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ABSTRACT

There is relatively little research based on the Big Five personality dimensions and job satisfaction and the relationship thereof. Job satisfaction of employees is a good indication of organizational effectiveness and is influenced by organizational and dispositional factors. The fundamental nature of the dispositional approach is that individuals have stable traits that significantly influence their affective and behavioral reactions to organizational settings. The general objective of this study was to determine the relationship between personality dimensions and job satisfaction of bank employees. A quantitative design was used in the empirical study. The sample consisted of 126 bank employees. The current research found that employees who are high in openness, conscientiousness and low in neuroticism tend to be more satisfied with their job. Agreeableness personality did not have a significant relationship with job satisfaction, while employees with high levels of extraversion had negative significant correlation with job satisfaction. However, overall personality dimensions explained relatively small percentages in the variance of job satisfaction. The findings will aid management institutions in selecting, and retaining employees as higher job satisfaction is linked to higher levels of productivity, effectiveness and commitment.

Key words: extroversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, job satisfaction, bank employees.
LIST OF ACRONYMS

ABSA - Amalgamated Banks of South Africa

FNB - First National Bank

O – Openness to experience

C – conscientiousness

E – extraversion-introversion

A - agreeableness

N - neuroticism
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

Job satisfaction is described by Judge, Parker, Colbert, Heller & Ilies (2001a) as one of the most frequently researched constructs in Industrial/Organizational psychology and organizational behavior research. Locke, (1976, cited in Sempane, Rieger & Roodt, 2002:23) defines job satisfaction "a pleasurable or a positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience." Buitendach & de 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 et al., 2002).

The majority of job satisfaction and motivation research literature is concerned with organisational or situational predictors (such as pay and supervision) (Locke, 1976) while neglecting individual differences (Staw & Ross, 1985). Most of this research therefore, relies on factors such as co-workers, promotions and salaries as the only factors that may have an impact on job satisfaction. However this study will look at individual difference, which is the personality of an individual and how it affects job satisfaction. This comes from the assumption that when an individual is in a job situation that suits their personality they are more satisfied than individuals with a contrasting personality. For example, in the case of bank employees tellers who have an extraversion personality will be satisfied as their job allows them to be friendly and
communicate directly with their consumers. Therefore, one can agree that personality has an effect on the way individuals perform their work.

Barrick & Mount are of the view that personality is good predictor of those behaviors, which are impossible to anticipate using general mental abilities, knowledge, adroitness and concrete situations, (Barrick & Mount, 2005). An individual’s behavior is determined by his personality characteristics and situational factors, which are changeable in time. In order to exchange and predict job satisfaction, knowledge about the individual’s personality characteristics and his surroundings is required.

According to Seta, Paulus & Baron (2000), personality is defined as “those feelings, thoughts, desires, and tendencies toward behavior that contribute to a person’s individuality” Personality refers to the totality of an individual’s behavioral and emotional characteristics. It embraces a person’s moods, attitudes, opinions, motivations and style of thinking, perceiving, speaking and acting (American Psychological Association: Psychology topics, Available at <http://www.apa.org/topics/personality>). Personality influences how others interact with individuals and how they evaluate and reward or punish them. Personality affects how individuals experience work events and work conditions, and how they emotionally and behaviorally react to them. Personality also affects the selective recall of events.

Cable & Judge (1994) assert that people begin this process by selecting into vocations that match their personalities. For example if a person has an openness personality trait he/she will look for work which allows for innovation and creative thinking such as being an artist or working in information technology. Research by Cable & Judge (1994) and
Judge & Cable (1997) renders evidence that applicants pro-actively choose organizational environments based on individual preferences such as reward systems and cultures that fit their personalities.

1.2 Problem statement

Despite contributions to our understanding of the causes of job satisfaction, one of the limitations in this literature is that it is not yet informative on how exactly dispositions affect job satisfaction. Therefore, there is a need to explore the psychological processes that underlie dispositional causes of job satisfaction. Lack of job satisfaction among employees lead to less productivity, low employee retention, high absenteeism and low morale. In light of the fact that research on the relationship between job satisfaction and the big five personality traits particularly in the South African banking sector, appears to be limited. The study reported on here set out to add empirical research to the current conceptual base relating to the relationship between these variables as manifested in the banking sector.

1.3 Purpose of study

According to Meyer (1999), most South African employees experience a lack of job satisfaction resulting in a low level of employee commitment that, in turn, impacts on performance and the achievement of organizational goals. Low job satisfaction may result in low productivity, high absenteeism, labour unrest, industrial action and high labour turnover which are detrimental to the organization. Hence the purpose of this study is to have a better understanding of how the big five personality traits influence...
job satisfaction and to be able to derive recommendations on recruitment, selection and placement of employees.

1.4 Objectives of the study

i) To investigate if there is a relationship between personality and job satisfaction among bank employees.

ii) To make recommendations to the banking organizations in recruiting, selecting and placing of employees in their jobs so that they will be a person-job fit to avoid dissatisfaction.

1.5 Hypothesis

Hypothesis 1

H$_0$: There is no significant relationship between the agreeableness trait and job satisfaction among bank employees

H$_1$: There is a significant relationship between the agreeableness trait and job satisfaction among bank employees

Hypothesis 2

H$_0$: There is no significant relationship between the conscientiousness trait and job satisfaction among bank employees

H$_1$: There is a significant relationship between the conscientiousness trait and job satisfaction among bank employees
Hypothesis 3

Hₐ: There is no significant relationship between the openness trait and job satisfaction among bank employees

H₁: There is a significant relationship between the openness trait and job satisfaction among bank employees

Hypothesis 4

H₀: There is no significant relationship between the extraversion trait and job satisfaction among bank employees

H₁: There is a significant relationship between the extraversion trait and job satisfaction among bank employees

Hypothesis 5

H₀: There is no significant relationship between the neuroticism trait and job satisfaction among bank employees

H₁: There is a significant relationship between the neuroticism trait and job satisfaction among bank employees

1.6 Significance of the study

Job satisfaction influences an organization’s well-being with regard to job productivity, employee turnover, absenteeism and life satisfaction (Spector, 2008). Schein (1996), asserts that motivated employees are crucial to an organization’s success hence understanding people in their jobs and what motivates them could be a driving force in
strengthening organisational commitment. Therefore it is crucial to understand how personality traits affects job satisfaction to improve the selection, recruitment and placing processes in organizations. It also helps individuals to choose their field of study with an understanding of their personality to avoid dissatisfaction as it impacts negatively on their working lives.

1.7 Definitions of key concepts

1.7.1 Job satisfaction

Spector (1997) relates job satisfaction to how people feel about their jobs, which includes the different aspects of their jobs such as promotion opportunities or relation to colleagues. Ellickson & Logsdon (2002) support this view by defining job satisfaction as the extent to which employees like their work.

1.7.2 Personality

Personality is defined as “those feelings, thoughts, desires, and tendencies toward behavior that contribute to a person’s individuality” (Seta et al., 2000). Personality traits can be described in terms of five basic factors, which are extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience (Costa & McCrae, 1992). These five are used in this study.
1.8 Theoretical framework

Person fit environment models

According to Chatman (1989), the fit between the person and the environment at work influences job satisfaction. One group of researchers has agreed that it is the situation which is primarily responsible for individual behaviours (Mischel, 1968; Davis-Blake & Pfeffer, 1989), while another group of researchers believes that the personal characteristics are primarily responsible for behaviour (Epstain, 1979; House, Shane & Herold, 1996).

The concept of P-E fit is grounded in the interactionist theory of behaviour (Chatman, 1989; Muchinsky & Monohan, 1987). The interactionist perspective begins with Lewin's (1951) proposition that behaviour is a function of the person and the environment. This view asserts that neither personal characteristics nor the situation alone adequately explain the variance in behavioral and attitudinal variables. Instead the interaction of personal and situational variables accounts for the greatest variance. The P-E fit is defined as the degree of congruence or match between personal and situational variables in producing the significant selected outcomes (Muchinsky & Monohan, 1987) such as job satisfaction and job performance.

The person-environment fit theory has been identified as a way of studying the fit between the job characteristics and the abilities and needs of the individual holding the job. Bowling, Beehr & Lepisto (2006) found that job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job involvement, career commitment and career satisfaction are significantly stable over time. Thus, it is possible that what causes individuals to feel
satisfied or dissatisfied is ingrained within themselves, such as their dispositional traits. Larsen & Ketelaar (1991) concluded that dispositional traits effects are best considered as a person’s average level or their typical emotion.

The concept of the person-environment fit basically indicates that the alignment between characteristics of people and their environment results in a positive outcome for both individual and organization (e.g. Schneider, Smith & Goldstein, 1995). This may mean that a good fit may lead to organization effectiveness and high performance at the same time employees will be satisfied with their work which leads to self actualization and lower stress levels. As reviewed in various articles (e.g. Edwards, 1991; Kristoff, 1996; Sekiguchi, 2003), several distinct constructs evolved from the P-E fit concept including an individual fit with the job (P-J fit), group (P-G fit), organizations (P-O fit) and vocation or occupation fit (P-V fit). For this study the P-J will be focused on more.

The Person-Job (P-J) fit is defined as the compatibility between a person’s characteristics and those of the job or task that he/she performs at work (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006). It has been found that when employees’ self-concept, abilities, personality traits, and preferences are in alignment with what their job requires it leads to increases in employee satisfaction, job performance, and other positive individual outcomes (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006, Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, Johnson, 2005).

In terms of applying personality to the P-J fit conceptualization, it is important to consider that certain jobs and job tasks require different personality traits. A job which involves a great deal of interpersonal relations may require an individual to be agreeable and extraverted in order to perform at a high level. For example, those
individuals who are extraverted may have a stronger ability to deal with job tasks of an interpersonal nature.

If individuals are high on a given personality trait, they will have a preference for job characteristics which are in line with this personality trait. If these preferences are matched with the characteristics of the job, a high P-J fit will be achieved. The job characteristics will then activate the relevant personality traits and this activation will lead to increased motivation and therefore result in increased job performance and job satisfaction. In contrast a low P-E fit is likely to result in dissatisfaction and ultimately leaving the occupation.

For example in the banking sector employees hold different positions. These may include tellers, teller’s supervisors, customer service and sales consultants, branch and assistant managers, loan officers and clerks. This model can be applicable to this study as it focuses on how personality affects job satisfaction. Hence the P-E fit suggests that there be a match between individuals’ personality and the positions they occupy.

To give a general view or assumption, it can be said that an effective bank teller must have an extraverted personality, as extroverts are warm, exhibit positive emotions and are sociable; hence, they perform well in sociable environments. Or consultants may have a low neuroticism personality, as low neurotic individuals are self-confident and tolerant to stress; hence, it helps them to built credibility and trust with clients. Also, one may say that managerial positions may require an individual who is high on agreeableness traits, as they are concerned with others’ well being hence, they create fair environment. And overall one can say in all positions individuals may have a
conscientiousness personality, as this provides for aiming for achievement, acting dutifully, being organized and efficient. Therefore, personality affects how individuals gain satisfaction with their work.

1.9 Delimitation of the study

Delimitation is about demarcating a study in order to make it more manageable. This study was delimited to ABSA, FNB and Standard Banks in East London, King Williams Town and Alice.

1.9.1 Size of the organisations

The organizations selected for this study are ABSA, Standard and FNB banks in East London, King Williams Town and Alice. These banks are small and in small towns and are composed of an estimated 30 employees per bank in an area; hence, there are about 250 employees in all the banks. Employees were be sampled according to subgroups of different departments which offer bank services to people.

1.9.2 Type of organisation

This study was limited to ABSA, FNB and Standard Bank. In the study, employees of these banks were used as the sample for the study.

1.9.3 Geographical demarcation

The study focused only on East London, King Williams Town and Alice, in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa.

1.9.4 Unit of analysis

The study was limited to employees of ABSA, FNB and Standard Bank.
1.9.5 Subject of evaluation
The subject of evaluation in this study is the relationship between the five personality traits and job satisfaction.

1.10 Outline of the study

Chapter 1: Introduction and background of the study

The chapter provides the background of the study in relation to what is known nationally and globally and points to the problem that led to the research. The chapter includes the problem statement of the research, objectives and hypotheses, significance of the study, theoretical framework and definition of key concepts.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter will provide a detailed literature review of the South African banking sector, the big five personality traits and job satisfaction among employees. The relationship between the big five personality traits and job satisfaction will be given special attention.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

This chapter provides a background and the methods which will be used in the study. It covers the research methodology in terms of the appropriate and relevant application of the various techniques in accordance with the fundamental principles and practices of research methodology.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis

Chapter 4 will focus on the comprehensive interpretation and analysis of the research results using quantitative analysis. Tables and graphs will be used to illustrate the results. Other statistical analysis will be used to test for the relationship between personality and job satisfaction.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Recommendations and Conclusions

This chapter will provide information for further research, as well as discussions and recommendations. The limitations and discussion of the results will also be provided in this chapter.

1.11 Conclusion

This chapter introduced and outlined the background of the study; it also stated the problem statement and significance of the study. The next chapter will provide the literature review of the relevant literature related to the subject of this study.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter looked at the background of the South African Banking Sector. Also this chapter discussed on aspects of job satisfaction such as remuneration, promotion, co-workers, work and supervision that are provided in previous related studies. Further, a detailed literature review on the big five personality traits which are, neuroticism, agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness and extraversion were briefly discussed. The chapter further extended to give another detailed review of the relationship between personality and job satisfaction.

2.2 The South African Banking sector
In a speech, South African Registrar of Banks stated that “…financial stability serves as a precondition for the growth of the economy of any country” (Kemp, 2002:2). Banks are the custodians or keepers of the community savings hence, it is paramount for them to be financially stable and growing. In South Africa, the banking sector has a few large financially strong banks and a number of small banks. Some foreign banks also operate in South Africa, as they also have branches in other countries. At the end of 2007, 33 banks were registered with the Office of the Registrar of Banks. A further 46 foreign banks had authorized representative offices in South Africa.

The South African banking industry is dominated by five major banking groups namely the Amalgamated Banks of South Africa Group Limited (ABSA), FirstRand Holdings Limited (FNB), Nedcor Limited (Nedbank), Standard Bank Investment Corporation
Limited (Standard Bank) and African Bank (De Wee, 2009). However, for the purpose of this study, only the three largest banking groups (ABSA, FNB and Standard Bank) will be investigated as these three groups together control 84% of South Africa’s banking market (South African Reserve Bank, 2008:55).

According to KPMG’s 2002 banking survey, changes in the South African banking industry over the past decade resulted in a banking system that is relatively well developed with excellent regulatory, legal and accounting infrastructures (Kemp, 2002). The 2008 press release by FinScope revealed that the sophisticated South African banking industry is allowing the country to become a more financial inclusive society (Banking comes to more people, 2008). This is supported by Van den Berg (2009) who states that the South African banking industry is well developed and properly regulated by the South African Reserve Bank (SARB). Metcalfe (2003) indicates that the retail banking industry in South Africa is a complex and competitive environment.

The profitability of local banks is regarded as “good”, but it is not at the same level as in some other developing markets. The South African banking industry serves a market that is relatively small when compared to international banking industries. The profitability of South African banks improved from 4.6% in 2002 to only 9.8% in 2003 (South African Reserve Bank, 2004:12). The latest statistics show that South African banks report profit margins for their retail banking sections of between 10% and 20% (Metcalfe, 2009:41). Metcalfe (2009:8) also states that the profitability of South African banks has been slightly been negatively affected (decreased slightly) over the past few years.
The South African banking industry plays an important role in the constancy of the country’s economy. Similarly Appel (2008), asserts that the financial services industry is one of the two most significant contributors to growth in South Africa’s service sector; the other being construction. The efficiency of South Africa’s financial system, including its banking industry, is of vital to ensure the efficiency of the complete economy (Competition in South African Banking, 2004:4). If a country wishes to attract investments, it must have a solid and profitable banking industry (Goosen et al., 1999:187). The functions performed by the banking industry affect all aspects of a country’s economy and are central to the overall performance of the economy. The banking industry represents many employees because at the end of 2007, 139 149 people were employed in the banking industry (South Africa Yearbook, 2008/09:229-230).

Banks offer five main categories of services, namely cash accessibility, asset security, money transfers, loans and financial advice (Meidan, 1996:8). Banks need to make clients’ funds available to them through various mediums, as required. Banks provide asset security to their clients through safes and by ensuring the safety of money deposits. Money transfers refer to the banking service of moving clients’ funds from one account to another, including payment services to external parties. A bank needs to provide the service of loans or deferred payments to its clients. Lastly, banks provide financial advice, including advice on investments, wills taxation, leasing, mergers and personal financial planning.

Basically banking is a service industry. It seems to be a mirror, a binding status between the customer and the bank. It is not only the customers’ success in doing business that
provides a lot of profit, but the banks achieve their target and gain profit from running businesses with customers. It can be concluded that in order for banks to be successful in their operation, they must be equipped with quality personnel and able to provide good services to the customer.

In this ever-increasingly competitive, complex and challenging business environment, banks need to ensure they retain their current, profitable clients (increase customer retention) in order to survive. This is only possible if the banks are determined to attract and retain clients. Support and loyalty from clients are ensured through acceptable customer service. The banking industry is one of the most competitive industries as far as customer service is concerned (Banking, 2004). Clients are faced with an array of financial services, expect customized offerings, value, ease of access and personalization from their financial service providers. These market forces lead to one overwhelming strategic imperative, namely a customer-focused strategy. The success of a firm’s business model depends on the firm’s ability to build and sustain long-term and profitable relationships with its clients (Sweeney & Swai, 2008:179 and Customer relationship management, 2004). It is a well established fact, as has been motivated in the sections above, that the best customer service can be rendered through the implementation of relevant relationship marketing strategies that ensure customer retention.

Several researches have argued that good service often comes from employees who possess a good personality and emotional intelligence. Employees with a high dimension of personality can adapt themselves easily to new working environments, obtain achievement and produce high quality work, increase job satisfaction and
diminish the boredom of the job environment (Chin, 1983). It can be explained that personality is an essential index for the measurement of career, which is in accordance with Holland (1996) who says that personality influences person’s choice of career. A person will pursue a career that suits his/her personality. It can therefore be seen that personality is an important indicator for any individual person to consider when choosing his own career, or for any organization such as a bank to place its employee in the right jobs.

2.2.1 ABSA

The banking group, now known as ABSA, was founded in 1986 and was listed on the JSE during the same year (Profile's Stock Exchange Handbook February 2010 - May 2010). However, only in 1996 was ABSA formed through an amalgamation of four South African banks, namely Allied Bank, Trust Bank, United Bank and Volkskas (Bosch et al., 2006:743). ABSA provides financial products and services by following a customer-oriented approach. Its main target market is South Africans in the middle income class who earn between R40 000 and R400 000 per year. ABSA also attempts to focus on the youth, students and senior markets (ABSA Group Annual Report, 2004:120).

Barclays Bank Plc took control of ABSA in 2005 (Whitfield, 2006:12) and now owns 58.6% of ABSA (Metcalfe, 2009:67). ABSA operates in South Africa, Mozambique (Barclays Bank Mozambique SA), Angola (Banco Comercial Angolano) and Tanzania (National Bank of Commerce) (Metcalfe, 2009:67 and ABSA Group Limited, 2008:12). ABSA employed more than 33 000 people in its retail banking division in 2008 and at the time approximately 45 000 people were employees of the whole ABSA Group.
According to the Profiles Stock Exchange Handbook (February 2010 - May 2010), ABSA currently has 36,920 permanent employees. It has 10.7 million South African banking clients (Metcalfe, 2009:67) and was the first South African bank to acquire one million Internet banking clients (Van Zyl, 2009).

ABSA already indicated in its Group’s Annual Report of 2004 that it focuses on building relationships with new markets, for example, the black middle income class, and also on the retention of existing clients through product and service delivery improvements (ABSA Group Annual Report 2004:120). ABSA realises the importance of relationship marketing as it emphasises its focus on customer interaction. The bank is moving away from being a transaction-focused business toward an increasingly customer-centric approach.

In 2008 ABSA was awarded the “Number-one Banking Brand” and “Coolest Bank” titles for the third consecutive year and was rated as the leading financial services institution among the top five employers in South Africa. In terms of ethical achievements in 2008, the ABSA Group was identified as the leader in corporate social investment. ABSA’s most recent highlights include their increased levels of customer service (as measured by the Ask Afrika Orange Index survey) and their increased use of technological product and service delivery channels. (ABSA Group Limited, 2008:3, 5, 55). The goals of ABSA, in terms of their retail banking include an increased focus on client retention, better communication with clients to ensure added word-of-mouth recommendations to attract new clients and the acquisition of highly skilled and talented employees (ABSA Group Limited, 2008:4).
2.2.2 Standard Bank

Standard Bank was founded in 1969 and listed on the JSE in 1970 (Profile’s Stock Exchange Handbook February 2010 - May 2010). Standard Bank’s operations extend over 17 African countries, and the bank also has operations in 19 countries outside Africa. Standard Bank is known for its focus on providing banking products and services to emerging markets.

Approximately 30 000 Standard Bank employees work in South Africa and in total the bank employs around 50 000 people worldwide. At the end of 2008, Standard Bank had a market capitalisation value of R127 billion (Metcalf, 2009:67). According to the Profile’s Stock Exchange Handbook (February 2010 - May 2010), Standard Bank’s marketing capitalisation was standing at approximately R151 billion in December 2009. Standard Bank’s key international markets are based in Europe, the Americas and Asia, with a total of 50 321 employees in June 2009 (Profile’s Stock Exchange Handbook February - May 2010).


2.2.3 FNB

FNB is part of the FirstRand Ltd financial services group listed on the JSE and the Namibian Stock Exchange (Profile’s Stock Exchange Handbook February 2010 - May 2010). FNB was formed as the Eastern Province Bank in Grahamstown in 1838.
Following a number of acquisitions and take-overs, the First National Bank of South Africa Limited emerged as a wholly South African owned and controlled entity in 1987 (The History of First National Bank n.d.). A major development in the bank’s history occurred in 1998 when the financial services interests of Rand Merchant Bank Holdings and Anglo-American were merged to form FirstRand Limited. FNB became a wholly owned subsidiary of FirstRand and currently trades as a division of FirstRand Limited.

The bank offers a range of banking products and services and also has operations in Swaziland, Botswana and Namibia (The History of First National Bank n.d.). FNB focuses on the South African market and provides niche products and services to selected international markets (Profile’s Stock Exchange Handbook February 2010 - May 2010). Angola and Zambia are among some of the East and West African countries that are being investigated as possible areas for increased FNB operations. FNB’s international growth prospects focus on a possible presence in India (where the bank already has a representative office in Mumbai) and Brazil (FirstRand Annual Report, 2008:13).

Approximately 31 000 employees were employed by FNB at the end of 2008 (Metcalf, 2009:67). In June 2009 FirstRand Ltd reported that its ordinary shareholders’ interest amounted to R45 485 million and it realized a return on shareholders’ funds of 12.48%. The FirstRand Group’s market capitalization amounted to over R99 billion in December 2009. (Profile’s Stock Exchange Handbook February 2010 - May 2010). According to statistics in The Banker (2008), FNB was ranked second largest in the South African banking industry in 2008.
FirstRand’s 2008 Annual Report states that the group, including FNB, strives towards the highest standards in good corporate citizenship and that they focus on sustainable business operations, protecting the environment, and their responsibility toward all its stakeholders, including its clients. The FirstRand group specifically measure their carbon footprint, emphasizes its goal of reducing its impact on the environment and focus on maintaining high ethical standards. In addition, FirstRand emphasises the importance of employee innovation, which stresses empowerment, open and honest communication and transparent pricing with increases below inflation (FirstRand Annual Report, 2008:54-58). This shows that FirstRand, and, therefore, FNB considers ethics, empowerment, communication and fees as important aspects in its operations.

2.3 Job satisfaction

Hoppock (1935) introduced the concept of job satisfaction in his book *Job Satisfaction*. He believed that job satisfaction is a worker's physiological and psychological feeling. It has been defined by Hoppock (1935) as “employees’ satisfactory feelings on working conditions and others factors, either mental or physical”; in other words, it is employees’ subjective response to working conditions.

It is perceived as an attitudinal variable measuring the degree to which employees like their jobs and the various aspects of their jobs (Spector, 1996). Individuals therefore evaluate their jobs on the basis of factors which they regard as being important to them (Sempane *et al.*, 2002). For example if more salary or opportunities for promotion are important to a person he/she will be satisfied with an organization which offers the incentives that one considers crucial. Job satisfaction is an important variable to study
as it enhances job performance, positive work values, high levels of employee motivation, and lower rates of absenteeism, turnover and burnout (Tharenou, 1993).

One of the biggest preludes to the study of job satisfaction was the Hawthorne studies. These studies (1924–1933), primarily credited to Elton Mayo of the Harvard Business School, sought to find the effects of various conditions (most notably illumination) on workers’ productivity. These studies ultimately showed that novel changes in work conditions temporarily increase productivity (called the Hawthorne Effect). It was later found that this increase resulted, not from the new conditions, but from the knowledge of being observed. This finding provided strong evidence that people work for purposes other than pay, which paved the way for researchers to investigate other factors in job satisfaction.

Additionally, job satisfaction has emotional, cognitive and behavioral components (Spector, 1996). The emotional component refers to feelings regarding the job, such as boredom, anxiety, or excitement. The cognitive component of job satisfaction refers to beliefs regarding one’s job, for example, feeling that one’s job is mentally demanding and challenging. Finally, the behavioral component includes people’s actions in relation to their work. These actions may include being tardy, staying late, or pretending to be ill in order to avoid work.

Job satisfaction is a complex and multifaceted concept which can mean different things to different people. Job satisfaction is usually linked with motivation, but the nature of this relationship is not clear. Satisfaction is not the same as motivation. Job satisfaction is more of an attitude, an internal state. It could, for example, be associated with a
personal feeling of achievement, either quantitative or qualitative (Mullins, 2005). According to Mullins (1998), the level of job satisfaction is affected by social, personal, cultural, environmental, and organisational factors. The content theories of motivation can be seen as more related to satisfaction than to motivation. For example, Herzberg’s theory is considered as a theory of job satisfaction related to motivation at work (Mullins, 1998). The content theories suggest unsatisfied needs lead to an unstable situation and state of tension.

Spector (1997) denotes that the important influences of job satisfaction can be classified into two major categories. First, the job environment itself and factors associated with the work an individual does. This includes how people are treated, the nature of the job tasks, relations with other people at work and the rewards that work conveys. Secondly, there are individual factors that the person brings to the job. These include both personality and prior experience. The above two categories together influence employee job satisfaction. Job satisfaction includes the following two types:

i. Intrinsic satisfaction: the sense of achievement, social status, and other satisfaction resulting from job variety, stability, independence, creativity, and the opportunity to demonstrate capabilities, such as, intangible inner feelings.

ii. Extrinsic satisfaction: the satisfaction from promotion, compensation, acknowledgement, super ordinates’ decision capacity, and peer relationship.
2.3.1 Facets of Job Satisfaction

A facet of job satisfaction can be described as any part of a job that produces feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Spector 1997). This perspective can be a useful tool to management as they can identify areas which need improvement thereby increasing employee retention and employees who are satisfied with their job.

Locke (1976, cited in Sempane et al., 2002) presented a summary of job dimensions that have been established to contribute significantly to employees' job satisfaction. The particular dimensions represent characteristics associated with job satisfaction. The dimensions are the work itself, pay, promotions, recognition, benefits, supervision and co-workers. This is postulated to influence employees' opinion of “how interesting the work is, how routine, how well they are doing, and, in general, how much they enjoy doing it” (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985:309). The work itself and recognition are part of the intrinsic satisfaction while benefits, supervision, benefits and co workers are part of the extrinsic satisfaction.

2.3.1.1 The work itself

Robbins et al., (2003, p. 77) refer to the work itself as “the extent to which the job provides the individual with stimulating tasks, opportunities for learning and personal growth, and the chance to be responsible and accountable for results. "Work is stated as “the tasks that have to be done” by Collins South African Thesaurus, (2004:655). In addition, it is defined as “something you have to do that needs effort and energy” (South African Oxford School Dictionary, 2004:253). Employee job satisfaction is dependent on satisfaction with the job components, such as the work itself.
Specific job characteristics lead to positive psychological states such as experiencing the meaningfulness of work, feelings of responsibility and knowledge about the products of the work, which in turn lead to satisfaction with the job (Judge, Bono & Locke 2000). Hackman and Oldham’s Job Characteristics Model identified five core dimensions of job complexity (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). It is composed of feedback, autonomy, task identity, task significance, and skill variety. According to Hunter (2006), complex or rich jobs are expected to increase both job satisfaction and job performance for employees. These core dimensions are explained below.

Skill variety is ostensible variety and intricacy of skills and talents required by a job to perform it (Buys, Olckers & Schaap, 2007). For example a teller must be computer literate and good at calculations. Therefore employees must have a variety of skills so that they perform their jobs effectively. Skill variety in an organization may be gained through training and also through job rotation.

Task identity requires a worker to perform all the tasks necessary to complete the job from the beginning to the end of the production process; whereas, the worker’s feeling for his job that it is meaningful for his colleagues and organization because of its impact upon them is termed task significance (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Sharma & Bhaskar (1991) postulate that the single most important influence on a person’s job satisfaction experience comes from the nature of the work assigned to him/her by the organization. It shows that if the job entails adequate variety, challenge, discretion and scope for using one’s own abilities and skills, the employee doing the job is likely to experience job satisfaction. Hence employees need to do jobs which they can be identified with, which shows that they are valuable assets to the organization.
According to Buyse et al. (2007) job autonomy is when a job provides its owner the freedom and power to exercise his own authority while making a decision is the job feature of autonomy. Autonomy gives rise to feelings of responsibility and accountability. When an individual is given authority to make decision on their own there are most satisfied as they view themselves as confident and valuable to the organization. Mentally challenging work that the individual can successfully accomplish, is satisfying and employees prefer jobs that provide them with opportunities to use their skills and abilities that offer a variety of tasks, freedom, and feedback regarding performance, is valued by most employees (Larwood, 1984; Luthans, 1992; Robbins, 1998, Tziner & Latham, 1989). Accordingly, Robbins (1998:152) argues that “under conditions of moderate challenge, most employees will experience pleasure and satisfaction.” Similarly, Culpin & Wright (2002) found in their study of job satisfaction amongst expatriate women managers, that they enjoyed the expansion of their job responsibilities. These women’s job satisfaction increased as they saw the significant impact of their job on their employees.

When employees get direct and clear information about their performance on the job it is known as the feedback characteristic of the job (Hunter, 2006). Knowledge about the products of work is gained through job feedback. Employees who receive feedback on their jobs will gain much knowledge on how to perform their work even better. Feedback may come as praise for the good work which leads to job satisfaction and increasing motivation. Also it may come as information for the need to improve on certain aspects, which the individual will work on to be more effective.
Recognition for good work (i.e., feedback) was found to be an important factor for satisfaction in commercial banks (Matubber & Miah, 2001). When employees are recognised for a task well done it gives them a sense of self actualization and they feel important. This may be the same with feedback which is given to the employees usually by their superiors.

When these characteristics are combined, the scope and complexity of a job is defined. High scope results in high levels of job satisfaction, while low scope leads to boredom and dissatisfaction. Aspects of the job and the organisational environment relate to job satisfaction, and as a result some situations produce positive job satisfaction, while others produce job dissatisfaction (Spector 2008).

In a research survey by Grant, Fried & Juillerat (2010) at a large bank, managers found that bank tellers were very dissatisfied with their jobs, stating that they were "just glorified clerks". They also said that their jobs were boring and that they felt micromanaged because they were unable to make decisions, even small ones, without the approval of their managers. In this case, the managers of the bank decided to re-design the teller jobs to increase job satisfaction. New tasks were added to provide variety and the use of a broad range of skills. In addition to their check cashing, deposit and loan payment tasks, they were trained to handle commercial and traveler’s checks and post payments on line. The tellers were also given more autonomy in their roles; they were given decision-making responsibilities. Finally, when feedback time approached, the managers felt that by re-designing the role of the teller they were giving the tellers responsibility for their own customers. In this particular case, it was found
that job satisfaction increased. Hence, the nature of the work influences job satisfaction.

2.3.1.2 Remuneration (Pay)

Heery & Noon (2001:306) define remuneration as “payment for work, which can assume a number of different forms, including a basic wage or salary, supplementary cash payments, such as shift pay and overtime pay, and benefits in kind.” According to Erasmus, van Wyk & Schenk (2001:526), remuneration is defined as “the financial and non financial extrinsic rewards provided by an employer for the time, skills and effort made available by the employee in fulfilling job requirements aimed at achieving organisational objectives.” Concepts such as pay, wage or salary is occasionally used as more or less having the same meaning as remuneration (Erasmus et al., 2001). Remuneration and earnings are a cognitively complex and multidimensional factor in job satisfaction. According to Luthans (1998), salaries do not only assist people to attain their basic needs, but it is also instrumental in satisfying the higher level needs of people. Included in the category of compensation are such items as medical aid schemes, pension schemes, bonuses, paid leave and travel allowances.

According to Boone & Kuntz (1992), offering employees fair and reasonable compensation, which relates to the input the employee offers the organization, should be the main objective of any compensation system. This means that for employees to consider their compensation to be fair it must relate to the input they offer the organization. They compare their inputs to received outputs relevant to that of others (Nel et al., 2004). If one feels that one’s work is not being compensated well they feel dissatisfied with their work which may lead to a low performance level. This view is
supported by Sweeney & McFarlin (2005), who concur that comparisons with similar others are important predictors of pay satisfaction. Their study, which was based on the social comparison theory, highlighted the fact that comparisons to similar others impacts on pay satisfaction. According to Boggie (2005), inequity in terms of lack of recognition and poor pay often contribute to a problem with employee retention.

Similarly a study carried out by Voydanoff (1990), in the public sector, managers found that pay levels affect job satisfaction, reporting that those public employees that compared their salaries with those of private sector employees experienced lower levels of job satisfaction. In this case, it shows us another way employees gauge if their compensation is fair by comparing it to other employees on the same rank. This results in job dissatisfaction, if employees feel that their oragnisation is compensating them poorly compared to other organizations’ employees.

Lambert, Hogan, Barton & Lubbock (2001) found financial rewards to have a significant impact on job satisfaction. Such findings are largely consistent with the idea that most employees are socialized in a society where money, benefits, and security are generally sought after and are often used to gauge the importance or the worth of a person. Hence if there is greater financial reward employees will be less worried about their financial status. Also in the society they will be viewed as worthy and improve their impression.

Garrido et al. (2005) conducted research to discover the factors that determine the job satisfaction of sales managers. The effect of HRM practices is analyzed by using the model which was already employed by an empirical study on Spanish industrial firms.
The study concludes that human resource management practices based on compensation type, compensation level and job design in terms of autonomy and resources are the essential determinants of sales managers’ job satisfaction.

From the above discussion, it can be noted that in linking pay to satisfaction, it is not the absolute amount that is paid, but rather, the perception of fairness that matters (Aamodt, 1999; Landy, 1989; Robbins, 1998). According to Robbins et al. (2003), employees seek pay systems that are perceived as just, unambiguous, and in line with their expectations. When pay is perceived as equitable, is commensurate with job demands, individual skill level, and community pay standards, satisfaction is likely to be the result. Adams (1965) proposed an equity theory which stated that pay satisfaction is determined by an employee’s perceived input-outcome balance. Employees feel satisfied when payment is equitable and feel dissatisfied if an inequity exists. In other words, pay satisfaction is determined by the perceived ratio of what employees receive from the job compared to how much they put into the job (Adams, 1965; Lawler, 1971). The employees may compare their remuneration with fellow work mates or employees at the same level in other organizations. For example an FNB bank teller can compare him/herself with other tellers who are ABSA or Standard bank tellers.

2.3.1.3 Supervision
Koustelios (2001) demonstrated that a positive relationship exists between job satisfaction and supervision. Supervision forms a pivotal role relating to job satisfaction in terms of the ability of the supervisor to provide emotional and technical support and guidance in work related tasks (Robbins et al., 2003). According to Ramsey (1997), supervisors contribute to high or low morale in the workplace. The supervisor’s attitude
and behaviour toward employees may also be a contributing factor to job-related complaints (Sherman & Bohlander, 1992). Hence supervisors with high relationship behaviour strongly impact on job satisfaction. Wech (2002) supports this view by adding that supervisory behaviour strongly affects the development of trust in relationships with employees. The author further postulates that trust may, in turn, have a significant relationship with job satisfaction.

It can be argued that the relationship between the supervisor and the subordinates has an impact on job satisfaction. Employees who have a good relationship with their supervisors are usually satisfied as they can go to them for help and also increase their confidence through praise. Therefore employees may have high levels of job satisfaction if their supervisors are supportive, cooperative and understanding, have good communication skills and provides constructive feedback. If there is a bad relationship between the employees and their supervisor, dissatisfaction with work usually occurs. For example an employee may feel that they fail in their work because their supervisors have a grudge against them or because they did not offer support and direction on how to do the work effectively.

Positive supervisory relationships are also those that treat the employees with respect, promote staff cohesion but allow for individual thinking, and fulfilling employee’s functional and interpersonal needs (Locke, 1970). Supervision is a complex variable however, and it is unrealistic to assume that job satisfaction can be guaranteed as long as supervisors interact positively with their employees. Individual personality characteristics may, for example, affect the employee’s needs and management expectations.
According to Bartol & Martin (1998:18), supervision at work refers to the “managers at the lowest level of the hierarchy who are directly responsible for the work of operating employees.” Supervising employees at work can either be a source of motivation or a source of de-motivation. The communication methods and control tools and measures used by the person in charge of the employees may lead them into either behavioral situation. For example a supervisor who allows participation from employees in decision making and delegating work to subordinates with autonomy may have a better relationship with subordinates than an autocratic leader. Supervisory permission of employee participation in decisions and decision-making processes affecting employee jobs, can lead to higher job satisfaction (Plous, 1993).

Not only does employee participation in decisions and decision-making processes enhance employee job satisfaction, but to a great extent, the creation of a participative climate on the part of supervisors encompasses a substantial effect on employee satisfaction as opposed to participation in particular decisions (Nadler, 1984). Hence the supervision method they use may have an impact on job satisfaction (Burney &Matherly, 2007). Employees want to be treated like human beings, who are capable of using their brain (Arnold, 2000:4).

A study conducted by Packard & Kauppi (1999) found that employees with supervisors displaying democratic management styles experienced higher levels of job satisfaction than those who had supervisors who exhibited autocratic or liassez – faire leadership styles. Therefore this shows that supervisors, who have consideration and compassion for their employees, have employees who are satisfied with their work. Supervisors
bringing the humanistic part to the job, by being considerate toward their employees, contribute towards increasing the employee’s level of job satisfaction.

2.3.1.4 Promotion

Heery & Noon (2001:286) define promotion as “the act of moving an employee up the organizational hierarchy, usually leading to an increase in responsibility and status and a better remuneration package.” Grobler et al., (2002:237) define promotion as “the reassigning of an employee to a higher-level job.” Promotions provide employees with opportunities for personal growth and increased responsibility on the new position.

An employee’s opportunities for promotion are also likely to exert an influence on job satisfaction (Landy, 1989; Larwood, 1984). This shows that if the organization provides opportunities for promotion, employees will be more satisfied with their work as they know there is room for personal growth and self actualization. This is similar to Drafke & Kossen’s (2002) view many people experience satisfaction when they believe that their future prospects are good. This may translate into opportunities for advancement and growth in their current workplace, or enhance the chance of finding alternative employment. Hence if people feel they have limited opportunities for career advancement, their job satisfaction may decrease. Usually the probability that employees will be promoted, as well as the basis and the fairness of such promotions impact on job satisfaction.

Similarly, employees seek fair promotion policies and practices. Individuals who perceive that promotion decisions are made in a fair and just manner are likely to experience satisfaction from their jobs (Witt & Nye, 1992). Fair promotion policies in any organization become their foundation of growth. When an employee gets fair promotion,
which is generally based on his true assessment, he gets a type of recognition, and hence, it increases his job-satisfaction. Kalleberg & Mastekaasa (2001) examined the impact of intra organizational (resignations and layoffs) and inter organizational (promotions and downward commitment) job mobility on changes in job satisfaction and organizational commitment. They found that promotions increase employee's perceptions of the quality of their job and thereby enhance both their satisfaction and commitment.

According to Tolbert (1996), promotion opportunities have divergent outcomes on job satisfaction due to their differing forms and multiplicity of accompanying rewards, and the usually identified forms of promotion are by seniority and performance. Promotion through seniority often exerts job satisfaction, but not as much as promotions through performance. Therefore, the style of promotion through performance despite its fair appeal becomes disqualified or ruled out, whilst, promotion through seniority – that is the best or most senior employee – becomes more desirable (Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson, 1996). However, it can turn into the Peter Principle – “promotion of employees until they reach their highest level of incompetence” (Aamodt, 2004:221). In addition Aamodt asserts that the promotion of the best performing employee is most desirable, however, it has become policy in many organizations to promote employees with the most seniority.

2.3.1.5 Co-workers

A co-worker is defined as “fellow worker, a colleague” (Chambers Compact Dictionary, 2005:181. According to Johns (1996), having friendly and supportive colleagues contribute to increased job satisfaction. Findings of a survey conducted by Madison
(2000) on more than 21000 women occupying the most demanding jobs indicated that those participants who lacked support from co-workers, were more likely to suffer from job dissatisfaction. Empirical evidence indicates that relationships with colleagues have consistently yielded significant effects on job satisfaction of federal government workers in the United States (Ting, 1997). Similarly a study conducted by Viswesvaran, Deshpande & Joseph (1998) further corroborated previous findings that there is a positive correlation between job satisfaction and co-workers.

An individual’s level of job satisfaction might be a function of personal characteristics and the characteristics of the group to which he or she belongs. The social context of work is also likely to have a significant impact on a worker’s attitude and behaviour (Marks, 1994). Employees’ relationships with the co-workers and supervisor have an impact on individual job satisfaction. If an employee does not feel welcome among colleagues it may lead to lower job satisfaction. Employees are concerned with their work environment for both personal comfort and how it facilitates doing a good job. People get more out of work than merely money or tangible achievements. For most employees, work also fills the need for social interaction. Not surprisingly, therefore, having friendly and supportive co-workers leads to increased job satisfaction. Similarly, Wharton & Baron (1991) examined the impact of friendship on workplace outcomes. Their results indicated that friendship opportunities were associated with increases in job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment, and with a significant decrease in intention to turnover.

The importance of co-worker social support has been investigated for decades. As far back as the Hawthorne Studies of the 1920’s, research has shown that workers who
belong to a social group and have friendships on the job tend to be more satisfied (Maynard, 1986). If employees lack the support of their colleagues, they experience more stress, which leaves them generally dissatisfied. Fellow employees can satisfy many social needs, and sympathetic and supportive co-workers can increase job satisfaction (Green, 2000). Co-workers are also vital for evaluating the equity and fairness of one’s pay and work requirements, and social needs studies have shown that co-worker job satisfaction can influence one’s own job satisfaction (Green, 2000).

According to Hodson (1997), such social relations constitute an important part of the social climate within the workplace and provide a setting within which employees can experience meaning and identity. Luthans (1998) postulates that work groups characterized by co-operation and understanding amongst their members tend to influence the level of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. When cohesion is evident within a work group it usually leads to effectiveness within a group and the job becoming more enjoyable. However, if the opposite situation exists and colleagues are difficult to work with, this may have a negative impact on job satisfaction. Organizations should engage in the integration of employees so as to create group cohesion among employees and departments within the organization (Lambert et al., 2001).

Aamodt (2004) asserts that, the positive is indicative of those who enjoy working with their co-workers due to the fun that they have with one another, as a result, the work becomes more bearable, but on the negative side, job satisfaction becomes unlikely to manifest where co-workers make jobs unbearable. In a study with a sample size of 500 employees, Aamodt (2004) discovered a positive relationship between team and
organizational commitment to result in higher productivity and a greater willingness to work when compared to job satisfaction.

2.4 Personality

The history of the Big Five (FFM) began with Allport & Odbert (1936), the first group of researchers who laboriously went through the dictionary and identified some 17,953 traits terms. Later in 1940, Castell suggested some conceptualized structure of 16 traits or personality factors. However, in 1949 Fiske found and pointed out some shortcomings in Castell’s concepts and argued that only five factors reflecting personality traits were essentially significant, but unfortunately no further research work on his suggestion had been done by Castell. Later, from during the 1954-1961, Tupes & Chirstal (1961) suggested a model of personality traits consisting of five personality factors. However, this report was not widely known to the public circle since it was only published in an army’s journal. In 1963, Norman of Michigan University studied thoroughly Tupes & Chirstal’s model of the five personality factors and made this model widely recognised. In 1981 Goldberg named this model of personality traits “the Big Five”. After a continuous stretch of research study efforts of five personality factors, within 50 years of personality research there emerged a common agreement in the field that there are five basic dimensions that can be used to describe differences in cognitive, affective and social behaviour.

The five-factor structure was generalized across measures, cultures, and sources of ratings (McCrae & John, 1992). The Big Five traits are most important for getting an abstract, theoretical understanding of the big, over-arching domains of personality, and
in understanding how different traits of personality relate to each other and how different research findings relate to each other. The big-five are important for understanding and interpreting an individual's personality profile mainly in getting a broad overview of their personality make-up at the highest level of personality organization.

Personal characteristics mainly describe and predict human behavior, not their behavioral changes or development. The systemic classification of personal characteristics suggested by McDougall (1932) asserts that personality consists of five factors: intellect, character, temperament, disposition, and temper. Today, many contemporary personality psychologists believe that there are five basic dimensions of personality, often referred to as the "Big 5" personality traits. Previous trait theorist had suggested a varying number of possible traits, including Gordon Allport's list of 4,000 personality traits, Raymond Cattell's 16 personality factors and Hans Eysenck's three-factor theory. However, many researchers felt that Cattell's theory was too complex and Eysenck's was too limited in scope. As a result, the five-factor theory emerged to describe the basic traits that serve as the building blocks of personality.

The following are some of the important characteristics of the five factors. First, the factors are dimensions, not types, so people vary continuously on them, with most people falling in between the extremes. Second, the factors are stable over a 45-year period beginning in young adulthood (Soldz & Vaillant, 1999). Third, the factors and their specific facets are heritable (i.e., genetic), at least in part (Jang, McCrae, Angleitner, Riemann & Livesley, 1998; Loehlin, McCrae, Costa & John, 1998). Fourth, the factors probably had adaptive value in a prehistoric environment (Buss, 1996). Fifth, the factors are considered universal, having been recovered in languages as diverse as
German & Chinese (McCrae & Costa, 1997). Sixth, knowing one's placement on the factors is useful for insight and improvement through therapy (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Individuals behave differently in similar situations and evaluate conditions differently based on their unique expectations, values, previous experiences and temperament (Ahangar, 2010). The role of personality traits in work-related behaviors and values has received renewed interest over the past decade (Adler, 1996; Costa, 1996; Hough, 1998; Vandenberghe et al., 2008). It has been shown to be a valid predictor of behavior in work settings.

2.4.1 Extraversion-introversion

Although people were recognized as falling at a certain level on behavioral dimensions resembling extraversion as far back as 2500 years ago, it was not until C.G. Jung (Jung, 1921/1971) that the names extraversion and introversion were brought into the popular terminology of psychology.

According to Cooper (2003) an extroverted personality tends to be sociable, assertive, gregarious, talkative, and ambitious. Such people often use their work environment to represent a key facet of their lives that enables them to meet their aspirations and exhibit their talents (Hurley, 1998). Highly extroverted employees are likely to use their stable, cool-headed, optimistic, and aggressive manner to react to customers’ requests, which results in work completion and customer satisfaction. Smithikrai (2007) finds a positive relationship between extraversion and job success, especially in jobs that require interpersonal contact. Communication is very in important in the banking industry as bank employees have found that their role has shifted to financial counselling, which involves the processes of listening, aligning and matching (Duncan &
Moriarty 1998:2). These processes require bank employees to possess communication, listening and persuasion skills. Therefore if bank employees have this skill, it leads to job success and job satisfaction.

McCrae & Costa (2006) divided the six facets of extraversion into interpersonal and temperamental traits. The three interpersonal traits are warmth, gregariousness and assertiveness. Given extroverts’ propensity to seek new relationships and the social nature of performers, extroverts are expected to be more likely than introverts to volunteer their service as performers. In his qualitative study of performers, Smithikra (2007) found that performers were attracted to customers with people and communication skills, and also sought performing opportunities in order to develop close relationships. While introverts might not avoid a specific performing opportunity for other reasons, extroverts will likely seek such opportunities more often than introverts simply due to the communication aspects.

Because of their sociable nature extraverts are highly motivated by intrinsic factors such as recognition, positive feedback and rewards which comply with their sociable nature, (Furnham, 1997). Extraversion is especially important in jobs that are people- or service oriented (Hurtz & Donovan, 2000). Also, extraverts strive to obtain status and rewards at work, thus increasing their performance (Barrick, Stewart & Piotrowski, 2002). Therefore from the above it can be noted that extraverts strive to obtain recognition and status as this will help them in their social networking. If they are recognised among their peers it increases their social levels as they feel important and valued in the organization. On the other hand introverts are motivated to avoid punishment, Gray’s (1975).
In addition, extraversion is associated with a tendency to be optimistic and a tendency to reappraise problems positively. Extraverts’ generally optimistic temperament (e.g., Watson & Clark, 1992) may bring them to focus on the good and positive side of their experiences. In addition, extroversion tends to be associated with the use of rational, problem-solving coping strategies and with social-support seeking and positive reappraisal (Watson & Hubbard, 1996). Thus, extraverts have more friends and spend more time in social situations than do introverts and, are likely to seek interpersonal interactions that are more rewarding.

2.4.2 Neuroticism

It refers to the degree to which a person is anxious, irritable, temperamental, and moody. It is perhaps the only Big Five dimension where scoring high is undesirable. Neurotic people have a tendency to have emotional adjustment problems and habitually experience stress and depression. People very high in Neuroticism experience a number of problems at work. For example, they have trouble forming and maintaining relationships and are less likely to be someone people go to for advice and friendship. In this case it is not favorable in the banking sector as employees have to be friendly and provide advice to clients. They tend to be habitually unhappy in their jobs and report high intentions to leave, but they do not necessarily actually leave their jobs (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002). Being high in Neuroticism seems to be harmful to one’s career, as these employees have lower levels of career success.

If they achieve managerial jobs, they tend to create an unfair climate at work (Mayer, Nishii, Schneider, & Goldstein, 2007). A manager who is always moody, anxious and has no confidence in their ability to run the organization is not effective to the growth of
employees and the organization. Individuals at low levels of neuroticism are emotionally stable hence they can face negative stimuli in their working place without crumbling. On the other hand individuals who have higher levels of neuroticism will be less resilient and more likely to develop negative emotions in the face of such stimuli (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Performing involves extra effort on the part of the performer. Colbert et al., (2004) found that neurotic individuals would be more likely to withhold effort. This can mean that if an individual gets involved in a situation that needs effort, neurotic individuals might feel less confident and secure in partaking in the task as opposed to emotionally stable individuals.

In a meta-analysis of the five-factor model and leadership, Judge and his colleagues (Judge et al., 2002) found neuroticism to be consistently negatively correlated with leadership emergence and effectiveness. This can be due to anger and anxiety that neurotic individual's experience. They tend to dwell on their mistakes, shortcomings and focus more on the negative aspects of the world. Thus, neurotics tend to have negative evaluations and lower level of justice perceptions concerning procedures, which in turn affects their level of satisfaction unfavorably. Therefore one cannot be a leader if one focuses on one's mistakes and has less confidence.

A neurotic employee probably does not have positive attitudes toward work and may lack of confidence and optimism, which should result in less ambition and less focus on career goals. Therefore, a negative relationship is likely to exist between neuroticism and goal direction (Malouff et al., 1990), such that, low goal trends should be due to low work efficiency. Neurotic employees are also less likely to devote themselves to work
and more likely to be distracted easily, which increases their behavioral risks and suggests a positive relationship between insufficient work efficiency and neuroticism.

When a person possess high neuroticism they are likely to consider feedback a type of threat that produces anxiety and overly intense stimuli (Smither, London & Richmond, 2005). For example if the feedback is negative it increases their anxiety. More specifically these individuals tend to have fewer opportunities to learn new skills, express creativity in their work and make their own decisions throughout their career.

The individuals with neurotic traits have poor social skills and they escape from highly demanding jobs (Judge, Locke & Drham, 1997). One of the reasons, why neurotics perform poorly, could be explained in terms of their perceptions of the world around them. Neurotics lack trust in others and have unfair views of the world. They perceive failure scenarios in life that can lead to defensive attribution processing (e.g. perception that the organization has been unfair) in an attempt to discount psychologically threatening information (Judge et al., 1997).

Because of their essentially negative nature, individuals high on neuroticism tend to experience more negative life events than other individuals and experience a number of negative emotions including anxiety, hostility, depression, impulsiveness, self-consciousness, and vulnerability (Costa & McCrae, 1992). People who are low on neuroticism can be characterized as self-confident, calm, even tempered, and relaxed. In general, individuals high on neuroticism tend to lead themselves into situations that foster negative effect (Emmons, Diener & Larsen, 1985). Hence, individuals with high
neuroticism would experience diminished levels of both job satisfaction and job performance, which would further increase their strain.

According to Mount et al., (1998), service employees such as bank employees scoring high on Emotional Stability are likely to be more relaxed and tolerant of stress, which helps them build credibility and trust with clients. Credibility and trust have been linked to higher quality service suggesting that Emotional Stability and service performance will be positively correlated. Therefore individuals who possess neuroticism may not work well in the banking sector as they will be moody and view every comment by a client as a threat.

In contrast, people who are low on Neuroticism—those who have a positive affective disposition—tend to experience positive moods more often than negative moods. They tend to be more satisfied with their jobs and more committed to their companies (Connolly, & Viswesvaran, 2000). This is not surprising, as people who habitually see the glass as half full will notice the good things in their work environment while those with the opposite character will find more things to complain about. Whether or not these people are more successful in finding jobs and companies that will make them happy, build better relationships at work that increase their satisfaction and commitment, or simply see their environment as more positive, it seems that low Neuroticism is a strong advantage in the workplace.

2.4.3 Openness to experience

According to Costa & McCrae (1992), the openness trait is concerned with assessing proactive seeking, appreciation of experience, toleration and exploration of the
unfamiliar so that someone high on openness would be curious, creative, original and imaginative. Openness to experience suggests an attraction to new ideas, concepts, actions, feelings, imagination, culture, broad-mind, and flexibility. Individuals with high levels of openness to experience would likely be attracted to perform because this type of trait leaves space for staff to explore new things and contribute their own ideas towards organization effectiveness. Those at a low level of openness would likely avoid performing, choosing to maintain the status quo in their activity level.

People high in openness seem to thrive in situations that require flexibility and learning new things. They are highly motivated to learn new skills, and they do well in training settings (Barrick & Mount 1991). They do well in training setting as they are curious and love gaining more knowledge.

They also have an advantage when they enter into a new organization. Their open-mindedness leads them to seek a lot of information and feedback about how they are doing and to build relationships, which leads to quicker adjustment to the new job (Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller 2000). When given support, they tend to be creative. Therefore their open mindedness allows them to be open in any situation they find themselves in. They are eager to learn and accept any feedback be it negative or positive open mindedly as they view it as a way of gaining knowledge and learning.

Open people are highly adaptable to change, and teams that experience unforeseen changes in their tasks do well if they are populated with people high in openness (LePine, 2003). This may be because open people are satisfied with jobs that allow them to be innovative and acquire new skills (Furnham, Petrides, Tsaousis, Pappas &
Garrod, 2005). This may be applied in the case of the banking sector which experiences changes due to the market and inflation rates, hence the need of open employees to be creative and be open minded to change.

In addition, individuals open to experience have also been found to use humor as a stress coping mechanism and tend to appraise stressful situations as less threatening (Bakker et al., 2006). High openness may prompt job efficiency, because work enables these employees to satisfy their curiosity, explore new viewpoints, and develop real interests in their activities. When work fields expand and technological changes proliferate, there is likely to be greater demand for productive workers who are aware of new developments and engage in continuing education and professional growth, which may increase the importance of openness for ensuring positive work efficiency (Lounsbury et al., 2007). Furthermore, open employee tend to be task based, searching for new methods to complete their work (Stewart & Nandkeolyar, 2006), which again strengthens working efficiency.

The potential downside is that they may also be prone to becoming more easily bored or impatient with routine. One can argue that the degree to which open employees are satisfied depends on the job itself. If the jobs involve routine work they will be easily bored as their jobs do not allow them to be innovative and creative. High openness is important in jobs that require creativity and flexibility; one would definitely prefer to have high openness in advertising or research positions. However, some jobs reward routine work, and a person low in openness may find these jobs more rewarding as creativity is not needed or desired.
2.4.4 Agreeableness

The agreeableness personality dimension suggests a courteous, flexible, trusting, good-natured, cooperative, forgiving, soft-hearted, tolerant person (Cooper, 2003). In other words, people who are high in agreeableness are likeable people who get along with others. Not surprisingly, agreeable people help others at work consistently and their behaviour does not depend on their good mood (Ilies, Scott, & Judge, 2006). Agreeable persons are less likely to strike back when they are treated unfairly (Skarlicki, Folger, & Tesluk, 1999). This may reflect their ability to show empathy and to give people the benefit of the doubt. Agreeable people may be a valuable addition to their teams and may be effective leaders because they create a fair environment when they are in leadership positions (Mayer et al., 2007).

Agreeable individuals value cooperative environments (e.g., Barrick et al., 2002) and are motivated to maintain harmonious relationships with their coworkers. Agreeable employees consider personal interactions carefully, such that they offer more constructive responses to customers and to their work. Because of their nature they are helpful and they want others to prosper hence they are delicate when they are dealing with others.

A highly agreeable employee likely develops positive perceptions of work efficiency. They are more involved in their jobs as they tend to regard work and career achievement as helping them. This is in keeping with their desire to improve their personal value and earn respect. When interacting and cooperating with others, agreeable employees also achieve better effects (Barrick & Mount, 1991), which likely increases work efficiency.
Agreeable employees are cooperative and forgiving, tend to follow rules, and act courteously to get ahead. In this sense, agreeableness provides a valid predictor of criteria that pertain to customers (Mount & Ilies, 2006), because agreeable persons are more concerned with others’ welfare (Ashton & Lee, 2001). The importance of customer service as a valued attribute of workers appears likely to increase in the future, considering the multiple internal customers that modern employees must serve, such as marketing and sales departments, as well as the push toward an ever-increasing integration of work with other organizational functions (Lounsbury et al., 2007).

Wiggins (1991) considered agreeableness to underlie striving toward communion. That is being part of a community; striving for inclusion, intimacy, and solidarity. Agreeableness is linked to collective behavior in the form of compliance and willingness to serve the needs of a group (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997). Agreeable individuals are predisposed to do things to make themselves valuable to a group, such as to facilitate group cohesion, and indeed there is evidence that other group members value agreeable individuals more than those who are not agreeable (Barrick, Stewart, Neuberg & Mount, 1998). Agreeable individuals want to be part of the community which may be the case in the banking sector as they will be helping the community in their financial affairs.

As Ashton & Lee (2001) noted, agreeable individuals are likely to have lower thresholds for engaging in helping behavior, partly because they attach an intrinsic value to others’ welfare. This suggests that individuals’ lows in agreeableness are less likely to be intrinsically motivated to behave prosocially (Ashton & Lee, 2001) and need additional motivation to work on behalf of a group or organization.
At the other end of the spectrum, people low in agreeableness is less likely to show these positive behaviours. Moreover, people who are disagreeable are shown to quit their jobs unexpectedly, perhaps in response to a conflict with a boss or a peer (Zimmerman, 2008). They do not take feedback well especially negative feedback. It is to be expected that some jobs would require a high level of agreeableness. However in other professions, being low in agreeableness may be a necessity. For example when one hires a lawyer they prefer a person who is not gentle and kind when facing an opponent. People high in agreeableness are also less likely to engage in constructive and change-oriented communication (LePine, & Van Dyne, 2001). Disagreeing with the status quo may create conflict, and agreeable people may avoid creating such conflict, missing an opportunity for constructive change.

2.4.5 Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness is concerned with an individual’s degree of organization, persistence, and motivation in goal-directed behavior, reliable, hard working, self-disciplined, punctual, scrupulous, neat, ambitious and persevering (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Conscientious individuals have also been found to utilize a coping strategy based on problem solving (Bakker et al., 2006). According to Costa & McCrae (1992), conscientiousness refers to a characteristic involving goal focus, dutifulness, self-discipline, and competence. A conscientious person is committed to doing the task the right way. Conscientious individuals were expected to perform more frequently than less conscientious individuals.

Conscientiousness is the one personality trait that uniformly predicts how high a person’s performance will be across a variety of occupations and jobs (Barrick, &
Mount, 1991). This may be so because even on different jobs employees must be organized and goal oriented when performing their task, which leads to career success and job satisfaction. In fact, conscientiousness is the trait most desired by recruiters, and highly conscientious applicants tend to succeed in interviews (Dunn, Mount, Barrick, & Ones, 1995). Once they are hired, conscientious people not only tend to perform well, but they also have higher levels of motivation to perform, lower levels of turnover, lower levels of absenteeism, and higher levels of safety performance at work (Judge, & Ilies, 2002).

Conscientiousness is a broad personality dimension which includes two primary facets, which are achievement motivation and dependability (e.g., Mount & Barrick, 1995). Organ & Lingl (1995) indicated that conscientiousness should be related to job satisfaction because it shows a general work involvement tendency and leads to greater likelihood of obtaining satisfying work rewards including both formal (e.g., pay, promotions) and informal (e.g., respect, recognition of personal achievement). Hence, individuals with high conscientiousness would lead to higher levels of both job satisfaction and job performance, and would further increase their strain.

Although conscientiousness is task-based, it emphasizes goal achievement. The employee recognizes the importance of reaching a goal and expends energetic, long-suffering, and untiring efforts (Burch & Anderson, 2004) to obtain satisfaction from performing the duty effectively. Low conscientiousness instead suggests the employee tries to meet only immediate demands, does not care about prospective results, lacks a sense of goals, mistakenly observes rules (Arthur & Doverspike, 2001) or standards, and performs tasks poorly (Wallace and Vodanovich, 2003).
Smithikrai (2007) posits a positive relationship between conscientiousness and job success, because conscientious persons tend to work toward their goals in an industrious manner. These employees are more likely to believe that their work has special meaning, and thus, they experience greater psychological attachment to their jobs (Li, Lin & Chen, 2007). They also regulate their work behavior more effectively (Wallace & Chen, 2006). Judge & Ilies (2002) reveal that conscientiousness is instrumental to people’s work success, as well as their motivation to get along and their desire to be productive. Those high in conscientiousness exhibit the capacity to function or develop in generally productive ways and can accomplish more work more quickly.

Conscientiousness is said to be at the core of service provision (Barrick & Mount, 1998). Successful service providers are accurate, dependable, responsive and timely. The construct similarity between its description and Conscientiousness suggests that more conscientious employees provide high quality service.

A potential downside is that highly conscientious individuals can be detail-oriented rather than seeing the big picture. However conscientious employee will always work hard on what they do.

2.5 The relationship between the big five personality and job satisfaction

According to Locke (1976), personality is one among other factors that act as a source of job satisfaction. This idea can be traced back to the Hawthorne Studies (Roethlisberger, 1941). It was noted that job satisfaction for individuals seemed to be stable over a period of time and that it might be a product of personality (Schneider & Dachler, 1978). The personality of an individual is usually stable over time. Staw &
Ross (1985) further explored the satisfaction stability idea by studying the job satisfaction of people who change types of jobs or employers and found that the job satisfaction of these individuals was correlated across jobs and organizations. They concluded that job satisfaction was caused in part by underlying personality. Some people are predisposed to like their jobs, whereas others are predisposed not to like them.

In the mid-1980s, there was increased interest in personality effects on job satisfaction. Studying personality has also been made easier with the emerging of the five personality traits which encompass all personality types. With the big five, a model was created which showed robustness across cultures, media and across all age groups (Costa & McCrae, 1988b; Digman & Takernoto-Chock, 1981). Hence these five factors have offered a model for unifying the field of personality attributes (Goldberg, 1993).

Judge, Heller & Mount (2002) conducted a meta-analysis of relationships between personality and job satisfaction. Their study results showed that individual's dispositions are important in understanding job satisfaction. The estimated true score correlations with overall job satisfaction for the three personality traits of interest in this study were Emotional Stability .29 (labeled Neuroticism in their study, reverse scored), Conscientiousness .26, and Agreeableness .17. Hence from their study it can be noted that personality does have an influence on an individual's job satisfaction.

In addition, individuals behave differently in similar situations and evaluate conditions differently based on their unique expectations, values, previous experiences and temperament (Ahangar, 2010). Therefore the reason for their individual differences lies
with their personality as they perceive things and situation differently according to what appeals to them. Hence job satisfaction can be viewed to be of a dispositional nature. This dispositional viewpoint assumes that measuring personal characteristics can aid in the prediction of job satisfaction (Staw & Ross, 1985). The dispositional source of job satisfaction has been supported by studies that show stability in job satisfaction both over time and over different situations (see Ilies & Judge, 2003).

From the above it can be seen that personality traits have an influence on job satisfaction and they vary in their degree of impact. This has lead to renewed interest in personality traits in work-related behaviours and values over the past decade (Adler, 1996; Costa, 1996; Hough, 1998; Judge, Higgins, Thoresen & Barrick, 1990; Salgado, 1997; Schneider, 1996; Twenge & Campbell, 2008; Vandenberghhe et al., 2008). It has been shown to be a valid predictor of behavior in work settings.

2.5.1 Neuroticism and job satisfaction

Emotional stability is usually considered as the other extreme of neuroticism, thus, the characteristics of emotionally stable individuals are usually the opposites of their neurotic counterparts. Emotional stability is the low score of neuroticism. Several studies (Watson & Hubbard, 1996; Judge et al., 1998; 2000) carried out have shown that neuroticism is negatively correlated with job satisfaction while emotional stability is positively correlated to job satisfaction. This may be because neurotic individuals are usually anxious, moody and lack self confidence and dwell in negative emotions, which make them not enjoy the work they do. Emotionally stable individuals are able to control their emotions; hence, it’s positively correlation to job satisfaction. Thus, neurotic
individuals usually are less satisfied with their jobs than those who are emotionally stable.

According to Dunn, Mount, Barrick & Ones (1995) emotional stability is the second most important characteristic that affects the employability of candidates. This may be because every organization needs employees who are emotionally stable as they will be able to perform to their best. A study carried out by Warr, Cook & Wall (1979) using a six-item scale to measure anxiety about a variety of current and future concerns, found low but significant negative correlations with various components of their job satisfaction measure.

On the other hand neurotic individuals, who are those who score low on levels of Emotional Stability experience more negative life events (Magnus, Diener, Fujita & Pavot, 1993). This may be because they put themselves in situations that can foster negative effects (Emmons, Diener & Larsen, 1985). Neuroticism has been described as the primary source of negative affectivity, and the link between negative affectivity and job satisfaction was documented in Connolly & Viswesvaran’s (2000) meta-analysis, which showed that neuroticism was negatively correlated to job satisfaction. This negative perception can influence, and therefore lower, the perception of satisfaction in the workplace. Individuals who are low in Emotional Stability are more likely to be irritable, depressed, or anxious, and these traits inhibit the completion of workplace tasks (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Thus, low levels of Emotional Stability will lead to decreases in both job satisfaction and job performance because of the negative moods and perceptions that typically occur in emotionally unstable individuals.
The negative effect of Neuroticism makes individuals less able to feel positive experiences and thus show lower satisfaction and lack of positive emotions. For the domain of job satisfaction, Argyle (1989) found that neurotic individuals cannot handle stress well and therefore tend to work inefficiently and suffer from health problems. This leads to a lower job satisfaction, as was found by Judge et al., (2002). Negative emotionality deals with whether a person adjusts to an unpleasant situation or becomes emotionally unstable. It looks at a person’s ability to be rational, resist urges, and use positive coping. Employees with high neuroticism scores tended to be less satisfied with the amount of work, their coworkers and their pay. Therefore, overall, individuals high in neuroticism are less satisfied with their work as compared to those with emotional stability.

2.5.2 Extraversion-introversion and job satisfaction

Whereas Neuroticism is related to the experience of negative life events, extraverts are predisposed to experience positive emotions (Costa & McCrae, 1992), and positive emotionality likely generalizes to job satisfaction, as demonstrated by Connolly and Viswesvaran’s (2000) meta-analysis of positive affectivity-job satisfaction relationships. Therefore extraverts are characterized as individuals with positive feelings and experiences (Clark & Watson, 1991).

Tokar & Subich (1997), Toker, Fisher & Subich (1998) and Day et al., (1998) found a positive relationship between extraversion and job satisfaction. This is also in line with the study by Furnham & Zacherl (1986) who found that extraversion on the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire correlated significantly with overall job satisfaction. In general, extraverts will have higher levels of both job satisfaction and job performance.
because of their overall positive perceptions, social interactions on the job, and desire to gain status in the workplace.

Turning to the Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory, introverts are more sensitive to punishment and frustrate on non reward than are extroverts (Gray, 1970). Extroverts have low sensitivity to punishment cues (Pickering et al., 1999) which could help to explain why they would have higher levels of job satisfaction. It shows that both people low and high extraversion receive the same feedback differently. Those low in extraversion may notice indications of punishment where there is none than extraversion. Thus, their satisfaction would be lowered because of the perception that they were being punished. The Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory also suggests that individuals’ low in extraversion is more prone to fear than are their more extroverted counterparts (Gray, 1970). If low Extraversion employees are at their job, continuously feeling fear because of their dispositional susceptibility to fear, they will likely be less satisfied with the job. The fear could come from many different sources, including a fear of failing or of being punished or fired.

Because of their nature extraverts have more friends and spend most of their time in social situations hence they are likely to find satisfaction in their work as they find interpersonal relationship rewarding (Watson & Clark, 1997). The idea that extraverts have higher levels of social interaction in the workplace could increase their performance as well as their satisfaction because if extraverts know more people in the workplace, they are likely to have a better idea of whom to go to for advice or help. These social interactions can lead to higher levels of satisfaction in the workplace. Also,
extraverts are more likely to perceive positive events in their lives (Magnus et al., 1993), which would lead to higher levels of job satisfaction.

2.5.3 Openness to experience and job satisfaction

To some extent openness to experiences is related to job satisfaction. This may be due to the nature of the trait. Individuals high on openness are full of curiosity and innovative ideas; hence, if they are given a job which does not allow them freedom to express their creativity, it leads to job dissatisfaction. Hence openness to experience and its relationship with job satisfaction may depend on the type of work or job one does. Judge et al., (2002) was one of researchers who found a positive correlation between openness and job satisfaction. Similarly Axtell et al., (2002) also found a positive relation between openness and job satisfaction.

On the other hand the openness trait was not found to have an influence on job satisfaction. According to Feist (1998), openness to experiences is related to scientific and artistic creativity, divergent thinking, low religiosity, and political liberalism. None of these psychological states seem to be closely related to job satisfaction. Furthermore, DeNeve & Cooper (1998:199) noted that “Openness to Experiences is a ‘double-edged sword’ that predisposes individuals to feel both the good and the bad more deeply”, rendering its directional influence on affective reactions like subjective well-being or job satisfaction unclear.

A highly open person may enjoy a complex job but may also cherish self-determination. Contrary to the other four traits, DeNeve & Cooper (1998) find no significant effect of Openness on subjective well-being. Their explanation is the fact that this trait is the
broadest and the least understood within the Big Five model and that it is not really clear which dimension is captured by the respective measurement items used. Judge et al. (2002) only found a very weak correlation of Openness to Experience and job satisfaction. Overall, the openness trait is the least understood and its relationship to job satisfaction is unclear.

2.5.4 Agreeableness and job satisfaction

According to Goldberg (1990) agreeable individuals tend to get along with others and form satisfying interpersonal relationships. These relationships in the workplace could lead to higher levels of overall satisfaction for employees. This is supported by Organ & Lingl (1995) who found that agreeable individuals were more satisfied with their work particularly in the context of work relationships. In addition, Silva (2006) found that agreeableness is positively related to several facets of job satisfaction, such as co-workers and the nature of work. Thus, if individuals who are high on agreeableness are satisfied with their co-workers and the nature of their work, they will be more satisfied with their job.

Judge et al. (2002) also found that job satisfaction is modestly positively correlated with agreeableness. An agreeable person is considered to be selfless, helpful, compassionate and cooperative. Less agreeable individuals, on the other hand, are egoistical, selfish and uncooperative. Analogous to Extraversion, Agreeableness can be connected with the quality of relationships. This trait is a strong predictor for positive affect (DeNeve and Cooper, 1998).
In contrast Seibert & Kraimer (1995) found that individuals with a high score on Agreeableness have lower job satisfaction. However, this result is not consistent over all studies. Similarly Day & Bedeian (1995) and Schneider (1999) found that agreeableness is not related to job satisfaction. However in general it seems that agreeableness has a positive relationship with job satisfaction.

2.5.5 Conscientiousness and job satisfaction

Organ & Lingl (1995) argued that Conscientiousness should be related to job satisfaction because it represents a general work involvement tendency and thus leads to a greater likelihood of obtaining satisfying work rewards, both formal (e.g., pay, promotions) and informal (e.g., recognition, respect, feelings of personal accomplishment). Hence since conscientious people are goal oriented it leads to working hard and receiving recognition for their work which is satisfying to them as they have met their goals.

The influence of Conscientiousness can be viewed in previous findings in job satisfaction literature (e.g. Salgado, 1997; Judge, Higgins, Thoresen & Barrick, 1999), and thus suggests that this trait is a relatively consistent predictor of job satisfaction (Furnham et al., 2002). A potential explanation for its influence is that conscientious individuals are likely to receive higher intrinsic and extrinsic rewards due to their efficient nature, consequently increasing job satisfaction.

In a study by Furnham et al. (2002) they found that conscientiousness is related positively to intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. Accordingly, DeNeve & Cooper (1998) confirmed that there is a positive relationship between conscientiousness and job
satisfaction. Hence, conscientiousness can be the most important predictor of job satisfaction. Conscientious people tend to exhibit important positive work attitudes, such as being hardworking, achievement-orientated, persistent, and punctual (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Barrick, Mount & Strauss, 1993). This shows that conscientious individuals will always perform the best and are satisfied with their work.

Further, research has found conscientiousness to be positively correlated with job satisfaction (Day & Bedeian, 1995; Fogarty et al., 1999; Judge, Higgins, Thoresen & Barrick, 1999). Of the five dimensions of personality conscientiousness has been shown to be the only significant predictor of job satisfaction (Judge et al., 1999).

On the other hand, conscientiousness has also shown not to improve predictions of job satisfaction over and above neuroticism and extraversion (Miller, Griffin & Hart, 1999). Conscientiousness has a down side, such as behaviour leading to workaholic behaviour, annoying fastidiousness or compulsive neatness. This may become stressful to other individuals, who may be under pressure to meet their goals. However in general conscientiousness has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

2.6 Conclusion

The present chapter has shown that personality has an effect on job satisfaction to some extent. It has also highlighted the background study of the South African Banking Sector. Job satisfaction has different facets such as remuneration, supervision, coworkers, promotion and the work itself that may be influenced by individual differences within individuals. The personality traits which have been included in this study are extraversion, neuroticism, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness.
To a greater extent, they have a positive relationship. The next chapter is will focus on the research methodology of the study which consists of the research design, the population and sample size of the study, the research instrument, data collection and data analysis.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
The chapter will highlight how the research problem was explored, with specific reference made to how the participants were selected and the procedure followed to gather the data. The research design, population, sampling methods, measuring instruments and statistical techniques used to analyze data will also be discussed.

3.2 Research design
A research design is a plan or blueprint of how the research will be conducted (Mouton, 2001). It reflects the type of study undertaken to provide acceptable answers to the research problem. Similarly, Kumar (2005) defines a research design as a plan, structure, and strategy of investigation so conceived as to obtain answers to research questions or problems. Research designs are invented to enable the researcher to answer research objectives as validly, objectively, accurately and economically as possible. A research design is a guideline within which a choice about data collection methods has to be made.

A research design can be qualitative research. Its main aim is to gain an insider's perspective and to understand the participants' perceptions in a specific situation; how they interpret the situation; and to establish common themes from the data collected through the interviews conducted (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001:153). In addition there is also triangulation research design which involves both quantitative and qualitative research.
Welman, Kruger and Mitchell (2006) noted that there are three types of research designs, that is, exploratory, descriptive and causal research. Descriptive research is appropriate when the research objectives include determining the degree to which variables are associated and making predictions regarding the occurrences of phenomena under study which is the general objective of this study. Descriptive research is used to answer questions about relationships among measured variables with the purpose of explaining, predicting and controlling phenomena. Therefore descriptive research design was used in this study. As highlighted above, this is a descriptive research which is quantitative in nature as indicated by Leedy and Ormrod (2001). In quantitative research the aim is to determine the relationship between one thing (an independent variable) and another (a dependent or outcome variable) in a population.

According to Terre Blanche, Durrheim & Painter (2007) quantitative researchers collect data in the form of numbers and use a statistical means of data analysis. Similarly, Goodwin (2002) defines quantitative research as a category of research in which results are presented numerically, typically in the form of descriptive and inferential statistics. It also guides the researcher in collecting and analyzing and interpreting data and giving meaning to it. In quantitative research the aim is to determine the relationship between one thing (an independent variable) and another (a dependent or outcome variable) in a population. Quantitative research designs are either descriptive (subjects usually measured once) or experimental (subjects measured before and after a treatment). Quantitative primary data can be collected through surveys, observations and experiments. The survey method in form of a questionnaire was used. There is no
computer or interviewer present to assist hence has an advantage of eliminating interviewer bias.

3.3 Population of the study
According to Welman & Kruger (2004:26-47) a population is defined as a study object, which may include individuals, groups, organizations, events or the condition in which they are uncovered. A population or universe is the entire or complete collection, group or set of observations of interest to the researcher of a study, for example, a body of people or objects (Russell & Purcell, 2009:174). In this study the population is 250 employees who work in ABSA, FNB and Standard Bank in Alice, East London and King Williams Town (N=250).

3.4 Sample and sample size
According to Sekaran (2003:266), sampling is “the process of selecting a sufficient number of elements from the population, so that a study of the sample and an understanding of its properties or characteristics would make it possible for us to generalise such properties or characteristics to the population elements.” According to Bless & Higson-Smith (2000), a sample refers to the group of elements drawn from the population, which is considered to be representative of the population, and which is studied in order to acquire some knowledge about the entire population. We study the sample in an effort to understand the population from which it was drawn. Fouch`e and Delport (2002), indicate that in most cases a 10% sample should be sufficient for controlling for sampling error. Having taken this into account, a sample of (n = 126)
employees comprising of males and females, permanent and contract employees members in the selected banks was used, extending across the different departments.

3.4.1 Sample frame

The sampling frame of a study is the list of elements from which the sample is drawn (Zikmund 2003:373). According to Singh (2007) a sampling frame is defined as a subset of the population, which provides the broad and detailed framework for the selection of sampling units. Babbie (2009) defines a sampling frame as the actual list of units from which the sample, or some stage of the sample, is selected. According to Babbie and Mouton (2001:184), many South African researchers find it difficult to acquire sampling frames for their research because of the lack of available information and/or errors on available lists. In this case the sample frames were obtained from the human resource departments, which included the list of all employees.

3.4.2 Sampling procedure

According to Fouch`e & Delport (2002)), there are two types of sampling procedures, probability sampling and non-probability sampling. Probability sampling is based on randomization; while non-probability sampling is done without randomization. Thus, probability samples reduce sampling error. The statistical sampling method called stratified sampling was used as it provides representatives from each subgroup within the population that need to be represented in the sample.

The first step in stratified sampling is to divide the population into subgroups (strata) based on mutually exclusive criteria. In this case the population was divided in terms of the positions available in banks. In this case employees were put into three groups
which are tellers, management and consultants. These banks are small and they do not have as many positions as other bigger banks. Hence, the tellers’ group was comprised of tellers, consultant group included all the consultants be they for marketing, sales or customer service, the management group involved branch managers, assistant branch managers and management from human resources, the finance department, marketing and other back offices in the banks. Individuals were chosen randomly using computer software to generate random numbers using their list of employee numbers arranged in ascending order

### 3.5 Data collection

The instruments used to gather the data is a questionnaire, comprising of three parts which are the biographical questions, the Mini IPIP questionnaire for personality and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire for job satisfaction. A questionnaire is a structured method of data collection (Sapford & Jupp, 2006:102). Collis & Hussey (2003:173) describe a questionnaire as a list of carefully chosen and structured questions with the objective of gathering reliable responses from a chosen sample. Questionnaires were used because:

- They translate the research objectives into specific questions that are asked of the respondents.
- They also standardise the question and response categories so that every participant responds to identical stimuli
- They speed up the process of data analysis as all the respondents are asked the same questions.
They are less expensive and offer greater anonymity.

A questionnaire is a set of questions dealing with the same topic or related group of topics, given to a selected group of individuals, for the purpose of gathering data on a problem under consideration (Van Rensburg, Landman & Bodenstein, 1994: 504). The questionnaire is regarded as the most widely used survey data-collecting technique (De Vaus 1990: 80). Churchill & Peter in (Schnetler, 1993:77) say that the questionnaire, as a measuring instrument, has the greatest influence on the reliability of research data.

3.5.1 Biographical questionnaire

A biographical questionnaire soliciting information on respondents’ gender, race, age, tenure, position and education level was compiled. The data with respect to these biographical questions were subsequently graphically presented and discussed to provide an indication of the most salient findings on these variables.

3.5.2 Mini IPIP

The big five personality traits measured by the Mini-IPIP constitute a 20-item scale, with four items measuring each of the five-factor model traits developed by Donnellan, Oswald, Baird & Lucas (2006). Each item is a phrase describing behaviour (e.g., ‘I am the life of the party’), and participants are instructed to indicate how accurate this phrase is for them, using a 5-point Likert-type scale. When correlating the Mini-IPIP scales, researchers found that they tapped nearly the same Big Five facet content as the original 50 item International Personality Item Pool.
Validity

The Mini-IPIP was validated across 5 studies by Donnelan, Oswald, Baird & Lucas (2006) and was found to be a psychometrically acceptable and a practically useful short measure of the Big Five Factors of personality. Donnellan et al. (2006) also found that the Mini-IPIP shows very good test–retest reliability, convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity, which is comparable to the NEO and other measures of the Big Five. These five traits have been shown to represent all of personality at the broadest level of abstraction (Goldberg, 1993, McCrae & Costa, 1987).

Reliability

The Mini-IPIP has acceptable alpha scores all above .60 for the five personality dimensions. Test-retest correlations of the Mini-IPIP demonstrated high correlations in the short term (.62 to .87) and longer term (.68 to .86). Donnellan et al., (2006) evaluated the Mini-IPIP across a series of studies, showing it had acceptable reliability and showed similar patterns of relationships with the longer IPIP-FFM when correlating the measure with facets of the FFM and other relevant personality measures.

3.5.3 Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is one of the most popular measures frequently used in job satisfaction research. It was developed by Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist (1967) and represented the result of research conducted on the Work Adjustment Project in studies conducted at the University of Minnesota. The theory underlying the Work Adjustment Project stated that "...work adjustment depends on how
well an individual’s abilities correspond to the reinforcers available in the work environment” (Weiss et al., 1967).

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used to gather data about the job satisfaction of participants in this study. It consists of 20 items (Spector, 1997) and uses a 5-point Likert type response format. The MSQ comprises of two distinct components: intrinsic job satisfaction measures feelings about the nature of the job tasks. For example, question 15 covers: ‘The freedom to use my own judgement’. Extrinsic job satisfaction measures feelings about situational job aspects, external to the job. For example, question 13 covers: ‘My pay and the amount of work I do’ (Spector, 1997).

- Validity

Validity refers to whether a measuring instrument is actually measuring what it is supposed to measure. In other words, validity relates to the appropriateness of the measure to assess the variable it claims to measure. (Gaiser & Schreiner 2009:69).

Content-related validity examines the extent to which the method of measurement includes all the major elements relevant to the construct being measured. This evidence was obtained from three sources, namely the literature, representatives of the relevant population and content experts (Burns & Grove, 2001: 400). It addresses the extent to which the instrument measures the domain defined in the study. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Cook et al., 1981: 23) consists of twenty (20) items that measure job (general) satisfaction. It also consists of sub-sections that measure intrinsic (motivating) factors and extrinsic (hygiene) factors. In the questionnaire the intrinsic/motivating factors are reflected in items 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16 and 20.
The extrinsic/hygiene factors are reflected in items 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18 19. Hence it has high content validity as it covers all the aspects of the Herzberg’s theory.

Construct validity is the “degree to which an instrument measures the traits or characteristics implied by the construct it is intended to measure” (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996:565). Evidence of construct validity for the MSQ scales was mainly derived from the construct validation studies with the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ) (Weiss et al., 1967), which Weiss and his co-workers considered to be a parallel survey instrument to the MSQ. To obtain evidence of the construct validity of general job satisfaction, studies were done that used general job satisfaction as the dependent variable and the MIQ scale scores as the independent variables. Weiss et al., (1967:18) wrote, “The results of these studies ... indicated that the MSQ measured satisfaction in accordance with expectations from the Theory of Work Adjustment”; thus, the general job satisfaction scale had good construct validity.

- Reliability

Reliability is concerned with the consistency, stability and credibility of a study’s findings that enable the findings to be reproduced (Sekaran, 2000:204). The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire showed a Cronbach alpha of 0.88 and its subsections consistently demonstrated acceptable internal consistency (Cook et al., 1981: 23) with different samples. According to Cook et al., (1981) the MSQ’s internal consistency ranged from .84 to .91 for the intrinsic subscale, .77 to .82 for the extrinsic subscale, and from .87 to .92 for the General Satisfaction scale. Test-retest reliabilities of between 0.70 and 0.80 are reported by Cook et al., (1981) with an alpha coefficient of 0.96.
Similarly Ivancevich & Matterson (1978) reported a Cronbach alpha of 0.80 and 0.84 for the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales in a study of 170 machinists and technicians.

Sempane et al., (2002) achieved a Cronbach Alpha of 0.9169 on the sample of government welfare employees in South Africa. Jacobs (2005) yielded a coefficient of 0.886 in the study of nurses in South Africa. Reliability was established using Hoyt correlations (DeStefano et al., 2005), which ranged from .97 to .59 for all factors. The median values were .93 to .78. Of 567 coefficients 83% were .80 and above with 2.5% lower than .70. Stability was established using 1-week test-retest reliabilities (coefficients ranging from .66 to .91, median .83) and 1 year test-retest reliabilities (coefficients ranging from .35 to .71) (DeStefano et al., 2005). A canonical correlation retest analysis yielded a one-week coefficient of .97 and 1-year coefficient of .89, both significant at .001 levels.

3.6 Administering of the questionnaire

One hundred and twenty six employees were targeted in areas which have been classified according to departments. The researcher personally requested permission from the Human Resource Manager or the Branch Manager of each bank to distribute the copies of the questionnaire. Questionnaire distribution was done in such a way as to cause no disturbance to work performance. The researcher distributed the questionnaire to the respondents during breaks (e.g. lunch time) and also asked the respondents to deposit completed questionnaires at the various receptionists’ desks.
Cover letters, affixed to the questionnaire, explained the nature of the study, and assured respondents of the confidentiality of any information provided. Respondents were also provided with detailed instructions on the completion and return of questionnaires. The rationale behind providing clear instructions and assuring confidentiality of information is that this significantly reduces the likelihood of obtaining biased responses (Sekaran, 2003).

3.7 Data analysis

According to Sharp, Peters & Howard (2002) analysis refers to the ordering and structuring of data to produce knowledge. The returned questionnaires were inspected to determine their level of acceptability and then coded. The data were transferred to an Excel sheet. For the purposes of testing the research hypotheses, a number of statistical techniques were employed. These included both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques as explained below.

3.7.1 Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics refers to the methods used for organising, summarizing and presenting data in an informative way (Lind et al., 2008:6). It includes the analysis of data using frequencies, dispersions of dependent and independent variables and measures of central tendency and variability and to obtain a feel for the data (Sekaran, 2003). The mean and standard deviation was primarily be used to describe the data obtained from the Mini IPIP and the MSQ. The results of the biographical questionnaire was based on the frequencies and percentages obtained based on the sample characteristics.
3.7.2 Inferential statistics

Inferential statistics include the procedure of estimating a property of a population on the basis of a sample (Lind et al., 2008:7). Inferential statistics allow the researcher to present the data obtained in research in a statistical format to facilitate the identification of important patterns and to make data analysis more meaningful. According to Sekaran (2003), inferential statistics are employed when generalizations from a sample to population are made. The statistical methods which will be used are done on the SAS 9.1 Version. SAS (Statistical Analysis System) is an integrated system of software products by SAS Institute Inc which enable programmers to perform statistical analysis. Where many other languages refer to tables, rows and columns, SAS uses the terms data sets, observation and variables. SAS was used in this study to analyze data. It provides for all other statistical analysis in this study as follows:

- Pearson correlations

For the purposes of determining whether a statistically significant relationship exists between job satisfaction and certain personality, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used. Cohen & Swerdlik (2002) posit that the Pearson Correlation Coefficient is a widely used statistic for obtaining an index of the relationships between two variables when the relationships between the variables is linear and when the two variables correlated are continuous.

It provides an index of the strength, magnitude and direction of the relationship between job satisfaction and personality (Sekaran, 2003). The Pearson Correlation Coefficient is,
therefore, suitable for the purposes of the present study since the study attempted to describe the relationship between job satisfaction and a particular personality.

- Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Independent Samples t test

These tests were utilized to determine whether any of the background variables specified have a statistical relationship with the work constructs in the laid out research objectives. The Independent Samples t test compares the means of one variable for two groups of cases (SPSS Inc, 2005a). This test is commonly used for comparisons between the groups of only two categories such as gender and job status as used in this study.

The one way ANOVA produces a one way analysis of variance for a quantitative dependent variable is by a single factor (independent) variable. The analysis of variance is used to test the hypothesis that several means are equal. This technique is an extension of the Independent t test (SPSS Inc, 2005a). Such staple examples a three categories variable include that of race or tenure. If the p-value is found to be less than 0.05, then the independent variable in question does have a significant relationship with the factor at hand. In this study it was be used on the demographic variable against personality and job satisfaction.

- Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient

The Cronbach’s Alpha correlation coefficient is used for scale data and indicates if the items are measuring the same variable (Burns & Burns, 2008:417). In other words, the Cronbach’s Alpha correlation coefficient indicates how well the items in a set are positively correlated to one another (Sekaran, 2000:308). According to Hair, Black,
Babin, Anderson & Tatham (2006) reliability is considered an assessment of the degree of consistency between multiple measurements of a variable. It is a measurement concept that represents the consistency with which an instrument measures a given performance or behaviour. A measurement instrument that is reliable will provide consistent results when a given individual is measured repeatedly under near identical conditions. The diagnostic measure used is the reliability coefficient that assesses consistency of the entire scale, namely the Cronbach’s Alpha. The Minnesota Job Satisfaction questionnaire used in this study had a co-efficient alpha ranging from 0.79-0.88 while, Mini IPIP had 0.78-0.82.

- Waller-Duncan K ratio t test

It is a multiple range test. Unlike the Turkey test, this test does not operate on the principle of controlling Type I error. Instead it compares Type I and Type II error rates based on Bayesian principles (Steel et al., 1997). It is performed on all means in the MEANS statement. In this study it was used to analyze the difference between means since the Independent sample t test is only for groups with two categories.

3.8 Ethical consideration

The researcher asked for permission from the Human Resource Department or the Branch Manager to carry out the research. The researcher supplied the respondents with the essential information about the research orally as well as by means of the covering letter that accompanied the questionnaire. Confidentiality of information was also guaranteed as the questionnaire filled anonymously. No identifying information (such as name) was recorded to ensure anonymity. Individuals were provided with
envelopes to ensure confidentiality. Also they are given information on the research and its procedures, the reasons of the study and what was expected of them and also debriefing them on the findings of the study. Participation was voluntary and there was no discrimination, either of race, sex or ethnicity and also individuals were not forced to answer questions which they were uncomfortable with.

3.9 Conclusion

The research methodology utilized in the present study was addressed in this chapter. More specifically, the selection of the sample, the measuring instruments used and the rationale for their inclusion, as well as the statistical methods employed in testing the research hypotheses were discussed. The next chapter will show the results that have been obtained using this methodology.
CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

Data analysis is the interpretation of research findings. This chapter represents the result from the study conducted and looks at the descriptive statistics of the sample and hypothesis testing in response to the questionnaires. The results are laid out using tables, figures, statistical summaries and graph distributions formats to facilitate ease interpretation of respondent characteristics. Results from the questionnaire were organized into their underlying traits to be consistent with the hypotheses as laid out in chapter 1 and 3.

4.2 Internal consistency

4.2.1 Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Table 4.1 Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha of the MSQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB SATISFACTION</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>ALPHA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTRINSIC</td>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.81746</td>
<td>0.95834</td>
<td>0.870369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDEPENDENCE</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.74603</td>
<td>1.03488</td>
<td>0.871003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VARIETY</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.80159</td>
<td>1.00415</td>
<td>0.870980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOCIAL STATUS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.85714</td>
<td>0.93564</td>
<td>0.874800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MORAL VALUES</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.59524</td>
<td>1.13263</td>
<td>0.873538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SECURITY</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.57937</td>
<td>1.01472</td>
<td>0.878776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHIEVEMENT</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.76190</td>
<td>0.99943</td>
<td>0.882577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SERVICE</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.88889</td>
<td>0.88744</td>
<td>0.874803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHORITY</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.57937</td>
<td>0.98268</td>
<td>0.879102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABILITY UTILIZATION</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.98413</td>
<td>0.96320</td>
<td>0.872513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.39683</td>
<td>1.03599</td>
<td>0.874597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVITY</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.33333</td>
<td>1.08074</td>
<td>0.870545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTRINSIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISION HUMAN RELATIONS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.57937</td>
<td>1.03036</td>
<td>0.808795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISION TECHNICAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.70635</td>
<td>0.87697</td>
<td>0.810709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICIES PRACTICES</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.39683</td>
<td>1.10330</td>
<td>0.815023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPENSATION</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.91270</td>
<td>1.24592</td>
<td>0.812675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCEMENT</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.39683</td>
<td>1.04368</td>
<td>0.816167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING CONDITIONS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.56349</td>
<td>1.03147</td>
<td>0.792439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO WORKERS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.76984</td>
<td>1.10390</td>
<td>0.820241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOGNITION</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.49206</td>
<td>1.08625</td>
<td>0.799876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 presents basic descriptive statistics for the items and total scores of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and also its reliability. The mean scores for each scale in this sample were broadly consistent with those reported by DeStefano et al., (2005). The Cronbach’s alpha for each scale was acceptable, particularly given the relatively small number of items in each scale. The Cronbach’s alphas for the items ranged from 0.79 to 0.88. The reliability estimates were also similar to those reported by Cook et al., (1981) and Ivancevich & Matterson (1978).
### 4.2.2 Mini IPIP Questionnaire

#### Table 4.2 Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha of the Mini IPIP Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONALITY</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>ALPHA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTRAVERSION</td>
<td>LIFE OF A PARTY</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.34921</td>
<td>1.54048</td>
<td>0.822159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON’T TALK A LOT</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.46825</td>
<td>1.59342</td>
<td>0.814684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TALK A LOT AT PARTIES</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.34127</td>
<td>1.56032</td>
<td>0.819480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KEEP IN THE BACKGROUND</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.41270</td>
<td>1.42700</td>
<td>0.788285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREEABLENESS</td>
<td>SYMPATHIZE WITH OTHER’S FEELINGS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4.21429</td>
<td>0.98474</td>
<td>0.805248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT INTERESTED IN PEOPLE’S PROBLEMS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.30159</td>
<td>1.52457</td>
<td>0.805616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEEL OTHERS EMOTIONS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4.15873</td>
<td>1.07638</td>
<td>0.805525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT INTERESTED IN OTHERS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.53175</td>
<td>1.48425</td>
<td>0.802019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUSNESS</td>
<td>GET CHORES DONE RIGHT AWAY</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.90476</td>
<td>1.20285</td>
<td>0.784269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FORGETS TO PUT THINGS BACK</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.45238</td>
<td>1.43447</td>
<td>0.791648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIKE ORDER</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.80952</td>
<td>1.22451</td>
<td>0.788419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAKE A MESS OF THINGS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.53175</td>
<td>1.50033</td>
<td>0.788430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>FREQUENT MOOD SWINGS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.01587</td>
<td>1.15920</td>
<td>0.802894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RELAXED MOST OF THE TIME</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.34921</td>
<td>1.30425</td>
<td>0.805512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GET UPSET EASILY</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.12698</td>
<td>1.34452</td>
<td>0.801672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SELDOM FEEL BLUE</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.19841</td>
<td>1.25232</td>
<td>0.802793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPENNESS</td>
<td>VIVID IMAGINATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT INTERESTED IN ABSTRACT IDEAS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.61905</td>
<td>1.25766</td>
<td>0.800849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFICULTY IN ABSTRACT IDEAS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.55556</td>
<td>1.24294</td>
<td>0.793612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON’T HAVE A GOOD IMAGINATION</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.46825</td>
<td>1.29421</td>
<td>0.787421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 presents basic descriptive statistics for the items and total scores of the Mini IPIP Questionnaire. The Cronbach’s alpha for each scale showed internal consistence for the whole questionnaire. The Cronbach’s alphas for the items ranged from 0.78 to 0.82. The reliability estimates were also similar to those reported by Donnellan et al. (2006).

4.3 Demographic Information in terms of the sample

In this study 150 questionnaires were distributed to all participants ABSA having more participants as they have bigger banks than FNB and Standard Bank. A total of 127 questionnaires were returned, 126 with complete information and one with incomplete information which was removed from the study as 2 questions were only answered. Questionnaires were distributed to both managerial and general employees since they all occupy different categorise of jobs which are affected by personality.

Analysis of the biographical data gathered from the research sample \( n = 126 \) was analysed. This section examines broad descriptive categories including age, number of respondents per bank, job status, gender, race, highest formal education and number of years working of the organization.
4.3.1 Gender

Figure 4.1 depicts the gender of respondents. The majority of the respondents (58%, n = 73) were female employees, while male employees comprised 42% of the respondents (n = 53).

Figure 4.1 Distribution of respondents by gender

4.3.2 Age

Figure 4.2 shows that 50% (n=63) of the employees in the sample were between the ages of 25-34. Almost 30% (n=37) of the employees were of the ages around 35-44, whilst 11% (n=15) of the employees were in between 18-24 years old. 8.37% (n=11) of the employees were around the age of 45 years onwards.
4.3.3 Race

Figure 4.3 Distribution of respondents by race

Figure 4.3 illustrates that the majority of the employees, \( n = 73 \) or 58% were Black, while a further 20% \( n = 25 \) were Coloured employees. Fourteen percent (14%) or 18 respondents were Asian and 8% \( n = 10 \) were White employees.
4.3.4 Formal Education

Figure 4.4 depicts the formal education qualification of the employees. 44% (n=56) of employees were at Diploma level, 34% (n=43) were at Certificate, 19% (n=25) were at Bachelors level, while Masters or Honours degrees were less than 1% (n=1).

Figure 4.4 Distribution of respondents by educational qualification

4.3.5 Period at work

Figure 4.5 shows the period of time the employees had been working for the organizations. About 49% (n=61) of employees had worked at the banks for 6 to 10 years, 34% (n=43) had worked between 1 and 5 years in their organization, 15% (n=19) had worked for 11 to 15 years, 1.59% (n=2) for 16 to 20 years while less than 1% (n=1) of employees had worked for more than 20 years.
Figure 4.5 Period of employment at organization

![Bar chart showing time served on current organisation.](image)

Time served on current organisation

- 1 - 5 years: 34.13%
- 6 - 10 years: 48.41%
- 11 - 15 years: 15.08%
- 16 - 20 years: 1.59%
- 20 +: 0.79%

4.3.6 Employee representation per bank

Figure 4.6 Employee Representation per bank

![Pie chart showing employee representation per bank.](image)
Figure 4.6 shows that each bank had almost equal representation in the sample. ABSA had the highest percentage of employees who participated in the research with 36% (n=46). It was followed by both FNB and Standard Banks with 32% with same (n=40).

4.3.7 Job status

Figure 4.7 Job status of respondents

Figure 4.7 shows that 92% (n=116) of the sample had permanent jobs and 8% (n=10) of the employees were in temporary posts.

4.3.8 Job titles

Figure 4.8 above shows that 50% (n=63) of the employees were consultants, 31% (n=39) management and 19% (n=24) tellers.
4.3.9 Mean levels of personality and job satisfaction for banks

Figure 4.9 Mean levels of personality and job satisfaction
Figure 4.9 shows the mean values of personality and job satisfaction in terms of the different banks. It can be seen that all banks had employees with low mean levels of the neuroticism personality trait, while they had high mean levels of agreeableness, extraversion, openness, conscientiousness and job satisfaction. FNB had higher mean levels of every variable than other banks. In terms of job satisfaction FNB had high mean levels followed by Standard bank and lastly ABSA. Also in terms of personality all the banks had high levels on each personality trait except for neuroticism.

4.3.10 Mean levels of personality and job satisfaction for bank employees

Figure 4.10 Mean levels of personality and job satisfaction

![Mean levels for job titles](image)
Figure 4.10 depicts the mean levels of personality and job satisfaction among bank employees. In terms of job satisfaction, management employees had high mean levels (mean=4.0833333), while consultants had a mean value of (mean=3.6158730) and tellers had a low mean (mean=2.8145833). Employees in the management category had high levels of conscientiousness (mean=4.2243590), openness (mean=3.9102564), agreeableness (mean=4.4423077), and low mean levels of neuroticism (mean=2.2820513) and extraversion (mean=2.8589744) personality traits. In terms of the consultants category employees they had high levels of openness (mean=4.0317460), conscientiousness (mean=4.1388889), agreeableness (mean=3.6587302) and extraversion (mean=3.3968254), while they had low levels of neuroticism (mean=2.3888889). Tellers had high mean levels of openness (mean=3.1770833), agreeableness (mean=4.7291667) and extraversion (mean=3.7500000), while they had low mean levels of conscientiousness (mean=2.9166667) and neuroticism (mean=1.3020833).

4.4 Inferential statistics

The following section addresses the results obtained for the inferential statistics to ascertain the relationship between job satisfaction and personality, the significant difference between biographical characteristics and job satisfaction, the significant difference between biographical characteristics and personality, and to determine which factors explain the variance in both job satisfaction and personality.
### 4.4.1 Comparisons of means in study variables and demographic features

Table 4.3 Comparisons of means in study variables and demographic features

ANOVA and Waller-Duncan K-ratio t Test for Comparisons of Means in Personality and Job Satisfaction for the Different Demographic Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>COMPARISON BY</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F-VALUE</th>
<th>t VALUE</th>
<th>WALLER GROUPING</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>OPENNESS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.48258</td>
<td>(A A A A) – (3 2 4 1)</td>
<td>0.2532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUSNESS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.54056</td>
<td>(A A A A) – (4 1 3 2)</td>
<td>0.3195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXTRAVERSION</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.19054</td>
<td>(A AB AB B) - (1 3 2 4)</td>
<td>0.0468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREEABLENESS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2.81083</td>
<td>(A A A A) – (1 2 3 4)</td>
<td>0.7349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.08959</td>
<td>(A AB AB B) – (4 2 1 3)</td>
<td>0.0174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOB SATISFACTION</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.42549</td>
<td>(A A A A) - (4 1 3 2)</td>
<td>0.1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>OPENNESS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.20124</td>
<td>(A A AB B) – (4 3 1 2)</td>
<td>0.0510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUSNESS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.42373</td>
<td>(A A A A) – (4 3 1 2)</td>
<td>0.1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXTRAVERSION</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.43464</td>
<td>(A A A A) – (3 4 2 1)</td>
<td>0.2051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREEABLENESS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.32852</td>
<td>(A AB AB B) – (2 4 1 3)</td>
<td>0.1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>2.00959</td>
<td>(A AB B B) – (1 2 4 3)</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOB SATISFACTION</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.08932</td>
<td>(A A AB B) – (4 1 3 2)</td>
<td>0.0174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALIFICATION</td>
<td>OPENNESS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.92870</td>
<td>(A A A A A) - (3 4 2 5 1)</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUSNESS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.26560</td>
<td>(A A A A A) - (4 3 2 5 1)</td>
<td>0.0473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXTRAVERSION</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.20823</td>
<td>(A A A A A) - (1 2 5 4 3)</td>
<td>0.0302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREEABLENESS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.77961</td>
<td>(A A A A A) - (4 3 1 5 2)</td>
<td>0.4419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Trait</td>
<td>Degree of Freedom</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Significance Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.87133</td>
<td>0.5568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB SATISFACTION</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.94049</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCHANGE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.99264</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUSNESS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.82216</td>
<td>0.4940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTRAVERSION</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.68145</td>
<td>0.3315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREEABLENESS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2.92126</td>
<td>0.6226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>1.89090</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB SATISFACTION</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.76705</td>
<td>0.4269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.35459</td>
<td>0.2848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUSNESS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.42425</td>
<td>0.4032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTRAVERSION</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2.34442</td>
<td>0.2697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREEABLENESS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.62183</td>
<td>0.9234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>1.88021</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB SATISFACTION</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.14992</td>
<td>0.0740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB TITLE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>1.81647</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUSNESS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.09</td>
<td>1.76709</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTRAVERSION</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>1.83558</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREEABLENESS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.14</td>
<td>1.77819</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>1.80420</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB SATISFACTION</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54.75</td>
<td>1.75878</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Levels of Personality and Job Satisfaction for Demographic Information and Correlation (refer to appendix)
Table 4.3 shows the comparisons of means in personality and job satisfaction for the different demographic features. In terms of age, the study shows that there was no significant difference between openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness and job satisfaction. However there was a significant difference between age and the extraversion personality trait ($pr>F=0.0468$, $t=2.19054$) and also a relationship was found between these two variables ($r=-0.20503$; $p=0.0213$). The mean levels show that extraversion was high (mean=3.7166667) in the age group 18 to 24 and it was low (mean=2.7954545) in the 45+ age group. Significant difference was also seen between age and the neuroticism personality trait ($pr>F=0.0174$, $t=2.08959$). From the mean levels of neuroticism it shows that in all age groups there were low levels of neuroticism with the age group 45+ having the mean value of (mean=2.5454545), and (mean=1.77702703) for 35-44 age groups.

The comparisons between race, personality and job satisfaction is also shown on the table. There was no significant difference between race and openness, conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness. The only significant difference shown was with neuroticism ($pr>F=0.0055$, $t=2.00959$) in the Black and Asian race. Again from the mean levels, neuroticism was very low in the Black race (mean=2.3698630) and even lower in Asians (mean=1.708333). Also a significant relationship was found between race and neuroticism ($r=-0.29621$; $p=0.0008$). The other significant difference was with race and job satisfaction ($pr>F=0.0174$, $t=2.08932$) which was high in both the Coloured race (mean=3.8660000) and White race (mean=3.1550000). A weak correlation was also found between race and openness ($r=0.17732$; $p=0.0470$).
Significant differences are seen in educational qualifications. There was a significant
difference in openness ($pr>F=0.0002$, $t=1.92870$), where it was high in employees with
Bachelor’s degree (mean=4.1900000) and in employees with Certificates
(mean=3.4186047). A relationship was also found between education and openness
($r=0.35190$; $p=<0.001$). A significant difference was also noticed in the
conscientiousness personality trait ($pr>F=0.0473$, $t=2.26560$) and a significant
relationship was also found ($r=0.24309$; $p=0.0061$). Conscientiousness was high among
employees with an Honours degree (4.7500000) and employees with Certificates
(mean=3.7209302). Qualification had also significant difference with extraversion
($pr>F=0.0302$, $t=2.20823$) where employees with Certificates (mean=3.5755814) had
high extraversion and those with Bachelors (mean= 2.9100000) had low extraversion. A
correlation was also found between extraversion and qualifications ($r=0.27007$;
p=0.0022). Also, qualifications have a significant difference with job satisfaction
($pr>F=0.0003$, $t=1.94049$) where job satisfaction was high in employees with a Masters
Degree (mean=4.8500000) and also in employees with Certificates (mean=3.363935).
A correlation was also found between these two variables ($r=0.38992$; $p=<0.001$). There
was no significant difference in the agreeableness and neuroticism personality traits.

In terms of experience there was a significant difference with openness ($pr>F=0.0016$,
t=1.99264) where those who had worked between 11-15years (mean=4.2631579) had
high openness and those with work experience 20+ years had low openness
(mean=2.2500000). There was also a significant difference with neuroticism
($pr>F=0.0001$, $t=1.89090$), those with 20+ years of experience (mean=3.2500000) had a
slightly higher neuroticism than those with 11-15 years (mean=1.7763158). A significant
A negative correlation was also found between experience and neuroticism ($r=-0.24713; \ p=0.0053$). There was no significant difference with conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and job satisfaction.

The type of bank had a significant difference with neuroticism ($pr>F=0.0006, \ t=1.88021$) where FNB (mean=2.532500) had low neuroticism levels and ABSA (mean=1.7880435) had lower levels of neuroticism. A correlation was also found between banks and neuroticism ($r=0.18825; \ p=0.0348$). There was no significant difference in terms of the types of banks with openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and job satisfaction.

In terms of job titles there was a great significant difference with all personality traits and job satisfaction. Significant relationships were found between job title and openness ($r=0.28121; \ p=0.00014$), conscientiousness ($r=0.50537; \ p=<.0001$), extraversion ($r=0.38494; \ p=<.0001$), neuroticism ($r=0.31769; \ p=0.0003$), and job satisfaction ($r=0.67394; \ p=<.0001$). There existed no significant relationship between job title and agreeableness.

4.4.2 Mean differences in study variables on gender and job status

**Table 4.4 T Tests for mean differences on gender and job status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>LEVELS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>COMPARISON BY</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>t VALUE</th>
<th>Pr &gt; t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.7508</td>
<td>OPENNESS</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.0786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.5388</td>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUSNESS</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.9425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXTRAVERSION</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.7911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGREEABLENESS</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.7607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 shows the mean differences in personality and job satisfaction on gender and job status. In terms of gender there was a significant difference with neuroticism (pr>t=0.0318, t=-2.17) though the mean levels are low for neuroticism for both male (mean=1.9433962) and female (mean=2.2979452). A correlation was also found between gender and neuroticism (r=0.19137; p=0.0318). There was no significant difference in openness, extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness and job satisfaction. Job status had a significant difference with job satisfaction (pr>t=0.0214, t=2.33) and also had a significant relationship (r=-0.20482; p=0.0214). There was no significant difference between job status and all the personality traits.
### 4.4.3 Pearson correlation between personality and job satisfaction

#### Table 4.5 Correlation between personality and variables of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM/S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td>0.25555</td>
<td>0.44319</td>
<td>-0.15233</td>
<td>-0.09517</td>
<td>0.20612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.0886</td>
<td>0.2891</td>
<td>0.0206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENCE</td>
<td>0.23647</td>
<td>0.29472</td>
<td>-0.26506</td>
<td>0.01945</td>
<td>0.17479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>0.8288</td>
<td>0.0503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIETY</td>
<td>0.23515</td>
<td>0.34039</td>
<td>-0.20682</td>
<td>-0.12438</td>
<td>0.33812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0080</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.0201</td>
<td>0.1652</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL STATUS</td>
<td>0.15360</td>
<td>0.35446</td>
<td>-0.19966</td>
<td>-0.11554</td>
<td>0.41370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0860</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.0250</td>
<td>0.1976</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORAL VALUES</td>
<td>0.21880</td>
<td>0.38251</td>
<td>-0.16433</td>
<td>-0.15242</td>
<td>0.07376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.0660</td>
<td>0.0884</td>
<td>0.4117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURITY</td>
<td>0.20718</td>
<td>0.26971</td>
<td>-0.16828</td>
<td>-0.09546</td>
<td>0.09777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0199</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>0.0596</td>
<td>0.2876</td>
<td>0.2761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHIEVEMENT</td>
<td>0.22480</td>
<td>0.28672</td>
<td>-0.13563</td>
<td>-0.01996</td>
<td>-0.00467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.1300</td>
<td>0.8245</td>
<td>0.9586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SERVICE</td>
<td>0.21123</td>
<td>0.44079</td>
<td>-0.26684</td>
<td>-0.03516</td>
<td>0.33951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0176</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>0.6959</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHORITY</td>
<td>0.26458</td>
<td>0.30618</td>
<td>-0.15906</td>
<td>-0.07194</td>
<td>0.03446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0752</td>
<td>0.4234</td>
<td>0.7017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABILITY UTILIZATION</td>
<td>0.18672</td>
<td>0.36053</td>
<td>-0.17406</td>
<td>0.00702</td>
<td>0.20395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0363</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.0513</td>
<td>0.9378</td>
<td>0.0220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>0.20920</td>
<td>0.27561</td>
<td>-0.20810</td>
<td>-0.16776</td>
<td>0.06568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0187</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
<td>0.0194</td>
<td>0.0604</td>
<td>0.4650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVITY</td>
<td>0.32320</td>
<td>0.27985</td>
<td>-0.23174</td>
<td>-0.18202</td>
<td>0.01008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.0090</td>
<td>0.0414</td>
<td>0.9108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISION HUMAN RELATIONS</td>
<td>0.24979</td>
<td>0.41678</td>
<td>-0.18909</td>
<td>-0.09632</td>
<td>0.11108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0048</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.0340</td>
<td>0.2833</td>
<td>0.2156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6 Pearson correlation between personality and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEUROTICISM</th>
<th>OPENNESS</th>
<th>JOB_SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTRAVERSION</td>
<td>-0.32080</td>
<td>-0.04480</td>
<td>-0.27498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.6184</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREEABLENESS</td>
<td>0.03398</td>
<td>-0.28930</td>
<td>-0.09564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7056</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.2867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUSNESS</td>
<td>0.13815</td>
<td>0.42671</td>
<td>0.58376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1229</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-0.18859</td>
<td>0.19084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0344</td>
<td>0.0323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPENNESS</td>
<td>-0.18859</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.34510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0344</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB_SATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.19084</td>
<td>0.34510</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0323</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 4.5 and 4.6 focus on the results per hypothesis. The table shows the analysis of the relationship between job satisfaction and a range of independent variables of personality which are neuroticism, extraversion, openness, conscientiousness and agreeableness. The results will be explained bellow for each hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 1**

1st. $H_0$: There is no significant relationship between the agreeableness trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

$H_1$: There is a significant relationship between the agreeableness trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

The findings of the study demonstrated that agreeableness was not correlated to job satisfaction ($r=-0.09564; p=0.2867$). The correlation shows that there is no significant relationship between job satisfaction and agreeableness. The mean level of agreeableness (mean=4.10516) shows that it was high in the sample hence high agreeableness has no significant relationship with job satisfaction. This can be seen in Table 4.5, Agreeableness did not have a relationship with any of the job satisfaction questions.

**Hypothesis 2**

2nd. $H_0$: There is no significant relationship between the conscientiousness trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

$H_1$: There is a significant relationship between the conscientiousness trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees
The result of the study indicated that conscientiousness was highly significantly and positively correlated with job satisfaction ($r=0.58376; p<.0001$) showing that conscientiousness significantly affects job satisfaction. The majority of the mean values from the sample show that most employees had a high conscientiousness personality trait ($mean=3.93254$). Therefore high conscientiousness was related to high job satisfaction among the bank employees. Conscientiousness was related to all questions of job satisfaction in Table 4.5.

**Hypothesis 3**

3rd. $H_0$: There is no significant relationship between the openness trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

$H_1$: There is a significant relationship between the openness trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

The study discovered that openness to experiences was significantly correlated with the measure of job satisfaction ($r=0.34510; p<.0001$). The mean level of personality shows that openness was very high among the employees ($mean=3.83135$). This result showed that the openness to experiences trait did significantly affect job satisfaction as it was related to all the variables of job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 4**

4th. $H_0$: There is no significant relationship between the extraversion trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees
H$_1$: There is a significant relationship between the extraversion trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

The results above show that extraversion was negatively correlated to job satisfaction among the employees. From the mean of the sample it can be seen that extraversion was high (mean=3.29762) among the employees and also there was a great significant difference between job title and extraversion (pr>F<.0001). Hence this study shows that high extraversion is negatively correlated to job satisfaction (r=-0.27498; p=0.0018). There was also negative relationship between extraversion and job satisfaction in terms of independence, variety, creativity and other questions as can be seen in Table 4.5.

**Hypothesis 5**

5th. H$_0$: There is no significant relationship between the neuroticism trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

H$_1$: There is a significant relationship between the neuroticism trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

The statistical analysis with Pearson Correlation significantly indicated that neuroticism was positively and weakly correlated to job satisfaction (r=0.19084; p=0.0323). The mean levels of the neuroticism personality trait show that it was very low (mean=2.14881). Hence low neuroticism is positively related to job satisfaction.

**4.5 Conclusion**

This chapter has provided an overview of the most salient findings obtained based on empirical analysis of the data. Statistical analysis involved both descriptive and
inferential statistics (SAS 9.1, Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient, ANOVA and Waller-Duncan K-ratio t Test and TTest). Empirical results which were obtained from the data analysis indicated a significant relationship between job satisfaction and three personality traits; which are low neuroticism, conscientiousness and openness traits. There was no significant correlation between job satisfaction and agreeableness personality trait. An extraversion personality trait was negatively correlated with job satisfaction. The following chapter presents a discussion of the findings obtained and contextualizes the research findings based on previous research on job satisfaction and personality. Finally, conclusions are drawn and recommendations are made.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

The chapter presents the research findings of the study and makes reference to relevant research to support the findings of the current study. In order to contextualise the research, comparisons are drawn with available literature on job satisfaction and personality among employees. The chapter provides conclusions that can be drawn from the research and offers suggestions for future research into job satisfaction and personality amongst bank employees.

5.2 Discussion of results

5.2.1 Demographics information

The sample consisted of 126 bank employees employed by Standard Bank, FNB and ABSA. The majority of the sample was female employees (n=73 or 58%) while male employees in the sample amounted to (n=53 or 42%). Most of the respondents were aged between 25-24 years (n= or 50%), followed by 35-44 year olds (mean=37 or 30%), 18-24 (n=15 or 12%) and lastly 45+ year olds (n=11 or 8%). The majority of the employees had permanent posts (mean=116 or 92%) and a few were temporary (mean=10 or 8%). Bank consultants made up the greater number of respondents that participated in the study (n = 63 or 50%). While management employees constituted the second highest number of respondents (n=39 or 31%). The number of tellers who participated was the lowest (n=23 or 19%). It may be concluded that most tellers did not
have much time to fill out the questionnaires as they are always busy and at the forefront.

The majority of respondents were Black (n = 73 or 58%), followed by Coloured (n=25 or 20%), Asian (n=18 or 14%) and lastly White (n=10 or 8%). Most of the respondents have Diplomas (mean=56 or 44%), while others had Certificates (mean=43 or 34%), Bachelor’s Degrees (mean=25 or 20%), Honors Degree (mean=1 or 1%) and Masters Degree (n=1 or 1%). The majority if the employees had 6-10 years of experience (mean=61 or 49%), while others had 1-5 years (mean=43 or 34%), 11-15 years (mean=19 or 15%), 16-20 years (mean=2 or 2%) and 20+ years (mean=1 or 1%).

5.2.2 Significant differences in study variables and demographic features

This discussion is about the comparisons of means in personality and job satisfaction for the different demographic features.

- **Age**

In terms of age, the study shows that there was no significant difference with openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness and job satisfaction. However there was a significant difference with the extraversion and neuroticism personality traits. Terracciano, McCrae, Brant & Costa (2005) conducted a cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis examining links between age and mean-levels of the Big Five. This study was completed too recently to be included in the Roberts et al., (2006) meta-analysis. Terracciano et al., (2005) found that scores on Extraversion generally declined from age 30 to 90 although the drop in Extraversion was more pronounced after the mid 50s or so. Similarly in this study extraversion was high in 18-24 year olds and low in 45+ year old employees.
Average levels of Neuroticism generally declined with age but increased slightly starting around age 80 (Terracciano et al., 2005) which is similar to this study’s results, where neuroticism was low in employees in the range of 35-44 years and 45+ years.

In this study age had no significant difference with job satisfaction. This is consistent with the study done by Reudavey (2001) in which it was determined that age and job satisfaction are not related based on a sample of employees in the aviation industry. These results are consistent with research done by Lee (1996) who found no relationship between age and job satisfaction.

❖ Race

There was no significance difference on race with openness, conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness. The only significant difference shown was with neuroticism in the Black and Asian races though it was low. The other significant difference was with job satisfaction which was high on both the Coloured race and White race. A number of studies have also found that White employees amongst different occupational classes experienced higher levels of job satisfaction in comparison to African employees (Strawser & Slocum (1972), Davis (1985), Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Wormley (1990), Martin & Tuch (1991) all cited in Friday et al., 2004).

❖ Educational qualification

Significant differences are seen on education qualification. There was a significant difference in openness, where it was high in employees with Bachelor’s degrees and in employees with Certificates. A significant difference was noticed on the
conscientiousness personality trait which was high among employees with Honours degrees and employees with Certificates. Qualification also had significant difference with extraversion, where employees with Certificates had high extraversion and those with Bachelors had low extraversion.

Qualifications has also a significant difference with job satisfaction were job satisfaction was high in employees with Masters Degrees and slightly high on employees with Certificates. These results are consistent with Bjork et al. (2007) who discovered that nurses with a master’s degree or other continuing education were more satisfied than those without additional education. The comparison between job satisfaction and education was also supported by Gazioglu & Tansel (2002) who observed that those with degrees and postgraduate degree holders had lower levels of job satisfaction compared to individuals with lower levels of education. One can say that those who have the highest qualifications experience job satisfaction due to their increased compensation or position in the organization which comes with the level of education. There was no significant difference on agreeableness and neuroticism personality in this study.

**Work experience**

In terms of experience there was a significant difference with openness where those who have worked between 11-15 years had high openness and those with work experience 20+ years had low openness. There was also a significant difference with neuroticism those with 20+ years of experience had slightly higher neuroticism and those with 11-15 years had low neuroticism. There was no significant difference with
conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and job satisfaction. Experience may also correlate with age; an employee who is older has more experience than young employees. Young employees are still high in openness as there are at a stage where they are creative, full of exploration and more curious than older employees who are now satisfied with their work like as it is.

- **Banks**

The different banks had a significant difference with neuroticism were FNB had low neuroticism levels and ABSA had lower levels of neuroticism. There was no significant difference in terms of the types of banks with openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and job satisfaction. From these results it is understandable that personality and job satisfaction had no significance difference as the job tasks and environment in the different banks are usually the same.

- **Job titles**

In terms of job titles there was a great significant difference with all personality traits and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction has a significant difference with job titles as it was high among management employees (mean=4.083333) than tellers (2.814583). These results are consistent with Burke (1996) who found that men and women at more senior levels in an organization reported higher levels of job satisfaction in relation to administrative, clerical and secretarial staff. Several other researchers have also found support for a positive association between job level and satisfaction. Results from a study by Robie, Ryan, Schmieder, Parra and Smith (1998) revealed a consistent and significant positive relationship between these two variables.
One can comment that this may be because most employees in higher positions in this case the management are more satisfied with their jobs as they receive more salary and benefits than tellers. Also their jobs give them more flexibility and variety than that of tellers who have routine jobs, which affects job satisfaction. On the part of job title and personality it may be because each job requires a certain personality trait for the job to be executed effectively. For example tellers were high on extraversion than management, which may be due to their working closely with clients. Management and consultant were high on openness, as their jobs require creativity and variety.

5.2.3 Mean differences in study variables on gender and job Status

- Gender

In terms of gender there was a significant difference with neuroticism though the mean levels are low for neuroticism for both male and female, though the female mean was higher than of male’s. These results are consistent with cross cultural research which had showed some patterns of gender difference in response to the big five personality traits. For example women consistently report higher neuroticism and men often report higher on extraversion and openness (Costa et al., 2001) Similarly a study of gender difference in 55 nations using the big five personality traits found that women tended to be somewhat higher than men in neuroticism, agreeableness and conscientiousness (Schmitt et al., 2008). The difference in neuroticism was the most prominent and consistent with significant difference found in 49 of 55 nations surveyed.

There was no significant difference on openness, extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness and job satisfaction in this study. It is consistent with research done by
Oshagbemi (2000) who failed to find that gender has a significant difference with job satisfaction. Similarly, Donohue & Heywood (2004) could not prove gender satisfaction differences in a study conducted amongst young American and British employees. There is no research to suggest that gender plays a role in job satisfaction (Brush, Moch & Pooyan, 1987).

- Job status

Job status had a significant difference with job satisfaction and there was no significant difference with all the personality traits. One can comment that the personality and job status of an employee have no significant difference as one may always have the same personality whether; the job was permanent or temporary. For example an extrovert, person will always be an extravert whether in a temporary post or a permanent post. However the significant difference with job satisfaction can be explained. It is high in permanent employees and slightly high on temporary employees. Permanent employees are more satisfied as they have job security and continued employment especially when unemployment rates are high in Eastern Cape. On the part of temporary employees they are satisfied with their job because they are gaining valuable experience to use in the future; hence, they are happy to be given the opportunity.

5.2.4 Mean levels of personality and job satisfaction for the different banks

In this study all banks had employees with low mean levels of the neuroticism personality trait, while they had high mean levels in agreeableness, extraversion, openness, conscientiousness and job satisfaction. FNB had high mean levels in every variable as compared to other banks. In terms of job satisfaction FNB had high mean
levels followed by Standard bank and lastly ABSA. Also In terms of personality all the banks had high levels of each personality trait except for neuroticism.

5.2.5 Mean levels of personality and job satisfaction for bank employees

From this study, in terms of job satisfaction, management and consultants had high mean levels, while tellers had a low mean value. Employees in the management category had high levels of conscientiousness, openness, agreeableness, and low mean levels in neuroticism and extraversion personality traits. One can explain that management has low levels of extraversion as they do not work in a social setting and do not face customers on a daily basis. Also they have low neuroticism levels as they cannot afford to panic, be depressed or unsure of their duties as they deal with a lot of employees and a lot of money. Their high levels of openness give the creativity and innovation on how to supply the best product service to consumers. And also, being conscientiousness helps them to be organized and systematic and being agreeable is important as they have to be supportive to their employees and help them when they face difficulties in dealing with clients.

In this study consultants’ employees had high levels of openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness and extraversion, while they had low levels of neuroticism. The results shows that many consultants had high levels of openness, as they need to be creative to deal with different request of customers. They are high in agreeableness and extraversion as they deal with costumers each day and their front line employees. According to Cooper (2003) an extroverted personality tends to be sociable, assertive, gregarious, talkative, and ambitious, which is very crucial when working in the bank to develop a good relationship with clients and for them to feel welcomed. They have low
levels of neuroticism as a foul mood when dealing with customers may lead to customers being dissatisfied with the service provided.

Results from this study show that tellers had high mean levels in openness, agreeableness and extraversion, while they had low mean levels in conscientiousness and neuroticism. Tellers deal with consumers first hand helping them with withdrawing, transferring and depositing of money. Hence, they have to be extraverts and agreeable. Agreeableness relates to individuals’ interpersonal tendencies concerning the degree of cooperation, helpfulness and the courtesy that the individual has (Barrick & Mount, 1991). This is crucial in the banking environment, because employees will be helpful and cooperate with the clients, which leaves the clients happy.

In this study tellers had low levels of conscientiousness. Conscientious employees are more likely to believe that their work has special meaning, and thus, they experience greater psychological attachment to their jobs (Li, Lin & Chen, 2007). Hence tellers may feel that their work has no special meaning to them as they feel that they are not given much control in doing their work, which is always routine. They also had low levels of neuroticism which is a good thing in the banking environment. Employees with high levels of neuroticism show anger and anxiety. The individuals with neurotic traits have poor social skills and they escape from highly demanding jobs (Judge, Locke & Drham, 1997). Therefore, tellers should have low levels of neuroticism as they have to be friendly all the time.
5.2.6 The relationship between personality and job satisfaction

This discussion focuses on the results per hypothesis. It is about the analysis of the relationship between job satisfaction and a range of independent variables of personality which are neuroticism, extraversion, openness, conscientiousness and agreeableness.

1st. $H_0$: There is no significant relationship between the agreeableness trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

$H_1$: There is a significant relationship between the agreeableness trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

The findings of the study demonstrated that agreeableness was not related to job satisfaction ($r=-0.09564$). The correlation shows that there is no significant relationship between job satisfaction and agreeableness.

Agreeableness relates to individuals’ interpersonal tendencies concerning the degree of cooperation, helpfulness and the courtesy that the individual has (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Agreeable employees are cooperative and forgiving, tend to follow rules, and act courteously to get ahead. One can say that banks need employees who are helpful to their customers. At the same time employees may get dissatisfied because the pressure of following rules may get to them. Dealing with money can be strenuous and it puts pressure on them to avoid mistakes which causes high risk. Hence being always on the alert may lower their job satisfaction. It is consistent with Judge et al. (2002) who could not identify this trait as a clear predictor of job satisfaction.
An agreeable person is sympathetic to others, fundamentally unselfish and eager to help, and in return, believe that others will be equally supportive. According to Judge, Higgins, Thoresen & Barrick (1999), agreeable individuals would compromise their own job satisfaction to make others happy. It is important to note that Day & Bedeian (1995) and Schneider (1999) found that agreeableness is not related to job satisfaction. It seems possible that individuals who are high on this dimension may have a tendency to over exert themselves in an effort to help and/or please others such as coworkers or family members. Recent research has indicated that agreeableness relates negatively with extrinsic career success and career satisfaction; suggesting that agreeableness may predispose individuals to be taken advantage of by the demands of others (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen & Barrick, 1999; Siebert & Kraimer, 2001).

However the results of this study do not corroborate those of DeNeve & Cooper’s (1998) meta-analysis, suggesting that cognitive, affective, and behavioral factors may lead to personality-job satisfaction relations. An agreeableness person being likeable, cooperative, and good-natured is more satisfied in their job. Similarity, the greater intellectual curiously and sensitivity to inner feelings of more open individuals, makes them more satisfied in their job.

2nd.  \( H_0: \) There is no significant relationship between the conscientiousness trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

\( H_1: \) There is a significant relationship between the conscientiousness trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees
The result of the study indicated that conscientiousness was highly significantly and positively related to job satisfaction \((r=0.58376)\) showing that conscientiousness significantly affect job satisfaction. Therefore employees with high conscientiousness had high job satisfaction.

Conscientiousness refers to the degree to which a person is organized, systematic, punctual, achievement-oriented, and dependable. Conscientiousness is said to be at the core of service provision (Barrick & Mount, 1998). Successful service providers are accurate, dependable, responsive and timely. The construct similarity between its description and Conscientiousness suggests that more conscientious employees provide high quality service. Conscientiousness is applicable to banking jobs as they need higher discretion as it deals with monetary operation. The employees must work discreetly and strenuously. Each regulation and working rule prescribed should be strictly followed so that no mistakes would happen to the customers. Hence people who are organized and systematic work very well in banks. The more Conscientious a person is the more competent, dutiful, orderly, responsible and thorough he/she is (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Because the banking sector handles big amounts of money, employees had to open accounts for customers who entered banking with trust. They also had to do their jobs carefully with high responsibility not only for the money deposited but also for the money loaned and credited.

The results from the study are consistent with Organ & Lingl (1991) that conscientiousness should be related to job satisfaction because it shows a general work involvement tendency and leads to a greater likelihood of obtaining satisfying work rewards including both formal (e.g., pay, promotions) and informal (e.g., respect,
recognition of personal achievement). Conscientiousness was also a consistent positive predictor of actual global job satisfaction, a result that echoes findings from Judge et al., (1999). Salgado (1997) noted that nearly all meta-analyses aggregating over different samples in different countries with different outcome criteria show that Conscioussness is probably the best trait predictor of work-related behavior.

Similarly Furnham et al. (2002) found that conscientiousness is related positively to intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction; therefore, conscientiousness is most highly related to overall job satisfaction than any other personality trait which is also the case with this study. Conscientiously was highly related to job satisfaction \( r=0.5376 \). Of the five dimensions of personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992), conscientiousness has been shown to be the only significant predictor of job satisfaction by Judge et al., (1999). Barrick & Mount (1991) found that conscientiousness was a strong predictor of job performance in occupational groups.

3rd. \( H_0 \): There is no significant relationship between the openness trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

\( H_1 \): There is a significant relationship between the openness trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

The findings of this study revealed that openness to experiences was significantly related to the measure of job satisfaction \( r=0.34510 \). The mean level of personality shows that openness was very high among the employees. This result showed that openness to experiences did significantly affect job satisfaction.
In this study openness is related to job satisfaction especially among consultants (mean=4.0317460). This is consistent with other literature. Openness tends to be unconventional, willing to question authority and prepared to entertain new ethical, social and political ideas. Open individuals are curious about both inner and outer worlds, and their lives are experientially richer. They are willing to entertain novel ideas and unconventional values, and they experience both positive and negative emotions more keenly than do closed individuals. Research has shown that Openness to experiences is related to success in consulting (Hamilton, 1988), training (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Vinchur et al., 1998) and adapting to change (Raudsepp, 1990).

In this study openness was very high in consultant employees followed by management and lastly tellers (see means in appendix). This may be because individuals' high in Openness are more satisfied with jobs which allow them to learn new skills and be innovative (Furnham et al., 2005). In the banking sector consultants and managers usually have tasks that may allow them to be creative and find different ways to meet the requirements of their customers. Their jobs are usually not as routine as those of tellers. Individuals with high levels of openness to experience would likely be attracted to perform because this type of trait leaves space for staff to explore new things and contribute their own ideas towards organization effectiveness. It helps them to satisfy their curiosity, explore new viewpoints, and develop real interests in their activities. Hence, they are satisfied with their work.

Individuals who are high in openness strive for creativity and knowledge of new ideas. Knowledgeable banking employees will understand client’s financial needs with regard to banking products and services and will be able to communicate banking information
more effectively (Jackson, 2003:71). Hence they will be satisfied with their jobs. In the banking industry, specifically, assistance from bank employees and their level of knowledge are considered to be very important by clients. A bank employee needs to possess the knowledge and expertise required to advise and assist clients in their financial matters. If relevant advice and assistance are provided, clients will feel valued by the bank and possibly have a better long-term relationship with the bank.

Judge et al., (2002) found that openness is positively correlated with job satisfaction. Axtell et al., (2002) considered openness as the ability to accept exposure to change. Greater exposure to change was directly related to subsequent improvements in openness. Acceptance of exposure to change is associated with improvements in job satisfaction. Thus, just like Judge et al., (2002), Axtell et al., (2002) concluded that openness is positively correlated with job satisfaction.

4th. \( H_0 \): There is no significant relationship between the extraversion trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

\( H_1 \): There is a significant relationship between the extraversion trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

The results in Table 4.6 shows that extraversion was negatively correlated to job satisfaction among the employees. From the mean of the sample (see appendix) it can be seen that extraversion was high among the employees and also there was a great significant difference between job title and extraversion (pr>F<.0001). Hence this study shows that high extraversion is negatively correlated to job satisfaction (r=-0.27498). So it led to the conclusion that the more extraversion there was, the less satisfied the
employees were in their jobs. These results are consistent with Ahmas & Razzack, 1983) who found that extraversion made no significant difference in job satisfaction.

These results are not consistent with other literature reviews. An extroverted personality tends to be sociable, assertive, gregarious, talkative, and ambitious (Cooper, 2003), so such people often use their working environment to represent a key facet of their lives that enables them to meet their aspirations and exhibit their talents (Hurley, 1998). People high in extraversion are satisfied in the workplace because work gives them an opportunity to experience an optimal level of arousal and it is correlated with job satisfaction.

In a research survey by Grant, Fried & Juillerat (2010) at a large bank, managers found that bank tellers were very dissatisfied with their jobs, stating that they were "just glorified clerks". They also said that their jobs were boring and that they felt micromanaged because they were unable to make decisions, even small ones, without the approval of their managers. Hence in this study though employees especially tellers had high extraversion they were not happy with their job in terms of their salary and the job itself. This may help in understanding that even if one has personality traits required for the job they may enjoy the job but they are not satisfied with everything that comes with the job.

Also from the correlation in Table 4.5 it can be seen that there was no significant difference in most questions on extraversion and job satisfaction. The few questions which had a significant difference had a negative relationship with job satisfaction. These questions included independence, variety, creativity, recognition and
responsibility. One can comment that in terms of tellers even though they had extraversion they were not happy with their jobs as they do have jobs which allow them variety and creativity. Hoffman & Bateson (2006:265) define empowerment as the option of giving discretion to front-line employees interacting with clients to meet client’s product and service needs creatively. Empowered employees are usually satisfied with their jobs, and their positive attitudes show when they conduct their job activities and during their interactions with clients (Hoffman & Bateson 2006:266). Their jobs are usually routine which may explain why they did not have job satisfaction like much of the literature accounts for.

5th. $H_0$: There is no significant relationship between the neuroticism trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

$H_1$: There is a significant relationship between the neuroticism trait and job satisfaction among the bank employees

The statistical analysis with the Pearson Correlation significantly indicated that neuroticism was positively and weakly related to job satisfaction. Low neuroticism was positively related to job satisfaction; therefore employees who had low neuroticism where satisfied with their jobs.

For a banking career, which requires encounters with a variety of people, countless work phases, haste in work, pressure at work those without good control to cope with emerging unfavorable situations would rarely feel satisfied with their job. Another important aspect is that work in banking requires team work and social relationships. As Asendorpt & Wilper (1998), Barrick et al., (1998) added successful teamwork must
involve persons who possess no aspect of neuroticism which leads to job satisfaction as a whole. As Tokar et al., (1998:144) noted in their qualitative review, greater job satisfaction is related to lower neuroticism and its variants, as well as to higher extraversion and related traits.

Persons with low levels of Neuroticism tend to be calm and free from persistent negative feelings (Howard & Howard, 2004). It could be reasoned that, as bank employees were well trained in serving customers they were aware of being calm, relaxed and had good self emotional control. Several studies (Watson & Hubbard, 1996; Judge et al., 1998; 2000) have found that neuroticism is negatively correlated with job satisfaction. Consequently, emotional stability is positively correlated with job satisfaction.

According to Mount et al., (1998), service employees such as bank employees scoring high on Emotional Stability (low neuroticism) are likely to be more relaxed and tolerant of stress, which helps them build credibility and trust with clients. Credibility and trust have been linked to higher quality service suggesting that Emotional Stability and service performance are positively correlated.

5.3 Limitations
As with all studies, the use of data which relies on self-reports is potentially problematic. The reliance on self-report data leaves open the possibility of distortion. The use of shortened versions of the personality and job satisfaction measures may also limit the ability to detect significant associations. Also, the sample size is small and not all banks are included in the study. Additionally the study also focuses on one geographical area
than a wider population. Lastly the study did not use interviews which would have gained an insight on the organisations’ recruitment practices.

5.4 Recommendations

Personality is very important in considering candidates for a position. However, it is not enough to serve as a measuring tool for the recruitment process. Personality helps to determine whether the person is suitable for that particular work environment. For instance a liberal work environment requires a liberal person, front-office personnel have to be warm and outgoing not only on a professional level, but on a personal one as well. Hence, it is recommended that use be made of the Occupational Personality Questionnaire (OPQ). Since personality traits can be an important factor and make a difference in job satisfaction, managers can utilize the personality traits questionnaire as a first screening in recruiting. It could be a useful tool in selecting and retaining good employees, thus reducing the turnover rate and associated costs with employee turnover. Therefore services of registered psychologist should be used to assess employee personality.

Also bank management should have motivational strategies to increase the job satisfaction and to retain employees for as long as possible. The organization's management should not only focus on improving job satisfaction of their employees in an effort to improve organizational effectiveness, they should rather focus on the multiplicity of factors relating to job satisfaction, such as entrepreneurship, personality fit for a specific job and empowerment. Management should encourage unique behaviour in order to allow for a culture of continuous learning.
The managers need to understand how best to make work more satisfying for staff and to overcome obstacles to effective performance. Nowadays, competition is very high. Therefore, every organization has to compete with other organizations. In this connection, in order to achieve the competitive advantage, the organization has to retain workers for an organization expects that satisfied employees perform better. In this regard, there is a need for organizations to satisfy their employees to achieve their objectives.

In terms of FNB most of the employees had high levels of job satisfaction hence management should keep motivating its employees and to enhance their jobs to increase job satisfaction. FNB has the highest level of neuroticism which should be avoided among employees as it is associated with moods and temperaments which is not good for a service industry. In terms of ABSA they have the highest level of job satisfaction and personality levels hence they should continue motivating employees to maintain the standards. Similarly this is also the case with Standard bank. Hence all the organization must view personality as an important aspect when recruiting and placing employees to avoid dissatisfaction.

5.5 Areas of future research

- Apply the NEO PI-R test instead of Mini IPIP

Researchers in conjunction with a registered psychologist could administer the NEO PI-R questionnaire on a similar sample of bank employees. According to Costa and McCrae (1991), the NEO PI-R is a more concise measure of the five traits of personality.
than the Mini IPIP questionnaire which provides a brief measure of the five traits of personality.

- Test narrow rather than broader personality traits

This study focused exclusively on the broad traits of personality while many researchers have argued that the narrow traits are better predictors of job satisfaction. Future research might attempt to replicate this study but focus on the narrow traits to potentially identify which of these correlate with job satisfaction.

- Extending the population and the sample

One of the major limitations of this study was that it covered only one region and sector of the industry. By extending the population to include different business categories within SA and extending samples across a wider geographical area and wider selection of banks within the banking sector, a more comprehensive result could be expected.

- Use of interviews

Another limitation of this study involves not using interview in the study. By interviewing the management personnel staff it enables to get first hand information as to what they are currently doing to enhance job satisfaction levels and how they select their employees to ensure person-job fit.

5.6 Conclusion

The aim of this research was to primarily determine the relationship between job satisfaction and personality amongst bank employees from ABSA, FNB, STANDARD
banks in King Williams Town, Alice and East London in the Eastern Cape. The results emanating from the research indicate that there is a statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and personality among the sample of employees selected to participate in the research.

The primary purpose of this thesis was to investigate how the Big Five personality traits of Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness play a role in job satisfaction. Individuals who are in professions that mismatch their personality usually face dissatisfaction that leads to stress and burnout. As such, understanding one’s own personality profile can help determine career choice and reduce attrition problems in the workforce. In this study low neuroticism, openness, and conscientiousness were positively correlated to job satisfaction, while extraversion was negatively correlated to job satisfaction. There was no significant relationship between agreeableness and job satisfaction.
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My name is Tatenda Shaleen Mhlanga and I am currently doing my Masters degree at the University of Fort Hare (Department of Industrial Psychology). As part of the requirements for the completion of my studies, I am conducting a study on “An investigation into certain personality traits and job satisfaction among employees. A case of selected organisation in the banking sector.”

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. It is not part of your job and will not have effect on your job or any employment evaluations. I appreciate your taking time to complete the questionnaire. It should take you 15 to 20 minutes. Your responses will be treated with the utmost of confidentiality; therefore no provision is made on the questionnaire for you to write down your name. It would be appreciated if you could place the questionnaire in the envelope provided and ensure that it is sealed on return. All questionnaires are to be returned within one (1) week of the date of receipt thereof.

For further information about this study, please contact me (200705969@ufh.ac.za). I assure you that the information provided is for research purposes only. I want to take this opportunity to thank you for availing yourself and thereby contributing towards making my research thesis a success.
### SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. **Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. **Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18 – 24</th>
<th>25 – 34</th>
<th>35 – 44</th>
<th>45 – 54</th>
<th>55 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. **Race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Coloured</th>
<th>Other (State)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. **What is your highest formal educational qualification?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Honours</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. **How long have you been working for your organization?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 – 5 yrs</th>
<th>6 – 10 yrs</th>
<th>11 – 15 yrs</th>
<th>16 – 20 yrs</th>
<th>20 + yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. **What is your job status?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. **What is your job title**

.................................................................
SECTION B: PERSONALITY

Describe yourself honestly and state your opinions as accurately as possible. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by placing the appropriate number (according to the scale below) in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Am the life of the party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sympathize with others' feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Get chores done right away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Have frequent mood swings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have a vivid imagination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Don't talk a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Am not interested in other people's problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Often forget to put things back in their proper place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Am relaxed most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Am not interested in abstract ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Talk to a lot of different people at parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Feel others' emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Like order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Get upset easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Keep in the background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Am not really interested in others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Make a mess of things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Seldom feel blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Do not have a good imagination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION C: JOB SATISFACTION**

Listed below are a series of statements that represents feelings that you may have about your present job. There is no right or wrong answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In my present job, this is how I feel about...........</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Being able to keep busy all the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The chance to work alone on the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The chance to do different things from time to time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The chance to be somebody in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The way my boss handles his/her workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 The competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 The way my job provides for steady employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The chance to do things for other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 The chance to tell people what to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 The way company policies are put into practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My pay and the amount of work I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The chances of advancement in this job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The freedom to use my own judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The chance to try my own methods of doing the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The way my co-workers get along with each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The praise I get from doing a good job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-End-Your participation is highly appreciated.
## Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic/Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>LEVELS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>18 – 24 YEARS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 – 34 YEARS</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 – 44 YEARS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 – 54 YEARS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 + YEARS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLOURED</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALIFICATION</td>
<td>CERTIFICATE</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIPLOMA</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BACHELORS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HONOURS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>1 - 5 YEARS</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 – 10 YEARS</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – 15 YEARS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 – 20 YEARS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 + YEARS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNB</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB STATUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMANENT</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>92.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPORARY</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB TITLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGER</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mean Levels of Personality and Job Satisfaction for Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>LEVELS</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>JOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>3.9716981</td>
<td>3.9386792</td>
<td>3.3207547</td>
<td>4.1320755</td>
<td>1.9433962</td>
<td>3.5283019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>3.7294521</td>
<td>3.9280822</td>
<td>3.2808219</td>
<td>4.0856164</td>
<td>2.2979452</td>
<td>3.6657534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>18 – 24 YEARS</td>
<td>3.5833333</td>
<td>4.1000000</td>
<td>3.7166667</td>
<td>4.2500000</td>
<td>2.1833333</td>
<td>3.7000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 + YEARS</td>
<td>3.5909091</td>
<td>4.2954545</td>
<td>2.7954545</td>
<td>3.9772727</td>
<td>2.5454545</td>
<td>3.9272727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>3.7568493</td>
<td>3.8801370</td>
<td>3.1815068</td>
<td>4.1164384</td>
<td>2.3698630</td>
<td>3.6143836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>3.4000000</td>
<td>3.6500000</td>
<td>3.2250000</td>
<td>4.5500000</td>
<td>2.2250000</td>
<td>3.1550000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>4.0555556</td>
<td>3.9027778</td>
<td>3.5833333</td>
<td>3.7638889</td>
<td>1.7083333</td>
<td>3.4750000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLOURED</td>
<td>4.0600000</td>
<td>4.2200000</td>
<td>3.4600000</td>
<td>4.1400000</td>
<td>1.7900000</td>
<td>3.8660000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALIFICATION</td>
<td>CERTIFICATE</td>
<td>3.4186047</td>
<td>3.7209302</td>
<td>3.5758142</td>
<td>4.2267442</td>
<td>2.2965116</td>
<td>3.3639535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIPLOMA</td>
<td>3.9866071</td>
<td>3.9151786</td>
<td>3.2633929</td>
<td>3.9464286</td>
<td>2.0758929</td>
<td>3.5973214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BACHELORS</td>
<td>4.1900000</td>
<td>4.3100000</td>
<td>2.9100000</td>
<td>4.2400000</td>
<td>2.0100000</td>
<td>3.9720000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HONOURS</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>4.7500000</td>
<td>3.0000000</td>
<td>4.5000000</td>
<td>2.5000000</td>
<td>4.3500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td>3.7500000</td>
<td>3.7500000</td>
<td>3.2500000</td>
<td>4.0000000</td>
<td>3.0000000</td>
<td>4.8500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>1 - 5 YEARS</td>
<td>3.6627907</td>
<td>4.0058140</td>
<td>3.3604651</td>
<td>4.2616279</td>
<td>2.6453488</td>
<td>3.6453488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 – 10 YEARS</td>
<td>3.8770492</td>
<td>3.8237705</td>
<td>3.3565574</td>
<td>4.0327869</td>
<td>1.8729508</td>
<td>3.5598361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB TITLE</td>
<td>ABSA</td>
<td>FNB</td>
<td>STANDARD</td>
<td>FNB</td>
<td>STANDARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>3.1770833</td>
<td>2.9166667</td>
<td>3.750000</td>
<td>4.729166</td>
<td>1.302083</td>
<td>2.814583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>4.0317460</td>
<td>4.138889</td>
<td>3.396825</td>
<td>3.658730</td>
<td>2.388889</td>
<td>3.615873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGER</td>
<td>3.9102564</td>
<td>4.224359</td>
<td>2.858974</td>
<td>4.442307</td>
<td>2.282051</td>
<td>4.083333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK</td>
<td>3.9673913</td>
<td>3.826087</td>
<td>3.250000</td>
<td>4.070652</td>
<td>1.788044</td>
<td>3.559783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNB</td>
<td>3.7125000</td>
<td>4.062500</td>
<td>3.468750</td>
<td>4.143750</td>
<td>2.531250</td>
<td>3.791250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD</td>
<td>3.7937500</td>
<td>3.925000</td>
<td>3.181250</td>
<td>4.106250</td>
<td>2.181250</td>
<td>3.480000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB STATUS</td>
<td>PERMANENT</td>
<td>3.849138</td>
<td>3.948275</td>
<td>3.284483</td>
<td>4.099138</td>
<td>2.168103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPORARY</td>
<td>3.6250000</td>
<td>3.750000</td>
<td>3.450000</td>
<td>4.175000</td>
<td>1.925000</td>
<td>3.165000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB STATUS</td>
<td>TEMPORARY</td>
<td>3.625000</td>
<td>3.750000</td>
<td>3.450000</td>
<td>4.175000</td>
<td>1.925000</td>
<td>3.165000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>ABSA</th>
<th>4.1315789</th>
<th>3.092105</th>
<th>4.026315</th>
<th>1.776315</th>
<th>3.684210</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>3.1770833</td>
<td>2.916666</td>
<td>3.750000</td>
<td>4.729166</td>
<td>1.302083</td>
<td>2.814583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>4.0317460</td>
<td>4.138889</td>
<td>3.396825</td>
<td>3.658730</td>
<td>2.388889</td>
<td>3.615873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGER</td>
<td>3.9102564</td>
<td>4.224359</td>
<td>2.858974</td>
<td>4.442307</td>
<td>2.282051</td>
<td>4.083333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>FNB</th>
<th>4.131578</th>
<th>3.092105</th>
<th>4.026315</th>
<th>1.776315</th>
<th>3.684210</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>3.177083</td>
<td>2.916667</td>
<td>3.750000</td>
<td>4.729166</td>
<td>1.302083</td>
<td>2.814583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>4.031746</td>
<td>4.138889</td>
<td>3.396825</td>
<td>3.658730</td>
<td>2.388889</td>
<td>3.615873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGER</td>
<td>3.910256</td>
<td>4.224359</td>
<td>2.858974</td>
<td>4.442307</td>
<td>2.282051</td>
<td>4.083333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>4.131578</th>
<th>3.092105</th>
<th>4.026315</th>
<th>1.776315</th>
<th>3.684210</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>3.177083</td>
<td>2.916667</td>
<td>3.750000</td>
<td>4.729166</td>
<td>1.302083</td>
<td>2.814583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>4.031746</td>
<td>4.138889</td>
<td>3.396825</td>
<td>3.658730</td>
<td>2.388889</td>
<td>3.615873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGER</td>
<td>3.910256</td>
<td>4.224359</td>
<td>2.858974</td>
<td>4.442307</td>
<td>2.282051</td>
<td>4.083333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>4.131578</th>
<th>3.092105</th>
<th>4.026315</th>
<th>1.776315</th>
<th>3.684210</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>3.177083</td>
<td>2.916667</td>
<td>3.750000</td>
<td>4.729166</td>
<td>1.302083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>4.031746</td>
<td>4.138889</td>
<td>3.396825</td>
<td>3.658730</td>
<td>2.388889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGER</td>
<td>3.910256</td>
<td>4.224359</td>
<td>2.858974</td>
<td>4.442307</td>
<td>2.282051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation of personality and job satisfaction with demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>JOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>-0.15727</td>
<td>-0.00649</td>
<td>-0.02383</td>
<td>-0.02740</td>
<td>0.19137</td>
<td>0.10687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0786</td>
<td>0.9425</td>
<td>0.7911</td>
<td>0.7607</td>
<td>0.0318</td>
<td>0.2336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>0.05115</td>
<td>0.04578</td>
<td>-0.20503</td>
<td>-0.09928</td>
<td>-0.06289</td>
<td>0.10861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5695</td>
<td>0.6107</td>
<td>0.0213</td>
<td>0.2687</td>
<td>0.4842</td>
<td>0.2261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>0.17732</td>
<td>0.14138</td>
<td>0.16949</td>
<td>-0.04025</td>
<td>-0.29621</td>
<td>0.10198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0470</td>
<td>0.1143</td>
<td>0.0578</td>
<td>0.6545</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.2558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALIFICATION</td>
<td>0.35190</td>
<td>0.24309</td>
<td>-0.27007</td>
<td>-0.01649</td>
<td>-0.07165</td>
<td>0.38992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.0061</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
<td>0.8546</td>
<td>0.4253</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>0.08538</td>
<td>-0.00817</td>
<td>-0.15298</td>
<td>-0.12713</td>
<td>-0.24713</td>
<td>-0.02187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3418</td>
<td>0.9277</td>
<td>0.0872</td>
<td>0.1560</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
<td>0.8080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK</td>
<td>-0.09822</td>
<td>0.05488</td>
<td>-0.02867</td>
<td>0.01875</td>
<td>0.18825</td>
<td>-0.04399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2739</td>
<td>0.5416</td>
<td>0.7500</td>
<td>0.8349</td>
<td>0.0348</td>
<td>0.6248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB STATUS</td>
<td>-0.07968</td>
<td>-0.06652</td>
<td>0.05409</td>
<td>0.02450</td>
<td>-0.07185</td>
<td>-0.20482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3751</td>
<td>0.4593</td>
<td>0.5475</td>
<td>0.7854</td>
<td>0.4240</td>
<td>0.0214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB TITLE</td>
<td>0.28121</td>
<td>0.50537</td>
<td>-0.38494</td>
<td>-0.02486</td>
<td>0.31769</td>
<td>0.67394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.7823</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Simple statistic for personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTRAVERSION</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.29762</td>
<td>0.83049</td>
<td>415.50000</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>5.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREEABLENESS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4.10516</td>
<td>0.84045</td>
<td>517.25000</td>
<td>2.00000</td>
<td>5.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUSNESS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.93254</td>
<td>0.80896</td>
<td>495.50000</td>
<td>1.25000</td>
<td>5.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUROTICISM</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.14881</td>
<td>0.91825</td>
<td>270.75000</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>4.25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPENNESS</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.83135</td>
<td>0.76343</td>
<td>482.75000</td>
<td>2.25000</td>
<td>5.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB_SATISFACTION</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.60794</td>
<td>0.63748</td>
<td>454.60000</td>
<td>1.85000</td>
<td>4.95000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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