



Exploring the Connection Among Character and Occupation Execution with Exceptional Reference to North Western Railline Association

Akanksha Rajora*

**Research Scholar, University: Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer, Rajasthan, India*

*Corresponding Email: *akanksha34rajora@gmail.com*

Received: 26 April 2021

Accepted: 10 July 2021

Published: 13 August 2021

ABSTRACT: *This paper researches the connection between the huge five character attributes and occupation execution. The current examination expects to explore the degree to which character and occupation execution of workers and to railroute association. It is also mainly concerned with analysis and theories surrounded by personality are related to five factors. The present work is therefore a more comprehensive research of the personality and its influence on job performance in the railway organization.*

Keywords: *Personality, Job Performance, Trait, Meta- Analysis, Organisation.*

1. INTRODUCTION (INDIAN RAILWAYS)

Indian rail routes is an Indian state possessed venture, claimed and worked by the public authority of India through the service of rail routes. It is one of track over a course of 65,436kms(40660mi) and 7172 stations. Rail routes start in India in the year 1853 from Mumbai to Thane. In 1951 the frameworks were nationalized as one unit, the rail lines, becoming probably the biggest organization on the planet. IR works both significant distance and suburban rail frameworks on a multiguage organization of wide, meter and tight gauges. It likewise owns locomotive and mentor creation offices at a few spots in India and are allocated codes recognizing their guage, sort of force and kind of activity. Its activity cover 29 states and seven association regions and furthermore offers restricted worldwide types of assistance to Nepal, Bangladesh and Pakistan.

Introduction (Personality and Job Performance)

From the previous century, the connection among character and occupation execution assumes exceptionally huge part in mechanical brain research. Job performance is a dimensional setup that reveal how well the employees perform their tasks in solving the



problems. Job performance could be influenced by situational factors i.e features of the job, the organization and the employees and by internal factors. Internal factors can be described as personality features, needs, motives, preferences and opinion that results in a way to react to the situations. Job performance is also affected by inherent ability, self esteem, affective temperament and need for achievement.[1]

The connection between character manners and occupation execution is estimated according to a quality perspective and all the more particularly the five factor model of character. The five factor model of character is a bunch of characteristics i.e created throughout the most recent fifty years. It is defined by a groups of interrelated traits which is known as facets. The five factor model incorporates Neuroticism, extraversion ,receptiveness, pleasantness and honesty as estimated by (NEO-PI-R) Neo characterstock reconsidered .

The finish of fluctuates studies and meta examination uncover that different enormous five character measurements are identified with work execution.

The goal of this examination was to research the connection between character measurements and occupation execution in North western rail line association.

The Role of Personality Dimensions in Job Performance.

Analysts says that all the character measures are grouped dependent on the five factor model of character. The five elements of five factor model of character are neuroticism, extraversion, receptiveness to experience, pleasantness and good faith.

Neuroticism:

It is often defined by anxiety, impulsiveness and vulnerability. The people who score high on neuroticism are likely to experience the feelings of moodiness and respond poorly. Those who score low on neuroticism is usually relaxed, and emotionally stable and handle the tough condition without being upset. Thus, neuroticism forecast job performance in decisive situation.

Extraversion:

It is defined to be warm, active, chatty and very cheerful in social interactions on the other hand Introverts are shy and they are very fearful in social interactions, they two are not the same. Extraversion is a substantial marker of execution in positions address by friendly connections.

Openness To Experience:

Openness is represented for “openness to experience”, people who have high feelings, take actions, enjoy adventure. The people low on openness are just opposite. They stick to their old habits and avoid new experiences. Thus, openness to experience is not a valid indicator of job performance because different jobs have different requirements.

Agreeableness:

Agreeableness represents the tendency to be trustworthy, straight forward, and tender minded. Then again unpalatable individuals are cold and less reliable and more averse to coordinate. Thus, agreeableness is a important predictor of job performance and agreeable individuals leads to success in professions where teamwork and customer service are compatible.



Conscientiousness:

Honesty addresses obedience, skill, self control, request, accomplishment situated then again individuals with low good faith are imprudent. Various researchers suggested that conscientiousness and job performance have powerful relations. Furthermore, assurance and objective setting affect the connection among scruples and occupation execution.[2]

It is understandable fact that personality factors playsignificant role in job performance.

2. METHODOLOGY OF STUDY

Problem: To assess the relationship between personality and job performance of five factor model with job performance. To research the genuine effect of character on representative occupation execution.

Objectives: To study the organizational psychology converged on the big five model comprising neuroticism, conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness to experience as a widely framework of personality, which allowed them to study meaningful relationships between personality traits and job performance.

Hypothesis:

- Concientiousness and extraversion is positively correlated with productivity and performance.
- Neuroticism and Appropriateness are contrarily related with initiative abilities.

Testing plan:

The universe for research study is north western rail line association in which the character qualities with work execution of representatives will be concentrated by utilizing enormous five factor model.

Space of study:

- Ajmer
- Jaipur
- Jodhpur
- Bikaner

Sampling technique:

335 respondents were classified between personality traits of employees in relation to job performancein which 135 research projects feedback reported into categories corresponding to the big five traits by means of meta analysis.

Analysis and Interpretation:

As the initial research highlight that the hypothesis taken forward that the two of five factor model. High score on conscientiousness and low score on neuroticism are positively correlated with job performance. Dutifulness is more strongly related to job performance than is low level of emotional stability.Thus, the employees have higher performance at work due to high scores on dutifulness. But being agitated, angry, they have low emotional stability is inappropriate to get high performance in any job . Thus, dutifulness and emotional stability



will be positively related to overall performance across jobs. Hence, conscientiousness and emotional stability affect the success on teamwork.

The other three five factor model measurements are probably going to be helpful indicators of execution. In jobs, important component of work is working with teamwork. High scores on extraversion leads to effective teamwork. Openness to experience includes take actions and are adventurous. Individuals who score high on transparency are prepared to encounter both positive and negative feelings. Openness to experience is related to success according to circumstances, the successful employees as compared to unsuccessful employees got lower in openness. It is not a valid indicator of job performance because the relationship says that different jobs have different requirements. Agreeableness is describe to be trustworthy, warm, straight forwardness towards other rather than violent and hostile behavior. Agreeableness is a important predictor of performance, the work together nature of agreeable individuals at work leads to success.

TABLE 1

BIG FIVE DIMENSIONS	FACET (AND CORRELATED TRAIT OBJECTIVE)
(O) Openness to experience	Ideas(curious) Fantasy(imaginative) Aesthetics(artistic) Actions(wide interests) Feelings(excitable) Values(unconventional)
(C) Conscientiousness vs lack of direction	Competence(efficient) Order(organized) Dutifulness(not careless) Achievement striving(thorough) Self discipline(not lazy) Deliberation(not impulsive)
(E) Extraversion vs introversion	Gregariousness(sociable) Assertiveness(forceful) Activity(energetic) Excitement-seeking (adventurous) Positive emotions (enthusiastic) Warmth(outgoing)



(A) Agreeableness vs antagonism	Trust(forgiving) Straightforwardness (not demanding) Altruism(warm) Compliance(not stubborn) Modesty(not show-off) Tender- mindedness(sympathetic)
(N) Neuroticism vs emotional stability	Anxiety(tense) Angry hostility (irritable) Depression(not contended) Self- consciousness (shy) Impulsiveness(moody) Vulnerability(not self-confident)

TABLE 2

Analysis of job performance of employees in north western railway organization.

WORK VALUE	MEAN	ST. DEVIATION
Management	3.47	0.49
Career progress	3.41	0.41
Economic Rewards	3.39	0.46
Workplace conditions	3.16	0.45
Creativity	3.15	0.49
Lifestyle	3.08	0.48
Task performance	3.07	0.49
Autonomy	2.96	0.57
Prestige	2.71	0.57
Overall Work Value	3.17	0.35

3. CONCLUSION

On the basis of investigation the paper draws its conclusion that the managers should look for the procedure by which employees are employed according to their personality traits and abilities. Based on the analysis of direct and indirect consequences, it is generally concluded that dutifulness has highest score on the job performance and positively related to performance in training. It is primarily considered in employing individuals. Dutifulness and enthusiasm are two parts of five factors model which is related with positive job performance, while Extraversion is negatively correlated when link with low scores on conscientiousness. Suitability is adversely related with work execution inside an influential position. Active imagination is different. Emotional stability is negatively related to job performance. The five factor model is a valid indicator of workplace performance



4. REFERENCES

1. Rothmann, S. et. al. (2003), "The big five personality dimensions and job performance", SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 29(1), pp 68-70.
2. Alsuwailem, Alanoud (2016), "Exploring the Relationship between Personality and Job Performance - New Approach", International Journal of Business and Management Invention, Vol. 5 Issue 12, December, pp 43-44.
3. "Times of India". The Times of India (India). 15 April 2010.
4. "Railways Fiscal Budget 2013". Retrieved 15 March 2013.
5. http://www.indianrailways.gov.in/railwayboard/uploads/directorate/stat_econ/IRSB_2012-13/PDF/Facts_Figures_Eng/22.pdf
6. http://www.indianrailways.gov.in/railwayboard/uploads/directorate/stat_econ/IRSB_2012-13/PDF/Statistical_Summary/Summary%20Sheet_Eng.pdf
7. http://www.indianrailways.gov.in/railwayboard/uploads/directorate/stat_econ/MTHSTAT/2014/MER_March_2014.pdf
8. "About Indian Railways-Evolution". Ministry of Railways website.
9. R.P. Saxena, Indian Railway History Timeline". Irse.bravehost.com. Retrieved 2012-12-15.
10. http://www.indianrailways.gov.in/railwayboard/uploads/directorate/finance_budget/2014-15_Final/Railway%20Revenue%20and%20Expenditure%202014-15.pdf
11. http://www.indianrailways.gov.in/railwayboard/view_section.jsp?lang=0&id=0,1,304,366,554,1451,1452
12. "About Indian Railways-Evolution". Ministry of Railways website.
13. Indian Railways Facts and Figures (2011–2012). Ministry of Railways, Government of India. 2012. p. personnel. Retrieved 21 July 2013.
14. Ashton, M.C. (1998). Personality and job performance: The importance of narrow traits. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19, 289-303.
15. Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44, 1-26.
16. Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. (1993). Autonomy as a moderator of the relationship between the Big Five personality dimensions and job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 111-118.
17. Barrick, M.R., Mount, M.K. & Strauss, J.P. (1993). Conscientiousness and performance of sales representatives: Test for the mediating effect of goal setting. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 715-722.
18. Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. (1996). Effects of impression management and self-deception on the predictive validity of personality constructs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 261-272.
19. Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9, 9-30.
20. Bing, M.N. & Lounsbury, J.W. (2000). Openness and job performance in U.S.-based Japanese manufacturing companies. Journal of Business and Psychology, 14, 515-522.



21. Borman, W.C., White, L.A., Pulkos, E.D. & Oppler, S.H. (1991). Models of supervisor job performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 863-872.
22. Boshoff, C. & Arnolds, C. (1995). Some antecedents of employee commitment and their influence on job performance. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 26 (4), 125-135.
23. Clark, L.A. & Watson, D. (1991). General affective dispositions in physical and psychological health. In C.R. Snyder & D.R. Forsyth (Eds.) *Handbook of social and clinical psychology: The health perspective*. New York: Pergamon.
24. Clark, L.A. & Watson, D. (1995). Construct validity: Basic Issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment*, 7, 309-319.
25. Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum & associates
26. Costa, P.T. & McCrae, R.R. (1988). Personality in adulthood: A six-year longitudinal study of self-reports and spouse ratings on the NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 853-863.
27. Costa, P.T. & McCrae, R.R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five Factor Model (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
28. Day, D.V. & Bedeian, A.G. (1995). Personality similarity and work-related outcomes among African-American nursing personnel: A test of the supplementary model of person-environment congruence. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 46, 55-70.
29. De Fruyt, F. & Mervielde, I. (1999). RIASEC types and Big Five traits as predictors of employment status and nature of employment. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 701-727.
30. Digman, J.M. (1989). Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability, and utility. *Journal of Personality*, 57, 195-214.
31. Dunn, W.S., Mount, M.K., Barrick, M.R. & Ones, D.S. (1995). Relative importance of personality and general mental ability in managers' judgements of applicant qualifications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 500-509.
32. Frink, D.D. & Ferris, G.R. (1999). The moderating effects of accountability on the conscientiousness-performance relationship. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13, 515-524.
33. Goldberg, L.R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The big five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1216-1229.
34. Goldberg, L.R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits: Authors' reactions to the six comments. *American Psychologist*, 48, 1303-1304.
35. Guion, R.M. & Gottier, R.F. (1965). Validity of personality measures in personnel selection. *Personnel Psychology*, 18, 135-164.
36. Hackman, J. & Oldham, G. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
37. Hamilton, E.E. (1988). The facilitation of organizational change. An empirical study of factors predicting change agents' effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 24, 37-59.
38. Hayes, T.L., Roehm, H.A. & Castellano, J.P. (1994). Personality correlates of success in total quality manufacturing. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 8, 397-411.
39. Hogan, R., Hogan, J. & Roberts, B.W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions: Questions and Answers. *American Psychologist*, 51, 469-477.



40. Hough, L.M., Eaton, N.K., Dunnette, M.D., Kamp, J.D. &McCloy, R.A. (1990). Criterion-related validities ofpersonality constructs and the effect of responsedistortion on those validities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,75, 581-595.
41. House, R.J., Shane, S.A., & Herold, D.M. (1996). Rumours of thedeath of dispositional research are vastly exaggerated.*Academy of Management Review*, 21, 203-224.
42. Hörmann, H. & Maschke, P. (1996). On the relation betweenpersonality and job performance of airline pilots. *TheInternational Journal of Aviation Psychology*, 6, 171-178.
43. Jang, K.L., Livesley, W.J. & Vernon, P.A. (1996). Heritability ofthe big five personality dimensions and their facets: A twinstudy. *Journal of Personality*, 64, 577-591.
44. Johnson, J.A. (1997). Seven social performance scales forthe California Psychological Inventory. *Human Performance*,10, 1-30.
45. Judge. T.A., Higgins, C.A., Thoresen, C.J. & Barrick, M.R. (1999).The big five personality traits, general mental ability,and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology*,52, 621-652.
46. Krilowicz, T.J. & Lowery, C.M. (1996). Evaluation of personalitymeasures for the selection of textile employees. *Journal ofBusiness and Psychology*, 11, 55-61.
47. Lowery, C.M. & Krilowicz, T.J. (1994). Relationship betweenontask behaviours, rated performance and objectiveperformance measures. *Psychological Reports*, 74, 571-578.
48. McCrae, R.R. & Costa, P.T. (1987). Validation of the fivefactormodel of personality across instruments andobservers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52,81-90.
49. McCrae, R.R. & Costa, P.T. (1997). Personality trait structure ashuman universal. *American Psychologist*, 52, 509-516.
50. Nunnally, J. & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rded.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
51. Ones, D.S. & Viswesvaran, C. (1997, July). Empirical andtheoretical considerations in using conscientiousness measuresin personnel selection. Paper presented at the 5th EuropeanCongress of Psychology, Dublin, Ireland.
52. Ones, D.S., Viswesvaran, C. & Reiss, A.D. (1996). Role ofsocial desirability in personality testing for personnelselection: The red herring. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81,660-679.
53. Raudsepp, E. (1990). Are you flexible enough to succeed? *Manage*, 42, 6-10.
54. Reilly, R.R. & Warech, M.A. (1993). The validity and fairness ofalternatives to cognitive tests. In C.C. Wing & B.R. Gifford(Eds.), *Policy issues in employment testing* (pp. 131-224).
55. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.Rosse, J.G., Stecher, M.D., Miller, J.L. & Levin, R.A. (1998). Theimpact of response distortion on pre-employmentpersonality testing and hiring decisions. *Journal of AppliedPsychology*, 83, 634-644.
56. Sackett, P.R. & Wannek, J.E. (1996). New developments inthe use of measures of honesty, integrity, conscientiousness,dependability, trustworthiness and reliability of personnelselection. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 787-830.
57. Salgado, J.F. (1997). The five-factor model of personality and jobperformance in the European Community. *Journal of AppliedPsychology*, 82, 30-43.
58. SAS Institute. (1996). *SAS Users Guide: Basics* (6th ed.) Cary, NC:SAS Institute.



59. Schepers, J.M. (1994). Die konstruksie en evaluering van 'nprestasiebeoordelingsvraelys vir nie-akademiese personeel. Johannesburg: RAU.
60. Schmitt, N., Gooding, R., Noe, R. & Kirsch M. (1984). Metaanalysis of validity studies published between 1964 and 1982 and the investigation of study characteristics. *Personality Psychology*, 37, 407-422.
61. Schneider, M.H. (1999). The relationship of personality and job settings to job satisfaction. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: Science and Engineering*, 59, 6103.
62. Shaughnessy, J.J. & Zechmeister, E.B. (1997). *Research methods in psychology* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill
63. Stewart, G.L. & Carson, K.P. (1995). Personality dimensions and domains of service performance. A field investigation. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 9, 365-378.
64. Steyn, H.S. (1999). *Praktiese betekenisvolheid. Die gebruik van effek groottes. Wetenskaplike bydraes – reeks B: Natuurwetenskappe Nr. 117. Potchefstroom: PU vir CHO.*
65. Strümpfer, D.J.W., Danana, N., Gouws, J.F. & Viviers, M.R. (1998). Personality dispositions and job satisfaction. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 28, 92-100.
66. Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
67. Tett, R.P., Jackson, D.N. & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 703-742.
68. Tokar, D.M. & Subich, L.M. (1997). Relative contributions of congruence and personality dimensions to job satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 50, 482-491.
69. Vinchur, A.J., Schippmann, J.S., Switzer, F.S. & Roth, P.L. (1998). A meta-analytic review of predictors of job performance for salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 586-597.
70. Wright, P.M., Kacmar, K.M., McMahan, G.C. & Deleeuw, K. (1995). Cognitive ability and job performance. *Journal of Management*, 21, 1129-1139.