

# The Relationship Between Personality Traits and Contextual Performance: A Study

Dr.Suniti Chandio<sup>1</sup>, Banarsidas Chandiwala<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor, Email: [suniti@bcips.ac.in](mailto:suniti@bcips.ac.in).

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Professional Studies (BCIPS), Dwarka, New Delhi. Email: [suniti@bcips.ac.in](mailto:suniti@bcips.ac.in). Ph: 9868512849

## Abstract:

Although the way we work today is very different from what we worked on twenty years ago, effective management of employee performance is still a key to organizational success. Our rewards and recognition systems still focus primarily on task completion and goal achievement. But there is another side to employee performance that is equally important but often unrecognized and unrewarded. Contextual performance refers to activities that do not task or goal-specific but that make individuals, teams, and organizations more effective and successful. Contextual performance includes cooperating and helping others, voluntarily performing extra-role activities, persevering with enthusiasm and extra determination to complete assignments successfully, defending the organization's goals, and adhering to organizational policies even when this is inconvenient. The research focuses on the relationships between personality traits and contextual performance. The dimensions of Personality traits are based on the Big 5 personality traits: Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Extroversion being positive traits and Neuroticism being the sole negative trait. In this research, the effects of Personality traits on contextual performance are to be analyzed.

**Keywords:** Performance, Personality, Pattern, Behaviour

## I Introduction:

Contextual performance refers to activities that do not task or goal-specific but that make individuals, teams, and organizations more effective and successful. Contextual performance includes cooperating and helping others, voluntarily performing extra-role activities, persevering with enthusiasm and extra determination to complete assignments successfully, defending the organization's goals, and adhering to organizational policies even when this is inconvenient. These non-traditional contextual performance behaviors have become even more important with the advent of virtual teams and project-based work. Indeed, the notion of teamwork itself incorporates contextual behaviors.

## Personality

Personality refers to individual differences in characteristic patterns of thinking, feeling, and behaving. The study of personality focuses on two broad areas one is understanding individual differences in certain personality traits, such as sociability or irritability. The other is understanding how the different parts of a person come together as a whole.

Most theories focus on motivation and psychological interactions with one's environment. Trait-based personality theories, such as those defined by Raymond Cattell, define personality as

the traits that predict a person's behavior. On the other hand, more behaviorally-based approaches define personality through learning and habits. Nevertheless, most theories view personality as relatively stable. The study of the psychology of personality, called personality psychology, attempts to explain the tendencies that underlie differences in behavior. Many tactics have been taken on to study personality, including biological, cognitive, learning, and trait-based theories, as well as psychodynamic, and humanistic approaches.

## Big Five personality traits

**Big Five personality traits**, also known as the **five-factor model (FFM)** and the **OCEAN model**, are a classification, or alliance, for personality traits. When factor analysis (a statistical technique) is applied to personality survey data, some words used to describe aspects of personality are often applied to the same person. For example, someone described as conscientious is more likely to be described as "always prepared" rather than "messy". This theory is based therefore on the association between words but not on neuropsychological experiments. This theory uses descriptors of common language and therefore suggests five broad dimensions commonly used to describe the human personality and psyche.

The five factors are:

- Openness to experience (inventive/ curious vs. consistent/cautious)
- Conscientiousness (efficient/organized vs. easy-going/careless)
- Extroversion (outgoing/energetic vs. solitary)
- Agreeableness (friendly/compassionate vs. detached)
- Neuroticism (sensitive/nervous vs. secure/confident)

The five factors are represented by the acronym *OCEAN* or *CANOE*. Beneath each proposed global factor, there are several correlated and more specific primary factors. For example, extraversion is said to include such related qualities as gregariousness, assertiveness, excitement seeking, warmth, activity, and positive emotions.

### Contextual Performance

**Contextual performance** is defined as activities that contribute to the social and psychological core of the organization and is beginning to be viewed as equally important to task performance. Examples of contextual performance include volunteering for additional work, following organizational rules and procedures even when personally inconvenient, assisting and cooperating with coworkers, and various other discretionary behaviors. By strengthening the viability of social networks, these activities are posited to enhance the psychological climate in which the technical core is nested.

Contextual performance is related to overall employee job performance. A significant portion of supervisor ratings can be accounted for by not just task performance, but contextual performance as well. Other organizational outcomes such as turnover (employment) are related to contextual performance. Research shows that contextual performance is a significant predictor of turnover over and above task performance. Employees displaying more contextual performance behaviors were less likely to turn over than those engaging in less contextual performance behaviors. While also touted as a predictor of contextual performance, organizational commitment is an outcome of contextual performance. The facet of interpersonal facilitation significantly predicts organizational commitment. Research generally supports that contextual performance does indeed relate to overall organization performance as measured by quality, quantity, financial measures, and customer service measures. Contextual performance is a fundamental part of the employee performance criteria, then contextual performance should be considered in all aspects of the employment

process, this includes selection, performance appraisal, and rewards. Selection procedures should take into account the predictors of both task and contextual performance.

### II Literature Review / Conceptual Development

The Big Five traits are believed to be predictors of future performance outcomes. Measures of work outcomes include work and training competence as well as personnel data. However, research supporting such a prediction has been criticized, in part because of the low correlation coefficients that characterize the relationship between personality and job performance. Expanding on Mischel's (1977) conceptualization of strong and weak situations, it was hypothesized that personality and contextual performance would correlate most strongly when there were only weak cues and correlate less when there were strong cues. FFM is a useful personality taxonomy. This evidence includes factor analytic evidence (Norman, 1963), genetic influences on the five factors (Bouchard, 1997), stability of the FFM across the lifespan (Costa & McCrae, 1998), and the replicability of the FFM across different theoretical frameworks, assessment approaches, in different cultures and different languages (e.g., Digman & Takemoto-Chock 1981 Digman & Shmelyov 1996 Somer & Goldberg 1999). Given that the conscientiousness dimension has been associated with motivational processes and outcomes, it is reasonable to expect that managers working on this dimension score high, and are more likely than their low-conscientious counterparts, to behave in a goal-oriented manner and to carry out tasks carefully and enthusiastically Organ & Ryan (1995), Scotter Motowidlo (1996) & Hatrup (1998). In their meta-analytic review, Organ and Ryan (1995) found that conscientiousness and agreeableness were the two strongest predictors of OCB.

Some studies reviewed for the meta-analysis found an association between Big Five factor neuroticism and OCB, but taken together the results were not significant. Dr. Kevin Murphy, professor of psychology at Pennsylvania State University and editor of the *Journal of Applied Psychology* (1996-2002) states: The problem with personality tests is that the power of personality measures as predictors of job performance is often disappointingly weak. The argument for using personality tests to predict performance does not seem convincing to me at first. Such criticism was advanced by Walter Mischel, whose publication lasted for two decades long a crisis in personality psychometry. However, later work showed that the

correlations obtained by psychometric personality researchers were very respectable compared to standards of comparison and that the economic value of even incremental increases in prediction accuracy was exceptional, given the vast disparity in performance among those occupying complex job positions.

Experience. In addition, they found that when these personality constructs were compared with the corresponding performance dimensions, higher mean validities were realized than in previous meta-analyses (e.g. Barrick & Mount, 1991, Hertz & Donovan, 2000). There are studies that link national innovation to openness to experience and conscientiousness. Those who express these qualities have shown leadership and positive ideas towards the country of origin. Managers who score high on the personality dimensions of extraversion and agreeableness are likely to be better suited to the social and interpersonal demands of contextual activities (e.g. fostering positive work relationships, interactions with subordinates, public relations) than managers who score low on these socially relevant one's dimensions. In addition, we see evidence in the literature supporting relationships between contextual performance and the dimensions of extraversion and agreeableness (Scotter & Motowidlo (1996). Borman & Motowidlo (1997) find that personality successfully predicts contextual performance and provides it an alternative explanation for recent meta-analytic findings that personality is moderately correlated with overall performance. Personality can predict the contextual component of overall performance. Results from studies using the Hogan Personality Inventory confirm that correlations between personality and contextual criteria are higher than correlations between personality and total per.

Mischel argued that personality traits are more likely to be expressed as behavior. Accordingly, the relative strength of one's job situation should moderate the amount of criterion variance explained by personality traits. Failure to account for situational effects is one explanation why even when significant personality performance correlations are found across job situations, personality traits only account for only a small proportion of criterion variance Pfeffer (1997) meta-analysis carried out by Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li, and Gardner (2011) shows that personality influences both types of performance, but through different traits. Conscientiousness ( $p_v = .22$ ),

Openness to experience ( $p_v = .17$ ), and Agreeableness ( $p_v = .17$ ) influence contextual

performance, while Conscientiousness ( $p_v = .16$ ) and Emotional Stability ( $p_v = .14$ ) influence task

performance. The contextual performance and OCB research suggests that, across occupational groups, there is a relation between four of the Big Five personality factors and behaviors associated with contextual performance. However, the correlations are often modest and therefore open the door to speculation about potential moderators (Borman, Hanson, & Hedge, 1997).

Some businesses, organizations, and interviewers assess individuals based on the Big Five personality traits. Research has suggested that individuals who are considered leaders typically exhibit lower amounts of neurotic traits, maintain higher levels of openness (envisioning success), balanced levels of conscientiousness (well-organized), and balanced levels of extraversion (outgoing, but not excessive). Further studies have linked professional burnout to neuroticism, and extraversion to enduring positive work experience. Some research suggests that vocational outcomes are correlated to the Big Five personality traits. Conscientiousness predicts contextual performance in general. Conscientiousness is considered top-ranked in overall contextual performance. Research further categorized the Big 5 behaviors into 3 perspectives: task performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and counterproductive work behavior. Task performance is the set of activities that a worker is hired to complete, and results showed that Extraversion ranked second after Conscientiousness, with Emotional Stability tied with Agreeableness ranked third. For organizational citizenship behavior, relatively less tied to the specific task core but benefits an organization by contributing to its social and psychological environment, Agreeableness and Emotional Stability ranked second and third. Lastly, Agreeableness is tied with Conscientiousness as the top-ranked for Counterproductive work behavior, which refers to intentional behavior that is counter to the legitimate interests of the organization or its members.

Work-related self-efficacy has also been shown to be positively connected with meticulousness and negatively correlated with neuroticism. Significant predictors of career-advancement goals are extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness. Openness is positively related to proactivity at the individual and the organizational levels and is negatively related to team and organizational proficiency. These effects were found to be completely autonomous of one another.

Agreeableness is negatively related to individual task proactivity. Conscientiousness is positively related to all forms of work role performance. Neuroticism is negatively related to all forms of work role performance.

Two theories have been integrated into an attempt to account for these differences in work role performance. Trait stimulation theory posits that within person trait levels predict future behavior, that trait levels differ between people, and that work-related cues activate traits that lead to work. Relevant behaviorists that role senders provide cues to elicit desired behaviors. In this context, role senders (i.e. supervisors, managers, et cetera) provide workers with cues for expected behaviors, which in turn activates personality traits and work-relevant behaviors. In essence, expectations of the role sender led to different behavioral outcomes depending on the trait levels of individual workers and because people differ in trait levels, responses to these cues will not be universal.

In recent years, contextual performance has become an important aspect of overall job performance. Work performance is no longer viewed solely as performance on a task. In fact, in an increasingly competitive job market, employees are expected to go above and beyond the requirements set out in their job descriptions. Therefore, when conducting performance appraisals, organizations should declare that they consider the facets of both contextual and task performance. Beaty, Jeanette, Cleveland, & Murphy (2001) stated that both a laboratory and a field study examined the extent to which behavioral cue strength in simulated and authentic job performance situations moderates the relationship between measures of broad personality dimensions and contextual performance behavior. Beaty et al., 2001 de Kwaadsteniet et al., 2006 Snyder and Ickes, 1985) A considerable body of basic theory and research shows that cognitive factors and personality traits exert a strong influence on behavior in such weak situations

### III Research Objectives and Question

- To understand the association between Personality traits & contextual performance.
- To find the effect of personality traits on contextual performance.

### Research Questions

The present report focuses on the associations between personality traits and contextual performance. The dimensions of Personality traits are based on the Big 5 personality traits: Openness,

Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Extroversion being positive traits and Neuroticism being the sole negative trait. In this report, the effects of Personality traits on contextual performance are to be analyzed.

### Research Design

Research methodology is the specific procedures or techniques used to identify, select, process, and analyze information about a topic. In this study the population was residents of India, comprising of men and women of all age groups, educational status, socio-economic status, and residential areas who have some amount of experience working in an organization. The research used the Descriptive Research Design. Descriptive research, also known as statistical research, describes data and characteristics of the population or phenomenon being studied. The research used Convenience Sampling. In this method, the sample units are chosen primarily based on the convenience of the researcher. The sample size 200 and is measures the number of individual samples measured or observations used in a survey or experiment. The Sources of data collection are both primary and secondary. In primary sources the data has been collected through the structured questionnaires circulated through the mode of Google Forms constitutes for the present study. Though, extensive literature search and adoption of text from different websites, published documents, and books for report preparation constitutes secondary data for this study. Tools and techniques of analysis: Percentage Analysis, Pearson Correlation Analysis, and Linear Regression are the tools used to establish the relationship between personality traits and contextual performance and study the impact of the same. The instrument used in MS Excel, and SPSS is used to create and analyzed pie charts and correlation and regression tables.

### IV Data Analysis and Interpretation

In this study the population was residents of India, comprising of men and women of all age groups, educational status, socio-economic status, and residential areas who have some amount of experience working in an organization. The data has been collected from the participants through the medium of Google forms. Tools and techniques of analysis: Percentage Analysis, Pearson Correlation Analysis, and Linear Regression are the tools used to establish a relationship between personality traits and contextual performance and study the impact of the same. The data then has been modeled into pie charts and tables through Excel and SPSS. The

data has been predominantly divided into demographics, personality traits, and contextual performance.

**Demographics:** The data has been studied based on Gender and Age.

**Table no-1**

S.No	Items	Options	No of Respondents	% of Responses
1	Genders	Male	86	43%
		Female	114	57%
2	Age	21 and under	6	3%
		22 – 27	106	53%
		28 and above	88	44%

**Interpretation:** According to table no-1 that both gender and age of respondents the majority of participants, 57% are female with male participants being 43% and the age of respondents is 53% are 22 – 27, 44% are 28 and above and only 3% are 21 and under.

**B. Personality Traits**

Participants are analyzed on personality traits Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Openness, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism.

**1) Extraversion: Table 2**

S.No.	Options	No. of Respondents	% of Responses
1.	Disagree	2	1%
2.	Neutral	38	19%
3.	Agreeable	144	72%
4.	Most Agreeable	16	8%
5.	Total	200	100%

**Interpretation:** According to table no 2 that 1% disagree that they are extroverts, 19% are neutral, 72% are agreeable, and 8% are most agreeable on their extroversion traits. The majority of participants, 72% are extroverts.

**2) Conscientiousness: Table 3**

S.No.	Options	No. of Respondents	% Of Responses
1.	Disagree	2	1%
2.	Neutral	12	6%
3.	Agreeable	146	73%
4.	Most Agreeable	40	20%
5.	Total	200	100%

**Interpretation:** According to table no 3 that 1% disagree that they are conscientious, 6% are neutral, 73% are agreeable, and 20% are most agreeable on their conscientious traits. The majority of participants, 73% are conscientious.

**3) Openness: Table 4**

S.No.	Options	No. of Respondents	% of Responses
1.	Disagree	2	1%
2.	Neutral	34	17%
3.	Agreeable	144	72%
4.	Most Agreeable	20	10%
5.	Total	200	100%

**Interpretation:** According to table no 4 that 1% disagree that they are conscientious, 17% are neutral, 72% are agreeable, and 10% are most agreeable on their openness traits. The majority of participants, 72% are high on openness.

**4) Agreeableness: Table 5**

S.No.	Options	No. of Respondents	% of Responses
1.	Neutral	14	7%
2.	Agreeable	114	57%
3.	Most Agreeable	72	36%
4.	Total	200	100%

**Interpretation:** According to table no 5 that 7% are neutral, 57% are agreeable, and 36% are most disagreeable on their agreeableness traits. The majority of participants, 57% are high on agreeableness.

**5) Neuroticism: Table 6**

S.No	Options	No. of Respondents	% of Responses
1.	Least Agreeable	8	4%
2.	Disagreeable	102	51%
3.	Neutral	34	17%
4.	Agreeable	8	4%
5.	Total	200	100%

**Interpretation:** According to table no 6 that 7% are neutral, 57% are agreeable, and 36% are most disagreeable on their agreeableness traits. The majority of participants, 57% are high on agreeableness.

**C. Contextual Performance**

The participants are analyzed over whether they are performing contextually besides their job. Tasks include - active participation in meetings, taking on challenging roles, getting along with coworkers, maintaining stress and emotions during job etc

**Table 7**

S.No.	Options	No. of Respondents	% of Responses
1.	Least Agreeable	8	4%
2.	Agreeable	102	51%
3.	Neutral	34	17%
4.	Most Agreeable	8	4%

5.	Total	200	100%
----	-------	-----	------

**Interpretation:** According to table no 7 that 4% are least agreeable, 51% agreeable, 17% are neutral, 4% are most agreeable that they perform contextually too. The majority of participants, 51% are high on contextual performance i.e., they perform beyond their job performance and are also focused on the surrounding performance. In above information can be interpreted that the participants are high on positive personality traits and low on the negative personality trait. It can also be seen that the participants are also high on contextual performance.

**Pearson Correlation Analysis and Regression Analysis**

**A Pearson Correlation Analysis between Extraversion and Contextual Performance**

**Table 8**

Correlations			
		EXTRAVERS ION	CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE
EXTRAVERS I ON	Pearson Correlation	1	.698**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	100	100
CONTEXTUA L PERFORMAN CE	Pearson Correlation	.698**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	200	200

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a significant positive relationship between Extraversion and Contextual Performance,  $r(98) = .69, p = .000$

**B Linear Regression Analysis of Extraversion and Contextual Performance**

**Table 9**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.698 <sup>a</sup>	.487	.481	.32735

a. Predictors: (Constant), EXTRAVERSION

Simple correlation and is 0.69, which indicates a high degree of correlation. Here, 48.10% of the total variation in Contextual Performance can be explained by Extroversion which is large

**Table 10**

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	9.958	1	9.958	92.929	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	10.502	98	.107		

Total	20.460	99			
a. Dependent Variable: CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE					
b. Predictors: (Constant), EXTRAVERSION					

Here,  $p < 0.0005$ , which is less than 0.05, and indicates that, overall, the regression model statistically significantly predicts the outcome variable (i.e., it is a good fit for the data).

**Table 11**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.529	.259		5.900	.000
	EXTRAVERSION	.647	.067	.698	9.640	.000

a. Dependent Variable: CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE

To present the regression equation as: Contextual Performance = 1.529 + 0.647 (Extraversion)

**Interpretation:** It can be interpreted that one unit change in the independent variable (Extraversion) will bring 48.10% of the variation in the dependent variable (Contextual Performance)

**C Pearson Correlation Analysis between Conscientiousness and Contextual Performance**

**Table 12**

Correlations			
		CONSCIENTI OUSNESS	CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANC E
CONSCIENTI OUSNESS	Pearson Correlation	1	.508**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	100	100
CONTEXTUA L PERFORMAN CE	Pearson Correlation	.508**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	100	100

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a significant optimistic relationship between Conscientiousness and Contextual Performance,  $r(98) = .50, p = .000$

**D. Linear Regression Analysis of Conscientiousness and Contextual Performance**

**Table 13**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.508 <sup>a</sup>	.258	.250	.39361

a. Predictors: (Constant), CONSCIENTIOUSNESS

Simple correlation and is 0.50, which indicates a high degree of correlation. Here 25.80% of the total variation in Contextual can be explained can be explained by Conscientiousness which is large

**Table 14**

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5.277	1	5.277	34.064	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	15.183	98	.155		
	Total	20.460	99			

a. Dependent Variable: CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE  
 b. Predictors: (Constant), CONSCIENTIOUSNESS  
 Here,  $p < 0.0005$ , which is less than 0.05, and indicates that, overall, the regression model statistically significantly predicts the outcome variable (i.e., it is a good fit for the data).

**Table 15**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	2.087	.331		6.300	.000
	CONSCIENTIOUSNESS	.462	.079	.508	5.836	.000

a. Dependent Variable: CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE

To present the regression equation as: **Contextual Performance = 2.087 + 0.462 (Conscientiousness)**

**Interpretation:** It can be interpreted that one unit change in the independent variable (Conscientiousness) will bring 25.00% of variation in the dependent variable (Contextual Performance)

**E Pearson Correlation Analysis between Openness and Contextual Performance**

**Table 16**

Correlations			
		OPENNESS	CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE
OPENNESS	Pearson Correlation	1	.705**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	100	100
CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE	Pearson Correlation	.705**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	100	100

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a significant positive relationship between Openness and Contextual Performance,  $r(98) = .70$ ,  $p = .000$

**F Linear Regression Analysis of Openness and Contextual Performance**

**Table 17**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.705 <sup>a</sup>	.497	.492	.32393

a. Predictors: (Constant), OPENNESS

Simple correlation and is 0.70, which indicates a high degree of correlation. Here, 49.20% of the total variation in Contextual Performance can be explained can be explained by Openness which is large

**Table 18**

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	10.177	1	10.177	96.987	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	10.283	98	.105		
	Total	20.460	99			

a. Dependent Variable: CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE  
 b. Predictors: (Constant), OPENNESS

Here,  $p < 0.0005$ , which is less than 0.05, and indicates that, overall, the regression model statistically significantly predicts the outcome variable (i.e., it is a good fit for the data).

**Table 19**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	1.563	.250		6.249	.000
	OPENNESS	.624	.063	.705	9.848	.000

a. Dependent Variable: CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE

To present the regression equation as: **Contextual Performance = 1.563 + 0.250 (Openness)**

**Interpretation:** It can be interpreted that one unit change in the independent variable (Openness) Will bring 49.20% of the variation in the dependent variable (Contextual Performance)

**G Pearson Correlation Analysis between Agreeableness and Contextual Performance**

**Table 20**

Correlations			
		AGREEABLENESS	CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE
AGREEABLENESS	Pearson Correlation	1	.604**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000

	N	100	100
CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE	Pearson Correlation	.604**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	100	100

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a significant positive relationship between Agreeableness and Contextual Performance,  $r(98) = .60, p = .000$

**H Linear Regression Analysis of Agreeableness and Contextual Performance**

**Table 21**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.604 <sup>a</sup>	.365	.358	.36416

a. Predictors: (Constant), AGREEABLENESS

Simple correlation and is 0.60, which indicates a high degree of correlation. Here, 35.80% of the total variation in Contextual Performance can be explained can be explained by Agreeableness which is large.

**Table 22**

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7.464	1	7.464	56.284	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	12.996	98	.133		
	Total	20.460	99			

a. Dependent Variable: CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE  
b. Predictors: (Constant), AGREEABLENESS

Here,  $p < 0.0005$ , which is less than 0.05, and indicates that, overall, the regression model statistically significantly predicts the outcome variable (i.e., it is a good fit for the data).

**Table 23**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	1.417	.347		4.083	.000
	AGREEABLENESS	.596	.079	.604	7.502	.000

a. Dependent Variable: CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE

To present the regression equation as: **Contextual Performance = 1.417 + 0.596 (Agreeableness)**

**Interpretation:** It can be interpreted that one unit change in the independent variable (Agreeableness) will bring 35.80% of the variation in the dependent variable (Contextual Performance)

**I Pearson Correlation Analysis between Neuroticism and Contextual Performance**

**Table 24**

Correlations			
		NEUROTICISM	CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE
NEUROTICISM	Pearson Correlation	1	-.701**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	100	100
CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE	Pearson Correlation	-.701**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	100	100

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a significant negative relationship between Neuroticism and Contextual Performance,  $r(98) = .70, p = .000$

**J Linear Regression Analysis of Neuroticism and Contextual Performance**

**Table 25**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.701 <sup>a</sup>	.492	.486	.32579

a. Predictors: (Constant), NEUROTICISM

Simple correlation and is 0.70, which indicates a high degree of correlation. Here, 48.60% of the total variation in Contextual Performance can be explained by Neuroticism which is large

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	10.058	1	10.058	94.761	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	10.402	98	.106		
	Total	20.460	99			

a. Dependent Variable: CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE  
b. Predictors: (Constant), NEUROTICISM

Here,  $p < 0.0005$ , which is less than 0.05, indicates that, overall, the regression model statistically significantly predicts the outcome variable (i.e., it is a good fit for the data).

**Table 26**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	4.812	.089		54.120	.000
	NEUROTICISM	-.409	.042	-.701	-9.735	.000

a. Dependent Variable: CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE

To present the regression equation as: **Contextual Performance = 4.812 + (- 0.409) (Neuroticism)**



**Interpretation:** It can be interpreted that one unit change in the independent variable (Neuroticism) will bring 48.60% of variation in the dependent variable (Contextual Performance)

### Findings of the Study:

As a whole, a majority of participants have been found to be extroverts, they find themselves to be vital, energetic, and lively (40.00%), however many find themselves as being giving into conflicts (24.00% having neutral or disagreeable opinions). 71.00% of participants are self-assertive. They also have rated themselves high on conscientiousness. 21.00% of participants have high standards of themselves. There has been a high percentage of variance in the case of openness. 55.00% are attentive and able to concentrate. 28.00% are curious and exploring. 57.00% of participants positively take on challenges without hesitation. In the case of agreeableness, they have rated themselves as high. 49.00% of participants are considerate and thoughtful of others. An astonishing 65.00% feel empathy and concern for their colleagues and the organization even though less participants get along well with their coworkers and help them. Participants are also found to be open. There however are conflicting views on Neuroticism. As there are polarizing views, in case of becoming anxious in unpredictable environments, there have been equal favors in both agreeable and disagreeable opinions. Similarly, in case of taking offense, there are split views. However, in stressful situations, many find it easier to bounce back (60.00%). Neuroticism impacts contextual performance negatively. 79.00% of participants don't become anxious in stressful environments. 81.00% can bounce after stressful events. 79% of participants don't get easily offended. In case of contextual performance, many seem to give importance to contextual performance and engage in it. 70.00% of participants responded positively to looking for new challenges. 60.00% claim to do more than what is expected of them. 79.00% of participants responded positively to participating in meetings. 97.00% of participants responded positively to looking for ways to improve their performance. However, there are less favorable views in comparison on contributing to organizational work, with 39.00% having neutral opinions.

### Concluding Comments

This study aims to show whether there is any relationship between personality traits and

contextual performance and if it, is positive or negative. The results of the study show that there is a meaningful relationship between the components of personality contextual performance. Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Extraversion are closely related to contextual performance in the academic sphere. Openness however shows the most significant relationship with Contextual performance, with the variable change being 49.20% change in a unit change of openness. Contextual performance of performance is also impacted by extraversion with 48.10% of change due to a unit change of extraversion. It can be said that participants who are more considerate of their contextual performance are extroverts, who are more engaging with their coworkers and organization. Extraversion helps in engaging beyond the job as they also function beyond their job. It can be noted that personality traits like agreeableness are contributing to contextual performance like helping coworkers and keeping in touch with coworkers beyond the organization. Extraversion helps with active participation, reduced conflicts. Conscientiousness helps with being more contributing to the organization and voluntary contribution. Neuroticism, on the other hand, is negatively associated with contextual performance i.e., stress, anxiety, and mood instability negatively impacts contextual performance.

### Emerging Managerial Implications

It can be seen that personality traits like extraversion, openness, agreeableness and carefulness have a positive impact on contextual performance. In an organizational setting, personality might not have that significant effect on job performance as they are more related to the knowledge, skills, and attributes of the employee, however contextual performance; it helps in supporting the job performance of the employee. Personality indicates who more is willing to work on their contextual performance, as they would prefer to engage more with their work surroundings, beyond their job. As openness is a key contributing factor to contextual performance, organizations may open up more ways in which workers may engage in team-building exercises, and building interpersonal relationships. Personality traits like agreeableness and extraversion, helps employee be more corporative in an organizational setting. From an applied perspective, the results could be useful in an organizational setting, particularly in relation to the formation of working groups, given that certain personality characteristics of group members could influence

their contextual performance. These results also stress the importance of promoting self-efficacy among employees related to group tasks. Lastly, rewards and incentives should be set up to address employees who perform helping behaviors that contribute to the overall goals of an organization as well as behaviors that contribute strictly to individuals' projects.

### Limitations of the study

The research suffered from its fair share of limitations. A major way was that the study had only 200 participants. The participants were not from a homogenous group, participants were from different organizations, private as well as government. Many participants were recruits at entry-level designation, which put their lack of experience as a hurdle for their response. Also, questionnaires cannot be considered adequate to analyse the participants' Personalities. A more extensive questionnaire may fill that gap. Expert help from a trained psychologist could provide a better understanding of participants' personality.

### Bibliography

- [1]. Borman, W. C., Hanson, M. A., & Hedge, J. W. (1997). Personnel selection. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, 299-337.
- [2]. Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of con-textual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp.71–98). New York: Jossey–Bass.
- [3]. Hatrup,K.,O'Connell,M.S.,&Wingate, P. H. (1998). Prediction of multidimensional criteria:Distin-guishing task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 11, 305–319.
- [4]. James C. Beaty Jr., Jeanette N. Cleveland & Kevin R. Murphy (2001) *The Relation Between Personality and Contextual Performance in "Strong" Versus "Weak" Situations*, *Human Performance*, 14:2, 125-148.
- [5]. Mischel, W. (1977). The interaction of person and situation. In D. Magnusson & N. S. Endler (Eds.), *Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology* (pp. 333-352). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- [6]. Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775–802.
- [7]. Pfeffer, J. (1997). *New directions for organizational theory: Problems and prospects*. New York: Oxford University Press
- [8]. Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 525–531.
- [9]. Walter C. Borman & Stephan J. Motowidlo (1997) *Task Performance and Contextual Performance: The Meaning for Personnel Selection Research*, *Human Performance*, 10:2, 99-109.