

A study of the Relationship between Psychological Capital and Personality Traits.

Kirti Barad¹

Pragati College of Arts and Commerce, Dombivli

Introduction:

Psychologists led by Martin Seligman, a well-known researcher in the traditional negative approach (e.g., learned helplessness), toward the turn of 21st century, took inventory of their achievements under the disease model for over 50 years in the post – World War II era. Despite definite accomplishments in finding effective treatments for mental illness and dysfunctional behaviour, psychology has paid relatively very little attention to psychologically healthy individuals in terms of growth, development, self-actualization, and well-being. The call was made by Seligman and a few others (e.g., Mike Csikszentmihalyi, Ed Diener) for redirecting psychological research toward psychology's two forgotten missions of helping psychologically healthy people become happier and more productive and actualizing their human potential.

Positive psychology bases its conclusions on rigorous scientific methods rather than philosophy, rhetoric, anecdotes, conventional wisdom, gurus, or personal experience and opinion. It is noteworthy that the theory and research requirement of positive psychology was intended and indeed has differentiated it from the plethora of popular literature and the power of positive thinking over the years and much of positively oriented humanistic psychology, personal development, and the human potential movement.

Positive psychology can be used in many ways to increase happiness and satisfaction within the workforce. Given that we spend on average half of our waking hours at work, many organizations and business leaders are increasingly starting to acknowledge that utilizing psychological techniques and know-how in the workplace is imperative.

Besides positive psychology, organization theory and behaviour scholars have recognised the untapped potential of a science-based positively oriented approach that has resulted in two major parallel, and complementary, movements. These are commonly referred to as positive organizational scholarship (POS; see Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003; Cameron & Spreitzer, 2012) and our positive organizational behaviour (POB; Luthans, 2002a, 2002b,; Luthans & Youssef, 2007), which serves as the foundational perspective for psychological capital or PsyCap.

Psychological Capital:

POB and PsyCap draw extensively from the contributions of POS (e.g., see Paterson, Luthans, & Jeung, 2014). However, while POS is a general "umbrella concept," POB and PsyCap tend to be more specific in their conceptualization, measurement, and outcomes, and they primarily focus on the individual level

of analysis but also are moving toward team, unit, organizational, community, and country levels. Based on appreciation and positive emotions, PsyCap is a core construct for well-being and thriving.

the theoretical construct, research, and practices of the field of positive organizational behavior focused mostly on self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience. In subsequent works, Luthans et al. combined these four structures in a superstructure named as psychological capital (Luthans et al., 2005: 252-253). Luthans, Youssef and Avolio (2007: 3) state that psychological capital is developing in the positive psychological state of the individual and can be characterized as follows:

1. Having the confidence (self-efficacy) that ensures the successful fulfillment of difficult duties by means of showing the necessary effort,
2. Making positive attribution (optimism) on the existing and future success,
3. Re-directing the roads to persevere and achieve the targets to be successful when necessary (hope),
4. Gathering oneself up and maintaining this in the face of problems and difficulties (resilience).

Personality:

A human being is the most complex creature in the universe with aspects such as body, emotion, thought and behaviors. In the effort of understanding people, this complexity makes it hard to define, explain and understand certain concepts. This challenge reveals itself fully in the concept of personality. While personality is a concept that is understood by many people when expressed, difficulties emerge in defining the concept. Therefore, there is not a single definition of personality that the researchers agree on. Personality originates from the Latin word “Persona”, and it means mask. In classical Roman theatre, the mask was a tool used to symbolize the character represented, and not to hide the identity of a character. Personality is the way of thinking, emotions, and behaviors that are constantly exhibited by individuals and affect the expectations, self-perception, values, and attitudes of the individual strongly in time. Personality is the determinant of the reactions of individuals in their relations with other individuals and in the face of various life events. In short, personality is not only about who we are, but also how we are (Ahmadi et al., 2012: 321). Hogan (2009: 23-24) states that personality, which is a frequently used concept in daily language has two meanings as “the you that you know” and “the you that we know”, and these two meanings are used for many different objectives; and it is necessary to differentiate between them for a correct use. “The you that you know” is an individual’s own personality from through his/her own eyes. This is how an individual sees himself/herself; his/her hopes, dreams, wishes, values and fears. This is their opinions on getting on well with other people, becoming successful, and adding meaning to life. Whereas “the you that we know” is the personality from the outside. It is how people see an individual starting from his/her behaviors. In the definitions made by Triandis and Suh (2002: 136), Mayer (2007: 1), Ahmadi et al. (2012: 321), Robbins and Judge (2013: 135), they state that personality covers the features that make up the emotion, thought and behaviour patterns of an individual and the psychological mechanisms behind these patterns; and it is the group

of relatively consistent features affecting the understanding, motivation, habits of an individual and the relations with other individuals, that is unique to the individual and differentiates an individual from other people. And the most frequently used definition of personality was made by Gordon Allport. Allport (1937: 48) defined personality as “the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment” (Robbins and Judge, 2013: 135). Certain theoreticians assert that personality may only be investigated by observing external social behaviors. However, most psychologists state that personality is formed within an individual, it may exist in the absence of other individuals and have invisible aspects. Also, certain aspects of personality such as thoughts, memories, and dreams cannot be observed while actions that are clearly seen can be observed. Personality covers the hidden and subconscious aspects, as well as conscious aspects and those that the individual is aware of (Ewen, 2003: 4).

It is seen that Five-Factor Personality Model is widely used in the literature in expressing personality characteristics, and this model was used in our study. The model in question defines personality differences by regulating personality features in five dimensions, and it is based on the distinctive feature approach. The model explains these five dimensions as extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, and openness to experience. The researches on this model have shown the consistency of the five-factor structure. Among the factors that make up the Five-Factor Personality Model, extroversion means being talkative, sociable, gregarious, warm-blooded and active. It is assumed that individuals who have high scores in conscientiousness dimension are careful, reliable, organized, hardworking and achievement-oriented. Agreeableness, which is among other features is used as an equivalent of the features of kind, compassionate, benevolent, helpful and self-sacrificing. And individuals who have high scores in neuroticism dimension are qualified as depressed, angry, worried, insecure and pessimistic. The feature of openness to experience means high imagination and creativity. Personality is one of the most significant values that an individual possesses. This value is very important both individually and in organizational terms. That individuals make a more in-depth interrogation and assessment about their own personality and know their personality characteristics will ensure that they guide their relations, behaviors, preferences, and decisions in a healthier manner in various environments and situations. Schultz and Schultz (2009: 3) state that personality helps to shape one’s experiences and define their limits on success and happiness, and they assert that the expectations of an individual about the future, whether he/she can be a good spouse or parents, and even his/her health may be defined by their personality and the personalities of the people they interact with. Understanding the personality of individuals is also very important for organizations. For, this information may give the managers important clues on employing individuals in the correct positions, how they can act and how they can feel in various situations (Kappagoda, 2013: 2). However, it is seen that the practices on understanding the personality characteristics of the employees working at the

enterprises in our country are quite insufficient. Yildiz (2013: 103-113) reveals results that support this insufficiency in her study. Studies conducted reveal that personality is correlated with many organizational results such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational trust, leadership, job performance, motivation, burnout, coping with stress, and counterproductive work behaviors. In this context, it is necessary for organizations to make an effort to understand the personality characteristics of their employees and the individuals to be employed in the organization, implement the studies conducted in this direction, and assess the reflection of implementation results to their ways of business behaviour and the whole organization by monitoring the results.

Lewis Goldberg may be the most prominent researcher in the field of personality psychology. His groundbreaking work whittled down Raymond Cattell's 16 "fundamental factors" of personality into five primary factors, similar to the five factors found by fellow psychology researchers in the 1960s.

The five factors Goldberg identified as primary factors of personality are:

1. Extroversion
2. Agreeableness
3. Conscientiousness
4. Neuroticism
5. Openness to experience

This five-factor model caught the attention of two other renowned personality researchers, Paul Costa and Robert McCrae, who confirmed the validity of this model. This model was termed the "Big Five" and launched thousands of explorations of personality within its framework, across multiple continents and cultures and with a wide variety of populations.

The Big Five brings us up to about the current era in personality research. The Big Five theory still holds sway as the prevailing theory of personality, but some of the salient aspects of current personality research include:

- Conceptualizing traits on a spectrum instead of as dichotomous variables
- Contextual personality traits (exploring how personality shifts based on environment and time)
- Emphasis on the biological bases of personality and behavior

Since the Big Five is still the most mainstream and widely accepted framework for personality, the rest of this piece will focus exclusively on this framework.

OCEAN: The Five Factors

As noted above, the five factors grew out of decades of personality research, growing from the foundations of Cattell's 16 factors and becoming the most accepted model of personality to date. This model has been translated into several languages and applied in dozens of cultures, resulting in research

that not only confirms its validity as a theory of personality but also establishes its validity on an international level.

These five factors do not provide completely exhaustive explanations of personality, but they are known as the “Big Five” because they encompass a large portion of personality-related terms. The five factors are not necessarily traits in and of themselves, but factors in which many related traits and characteristics.

For example, the factor agreeableness includes terms like generosity, amiability, and warmth (on the positive side) and aggressiveness and temper (on the negative side). All of these traits and characteristics, and many more, make up the broader factor of “agreeableness.” A popular acronym for the Big Five is “OCEAN.”

The five factors are laid out in that order here.

Openness to Experience

Openness to experience has been described as the depth and complexity of an individual’s mental life and experiences (John & Srivastava, 1999). It is also sometimes called intellect or imagination. Openness to experience concerns an individual’s willingness to try to new things, to be vulnerable, and the ability to think outside the box.

Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness is a trait that can be described as the tendency to control impulses and act in socially acceptable ways, behaviors that facilitate goal-directed behavior (John & Srivastava, 1999). Conscientious people excel in their ability to delay gratification, work within the rules, and plan and organize effectively.

Extroversion

This factor has two familiar ends of the spectrum: extroversion and introversion. It concerns where an individual draws their energy and how they interact with others. In general, extroverts draw energy or “recharge” from interacting with others, while introverts get tired from interacting with others and replenish their energy from solitude.

Agreeableness

This factor concerns how well people get along with others. While extroversion concerns sources of energy and the pursuit of interactions with others, agreeableness concerns your orientation to others. It is a construct that rests on how you generally interact with others.

Neuroticism

Neuroticism is the one Big Five factor in which a high score indicates more negative traits. Neuroticism is not a factor of meanness or incompetence, but one of confidence and being comfortable in one’s own skin. It encompasses one’s emotional stability and general temper.

Review of Literature:

In a study on 'Personality and psychological capital as indicators of future job success? A multicultural comparison between three European countries' T. Brandt, Jorge F. S.Gomes and D. Boyanova found that Results indicated that personality and psychological capital were connected. In particular, Extraverted ($p < 0.01$), intuitive ($p < 0.01$) and Thinking people ($p < 0.01$) revealed higher scores in all psychological capital dimensions than their counterparts: Introverted, Sensing and Feeling people.

Yongduk Choi, (Korea University Business School, Seoul, South Korea), Dongseop Lee, (Korea University Business School, Seoul, South Korea) found from the Hierarchical multiple regression analyses that employees' PsyCap is related to their perceived performance, turnover intention, work happiness, and subjective well-being, even after controlling for the Big Five personality traits.

Aqeel Khan, Saedah Siraj and Lau Poh Li, University of Malaya, Faculty of Education, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, on Role of Positive Psychological Strengths and Big five Personality Traits in Coping Mechanism of University Students, aimed to explore the relationship of coping strategies with positive psychological strengths i.e., hope, optimism, self-efficacy and resiliency and big-five personality factors among undergraduate university students. Data were collected from 200 students in universities of the Federal Territory Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Psychological Capital Questionnaire (Luthans's et al. 2007) [1], Brief Cope Scale (Carver, Scheire & Weintraub, 1989) [2], and Ten-Items Personality Inventory (Swann, Rentfrow, & Gosling, 2003) [3]. were used. Research findings revealed that Positive psychological strengths and Big five personality dimensions were found to be significantly related to coping responses except neuroticism, as persons with high neuroticism were found to be less engage in coping mechanism, while high extraversion, openness and conscientiousness individuals engaged in more problem-focused coping. The results indicate personality factors and PsyCap are emerged as important domains for coping mechanisms.

The study on The Effect of the Psychological Capital and Personality Characteristics of Employees on Their Organizational Commitment and Contribution to the Work: A Qualitative Research on Managers by Ebru Yildiz reveals the views and thoughts of managers regarding the employees' psychological capital, personality characteristics and organizational commitment and their contribution to the work. Qualitative research was conducted in order to reveal the views and thoughts of the managers of a furniture accessories manufacturing company regarding the concepts in question using the in-depth interview method. The data obtained from the interviews were evaluated and interpreted by being subjected to the content analysis. According to the findings of the research, managers believe that both the psychological capital and personality characteristics of employees contribute significantly to the work and the enterprise, and these characteristics also have effects on the organizational commitment of employees.

In a study on Big Five Personality Traits as The Predictor of Teachers' Organizational Psychological Capital, Hasan Bozgeyikli, Faculty of Education, Erciyes University, Melikgazi, Kayseri, Turkey aimed

to test whether the personality traits of teachers are a significant predictor of their psychological capital levels in this study. 416 teachers (60.3% female, 39.7% male) who were teaching in the schools of Ministry of National Education in İstanbul and were selected by simple random element sampling method constituted the study group of the research. While 37.3% of teachers who participated in the research were working in primary schools, 39.2% of them were working in secondary schools and 23.6% of them were working in high schools. In the research, the personality traits of the teachers were measured by "adjective based personality test", and their psychological capital levels were measured by "organizational psychological capital" scale. Pearson correlation technique and multiple linear regression analysis were used to analyze the collected data. Research results showed that there was a positively significant relationship between extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness, which are big five personality traits of teachers, and optimism, hope, resilience and self-efficacy, which are the sub-dimensions of the psychological capital scale, and that there was a negatively significant relationship with neuroticism personality trait. According to the findings obtained as a result of prediction analyses, personality traits were found to be significant predictors of optimism, resilience, hope, and self-efficacy, which are the subdimensions of the psychological capital scale.

Research Methodology

Objective:- The objective of this study is to assess the PsyCap and big five factors in employees and explore the relationship between Big Five Personality factors and components of PsyCap.

Sample:- This study comprised of 100 employees working at Indoco Pharma in Mumbai in the age range of (25-40 years).

Materials:- Proforma:- Information about the demographic details such as age, gender, etc. were obtained from each employee who participated in the survey

Tools used:-

1. Psychological Capital Questionnaire (Luthans, Youssef & Avolio, 2007) - PCQ was developed by Luthans, Avey and Avolio in 2007. It measures PsyCap and comprises four subscales, namely, hope, optimism, resilience and self – efficacy. The PCQ is a self - report 24 item questionnaire. Each subscale is comprised of six items and assessed on a six-point Likert scale with the response options: 1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – somewhat disagree, 4 – somewhat agree, 5 – agree, 6 – strongly agree. The resulting score represents an individual's level of PsyCap.

Luthans et al. (2007) calculated the reliability estimates for the total PsyCap and each adapted measure from four sample populations. The optimism scale in the second sample (.69) and the resilience scale in the third sample (.66) did not reach generally acceptable levels of internal consistency, but the reliability of the overall PsyCap measure in all samples was consistently above conventional standards (Luthans, Avolio et al., 2007). The Cronbach alphas were as follows: hope (.72, .75, .80, .76); efficacy

(.75, .84, .85, .75); resilience (.71, .71, .66, .72); optimism (.74, .69, .76, .79); and overall PsyCap (.88, .89, .89, .89).

Each of the four positive constructs has been shown to have empirically based discriminant validity in previous studies (Bryant & Cvengros, 2004; Carifio & Rhodes, 2002; Magaletta & Oliver, 1999; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Luthans, Avolio et al. (2007) found that PsyCap was not related to age or education demographics and was also not related to the personality dimensions of Agreeableness or Openness. PsyCap had a strong positive relationship with core self-evaluations (.60) and a moderate relationship with Extraversion (.36) and Conscientiousness (.39) (Luthans, Avolio et al., 2007). For correlations from Luthans, Avolio et al. (2007)

2. NEO Five Factor Inventory Neo-FFI-3 (Robert McCrae & Paul Costa, 2010) – NEO-FFI-3 was developed by Robert McCrae & Paul Costa, 2010. This 60-item instrument assesses the five major domains of personality, namely extraversion, conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Openness and Agreeableness. The NEO-FFI-3 is a revision of the Neo- FFI in which 15 of the 60 items have been replaced to improve reliability and psychometric properties. All items are taken from the NEO-PI-3; thus, the NEO- FFI-3 is also appropriate for respondents age 12 and older.

Alpha reliabilities for adult sample for form S domain were reported as .86 for Neuroticism, .79 for Extraversion, .79 for Agreeableness, .82 for Conscientiousness, and .78 for Openness to Experience.

Procedure: - Participants were recruited from a MNC, Indoco Pharma, Mumbai Division. PsyCap questionnaire and Big Five Personality Inventory were administered among 100 respondents in their place of work. Demographic information was collected through questionnaires. Instructions were given to the respondents before administration of the scale.

Data Analysis: - For data analysis, SPSS version 21 was used for descriptive analysis (mean, standard deviation) of the data. Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to investigate the relationship of PsyCap to Big Five Personality factors.

Results

Table 1. Statistical analysis of Psychological Capital and Agreeableness

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Agreeableness	44.3375	7.33458	100
Self_Efficacy	30.2625	3.08423	100
Hope	30.7375	2.97136	100
Resilience	25.9375	3.93409	100
Optimism	26.9625	3.01659	100

Psych_Capital	113.9000	9.70919	100
---------------	----------	---------	-----

Table 2 - Showing the relationship between Psychological Capital and Big 5 Personality Traits

Note - * = $p < 0.05$; ** = $p < 0.01$

	Neuroticism	Extraversi on	Openness	Agreeablenes s	Conscientiousness
Self Efficacy	-.192	.020	.250*	.168	.173
Hope	-.203	.236*	.225*	.314*	.225*
Resilience	-.145	.259*	.058	.188	.240*
Optimism	-.295*	.181	.118	.328*	.226*
Psych Cap	-.274*	.240*	.209	.327**	.313**

Table 2 reveals that Self efficacy is significantly related to Openness to experience, Hope is significantly related to Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, Resilience is significantly related to Extraversion and Conscientiousness, Optimism is significantly negatively related to Neuroticism, Optimism is significantly related to Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, Overall Psychological Capital is significantly negatively related to neuroticism, and Overall Psychological Capital is significantly related to Extraversion, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness.

Discussion:

The objective of the study was to explore the relationship between the components of psychological capital and the five personality traits i.e., the Big five personality factors. An attempt was also made to find how the components of psychological capital predict various dimensions of personality.

The statistical analysis revealed that overall psychological capital is positively correlated with extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness. This clearly indicated that people high on psychological capital tend to be extrovert, are agreeable and have high conscientiousness, whereas as expected overall psychological capital is negatively correlated with neuroticism. This also is a clear indication that people low on hope, efficacy, resilience and optimism are more likely to be high on neuroticism. The overall correlation results speak a lot about human behaviour and its precedence.

With respect to the five personality factors, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness is having significant positive relationship with overall Psychological Capital. Agreeableness trait has an interpersonal dimension which means that the employees are empathetic and like to help others (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

Conclusion:

Self-efficacy is significantly related to Openness to experience, Hope is significantly related to Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, Resilience is significantly related to Extraversion and Conscientiousness, Optimism is significantly negatively related to Neuroticism, Optimism is significantly related to Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, Overall Psychological Capital is significantly negatively related to neuroticism, and Overall Psychological Capital is significantly related to Extraversion, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness.

Results also showed that Self-efficacy is significantly related to Openness to experience, Hope is significantly related to Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. Optimism is negatively related with Neuroticism. This clearly implies that employees who were optimistic were more emotionally stable and less impulsive. It is very necessary to be emotionally stable at the place of work as good decision making requires sound mind and an optimistic approach.

It is very important for the employees to always be very careful, patient, and able to control their emotions especially when faced with crisis situations. They also need to be calm and have strong coping abilities. High scores on psychological capital indicates that employees tested for this study are high on hope, efficacy, resilience and optimism, and further those high on these factors tend to be high in agreeableness, are extrovert, that is prefer talking to people to sort out the problems or to take decisions and are also high on conscientiousness, meaning hardworking, persistent, resourceful, etc.

This study indicates the need to investigate predictors with respect to PsyCap and Personality traits in employees using Regression Analysis and identify positive psychological resources in different groups people across workplace as well as in general to promote stress management, mental health promoting programs, and helping people increase their psychological capital thereby leading to a more satisfied life.

6. References

1. Abbas, M., Raja, U., Darr, W. A., & Bouckenoghe, D. (2012). Combined Effects of Perceived Politics and Psychological Capital on Job Satisfaction, Turnover Intentions, and Performance. *Journal of Management*, 40(7), 1813–1830.
2. Achor, S. (2011). *The Happiness Advantage: The Seven Principles of Positive Psychology That Fuel Success and Performance at Work*. London, UK: Random House.
3. Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived Behavioural Control, Self-Efficacy, Locus of Control, and The Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(4), 665-683. Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, 4, 71-81.

4. APA. (2017). Personality. American Psychological Association. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/topics/personality/>
5. Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: W.H. Freeman. Coutu, D. L. (2002). How Resilience Works. Harvard Business Review, May, 1 - 8.
6. Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1-26.
7. Boyce, C. J., Wood, A. M., & Powdthavee, N. (2013). Is personality fixed? Personality changes as much as “variable” economic factors and more strongly predicts changes to life satisfaction. *Social Indicators Research*, 111, 287-305. doi:10.1007/s11205-012-0006-z
8. Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2003a). Personality traits and academic examination performance. *European Journal of Personality*, 17(3), 237 – 250.
9. Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2003b). Personality predicts academic performance: Evidence from two longitudinal university samples. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(4), 319-338.
10. Connolly, J. J., & Viswesvaran, C. (2000). The role of affectivity in job satisfaction: A metaanalysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29(2), 265-281.
11. Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13(6), 653-665.
12. Douglas, H. E., Bore, M., & Munro, D. (2016). Openness and intellect: An analysis of the motivational constructs underlying two aspects of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 99, 242-253. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.05.030
13. Du, H., Bernardo, A. B. I., & Yeung, S. S. (2015). Locus-of-hope and life satisfaction: The mediating roles of personal self-esteem and relational self-esteem *Personality and Individual Differences*, 83, 228-233.
14. Farsides, T., & Woodfield, R. (2003). Individual differences and undergraduate academic success: The roles of personality, intelligence and application. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34(7), 1225-1243.
15. Ferguson, E., Sanders, A., O’Hehir, F., & James, D. (2000). Predictive validity of personal statements and the role of the five-factor model of personality in relation to medical training. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(1), 321-344.

16. Ferguson, F., Payne, T., & Anderson, N. (1994). Occupational personality assessment. Theory, structure and psychometrics of the OPQ FMX-5 student. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 17(1), 217-225.
17. Fischer-Epe, M. (2016). *Coaching* (Vol. 5). Munich: Rowohlt. Hobfoll, S. E. (2002). Social and Psychological Resources and Adaptation. *Review of General Psychology*, 6(4), 308-324.
18. Gray, E. K., & Watson, D. (2002). General and specific traits of personality and their relation to sleep and academic performance. *Journal of Personality*, 70(2), 177-206.
19. John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (Vol. 2, pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.
20. John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 2, 102-138.
21. 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.
22. Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. J. (2002). Are measures of self-esteem, neuroticism, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy indicators of a common core construct? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 693-710. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.83.3.693
23. Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 797-807. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.797
24. Judge, T. A., & Watanabe, S. (1993). Another Look at the Job Satisfaction-Life Satisfaction Relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(6), 939-948. Lippmann, E. (2013). *Coaching* (Vol. 3). Berlin-Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
25. Khan, A., Siraj, S., & Li, L. P. (2011). Role of positive psychological strengths and big five personality traits in coping mechanism of university students. In *International Conference on Humanities, Society and Culture* (Vol. 20, pp. 210-215).

26. Klasner, L., & Pistole, M. C. (2003). College adjustment in a multiethnic sample: Attachment, separation/individuation, and ethnic identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(1), 92-109.
27. Laidra, K., Pullmann, H., & Allik, J. (2007). Personality and intelligence as predictors of academic achievement: A cross-sectional study from elementary to secondary school. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(3), 441-451.
28. Lievens, F., Coetsier, P., De Fruyt, F., & De Maeseneer, J. (2002). Medical students' personality characteristics and academic performance: A five-factor model perspective. *Medical Education*, 36(11), 1050-1056.
29. Lebowitz, S. (2016a). The 'Big 5' personality traits could predict who will and won't become a leader. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/big-five-personality-traits-predict-leadership-2016-12>
30. Lebowitz, S. (2016b). Scientists say your personality can be deconstructed into 5 basic traits. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/big-five-personality-traits-2016-12>
31. Luthans, F., & Youssef-Morgan, C. M. (2017). Psychological Capital: An Evidence-Based Positive Approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 339-366.
32. Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. (2007). Emerging Positive Organizational Behavior. *Journal of Management*, 6, 321-349.
33. Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 541-572.
34. Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. (2004). Human, social, and now positive psychological capital management: Investing in people for competitive advantage. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(2), 143-160.
35. Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 23, 695-706.
36. Lorenz, T., Beer, C., Pütz, J., & Heinitz, K. (2016). Measuring Psychological Capital: Construction and Validation of the Compound PsyCap Scale. *Plos One*, 11(4).

37. Martin, A. J., & Marsh, H. W. (2006). Academic resilience and its psychological and educational correlates: A construct validity approach. *Psychology in the Schools*, 43(3), 267-281.
38. McLeod, S. (2007). Maslow's hierarchy of needs. *Simply Psychology*. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html>
39. Mirsaleh, Y. R., Tabatabaee, A., Rezai, Kivi, S.R., & Ghorbani, R. (2010). The role of religiosity, coping strategies, self-efficacy and personality dimensions in the prediction of Iranian undergraduate rehabilitation interns' satisfaction with their clinical experience. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 24(12), 1136–1143.
40. Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38(1), 30.
41. Mustaffa, M. B., Wan Shahrazad, W.S., Khairudin, R., & Syed Salim, S. S. (2012). Parental support, personality, self-efficacy as predictors for depression among medical students. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 19(4), 9-15.
42. Nofle, E. E., & Robins, R. W. (2007). Personality predictors of academic outcomes: big five correlates of GPA and SAT scores. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(1), 116.
43. Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Reiss, A. D. (1996). Role of social desirability in personality testing for personnel selection: The red herring. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 660-679. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.81.6.660
44. Ozer, D. J., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2006). Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 401-421. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190127
45. Radcliffe, C., & Lester, H. (2003). Perceived stress during undergraduate medical training: A qualitative study. *Medical Education*, 37(1), 32-38.
46. Reivich, K., & Shatté, A. (2002). *The resilience factor: 7 essential skills for overcoming life's inevitable obstacles*. New York: Broadway Books.
47. Revelle, W. (2013). Personality theory and research. *Personality Project*. Retrieved from <https://www.personality-project.org/index.html>

48. Roccas, S., Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S. H., & Knafo, A. (2002). The Big Five personality factors and personal values. *Personality and Social Psychology*, 28, 789-801. doi:10.1177/0146167202289008
49. Salgado, J. F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the European community. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(1), 30-43.
50. Schaefer, P. S., Williams, C. C., Goodie, A. S., & Campbell, W. K. (2004). Overconfidence and the Big Five. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38, 473-480. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2003.09.010
51. Schmitt, D. P., Allik, J., McCrae, R. R., Benet-Martinez, V., Alcalay, L., Ault, L., ..., & Zupanè, A. (2007). The geographic distribution of Big Five personality traits: Patterns and profiles of human self-description across 56 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38, 173-212. doi:10.1177/0022022106297299
52. Schretlen, D. J., van der Hulst, E., Pearlson, G. D., & Gordon, B. (2010). A neuropsychological study of personality: Trait openness in relation to intelligence, fluency, and executive functioning. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 32, 1068-1073. doi:10.1080/13803391003689770
53. Slavin, S. J., Schindler, D., Chibnall, J. T., Fendell, G., & Shoss, M. (2012). PERMA: A model for institutional leadership and culture change. *Academic Medicine*, 87(11), 1481.
54. Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S., . . . Harney, P. (1991). The Will and the Ways: Development and Validation of an Individual-Differences Measure of Hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(4), 570-585.
55. Soldz, S., & Vaillant, G. E. (1999). The Big Five personality traits and the life course: A 45-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 33, 208-232. doi:10.1006/jrpe.1999.2243
56. Tanoff, G. F. (1999). *Job satisfaction and personality: The utility of the Five-Factor Model of Personality* (Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest Information & Learning).
57. Verduyn, P., & Brans, K. (2012). The relationship between extroversion, neuroticism, and aspects of trait affect. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 664-669. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.12.017

58. Wang, W., & Miao, D. (2009). The relationship among coping styles, personality traits and mental health of Chinese medical students. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 37(2), 163-172.
59. Woods, S. A., Patterson, F. C., Koczwara, A., & Sofat, J. A. (2016). The value of being a conscientious learner: Examining the effects of the big five personality traits on self-reported learning from training. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 28, 424-434. doi:10.1108/JWL-10-2015-0073
60. Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). Positive Organizational Behaviour in the Workplace: The Impact of Hope, Optimism and Resilience. *Journal of Management*, 33, 774-800.