European Journal of Business and Management
ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online)
Vol.5, No.10, 2013

Personality and Learning Motivation

Dorothea Wahyu Ariani
Department of Management, Economic Faculty-Atma Jaya Yogyakarta University
Jl. Babarsari No. 43 Yogyakarta, Indonesia - 55281
Tel: +62 274 487711 E-mail: dwariani@gmail.com

Abstract

In this study I investigated the relationship between personality traits and learning motivations by correlating Big Five model of personality, Core Self-evaluation, achievement and affiliation motivation, and intrinsic and extrinsic motivations for leaning. Data were collected from 298 participants using a questionnaire. Regression analysis results indicated that extraversion, agreeableness, openness to experience and conscientiousness were positively associated with intrinsic motivation, but neuroticism was positively associated with extrinsic motivation. Core self-evaluation was also positively related with intrinsic motivation and negatively related to extrinsic motivation. Furthermore, intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation are two concept that was mutually exclusive. Implications and further research directions are then discussed.

Keywords: five-factor model, core self-evaluation, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivations

1. Introduction

Numerous researchers have indicated that personality is one of the most important determinants of human behavior and work motivation. One of the main views of organizational research has been that personality (dispositional) factors and situational factors are determinant of human behavior (Erez, 1997). In other words, situation and disposition are equally important variables. Dispositional factors (e.g. personalities) have a role of determining motivation (and performance). Personality traits may be a sense of motivation, as personality is considered to be a crucial factor in various contexts (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Teng, Huang, & Tsai, 2007; Huang & Yang, 2010). In this study, I investigated links between individual personality attributes and motivation to perform tasks and performance. One's motivation toward tasks is an indication of desire and willingness to exert effort to higher performance.

Research on personality in organization has been increasing rapidly in areas dealing with work motivation and various types of performance. Historically, attempt to relate personality traits to motivation have been disappointing. Personality traits are unrelated to specific motivated actions, and when relationship is found, it is usually not very strong. The fundamental problem in the research on dispositional effects on motivation and behavior stem from the prevailing lack of unified theoretical perspective for understanding which dispositional constructs influence the motivational stem and how they operate (Weiss & Adler, 1984).

Disposition is a variable of interest includes an individual's personality, which is made up of traits, affective, mood, structure, and value (Naquin & Holton, 2002). Despite the limited number of such studies in human resource development, dispositional research has led to the conclusion that there is a conceptual relationship between disposition and behavior. How persons behave is a function of consistent individual differences in their personality, but it is also a function of the situation in which they find themselves. They are influenced by their own personality characteristics and they are influenced by situations.

Previous research has demonstrated that motivation to learn can be influenced by both person and situation variables (Colquitt, LePine, & Noe, 2000). When organizational support or situation variable support for learning process are strong, personality variables may be less important than when situational support are weak (Major, Turner, & Fletcher, 2006). Numerous researchers have indicated that personality is one of the most important determinants of human behavior and work motivation. Personality traits may be a source of motivation. Personality considered being a crucial factor in various contexts (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Huang & Yang, 2010).

Personality trait is predictor of attitudes, motivation, and leadership, but central focus of that research is usually attitudes, motivation, and leadership, not personality. Historically, personality research on organizational behavior has suffered from inadequate conceptual development and poor methodology, and these factors have conspired to give personality a bad name (Weiss & Adler, 1984). Much of the personality research is not systematically derived

from theory. Research has demonstrated that attempts to empirically link personality characteristics to motivational variables have produced inconsistent result (Furnham, Eracleous, & Premuzie, 2009). No clear guiding framework exists to show the relations between personality and motivation constructs. This study investigated how personality traits motivate learning that is how personality traits and learning motivations are linked. Additionally, to provide a more complete picture of how personality traits affect learning motivations, this study also attempted to determine which personality dimension predicts a person's overall learning and which personality dimension predicts a person's learning.

Motivation to learn encompasses the desire to engage in learning process in campus. Motivation to learn consists of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Motivation toward learning process is an indication of desire and willingness exert effort toward all process of learning in campus. Personality variables are relatively more enduring, stable, individual characteristics that indicate general tendencies and predispositions (Major et al., 2006). Colquitt et al. (2000) found that several personality variables were related to motivation to learn. Several studies have shown positive correlations between intrinsic motivation and achievement motivation (Lepper, Corpus, & Iyengar, 2005) suggesting that decline in intrinsic motivation may signify a decline in achievement motivation. Researchers have often operationalized these two constructs as mutually exclusive, such that an individual high in intrinsic motivation would necessarily be low in extrinsic motivation.

Personality has emerged as being influential in various contexts (Barrick & Mount, 1991), which suggests that personality traits should be a source of motivation (Jeng & Teng, 2008). By determining the influence of personality traits on individual motivations to learn, one can examine what influences learning behavior. Using guidelines stated above, the purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between several personality variables and motivation. This study investigated the relationship between personality traits (the big five personality and the core self-evaluation) and learning motivations (intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and achievement and affiliation motivation). In this study, we also investigated links between intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation to learn using independent measures. These findings demonstrate the value of personality variables as predictors of motivation to learn and negative correlation between intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation and between achievement motivation and affiliation motivation.

2. Literature Review and Hypotheses

2.1. Motivation

In organizational research, work motivation has been the subject of more theories than any other topic. Organizational researchers see motivation as a fundamental building block in the development of effective theories (Steers, Mowday, & Shapiro, 2004). Understanding motivation is important for both academics and managers. Pinder (1998) defined motivation as well as beyond an individual's being, to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity, and duration. Motivation is a buzzword in virtually all work settings and educational institutions. Motivation is a force that directs specific behavioral alternatives which are suggested when individuals choose to behave in a certain way (Chiang & Jang, 2008). Motivation is drive to fulfill a need. Numerous researches have suggested that personality impacts performance through its effect on various motivational variables (Gellatly, 1996; Judge & Ilies, 2002).

Motivation is a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond and individual's being, to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity, and duration (Steers & Porter, 1991; Vroom, 1964; Locke, Shaw, Saari, & Latham, 1981; Pinder, 1984). There so many definitions of different aspects of motivation. Some writers view motivation from a strictly physiological perspective, while others view human beings as primarily hedonistic, and explain most of human behavior as goal-oriented, seeking to gain pleasure and avoid pain (Pinder, 1998). Motivation will manifest itself through effort. Concept of effort and motivation frequently treated as identical and can change each other. In other word, effort is used as an operationalization of motivation. Motivation, as a process, includes a series of assessment such as whether or not to engage in a behavior, how much effort to exert, and how to regulate behavior once a person decides to engage in the chosen task.

Motivation is the force that arouses enthusiasm and persistence to prove a certain cause of action. Motivation is one think of determinant of behavior. Motivation may be driven by either intrinsic or extrinsic factors. Intrinsic motivation refers to a natural inclination toward mastery, interest, and exploration that represent a critical source of enjoyment and vitality. With intrinsic motivation, individuals undertake tasks because they find them interesting and

because they derive satisfaction from performing the tasks themselves (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 2001). Intrinsic motivation is driven by deep interests and involvement in the work, curiosity, enjoyment, or a personal sense of challenge. Intrinsic motivation is measured along the dimensions of the will to success, mastery need in relation to challenging tasks and the meaningfulness of academic performance (Goodman, Jaffer, Keresztesi, Mamdani, Mokgatle, Musariri, Pires, & Schlechter, 2011).

The study of intrinsic motivation has required the assumption that people are active organisms working to master their internal and external environments, and it has led to an examination of the importance of self-determination in a wide range of human behaviors and experiences (Steers & Porter, 1991). Self-determination theory is a theory of personality development and self-motivated behavior change (Markland, Ryan, Tobin, & Rollnick, 2005). Self-determination is important in the development and exercise of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. Self-determination is a quality of human functioning that involves the experience of choice. It is integral to intrinsically motivated behavior and is also in evidence in some extrinsically motivated behaviors. Self-determination is the capacity to choose and to have those choices. Self-determination is more than a capacity, it is also a need.

Extrinsic motivation refers to the individual's inclination to perform tasks in order to attain some separable consequences, such as tangible or verbal rewards (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Extrinsic motivation is driven by the desire to attain some goal that is separate from the work itself, such as achieving a promised reward, meeting a deadline, or winning a competition (Cheng, Lin, & Su, 2011). In academic environment, especially for students, refers to external sources of influence on a students' motivation and is subdivided into socialization, such as interactions with and support from parents, teachers, and friends, and rewards such as tangible and intangible incentives (Goodman et al., 2011). Motivation consists of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation determines what a person is capable of doing within a given domain. Extrinsic motivations are strongly influenced by social demands and normative pressure, whereas intrinsic motivations are connected to basic affective reaction (Lawrence & Jordan, 2009).

Harter deliberately designed these three subscales to represent intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation as contrasting ends of a single dimension, but one might imagine that this opposition is not always necessary or appropriate in the average classroom (Lepper et al., 2005). The first subscale is challenging work versus the easy work decrease. The second subscale is motivation based on curiosity or interest versus motivation based on pleasing the teacher or receiving good grades. Many students may engage in academic task both because it interests them and because it will please their teacher or help them to earn a good grade. The third subscale may be motivated by both independent problem solving and assistance from the teacher versus depending on the stage in the learning process and the particular problem in question. Intrinsic motivation refers to engaging in a task for its own inherent rewards whereas extrinsic motivation refers to engaging in a task in order to attain some separable outcome (Hayenga & Corpus, 2010).

Intrinsic motivators are characterized by a personality variable called achievement motivation. In order to be intrinsically motivated, a person must experience interest and enjoyment in his or her task, along with feelings of competency. Achievement motivation is also selected factor representing intrinsic motivation. Achievement motivation is measured along the dimensions of the will to succeed, mastery need in relation to challenging tasks, and the meaningfulness of academic performance (Goodman et al., 2011). Extrinsic motivation refers to external sources of influence on a students' motivation and is subdivided into socialization and rewards. Socialization means interactions wit and support from parents, teachers, and friends. Rewards mean tangible and intangible incentives. In other word, intrinsic motivation is the motivation to be involved in an activity for its own sake, whereas extrinsic motivation is the motivation to engage in an activity as a means to an end. Using guidelines stated above, the hypothesis of this study is:

H1: Intrinsic motivation for learning will be negatively related to extrinsic motivation for learning.

How are people motivated? Motivation is a process, include a series of assessment such as whether or not to engage in a behavior, how much effort to exert, and how to regulate behavior once a person decides to engage in the chosen task (Judge, Erez, Bono, 1998). The critical role of motivation is an individual's inner resources that are developed for behavioral self-regulation and engaging in behaviors becoming aligned with appropriate goals and standard (Kark & Van Dijk, 2007; Sung & Choi, 2009). It has long been an aim of work psychology to uncover the reasons why

individuals vary in their motivation to work, as well as how individual differences interact with organizational or situational factors to influence individual motivation.

2.2. Personality

Previous researchers have offered many explanations for the sources of work motivation, relatively few individual difference factors have been considered. Personality characteristics are the root cause of behavior. Personality refers to cognitive and behavior patterns that show stability overtime and across situation. There is stability in personality characteristics across time. About fifty years ago, researchers in personality began to develop interest in the experimental analysis of human motivation (Sokolowski, Schmalt, Langens, and Puca, 2000).

Personality is defined as the sum total of ways in which an individual reacts to and interacts with others (Robbins & Judge, 2011). Personality has been considered in many motivation studies, but there is an incomplete understanding of how personality relates to motivation. Motivation is an energizing forces that indices action. Motivation relates to decisions (conscious or unconscious) that involves how, when, and why we allocate effort to task or activity. Past research exists that has attempted to emphasize psychological individual differences factors as determinants of motivation. Personality influences attitude. Attitudes affect motivation, which then leads to behavioral outcomes. The big five personality traits are associated with work-related attitudes and behaviors like work motivation (Judge & Illies, 2002) or performance (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001).

The big five factor of personality is one of the most widely accepted comprehensive models of personality. The big five factor include extraversion, agreeableness, openness to experience, conscientiousness, and neuroticism (Robbins & Judge, 2011). Extraversion is a tendency to like people, prefer being in large groups, sociable, desire excitement and simulation, likely to be assertive, active, talkative, gregarious, energetic, and ambitious. Agreeableness is a tendency to be altruistic, cooperative, trusting, compliant, caring, gentle, and warm. Openness to experience is a tendency to have an active imagination, esthetic sensitivity, intellectual curiosity, and be attentive to feeling, flexible, autonomous, and unconventional. Conscientiousness is a tendency to be purposeful, organized, reliable, determined, achievement, dependability, and ambitious. Neuroticism (often labeled by its converse, emotional stability) is a tendency as fear, sadness, embarrassment, anger, guilt, depression, vulnerability, and disgust (Major et al. 2006).

Based on Judge and Illes' (2002) research, it was concluded that the big five personality are an important source of motivation. Conscientiousness is only factor of the big five personality that prior research has expressly linked to motivation to learn (Colquitt et al., 2000). They also found that neuroticism factor was negatively related to motivation to learn. Individuals high in openness to experience may be interested in learning. Previous research found that conscientiousness and openness to experience were positively related to intrinsic motivation, but conscientiousness and extraversion related to extrinsic motivation significantly (Watanabe & Kanazawa, 2009).

Barrick et al (2001) found that there is strong evidence that personality especially conscientiousness and neuroticism has an impact on motivational constructs. Conscientiousness was related to the tendency to set and be committed to goals. Gellatly (1996) found that conscientiousness was related to expectancy for success and was related to motivate to achieve goals. Emotional stability or neuroticism has also been shown to relate to motivation. Judge and Illies (2002) meta-analytically result indicated that conscientiousness and neuroticism were consistently related to motivation regardless of the motivational theory being studied. Other dimension of big five personality traits exhibited weaker and less consistent relationships. Highly extraverted students also perform relatively well in learning context (De Raad & Schouwenburg, 1996). De Raad and Schouwenburg (1996) also said that agreeableness dimension is probably the most concerned with interpersonal relationship and enables individuals to cope with problems associated with communal living. Past studies suggest that people who are high on openness to experience desire to explore and understand things that are unfamiliar to them, and tend to be able to find more meaningfulness and to experience more feelings of competence than those who are low in this trait (Watanabe & Kanazawa, 2009). Using guidelines stated above, the hypotheses of this study are:

H2: Extraversion will be positively related to intrinsic motivation for learning and no or negatively to extrinsic motivation for learning.

H3: Agreeableness will be positively related to intrinsic motivation for learning and no or negatively to extrinsic motivation for learning.

H4: Openness to experience will be positively related to intrinsic motivation for learning and no or negatively to

extrinsic motivation for learning.

H5: Conscientiousness will be positively related to intrinsic motivation for learning and mo or negatively to extrinsic motivation for learning.

H6: Neuroticism will be negatively related to intrinsic motivation for learning and no positively to extrinsic motivation for learning.

Motivation concerns energy, direction, and persistence which are all the aspects of activation and intention, with regard to behavior in question. Personality traits are seen as stable characteristics that influence a person's behavior in a given situation (Bipp, 2010). In the last decade, another personality trait has received much attention in research relating dispositional constructs to employee behavior and attitudes is core self-evaluation (CSE). CSE refers to fundamental assessments that people make about their worthiness, competence, and capabilities (Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, 2005) and is posited to be the underlying latent construct that accounts for shared variance among other self-evaluative measures (Judge, Erez, Bono, Thoresen, 2003). CSE may be crucial to the formation of more specific assessment that are directly related to decisions regarding events. CSE should influence individuals' motivational decision making process. CSE is a fundamental bottom line evaluation that people make of themselves. CSE is viewed as a broad latent concept, indicated by at least four traits: self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and low neuroticism or high emotional stability.

A more recent concept in the research on personality is the core self-evaluation model. CSEs are fundamental evaluations that people hold about themselves and form the basis of other self-appraisals like neuroticism, generalized self-efficacy, self-esteem, and locus of control (Judge et al. 1998; Ferris, Rosen, Johnson, Brown, Risavy, & Heller, 2011). Numerous studies have shown that CSE is associated with many important organizational outcomes (Judge & Bono, 2001). The theory states that self-evaluation influences motivation and performance (Erez & Judge, 2001) and work satisfaction (Judge & Bono, 2001; Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998). The self-evaluation concept influences performance, especially through motivation in designing target and performance. A hard and special target will motivate a person to be committed to achieve it (Locke & Latham, 1996). Individuals who have positive self-evaluation will be more motivated in presenting better performance.

Then, from the empirical study, there are relations between self-evaluation and motivational variables, including self-determination, task motivation, and goal setting behavior (Erez & Judge, 2001). From control theory perspective, when individual finds a gap between standard and the received feedback, he/she will choose to (1) put more efforts to reach the high standard, (2) pick a lower standard to reach, or (3) resign from the activity or position. Meanwhile, according to Korman (1970), based on self-consistency theory, individual who evaluate oneself positively will be motivated to improve and fix the existing gaps (Bono & Colbert, 2005). In accordance with self consistence theory, individual will be motivated to act consistently with his/her self image. Individual will adapt to the standard performance by putting more efforts. CSE may be central to assessment process which determines motivation. CSE may be crucial to the formation of more specific assessment which are directly related to decisions regarding motivation.

CSE was related to motivation and performance (Erez & Judge, 2001; Judge et al., 1998). Individuals with positive CSE would be more motivated to perform and exhibit higher levels of task performance. Past research has shown that high score on CSE, reflecting a positive self-concept is related to a broad array of work and non work criteria, including increase levels of job and life satisfaction, better job performance, higher work motivation, and higher income (Judge & Hurst, 2007; Judge, 2009). Individuals with positive CSE appraise themselves in a consistently positive manner across situation, such individuals see themselves as capable, worthy, and control of their lives. Judge et al. (1998) argue that individuals with high CSE are more motivated to perform their jobs. Individuals with a strong sense of self are more highly motivated, higher achieves, more resourceful. They are also more resilient in the face of adversity than those individuals who have a weak self-concept (Gardner & Pierce, 1998). Individuals high in self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, internal locus of control, and high emotional stability tend to increase their effort. They should be more motivated than those individuals with low self-esteem, low generalized self-efficacy, external locus of control, and low emotional stability who tend to lower their standards of tasks and have lower motivation.

Self consistency theory said that when all else is equal, people will enact and be satisfied with those behavioral roles that maximize their sense of cognitive balance or consistency (Korman, 1970). Individuals should be motivated to

behave in a manner consistent with their self-image and they will approach tasks in a way that allows them to preserve their self-image. Based on control theory, individuals have self-regulation for their behavior via negative feedback. Individuals compare standards and perceived performance result in cognitive and behavioral aspects. CSE has exhibited positive relations with motivation. Erez and Judge (2001) found that CSE is a valid prediction of motivation in several ways to motivation. Using the guidelines stated above, the hypotheses of this study are:

H7: CSE will be positively related to intrinsic motivation for learning and no or negatively to extrinsic motivation for learning.

An individual who scores high on CSE encompasses a fusion of four traits and is well adjusted, positive, self-confident, efficacious, and believes in his or her agency (Judge et al., 2003). The CSE construct has been shown to be related to a variety of relevant workplace constructs, for example a relationship between positive CSE and motivation (Erez & Judge, 2001). All four individual component traits were found to be related to motivation. Empirical studies have link CSE to motivational variables, including self-determination, task motivation, and goal setting behavior (Bono & Colbert, 2005).

3. Method

3.1. Sample and Procedure

This research focuses on personality and motivation of student in undergraduate degree in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The sample consisted of 298 students (with response rate 99.33%) of 300 students from undergraduate degree in Indonesia, especially in Yogyakarta. Of the 298 respondents, 155 were female and 144 were male. Students throughout the universities in Yogyakarta received pen-and-paper surveys. Respondents were assured of anonymity and completed the survey during working hours.

3.2. Measures

This research uses a questionnaire that is developed by some previous researchers by translating from and retranslating it to the original language. Each participant in the study was required to complete three measures: core self-evaluation, the big five personality, intrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation. Questionnaires on the score self-evaluation are taken from those developed by previous researchers, such as 12 items from Judge, Bono, Erez, and Thorensen (2003). The Big Five Personality questionnaires are taken 44 items from Hart, Stasson, Mahoney, and Story (2007). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of students was measured using 30 items from Lepper et al. (2005). Most research on the influence of individual factors in motivation has investigated differences that can be captured through self-report measures of personality.

4. Data Analysis and Results

4.1. Reliability and Validity Analysis

To assess the reliability of the measurement items of all variables, an internal consistency check was carried out. The Cronbach alpha from the test yielded a record of 0.6859 for core self-evaluation, 0.7120 for conscientiousness, 0.7365 for agreeableness, 0.7230 for neuroticism, 0.7286 for openness to experience, 0.6000 for extraversion, 0.7607 for intrinsic motivation – challenge, 0,6822 for intrinsic motivation – curiosity, 0.7197 for intrinsic motivation – independent mastery, 0.6585 for extrinsic motivation – easy work, 0.7752 for extrinsic motivation – pleasing teacher, and 0.6814 for dependence on teacher. The Cronbach alpha from the test yielded is above the cut-off line of reliability as recommended by Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (2006). Content validity that is used to assess for the measurement instruments was done in the pre-tested stage by soliciting the expert opinions of two professors from a university who are research specialists in quantitative methodology and organizational behavior disciplines. The scale was then pre-tested on 30 respondents who were students of undergraduate level in university that have similar characteristics to the target population as suggested by Sekaran and Bougie (2010). Factor analysis (FA) was also performed on the construct under study. Factor extraction was executed and any Eigenvalue that is greater than one (1) will be adopted. To further simplify the interpretation and seek a simpler structure, the Orthogonal technique and the Varimax rotation was then performed. The varimax rotated principal components factor revealed one structure factor. The factor loading recorded loading above 0.40. Given all the items extracted were recorded above 0.4. With varimax rotation and factor loading of minimum 0.4 as suggested by Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (2006) the results of construct validity testing are significant.

4.2. Descriptive Statistics and Mean Difference

Factor analysis is carried out to test construct validity. Then, with varimax rotation and factor loading the minimum of 0,4 as suggested by Hair et al. (2006) is achieved as a result of construct validity test which is significant. Then, the items that have the construct validity with the use of factor analysis are tested for their reliability. Based on theoretical and empirical estimations all variables were hypothesized to be positively related.

4.3. Results

Inter correlations among variables of this study are provided in Table 2. Inter correlations among three dimensions of intrinsic motivation and among three dimensions of extrinsic motivation are positively significant. Inter correlations among five dimension of big five personality are positively significant, except correlations between neuroticism and extraversion, neuroticism and agreeableness, neuroticism and openness to experience, and between neuroticism and conscientiousness.

Regression analysis was applied to test the hypotheses and personality factors were used as the independent variables, while motivations for learning were the dependent variables. Agreeableness was positively related to intrinsic motivation – challenge ($\beta = 0.378$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$) and to intrinsic motivation – curiosity ($\beta = 0.371$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), but agreeableness was no relationship with intrinsic motivation – independent mastery ($\beta = 0.018$ $p > 0.05$). Agreeableness was also negatively related to extrinsic motivation – easy work ($\beta = -0.251$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$) and to extrinsic motivation – pleasing teacher ($\beta = -0.156$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), but agreeableness was no relationship with extrinsic motivation – dependence on teacher ($\beta = -0.013$, $p > 0.05$). Hypothesis 2 was partially supported. Extraversion was positively related to intrinsic motivation – challenge ($\beta = 0.364$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), intrinsic motivation – curiosity ($\beta = 0.175$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), and intrinsic motivation – independent mastery ($\beta = 0.400$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$). Extraversion was no relationship with extrinsic motivation – easy work ($\beta = 0.089$, $p > 0.05$) and extrinsic motivation – dependence on teacher ($\beta = -0{,}107$, $p > 0.05$) and was negatively related to extrinsic motivation – pleasing teacher ($\beta = -0.116$, $p < 0.05$). Hypothesis 3 was supported.

Openness to experience was positively related to intrinsic motivation – challenge ($\beta = 0.211$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), intrinsic motivation – curiosity ($\beta = 0{,}130$, $p < 0.05$), and intrinsic motivation – independent mastery ($\beta = 0.124$, $p < 0.05$). Openness to experience and was no relationship with extrinsic motivation – easy work ($\beta = 0.040$, $p > 0.05$), extrinsic motivation – pleasing teacher ($\beta = -0.080$, $p > 0.05$), and extrinsic motivation – dependence on teacher ($\beta = -0.106$, $p > 0.05$). Conscientiousness was positively related to intrinsic motivation – challenge ($\beta = 0.474$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), intrinsic motivation – curiosity ($\beta = 0.295$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), and intrinsic motivation – independent mastery ($\beta = 0.298$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$). Hypothesis 4 was supported. Conscientiousness was negatively related to extrinsic motivation – easy work ($\beta = -0.209$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$) and extrinsic motivation – pleasing teacher ($\beta = -0.164$ $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), but no relationship with extrinsic motivation – dependence on teacher ($\beta = -0.023$, $p > 0.05$). Hypothesis 5 was supported. Neuroticism was negatively related to intrinsic motivation – challenge ($\beta = -0.188$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$) and intrinsic motivation – independent mastery ($\beta = -0.133$, $p < 0.05$) and was no relationship with intrinsic motivation – curiosity ($\beta = -0.099$, $p > 0.05$). Neuroticism was positively related to extrinsic motivation – easy work ($\beta = 0.381$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), extrinsic motivation – pleasing teacher ($\beta = 0.235$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), and extrinsic motivation – dependence on teacher ($\beta = 0.200$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$). Hypothesis 6 was partially supported.

CSE was positively related to intrinsic motivation – challenge ($\beta = 0.460$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), intrinsic motivation – curiosity ($\beta = 0.339$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), and intrinsic motivation – independent mastery ($\beta = 0.341$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$). CSE was negatively related to extrinsic motivation – easy work ($\beta = -0.402$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), extrinsic motivation – pleasing teacher ($\beta = -0.343$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), and ($\beta = -0.129$, $p < 0.05$). Hypothesis 7 was supported. Intrinsic motivation – challenge was negatively related to extrinsic motivation – easy work ($\beta = -0.542$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), intrinsic motivation - curiosity was negatively related to extrinsic motivation – pleasing teacher ($\beta = -0.251$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), and intrinsic motivation – independent mastery was negatively related to extrinsic motivation – dependence on teacher ($\beta = -0.186$, $p > 0.05$). Thus, hypothesis 1 gained support

The same result of these relationships is that intrinsic motivation - challenge was negatively related to extrinsic motivation – pleasing teacher ($\beta = -0.289$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$), and no relationship with extrinsic motivation - dependence on teacher ($\beta = -0.067$, $p > 0.05$). Intrinsic motivation – curiosity was negatively related to extrinsic motivation – easy work ($\beta = -0.405$, $p = 0.01 < 0.05$) and no relationship with extrinsic motivation – dependence on teacher ($\beta = 0.003$, $p > 0.05$). Intrinsic motivation – independent mastery was negatively related to extrinsic

motivation – easy work (β = -0.263, p = 0.01 < 0.05) and negatively related to extrinsic motivation pleasing teacher (β = -0.153, *p* = 0.01 > 0.05). These relationships were also evident for supported hypothesis 1.

5. Discussion

The presented results provide important insights into the connection of personality traits (Big Five, CSE) and the learning motivation (intrinsic learning motivation and extrinsic learning motivation). Evaluation of the validity of the Big Five and CSE suggests that both types of construct add unique variance to the prediction of the importance of motivation factors. Relationship between personality and motivation is not consistent. Personality traits are unrelated to specific motivated actions. When a relationship is found, it is actually not very strong. This research result confirm with the previous reviews of the literature linking personality to motivational constructs yield mixed findings. This is because the lack of a theoretical framework within. These weak associations may not mean a lack of true relationship between personality and motivation but this is because many researches incorporate personality variable without justifying their inclusion on theoretical basis.

This research found that there is strong evidence that intrinsic motivation was negatively related to extrinsic motivation on each of dimension (challenging versus easy work, curiosity versus pleasing teacher, and independent mastery versus dependence on teacher). These two types of motivation (intrinsic versus extrinsic) can coexist and perhaps even work together to motivate task engagement (Lepper et al., 2005; Hayenga & Corpus, 2010). Understanding how different types of motivation may operate in tandem is a critical issue not only for motivational theories, but also for practitioners. Students with high intrinsic motivation and low extrinsic motivation had the highest perceived competence, most adaptive affective reactions to performance, and highest perceived teacher acceptance. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations were assessed independently in the present study with instruments that have been shown to be both reliable and valid and that add to the literature in several meaningful ways.

This research result found that correlations between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are negative in each dimensions (higher intrinsic motivation, lower extrinsic motivation). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivators have long been studied as mutually exclusive constructs and more recently as independent entities (Hayenga & Corpus, 2010). In the classroom, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation can and do coexist. When measured separately, these two orientation proved only negative correlated, suggesting that they represent there are mutually exclusive of these motivation. The critical issue of this study is not whether a student is intrinsically or extrinsically motivated, but how much intrinsic and how much extrinsic motivation that student display. This finding is mean of intrinsic motivation (M = 3.4480) is higher than extrinsic motivation (M = 3.1125) exhibited more adaptive school behaviors and better performance.

Extrinsic motivation is based on rewards and influences of external authorities or controls over activities. Extrinsic motivation is largely driven by socialization within the family and academic environment. Parents and teachers are important role models in students' social system. Intrinsic motivation is the driving force that is fundamentals to the active nature of human beings (Deci et al., 2001). Intrinsic motivation is driven by deep interest and involvement in the work, curiosity, enjoyment, or a personal sense of challenge, while extrinsic motivation is driven by the desire to attain some goal that is separate from the work itself, such as achieving, a promised reward, meeting a deadline, or winning a competition (Cheng et al., 2011).

Our study findings provided only preliminary evidence concerning relationship between personality traits and motivation for learning. The results were almost in line with theoretical expectations and those gained in previous studies. People with high levels of extraversion tend to be assertive and ambitious, they may be interested in achievement or intrinsic motivation. John & Srivastava found that individuals with high agreeableness are benevolent and warm, so they are more likely to be driven by affective motives (Jang, 2012). Conscientious individuals characterized by diligence, efficiency, and trustworthiness tend to be motivated by intrinsic motivations. Individuals scoring highly on openness to experience were attracted to be motivated by achievement or intrinsic motivation. People with high neuroticism are generally self-centered, lacking in empathy, and have higher extrinsic motivation.

In the empirical analysis I revealed that extraversion and openness to experience had significantly effects on intrinsic motivation in all dimensions and no effects of extraversion and openness to experience on extrinsic motivation in all dimensions. Extraverts were more likely to rate their relationship with their friends as important for feeling happy at campus. Happy person is a productive and motivated person (Robbins & Judge, 2011). Individuals higher in

extraversion may more actively engage in social opportunities, enabling them to become more quickly acquainted with the informal power structure of the organization. Openness to experience was positively related to intrinsic motivation scale. High openness to experience should afford recent hires more complete access to the information necessary to make sense of their new environment and job related tasks. The past studies suggest that openness to experience might be a significant source of learning motivation.

Agreeableness had positive significantly effects on intrinsic motivation in challenge and curiosity and had negative significantly effects on extrinsic motivation in easy work and pleasing teacher. Like extraversion, agreeableness was significant positive predictors of work relationships. Agreeableness individuals are tolerant, kindly, and friendly, and it makes good sense that they seek satisfactory relationship with others. Conscientiousness measures the extent to which individuals are hardworking, organized, dependable, and persevering versus lazy, disorganized, and unreliable. Conscientious individuals are more effectively manage the high volume of information associated with new work environment. Three dimensions of intrinsic motivation, challenge, curiosity, and independent mastery imply a connection with conscientiousness. People were high scores on conscientiousness should prefer jobs that allow them to show their competence and provide them opportunities for achievement. In education, conscientiousness has been of the central concern. Conscientiousness indicates relevance to learning and the additional link to agreeableness mark the relationship to education. Neuroticism concern the degree to which the individual is insecure, anxious, depressed, and emotional, versus calm, self-confident, and care. Neuroticism or emotional stability had positive significantly effects on extrinsic motivation in all dimensions.

CSE encompass as a higher order concept the traits of self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability. Integration of the latter already implies an association of this construct with one of the Big Five factors and research has shown that CSE are moderate correlation with emotional stability or neuroticism but also demonstrate moderate correlations with extraversion and conscientiousness (Judge et al., 2003). The result is also consistent with Erez and Judge (2001) who state that CSE personality influences more on the motivation. Intrinsically motivated individuals tend to have an internal locus of control, are driven to accomplish, seek intellectual stimulation, and are enthusiastic about learning new things (Komaraju, Karau, & Schmeck, 2009). Komaraju et al (2009) also said that extrinsically motivated individuals pursue education to achieve contingent goals, rather than for an intrinsic enjoyment of learning.

My article makes contribution to the existing literature. The theory specifies the mechanisms by which a fundamental determinants of work motivation. The individual's personality influences work motivation. Personality constructs are recognized as playing an important role in organizational psychology. Different personality constructs have linked to such outcomes as performance, satisfaction, motivation, stress, job search behaviors, and copy (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge & Illies, 2002).

Individually, each study in this paper possesses limitations such as using cross-sectional and same-source data. Such methodological shortcomings may result in increased levels of common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Contamination in subjective measures can also come from several sources for examples, common-source bias occurs when the same participants complete all of the measures in a study. Common method bias occurs when all measures are at the same type of report (self-report) at the same time (Tremblay, Blanchard, Villeneue, Taylor, & Pellstier, 2009). Self-report measures are most commonly used measure of an employee's motivation. As self-report measures, personality measure scale scores can be influenced by socially desirable responding (Ellington, Sacket, & Hough, 1999). A recommendation for future study is that effort be used as independent variable. Other factor that is used in this study might have impact on students' performance. A longitudinal study would be more appropriate as it would monitor the participants over a longer period of time. All participants in this survey were students. Future research could select other, more representative sample to improve the generalizability of findings.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, conscientiousness, extraversion, openness to experience, emotional stability, and core self-evaluation seem to be robust predictors of intrinsic motivation. There is now some evidence with regard to which personality traits affect people's judgments of what makes them happy at work. The issue of personality correlates of work values is of considerable theoretical and practical importance. Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation were independent each other mutually exclusive. The results of the current study corroborate the findings of prior studies (e.g, Barrick & Mount, 1991; Gellatly, 1996; Colquitt et al., 2000; Erez & Judge, 2001; Judge & Illies, 2002; Teng et

al., 2007; Jeng & Teng, 2008; Huang & Yang, 2010). Despite the limitations discussed, we believe that this study made a significant contribution to the literature and to the workplace by empirically confirming in the trait-motivation relationship. For the further research, although it is clear that personality trait as a key determinant of motivation, it is important to know that underlying traits are not the only influence on motivation. The situation that people are in also plays a role. I hope that future research that makes up for the limitations of the present study will not only add orthogonal elements to the organizational behaviour and psychological literature, but also will provide a conceptual road map that can serve as a reliable guide for organizational practitioners who select and train people.

References

Barrick, M. and Mount, M. (1991). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1): 1-26. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=a701f710-d8d2-4b77-88db7268b63b4010%40sessionmgr10&vi d=12&hid=25

Barrick, M.R.; Mount, M.K., and Judge, T.A. (2001). Personality Performance at The Beginning of The New Millennium: What Do We Know and Where Do We Go Nest. *Personality and Performance*, 9(1): 9-30. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=43&sid=25ae098b-9780-4618 -9ed7-9df1baf2323f%40sessionmgr112&hid=19

Bipp, T. (2010). What Do People want From Their Jobs? The Big Five, Core Self-Evaluation, and Work Motivation. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 18(1): 28-39. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468 -2389.2010.00486.x.

Bono, J.E. dan Colbert, A.E. (2005). Understanding Responses to Multi-Source Feedback : The Role of Core Self-Evaluations. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(1): 171-203. Available: http://web. ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=a701f710-d8d2-4b77-88db7268b63b4010 %40sessionmgr10&vid=12&hid=25

Cheng, P.; Lin, M.; and Su, C.K. (2011). Attitudes and Motivations of Students Taking Professional Certificate Examinations. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 39(10): 1303-1314. Available: http://search. proquest.com/docview/909624679?accountid=44396

Chiang, C.F, and Jang, S.C. (2008). An Expectancy Theory Model For Hotel Employee Motivation. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27(2): 313-322. Available: http://web. ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=25&sid=88636bc2-3c69-4146-91a7-122d5439eed7%40sessionmgr14&hid=19&bdata=JnNpdGU9 ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=bth&AN=36074000

Colquitt, J.; LePine, J; and Noe, R. (2000). Toward an Integrative Theory of Training Motivation: A Meta-Analytic Path Analysis of 20 Years of Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 85(5): 678–707. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=13&sid=a701f710-d8d2-4b77-88db7268b63b4010% 40sessionmgr10&hid=25&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=buh&AN=12129116

De Raad, B. and Schouwenburg, H.C. (1996). Personality in Learning and Education: A Review. *European Journal of Personality*, 10(1): 303-336. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=25ae098b-9780-4618-9ed7-9df1baf2323f%40sessionmgr112& vid=43&hid=19

Deci, E.L.; Koestner, R., and Ryan,R.M. (2001). Extrinsic Rewards and Intrinsic Motivation in Education: Reconsidered One Again. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(1): 1-51. Available: http://search.proquest.com/docview/214116110?accountid=44396

Ellington, J., Sackett, P.R. & Hough, L.M. (1999). Social Desirability Corrections in Personality Measurement: Issues of Applicant Comparison and Construct Validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(2), 155-166. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=13&sid=a701f710-d8d2-4b77-88db 7268b63b4010%40sessionmgr10&hid=25&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=buh&AN=12129271

Erez, A. (1997). Core Self-Evaluations as Source of Work Motivation and Performance. Cornell University. Dissertation. Available: http://search.proquest.com/docview/304365619?accountid=443 96

Erez, A. dan Judge, T.A. (2001). Relationship of Core Self-Evaluation to Goal Setting, Motivation, and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6): 1270-1279. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=14&sid=a701f710-d8d2-4b77-88db7268b63b4010%40sessionmgr10&hid=25&bdata=JnNpdU9ZWhvc3 QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=buh&AN=12129183

Ferris, D.L.; Rosen, C.R.; Johnson, R.E.; Brown, D.J.; Risavy, S.D.; and Heller, D. (2011). Approach or Avoidance (Or Bioth?): Integrating Core Self-Evaluations Within An Approach/ Avoidance Framework. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1): 137-161. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01204.x.

Furnham, A.; Eracleous, A.; and Premuzie, C. (2009). Personality, Motivation, and Job Satisfaction: Herzberg Meets The Big Five. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(8): 765-779. Available: http://search.proquest.com/docview/215867349?accountid=44396

Gardner, D.G. and Pierce, J.L. (1998). Self-Esteem and Self-Efficacy Within The Organizational Content. *Group & Organizational Studies*, 23(1): 48-70. Available: http://search.proquest.com/ docview/203376861? accountid=44396

Gellatly, I.R. (1996). Conscientiousness and task Performance: Test of a Cognitive Process Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(5): 474-482. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=88636bc2-3c69-4146-91a7-122d5439eed7%40sessionmgr 14&vid=36&hid=124

Goodman, S,; Jaffer, S.; Keresztesi, M.; Mamdani, F.; Mokgatle, D.; Musariri, M.; Pires, J.; and Schlechter, A. (2011). An Investigation of The Relationship Between Students' Motivation and Academic Performance as Mediated by Effort. *South Africa Journal of Psychology*, 41 (3): 373-385. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=25ae098b-9780-4618-9ed7-9df1baf2323f%40sessionmgr112&vid=17&hid=19

Hair, J.E.; Black, W.C. ; Babin, B.J. ; Anderson, R.E. ; dan Tatham, R.L. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 6th edition. New Jersey : Prentice-Hall International Inc.

Hart, J.W.; Stasson, M.F.; Mahoney, J.M.; and Story, P. (2007). The Big Five and Achievement Motivation: Exploring Between Personality and Two-Factor Model of Motivation. *Individual Differences Research*, 5 (4): 267-274. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=25ae098b-9780-4618-9ed7-9df1baf2323f%40sessionmgr112&vid= 29&hid=19

Hayenga, A.O. and Corpus, J.H. (2010). Profile of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: A Person-Centered Approach To Motivation and Achievement in Middle School. *Motiv.Emot*, 34: 371-383. DOI 10.1007/s11031-010-9181-x

Huang, J. and Yang, Y. (2010). The Relationship Between Personality Traits and Unlike Shopping Motivations. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 38(5): 673-680. Available: http://search.proquest.com/docview/613952212?accountid=44396

Jang, C.L. (2012). The Effect of Personality Traits on The Public Service Motivation: Evidence From Taiwan. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 40(5): 725-734. Available: http://search.proquest. com/ docview/1027913942?accountid=44396

Jeng, M.R. and Teng, C.I. (2008). Personality and Motivations For Playing Online Game. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 36(8): 1053-1060. Available: http://search.proquest.com/docview/209915361?accoun tid=44396

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Erez, A., & Locke, E. A. (2005). Core Self-evaluations and Job and Life Satisfaction: The role of Self-concordance and Goal Attainment. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 90(2), 257-268. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.257.

Judge, T.A. (2009). Core Self-evaluations and Work Success. *Current Psychological Directions in Science*, 18(1): 379-387. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=66&sid=25ae098b-9780-4618-9ed7-9df1baf2323f%40sessionmgr112&hid=124

Judge, T.A. and Hurst, C. (2007). Capitalizing on One's Advantages: The Role of Core Self-Evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 1212-1227. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=13&sid=a701f710-d8d2-4b77-88db-7268b63b4010%40sessionmgr10&hid=25&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=buh&AN=26551037

Judge, T.A. and Illies, R. (2002). Relationship of Personality to Performance Motivation: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4): 797-807. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=14&sid=a701f710-d8d2-4b77-88db-7268b63b4010%40sessionmgr10&hid=25&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=buh&AN=12130451

Judge, T.A. dan Bono, J.E. (2001). Relationship of Core Self-Evaluation Traits – Self-Esteem, Generalized

Self-Efficacy, Locus Of Control, and Emotional Stability – With Job Satisfaction and Job Performance : A Meta Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 86 (1) : 80-92. DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.1.80.

Judge, T.A.; Erez, A.; and Bono, J.E. (1998). The Power of Being Positive: The Relation Between Positive Self-Concept and Job Performance. *Human Performance*, 11(2/3); 167-187. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=88636bc2-3c69-4146-91a7-122d5439eed7%40sessionmgr14&vid=16&hid=124

Judge, T.A.; Locke, E.A.; Durham, C.C.; dan Kluger, A.N. (1998). Dispositional Effects on Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Core Evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(1) : 17-34. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=13&sid=a701f710-d8d2-4b77-88db-7268b63b4010%40sessionmgr10&hid=25&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=buh&AN=12146043

Judge, T.A; Erez, A.; Bono, J.E.; and Thoresen, C.J. (2003). The Core Self-Evaluations Scale: Development of a Measure. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(2): 303–331. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=11&sid=a701f710-d8d2-4b77-88db7268b63b4010% 40sessionmgr10&hid=25

Kark, R. and Van Dijk, D. (2007). Motivation to Lead, Motivation to Follow: The Role of The Self-Regulatory Focus in Leadership Process. *Academy of Management Review*, 32 (2): 500-528. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.2007.24351846.

Komaraju, M., Karau, S.J., and Schmeck, R.R. (2009). Role of The Big Five Personality Traits College Students' Academic Motivation and Achievement. Learning and Individual Differences, 19: 47-52. DOI:10.1016/j.lindif.2008.07.001

Korman, A. K. (1970). Toward a hypothesis of work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 54, 31-41. http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=13&sid=a701f710-d8d2-4b77-88db-7268b63b4010%40sessionmgr10&hid=25&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=buh&AN=12569996

Lawrence, S. and Jordan, P. (2009). Testing Explicit and Implicit Measure of Motivation *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 17(2): 103-120. Available: http://search.proquest.com/docview/198613962?accountid=44396

Lepper, M.R.; Corpus, J.H.; and Iyengar, S.S. (2005). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivational In The Classroom: Age Differences and Academic Correlates. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2): 184-196. DOI: 10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.184.

Locke, E.A. dan Latham, G.P. (1996). Goal Setting Theory : An Introduction. In Steers, Porter, & Bigley, *Motivation and Leadership at Work,* 95-121. New York : McGraw-Hill Companies. Inc.

Locke, E.A.; Shaw, K.N.; Saari, L.M.; dan Latham, G.P. (1981). Goal Setting and Task Performance : 1969 -1980. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90(1), 125-152. Not Available

Major, D.A.; Turner, J.E.; and Fletcher, T.D. (2006). Linking Proactive Personality and The Big Five to Motivation to Learn and Development Activity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4): 927-935. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.927

Markland, D.; Ryan, R.M.; Tobin, V.J.; and Rollnick, S. (2005). Motivation Interviewing and Self-Determination Theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24(6): 811-831. Available: http://search.proquest.com/docview/224853613?accountid=44396

Naquin, S.S. and Holton, E.F. (2002). The Effects of Personality, Affectivity, and Work Commitment on Motivation to Improve Work Through Learning. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 13(4): 357-376. Available: http://search.proquest.com/docview/23490 4076?accountid=44396

Pinder, C.C. (1984). *Work Motivation: Theory, Issues, and Applications*. London: Scott, Foresman and Company

Pinder, C.C. (1998). *Work Motivation in Organizational Behavior*. Upper Saddle River, New Yok: Prentice Hall.

Podsakoff, P.M.; MacKenzie, S.B.; Podsakoff, N.P.; dan Lee, J.Y. (2003). Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research : A Critical Review of The Literature and The Recommended Remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5): 879-903. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Robbins, S.P. and Judge, T.A. (2011). *Organizational Behavior*, 14th edition. Singapore: Pearson.

Ryan, R.M. and Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-Determination Theory and The Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social

Development, and Well-Being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1): 68-78. DOI**:** 10.1037/0003- 066X.55.1.68

Sekaran, U and Bougie, R. (2010). *Research methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*, 5th edition. Singapore: A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Sokolowski, K.; Schmalt, H.; Langens, T.A.; and Puca, R.M. (2000). Assessing Achievement, Affiliation, and Power Motives All at Once: The Multi-Motive Grid (MMG). *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 74(1): 126-145. Available: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=88636bc2-3c69-4146-91a71 22d5439eed7%40sessionmgr14&vid=20&hid=19

Steers, R.M. and Porter, L.W. (1991). *Motivation and Work Behavior*, 5th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Steers, R.M.; Mowday, R.T.; and Shapiro, D.L. (2004). The Future of Work Motivation Theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(3): 379-387. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.2004.13670978.

Sung, S.Y. and Choi, J.N. (2009). Do Big Five Personality Factors Affect Individual Creativity? The Moderating Role of Extrinsic Motivation. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 37(7): 941-956. Available: http://search.proquest.com/docview/209931221?accountid=44396

Teng, C. I., Huang, K. W., and Tsai, I. L. (2007). Effects of Personality on Service Quality in Business Transactions. *The Service Industries Journal*, 27(7): 849-863. Available: http://search.proquest.com/ docview/203342452?accountid=44396

Tremblay, M.A.; Blanchard, C.M.; Villeneue, M.; Taylor, S.; and Pellstier, L.G. (2009). Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale: Its Value For Organizational Psychology Research. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 41(4): 213-226. Available: http://search.proquest.com/docview/220498089?accountid =44396

Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Watanabe, S. and Kanazawa, Y. (2009). A Test of a Personality Based View of Intrinsic Motivation. *Japanese Journal of Administrative Science*, 22(2): 117-130. Available: http://jaas.jpn.org/doc/pdf/journal/ 22_2/22_2_11.pdf

Weiss, H.M. and Adler, S. (1984). Personality and Organizational Behavior. In Staw and Cummings (editor). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 6(1): 1-50. Greenwich, CT : JAI Press.

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage: http://www.iiste.org

CALL FOR PAPERS

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. There's no deadline for submission. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** http://www.iiste.org/Journals/

The IISTE editorial team promises to the review and publish all the qualified submissions in a **fast** manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar