” of concepts and scales (John & Srivastava, 1999).

Efforts to put personality factors into definite brackets began after McDougall (1932) wrote that “Personality may to advantage be broadly categorised into 5 distinguishable but separate factors, namely intellect, character, temperament, disposition and temper”. A few years later, Cattell (1943, 1946, 1947, 1948) developed another framework wherein 16 primary factors and 8 second order factors were developed.

By the mid eighties, the Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality started to become acceptable and gain popularity among researchers (John & Srivastava, 1999). The FFM is based on the work of Cattell (1943, 1945), who while working on Allport’s (1937) trait list, developed the legendary 16 Personality Factor (16PF) questionnaire (Catell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970). Tupes and Christal discovered “five relatively strong and recurrent factors and nothing more of any consequence” (Tupes & Christal, 1961). This five factor model went under a lot of scrutiny and was taken up enthusiastically for experimentation by many researchers (e.g., Borgatta, 1964; Costa & McCrae, 1987; Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1990; Norman, 1963), and finally was given the name ‘the Big Five’ (Goldberg, 1981,1990). With strong evidence to back its credibility, the Big Five model was accepted by scholars and academicians in the eighties. With the availability of advanced statistical tools and analytical methods, more robust personality taxonomies, and a commonly agreed set of common traits, research on personality was taken to the next level again by the late 1980s (John & Srivastava, 1999).

Throughout the past decade, there has been an increased agreement that individual differences in personality may be compositely brought under the umbrella of a hierarchical system consisting of three to seven major traits, and among all these perspectives, the five-factor models have gained primary importance (John & Srivastava, 1999; Pervin, 1994). Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness, agreed upon as the Big 5 Personality traits, emerged from decades of research. This has been traced and described in detail in the aforesaid section. The Big 5 have been applauded for their ability to condense an otherwise large number of traits (Hofstede, 1994; John, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1987), their cross-cultural applicability (McCrae & Costa, 1997), and their capacity to forecast other outcomes. Although the adequacy of the five-factor model of traits has been debated (e.g., Block, 1995; Pervin, 1994, McCadams, 1992), several trait measures are currently in wide use (Widiger & Trull, 1997) and the Big Five is today the most accepted and widely used personality taxonomy and is “a fruitful basis for examining the dispositional predictors of leadership” (Judge et al., 2002).

The Big-Five model offers an integrative framework for personality psychology (Costa & McCrae, 1995; Goldberg, 1993; McCrae & John, 1992). It focuses on an integral set of behavioral traits, namely; Extraversion, Neuroticism, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience—and scholars argue that people can be fathomed and their behaviour can be understood by assessing how much of each of the 5 traits (proportion) they display in their lives. Workers in this tradition have gathered sturdy evidence to support the cross-cultural, varied methodology application methods, and temporal consistency of the Big-Five traits (McCrae & John, 1992). As noted above, however, the Big-Five model has been repeatedly criticized for not taking note of the action in personality, partly because it does not take into account that people might behave differently in the different roles they play in their lives (Block, 1995; McAdams, 1992; Pervin, 1994).

Largely, the objective of the Big-Five assessment inventory is to place people on underlying characteristic continua as reliably as possible and hence, proponents of the model are likely to neglect cross-situational differences or to look at it as a measurement error (Shadel & Cervone, 1993; Smith & Williams, 1992). Situational differences in trait expression are thus, not completely understood and treated as a peripheral concept. Yet, it is an established fact that people, actions, and behavior do vary according to roles and situations (Funder & Colvin, 1991) and that this variation is systematic (Roberts & Donahue, 1994) and meaningful (Ryan, 1995). Such cross-situational variability seems justified and even acceptable, given the diversity of human nature and the consequent varied demands made by roles played by individuals and the diversity of the resources provided within the same.

In the past 2 decades, the Big Five traits have proven to relate to a huge number of personal and organizational outcomes in both empirical and meta-analytic studies (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991; Costa & McCrae, 1980, 1987; Judge et al., 2002). Today the person - situation debate is largely over (Funder, 2001; Hough & Schneider, 1996). However, in view of the effect of situationists downplaying the role of personality in predicting behavior in 1960s, personality researchers, usually investigating the effect of individual differences on behavior, have not paid enough attention to possible contextual influences on behavior (Funder, 2001).
A.1 Big Five Factor Model and Traits

Figure 5 describes the Big 5 model of personality. It consists of Extraversion, Openness to experience, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Agreeableness (Costa & McCrae, 1985; McCrae & John, 1992). Extraversion assesses the extent of interpersonal interactions and activity/energy levels of a person. Adjectives used for individuals with a high score on the extraversion scale consist of “active, assertive, energetic, enthusiastic, outgoing, and talkative” (McCrae and John 1992). Individuals with increased openness have active imaginations, aesthetic sensitivity, an intellectual interest, wide range of hobbies and interests, and a preference for change and adventure. Adjectives describing openness include artistic, curious, imaginative, insightful, and original (McCrae & John, 1992). Costa and McCrae (1985) propose conscientious as an individual’s level of organization, tenacity, and single minded focus in goal-directed behavior. Individuals with high scores are observed to be the most organized, dependable, and dedicated to the task at hand. Adjectives of this concept are efficient, organized, reliable, responsible, and thorough (McCrave & John, 1992). Costa and McCrae (1985) suggest that neuroticism trait is composed of people who are more likely to have psychological worries, tangential ideas, overt and sudden cravings or urges, and unpredictable coping responses in a said environment. Adjectives describing neuroticism include “anxious, self-pitying, tense, touchy, unstable, and worrying” (McCrae & John, 1992). Lastly, agreeableness tends to be a trait in an individual’s quality of interpersonal orientation ranging from compassion to antagonism in their thoughts, emotions and behaviours. Adjectives of agreeableness include “appreciative, forgiving, generous, kind, sympathetic, and trusting” (McCrae & John, 1992).

---

Figure 1: Big 5 Personality Dimensions and Traits

As suggested by Costa and McCrae (1988), neuroticism is the most consistent trait across personality measures; it is evident in nearly every measure of personality. Neuroticism leads to at least two associated tendencies; one talking about anxiety (instability and stress tendencies), the other relating to one’s well being (personal insecurity and depression). Thus, neuroticism by and large describes a lack of positive psychological temperament and emotional stability. Costa and McCrae’s (1992) measure of the Big Five traits breaks neuroticism into six aspects: anxiety, hostility, depression, self-consciousness, vulnerability, and impulsiveness. Similar to the Big Five traits in Costa and McCrae’s (1992) model, these dimensions point to a higher-order construct. Individuals who have a high neuroticism index are more likely to experience a variety of problems, including negative moods (anxiety, fear, depression, irritability) and physical symptoms and disorders. Evidence also highlights that neurotic individuals are likely to be especially affected by negative life events, and to have bad moods linger (Suls, Green, & Hills, 1998).

Like neuroticism, extraversion is a prominent factor in personality psychology, as is established by its usage and presence in most personality measures, and its crucial contribution in major taxonomies of personality (even those preceding the 5-factor model). Extraversion is ideally related to sociability. It is however seen that Extraversion is a huge construct that encompasses several other factors. Clark (1997) note, "extraverts are more sociable, but are also described as being more active and impulsive, less dysphoric, and as less introspective and self-preoccupied than introverts" (p. 769). Thus, extraverts are observed to be social (interactive and lively), and also are dominant, ambitious, active, adventuresome and assertive. Extraversion is related as a behavior to

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait Dimension</th>
<th>Endpoints of the Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>Calm = anxious, Secure = insecure, Self-satisfied = self-pitying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Sociable = retiring, Fun-loving = sober, Affectionate = reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Imaginative = practical, Preference for variety = preference for routine, Independent = conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>Self-hearted = ruthless, Trusting = suspicious, Helpful = uncooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Organized = disorganized, Careful = careless, Disciplined = Impulsive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from McCrae & Costa (1990, p. 103).
positive people and it is generally noted that Extraverts have a large circle of friends and are ideal to take on and confidently execute leadership roles (Watson & Clark, 1997).

Conscientiousness, which has emerged as the Big Five construct most consistently related to performance across jobs (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Salgado, 1997), is manifested in three related facets-achievement orientation (hardworking and persistent), dependability (responsible and careful), and orderliness (planful and organized).

Conscientiousness is thus observed to be related to a person's degree of self-control, along with a strong need for achievement, order, and persistence (Costa, McCrae, & Dye, 1991). As one examines these hallmarks of conscientiousness, it is but implying that the construct is a proven predictor of success at work. Recent empirical evidence substantiates the significance of conscientiousness at the job, linking the construct to several variables along with job performance, such as, counterproductive work behaviors (Hogan & Ones, 1997), effective job seeking behavior (Wanberg, Watt, & Rumsey, 1996), retention (Barrick, Mount, & Strauss, 1994), and attendance at work (Judge, Martocchio, & Thoresen, 1997). There is additional evidence in research to prove that conscientious individuals live longer, though the causal processes that are essential to this phenomenon are not well understood (Friedman et al., 1995).

The other two facets from the 5-factor model are openness to experience and agreeableness. Openness to experience is observed in people who display intellectance (philosophical and intellectual) and unconventionality (imaginative, autonomous, and nonconforming). Agreeable persons are cooperative (trusting of others and caring) as well as likeable (happy, clean hearted and docile). It certainly seems possible that these traits are related to career success. It is but obvious that the adaptability, creativity, and intellectual bent of mind of open individuals may be instrumental to success in many job roles. Parallely, the cooperative trait of agreeable people may lead to more successful careers, specifically in occupations where teamwork or customer service is a necessary skill. There is a however a point of distinction between the other Big Five traits and Openness or Agreeableness. In this scenario, there are several career options in which increased openness and agreeableness would not be a beneficial trait to possess (e.g., open individuals may be prone to job hopping or may be unhappy in conventional occupations, extremely agreeable individuals may sacrifice their success in pleasing others).

### A.2 Organisational and Interpersonal Outcomes of Big 5

The Big 5 have been related to several organizational outcomes in the past. For example, conscientiousness has been compared in several studies to job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Tett, Jackson, Rothstein, and Reddon (1999). Whilst the former study establishes that conscientiousness is positively related to job performance, the latter suggested that conscientiousness could become a liability in jobs that demand creativity and innovation. Therefore, high conscientiousness is likely to be a less desirable trait if the job requires high creativity.

Similarly, studies have investigated the relationships between other Big Five attributes and attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. Amongst these, job satisfaction, job performance, OCB, and creativity are a few prominent variables examined. Job satisfaction is a personal outcome that intrigued personality psychologists over several years (Judge et al., 2002). Two studies by Staw and colleagues (Staw et al., 1986; Staw & Ross, 1985) kick started research on job satisfaction and personality. Judge et al.’s (2002) recent meta-analytic study cemented and established the credibility of this relationship. They found that while neuroticism, extraversion, and conscientiousness were related to job satisfaction, results for agreeableness and openness to experience in relation to job satisfaction were unstable (Judge et al., 2002). Job Satisfaction is being examined as a separate construct in this study, to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and perceived use of Performance Appraisal Systems.

Job performance is one of the most extensively investigated job behaviors in OB and industrial/occupational psychology (Usman Raja, 2004). The equation between personality and job performance, specially with reference to the Big Five traits, has been established by several research scholars (e.g. Barrick & Mount, 1991; Salgado, 1997; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991). Organisational Citizenship Behaviour is another construct in the Big 5 arena that has been attempted by a few scholars. It refers to discretionary behaviors of employees that in total promote the effective functioning of organizations and are not enforceable under the formal agreement (Organ, 1988, 1997). Research on OCB and personality has not been robust, despite OCB being a crucial variable in the organizational behavior domain. Very limited evidence exists to establish a relationship between the Big Five and OCBs (Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Creativity has always been viewed with critical interest to personality psychologists (Feist, 1998) as a variable to be related to several personality dimensions. “Creativity is defined as thought or behavior that is novel and useful” (Amabile, 1988). Almost every personality related research has viewed creativity as an attribute that distinguishes amongst people (Woodman, 1981). A meta-analysis by Feist (1998) explained how the Big Five dimensions and traits were related to creativity.
Although several studies have examined the aforesaid outcomes, there is limited research on the relationship between the Big5 Personality Traits and Perceived satisfaction of Performance Appraisal Systems. This research aims to address this gap and establish a correlation between personality traits and perceptions of PA.

**B. Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is a subject of interest not only to the research fraternity, but is also of great relevance to business employers and employees because of its impact on the workplace (Mirza, 2005). Jobs today require complex skills and are more demanding in terms of intellectual capacity to deliver, customer interactions and interpersonal skills. In addition, globalization has created a competitive marketplace, wherein organizational restructuring and workforce diversity have given birth to a multifaceted work environment. In this context, Job satisfaction emerges as an issue of primary focus for researchers, where employees seek satisfaction from multiple sources.

The nature, causes, and consequences of job satisfaction have been the focus of research since the 1930’s (Locke, 1976). Spector (1996) has noted that close to 12,000 articles, books, and research studies have been published on the issue of job satisfaction. Measurement of employee job satisfaction at work is a construct that has been researched extensively by business analysts and organisational psychologists. New dimensions in workplace related literature, however, is suggestive of considering barometers other than job satisfaction to measure employee satisfaction and well-being.

The influence of individuals' personality traits on affective and behavioral responses to their job has been studied by several authors (Agho, Mueller, Price, 1994; Judge, Bono, Locke 2000; Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002; Johns, Xie, & Fang, 1992; Renn& Vandenberg, 1995; Roberts, &Foti, 1998). This belief in the significance of individual differences is so integral that, for more than half a century, scholars in the field have blended this notion into their models and theories relating to the determinants of employee satisfaction (Argyris, 1957, 1973; Dubin, 1956; Murray, 1938; Pervin, 1968; and Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995). For example Argyris (1973) stated that people seek jobs that make space for personal as well as professional growth and self-actualization. Strauss (1974) proposed that workers have two fundamentally varying attitudes toward work, some perceive work as a means to achieve another objective, while others satiate their need for accomplishment and self-actualization through their job. Theories like these suggest that differences in orientations toward work could lead to diverse responses to the exact work environment (O'Reilly, 1977), or as Hackman and Lawler (1971) suggest individuals may perceive the same job characteristics quite differently. O'Reilly (1977) noted there has been a huge amount of evidence supporting the importance of individual differences in work behavior but Weiss and Adler (1984) statement that "researchers have barely scratched the surface on the ways in which personality constructs may enter into theoretical systems" (p. 43) is still valid after years.

Despite these debates involving individual characteristics, many theorists and researchers opine that the method to enhance employee satisfaction and performance is to enrich the worker’s job (e.g., Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Umstot, Bell, & Mitchell, 1976; Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Several recognised models have been applied to ascertain job satisfaction and its relationship with personality, human psychology and other OB related variables.

**B.1 Importance of Job Satisfaction**

Considerable research has centered around the ways in which employees respond to their jobs. A large part of this research has examined the effects of a variety of job-related variables on employee motivation, satisfaction, and performance. Investigation in this direction has further contributed to methods to enhance productivity and the quality of work life of employees through the usage and experimentation of job-related variables (e.g., Barling, Kelloway, & Iverson, 2003; Blau, 1999; Fried, 1991; Griffin, 1991; Korunka, &Vitouch, 2000; Kulik, Oldham, & Hackman, 1987; Tivendell, & Bourbonnais, 2000; Pollock, Whitbred, & Contractor, 2000).

Research has consistently indicated that changing various aspects of the job itself may indeed lead to higher levels of motivation, satisfaction and worker productivity. In fact, some evidence has proven that an employee's responses to work may be more positively related to the characteristics of the job than to the individual characteristics of the employee himself (Griffin, 1991; O'Reilly & Roberts, 1975; Stone & Porter, 1985). Despite the compelling evidence, the ideology that a person’s behaviour is governed jointly by personality as well as environmental factors remains quite strong. Obvious conclusions point out that there exist basic differences in personality among employees and that these varied characteristics in personality may interact with the environmental influences to result in differential responses. In the work environment, this dynamic and the relationship between worker and job characteristics could have crucial implications for different work outcomes.

Today, a huge reason behind successful organizations is perceived to be dependent upon the knowledge and skills that employees bring in and hence, organizations are viewing employees as assets and not liabilities (Pituro, 1999). Factors that influence job satisfaction have been viewed with critical interest since the introduction of the factory system for which managers were required to “maintain a trained and motivated work force” (Shafritz&Ott, 2001, p. 29; Murray, 1983). Noteworthy companies like Xerox are now conducting
company-wide employee motivation and satisfaction surveys annually to ensure that employees are motivated 
as that as an organization, they are doing things right to keep employee morale high and attrition low (Fitter, 1999).

Organizations grasp the ideology that the motivations and perceptions that employees have about their jobs are 
the way to attain maximum levels of job satisfaction and productivity. In this arena, the connections are found to 
be very complicated. In order to gather more information and establish concrete evidence, researchers would 
have to bring in the purview of individual values and motivations, which could be gathered from in-depth 
interview techniques. As companies compete fiercely and position themselves for success in a dynamic business 
environment, they are quick to realize that ignoring the “people factor” can mean result in instant employee 
dissatisfaction resulting in decrease in individual as well as organizational performance (Donaldson & Folb, 2000). Hiltebeitel, Leauby, Karkin, and Morris (2000) established a correlation between organizational performance and employee job satisfaction and several other scholars have theorized that job satisfaction is a critical antecedent of employee turnover(Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979; Price & Mueller, 1986; Williams & Hazar, 1986).

Identification of factors that influence job satisfaction provides organizational stakeholders with useful and 
actionable information to make informed decisions to plan and execute interventions directed towards increasing employee job satisfaction (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992).

B.2 Theoretical Background of Job Satisfaction

One of the most comprehensive definitions of Job satisfaction has been proposed by Locke. He defines Job 
Satisfaction as “a self-reported, positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or from job 
experiences” (Locke, 1976). A thorough review of all related literature brought forth several interesting 
perspectives on job satisfaction. Campbell and his colleagues (Campbell, Dunnette, & Lawler, 1970) bifurcated 
these perspectives about job satisfaction into two generic categories—content theories and process theories. 
Content theories are based on the assumption that the satiation of needs results in job satisfaction. Several 
motivation and psychological theories are categorized as Content Theories by scholars. The objective of these 
models is to enlist, detail, and critically examine the factors that influence job satisfaction.

Maslow’s (1971) hierarchy of needs theory looks at the personal needs that an individual looks for in his 
interactions with his work environment. The employee’s needs direct him or her to act and present himself/herself in 
a manner that is acceptable to both the company and his/her colleagues. The Maslow model introduces a 
way for understanding the needs of the individual and the worker (Benson & Dundis, 2003). The Maslow model proposes that to be satisfactory, jobs have to cater to a variety of needs for the employee including:

1) Basic physiological needs,
2) Safety and security needs,
3) Socialization needs,
4) Esteem needs, and
5) Self actualization needs.

Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory strikes the right chord because of two compelling reasons; it puts forth both 
a theory of human motives by categorising human needs in a hierarchy, and a theory of human motivation that 
correlates these needs to general human behavior. Wahba and Bridwell’s (1975) conducted a factor analysis of 
the literature review on Maslow’s needs. The conclusions revealed that none of the researchers showed all of

Figure 5: Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs

Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory strikes the right chord because of two compelling reasons; it puts forth both 
a theory of human motives by categorising human needs in a hierarchy, and a theory of human motivation that 
correlates these needs to general human behavior. Wahba and Bridwell’s (1975) conducted a factor analysis of 
the literature review on Maslow’s needs. The conclusions revealed that none of the researchers showed all of
Maslow’s five needs categories as independent factors. The most debatable aspect of Maslow’s theory, however, is concerned with the concept of need in itself. There is evidence that employees seek motives and indulge in behaviors that are completely unrelated to the satisfaction of needs (Harlow, 1953; White, 1959). Maslow’s hierarchy is useful when the causes are intuitive, but when the reasons for motivation become less obscure due to social processes, the categories are difficult to define (Groves, Kahalas, & Erickson, 1975). Neher (1991) opines that people do have basic needs, but among these are needs that Maslow does not acknowledge as necessary for all round development. These needs are at a higher plane, for example, those that involve a great deal of organizational cultural input. This is certainly more than what is necessary to gratify needs of a lower order. In particular, many higher needs undoubtedly require encouragement from the environment for their development. Maslow’s theory is practical and understandable. The categorization of needs in a definite hierarchy from basic needs to self-actualization needs is what makes it most appealing. The broad theory of having to satisfy them in ascending order may be practically implementable in a stable world order where organizations provide employees with basic levels of satisfaction concerning security and provide certain conditions as a platform for progressing towards higher levels of fulfillment. However, contrary to this idealistic assumption, the business environment today is frustratingly dynamic. In this day and age of business, organizations are transforming by downsizing, restructuring, delaying, and reorganizing, all of which have left employees with low levels of confidence, trust, and loyalty towards their employers (Wooldridge, 1995). Maslow’s model conceptualizes employees’ motivational needs from lower levels to higher levels to the ultimate stage of self-actualization by viewing the individual in relation to the totality of his or her environment. However, Stum (2001) states that in today’s challenging environment, it may be better to view the employer/employee dynamic that takes place between an individual and the organization.

Frederick Herzberg (1959, 1966, 1968, 1976) proposes a two-factor theory of motivation and satisfaction. A generic assumption prior to the emergence of Herzberg’s two-factor theory stated that if an individual was dissatisfied with a factor related to their job, the desired level of satisfaction could be achieved by improving upon the factor. Herzberg and his colleagues developed the two-factor (or motivation-hygiene) theory which maintains that things which satisfy people in their work and things that dissatisfaction people in their work consist of mutually exclusive factors (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). This theory was a refreshing differentiator from the previously proposed hierarchy of needs theory of Maslow’s. Contrary to Maslow’s theory of motivation, which was centered around the extent of deficient need satisfaction, Herzberg’s theory is based on the belief that satisfaction is derived from intrinsic factors called motivators, yet dissatisfaction comes from extrinsic factors, termed hygiene factors (Egan, 2001; Shafritz & Ott, 2001).

Sergiovanni and Caver (1980) and Miskel’s (1982) criticism of Herzberg’s study is based on the critique that the study is method bound. That is, results are replicable only when the critical incident technique and in-depth interview methods are used. Other scholars also state the same criticism in their review of the two-factor theory and propound that the main factor limiting factor of Herzberg’s two-factor model is that it is bound by the critical incident method used in the original research (Miskel, 1982; Young & Davis, 1983). Hoy and Miskel (1982) and King (1970) opine that studies employing rating scales or other questionnaire schemata generally have not supported Herzberg’s two-factor theory. Herzberg’s two-factor theory is widely known in management circles, but several scholars have questioned its applicability to work environment settings (Ruthankoon & Ogunlana, 2003). However, Leach and Westbrook (2000), in their study of jobsatisfaction and motivation in a R&D environment, generally validate Herzberg’s theory.

As the work environment continues to change with rapid influences, there are several factors to be considered apart from the intrinsic need of employees. The influence of extrinsic elements also needs to be focused on. Process theories provide this distinct framework where the emphasis laid on the interaction of individual attitudes, values, and needs with characteristics of the job to create job satisfaction. These theories reject the supposition that job satisfaction can be affected by giving a person more of a variable that can lead to satisfaction (Gruneberg, 1979). According to Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory, people’s motivation for doing something will proportionate to the value they place on the potential outcomes. Porter and Lawler took Vroom’s theory further by connecting it to the amount of energy a person would be required to invest for a particular activity. In other words prior to obtaining the motivation to perform an activity, humans will have a tendency to calculate the value of the estimated outcome and the energy they are required to invest to achieve it. These factors largely determine how motivated they will be to take action (Porter & Lawler, 1986).

Other theories elucidated here speak of the breadth of job satisfaction and motivation research. The Agency Theory suggests that certain incentives will move the interests of managers more in line with the interests of owners. Equity theory suggests employees are satisfied and motivated when the ratio of their efforts to reward is proportionate to that of their co-workers. Control theory states that the more people feel they are in control of their lives and their jobs, the more they will be able to accept and acclimatize themselves to change. However, none of these theories are well researched, documented, or validated (Luthans, 2002).

One model that elicits particular interest because of its potential applicability to today’s changing global work environment is Hackman and Oldham’s (1975) theory of job characteristics. Their theory arises from the work
by Turner and Lawrence (1965) that examines the relationship between task attributes and job satisfaction in forty-seven industry jobs. From this and other research by Blood (1969), Blood and Hulin (1967), and Hackman and Lawler (1971), their theory suggests that employee attitudes and behaviors (such as employees’ need for personal growth and development at work) are responsible for their responses to the characteristics of the job. Hackman and Oldham (1975) pursued their work in motivation theory by developing not only a comprehensive model of work motivation, but also a measurement tool (the Job Diagnostic Survey) to identify the various components of their model. However, this theory and the model has been examined from another perspective in this study and will hence be described in detail in later parts.

B.3 Measurement of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been defined as the feeling an individual has about his or her job and one’s effectiveness in response to a situation (Locke, 1976). According to the study by Cranny, Smith, and Stone (1992), the traditional belief held by practitioners and researchers is that job satisfaction leads to certain behaviors. They posit that the satisfied worker is assumed to be generally more conscientious and hence, more productive. For example, overall performance ratings by supervisors have been found to be better for more persons who are more content in their jobs, according to Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). Lawler and Porter (1967) suggest that a person may behave in certain ways and then report his or her satisfaction to tally with or be in accordance with these behaviors. Moreover, Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) suggest that the level of satisfaction may also serve as a channel through which a person perceives the work situation. They suggest that satisfaction may not enter into a causal sequence at all, but may be merely a byproduct or epiphenomenon of the work situation, which in turn, causes an individual to report satisfaction in certain ways.

Other measurements of job satisfaction, which have been found in literature are personal correlates of job satisfaction. Researchers such as Dalton and Marcis (1987); Forgionne and Peters (1982); Mottaz, (1986); and Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), all indicate that physical characteristics and demographics such as age, gender, and race, and their relationship to job satisfaction have not been consistent or conclusive. All of these authors do suggest that the better predictor of satisfaction may be the proposition of promotional opportunity by the employer. The authors also suggest that there are individual differences in how important opportunity is to people based on individual differences in the form of a personality variable (Myers & McCaully, 1985). Cranny, Smith, and Stone (1992) contend that the JDI facet scales have helped to achieve the kinds of changes needed in particular work situations and to evaluate the success of interventions designed to bring about a higher level of satisfaction. As mentioned by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), changes are usually introduced in the hope that improvements in facet satisfaction will, in turn, affect broader areas of employee satisfaction.

The literature in job satisfaction has substantially contributed to the understanding of antecedents of job satisfaction using global measurements (Arnold et al., 2009; Babin and Boles, 1996; Kim et al., 2009). However, global measures of job satisfaction have been criticized because they have failed to provide an accurate assessment of individual aspects of job satisfaction (Churchill et al., 1974). In responding to the criticism against global measurements of job satisfaction, researchers have developed multifaceted job satisfaction scales (Churchill et al., 1974; Smith et al., 1969; Wood et al., 1986).

B.4 Job Satisfaction Related Constructs

A number of studies (Arvey et al., 1989; Ezzedeen, 2003; Griffin, 2001; Gu and Siu, 2009; Gunluet et al., 2010; Kusluvan and Kusluvan, 2005; McCain et al., 2010; Oshagbemi, 2000; Ryuet al., 2010; Spector, 1997; Tepeci and Bartlett, 2002) found that there are a number of factors affecting job satisfaction related to the establishment, such as employment status (permanent, temporary), duration of employment, location of the establishment, content of the work (the job itself and its components), designation, learning and growth opportunities, the work routine and timings, compensation, promotion and growth options, supervisory style of seniors and bosses, participation in the decision making process, dynamics within the organization and with colleagues, organizational culture, benefits and perks, job security, physical conditions, shifts, job-family adaptation, organizational support, employee empowerment, organizational climate, job orientation, understaffing and job-employee adaptation, as well as such demographic factors as age, gender, marital status, number of years of experience and level of education. Moreover, authors have emphasized the fact that evidence on which factors count more in job satisfaction is scant. Measuring job satisfaction provides feedback in terms of diagnosing potential problems as well as productivity issues (Flores and Rodríguez, 2008). New findings along with the new implementations make it necessary for management to employ them in order to be effective and efficient. The effects and extension of new findings and their managerial implications as well as perceptions of managers by employees will yield clues to the operational use of new findings and implementations.

Studies into psychological empowerment (Hechanovaet al., 2006; Dewettinck and Van Ameijde, 2007; Laschingertet al., 2004; Spreitzer, 1995, 1996; Spreitzeret al., 1997) pay particular attention to job satisfaction. What is more, studies of behavioral empowerment (Hardy and O’Sullivan, 1998; Saglam, 2003) and
psychological empowerment (Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Çöl, 2008; Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas and Velthouse, 1990) bring the question of the level of impact of behavioral and psychological empowerment on job satisfaction to the surface.

Employee empowerment is thought to enhance job satisfaction. For example, He et al. (2010) show that employee empowerment has positive effects on perceived service quality and job satisfaction. There has been a strong emphasis on the relation between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction in the studies performed (Aryee and Chen, 2006; Kuo et al., 2007; Sahin, 2007; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Wang and Lee, 2009). Behavioral empowerment, convenient communications, an atmosphere of trust, and motivational tools provided by employers lead to a positive impact on job satisfaction (Babin and Boles, 1996; Yoon et al., 2001). Employee empowerment bridges the gap between decision-makers and employees and thereby shortens the time duration of tasks. Any type of managerial style that can pave the way for developing the feeling of self-efficacy will yield employee empowerment. Empowered individuals will have an enhanced role in the organization, will take initiatives, and their participation in the activities of the organization will be enhanced.

Though research has focused on the psychological impact of job satisfaction and other constructs, little evidence is found to connect employee performance appraisal perceptions and job satisfaction. An attempt is made in this research to support this theory.

### III. Conclusion

An attempt has been made in this research article to establish a conceptual debate centering around the various aspects of the Big 5 Personality Traits, Job Satisfaction and their relationship with Perceived Employee Appraisal Satisfaction. There are several other variables that have not been included in this research. Organisational, System Related and other Job related factors have not been analyzed in depth.

### Bibliography and References

Abdula M, Adam Y, Kahn Z. 1999. Assessing health staff performance in Mozambique: the perspectives of the public and private sector. Research paper produced for the study Measuring Staff Performance in reforming health systems funded through a research grant of the European Union


Armstrong M and Baron A. 2010 Armstrong’s Handbook of Performance Management, Kogan Page


Babin, Barry and James S Boles (1996), 'The Effects of Perceived Co-worker Involvement and Supervisor Support on Service Provider Role Stress, Performance, and Job Satisfaction,” Journal of Retailing 72 (Spring), 57-77.


Caska, P. C I Bamber; J M Sharp; P Belohoubek. 2001 Factors affecting successful implementation of high performance teams Team Performance Management; 2001; 7, 7/8: ABI/INFORM Global


Gilles E St Amant, Claire IsaBelle, Helene Fournier 2008 , A current literature review of the concept of performance in virtual teams, National Library of Canada


Koonz, Harold, Making MBO Effective, California Management Review (pre-1986); Fall 1977; 20, 000001


Martínez J, 2000. Managing Staff Performance in Developing Countries: Issues and lessons from an international research study. Draft report from a research study funded by the European Union.


Mirza, Saleem, 2005 ; Job Satisfaction Among Research And Development Scientists: The Relationship Of Leadership Practices And Job Characteristics; Thesis submitted to Capella University, June, 2005


Murphy, Kevin R; Garcia, Magda; Kerker, Shanta; Martin, Carmen; Balzer, William K. Relationship Between Observational Accuracy and Accuracy in Evaluating Performance Journal of Applied Psychology 67.3 (Jun 1982): 320.


Raja, Usman; ‘The Relationship of the Big Five Personality Dimensions to Personal and Organizational Outcomes: Answering the Questions Who? and When?’ Thesis submitted to John Molson School of Business Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada


Sangeetha Vasudevan, American International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, 8(1), September-November, 2014, pp. 10-23


Schneider, Benjamin; Goldstein, Harold W; Smith, D Brent; The ASA framework: An update; Personnel Psychology 38.4 (Winter 1995): 747.


Gower, Aidershot.


Walsh, Marie Burns (2003) Perceived Fairness Of And Satisfaction With Employee Performance Appraisal, The School of Human Resource Education and Workforce Development, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College


Williams, Kevin J; DeNisi, Angelo S; Blencoe, Allyn G; Cafferty, Thomas P. The Role of Appraisal Purpose: Effects of Purpose on Information Acquisition and Utilization; Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 35.3 (Jun 1985): 314.


