Chapter #4

DISPOSITIONAL TRAITS AS PREDICTORS OF SELF-EFFICACY

Elena Lisá
Institute of Applied Psychology, Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Comenius University, Slovakia

ABSTRACT
Introduction: We started from Bandura's theory of self-efficacy, the onion model of achievement motivation according to Schuler & Prochaska, and the 5-factor personality theory by Costa & McCrae. The study aimed to analyze the predictive power of achievement motivation and personality traits on general self-efficacy and domain-specific career decision self-efficacy. We expected the more significant relationship of stable personality characteristics with general self-efficacy than with specific-domain career decision self-efficacy. Methods: 690 adult participants (university students and working adults) completed a career decision self-efficacy questionnaire, and 268 of them a general self-efficacy scale. All participants also fulfilled an achievement motivation questionnaire and a five-factor personality theory questionnaire. Results: All five personality traits, combined with four dimensions of achievement motivation (dominance, confidence in success, self-control, and competitiveness) explain 61% of general self-efficacy variability. Extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness with six achievement motivation dimensions (dominance, engagement, confidence in success, fearlessness, competitiveness, and goal setting) explain 42.5% of career decision self-efficacy variability. Discussion: Stable traits and achievement motivation dimensions had more significant predictive power on general self-efficacy than on domain-specific career decision self-efficacy. For further research, there is a suggestion about a theoretically and empirically integrated model of dispositional and social-cognitive approaches.

Keywords: achievement motivation, traits, general self-efficacy, career self-efficacy.

1. INTRODUCTION

The chapter brings the topic of stable dispositional variables: personality traits, achievement motivation, and the topic of dynamic social-cognitive variables: general self-efficacy, career self-efficacy. It introduces the fundamental starting theories and empirically examines the relationships between the stable and dynamic characteristics of personality. The results of the chapter indicate possible directions for research into the future. They start from the need for an integrative theoretical model to applied research in the field of self-efficacy development.

2. BACKGROUND

Self-efficacy refers to personal beliefs or an individual's confidence in his ability to perform effectively specified tasks. It affects behavior and motivation. The self-efficacy theory states that there are four primary sources of efficacy expectations: previous performance accomplishments, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological states (Bandura, 1977). These sources show the dynamic nature of self-efficacy. Efficacy

beliefs influence how people feel, think, motivate themselves, and behave (Bandura, 1993). Bandura stated that beliefs about the nature of ability could make a difference in a group's performance. For example, people who believed that ability has an inherent intellectual nature failed in group problem-solving. They who believed that ability is an acquired skill achieved the group goals more efficiently. They managed better by fostering a "highly resilient sense of personal efficacy" (p. 121).

Self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1982) says that perceived self-efficacy is a major motivational factor contributing to successful task performance. Research showed that self-efficacy is the most critical predictor of university student achievement (Bartimote-Aufflick, Bridgeman, Walker, Sharma, & Smith, 2016). Bandura understands motivation as a cognitive phenomenon and the self-efficacy in the same way. He said: "Expectations of personal efficacy do not operate as dispositional determinants independently of contextual factors." (Bandura, 1977, p. 203). Hence, it is necessary for a subject to identify the circumstance and to determine the required behavior. Therefore, the dynamic nature of self-efficacy applies to developmental goals in various settings, e.g., schools (Bartimote-Aufflick et al., 2016). An example of a domain-specific self-efficacy is a career self efficacy. It is broadly defined as "confidence in one's ability to manage career development and work-related tasks" (O'Brien, 2003, p. 110).

Self-efficacy beliefs are rooted in support of a sense of confidence provided by the caregiver; as children develop positive attitudes, they receive support from adults' tolerant behavior (Bandura, 1997). General self-efficacy is affected by early memories of warmth and safeness (Yilmaz Bingöl, 2018). Research studies show that also some other dynamic variables can influence the overall score of self-efficacy. E.g., Gardner's musical and linguistic intelligence were predictors of general self-efficacy (Zarei & Taheri, 2013). Knowledge of diabetes and insulin injection, insulin injection skills, senior high school or above education, and diabetes duration were predictors of self-efficacy in administering insulin injection, which explained 41% of the total variance in self-efficacy (Huang, Hung, Huang, & Yang, 2019). Psychological resilience and positivity together explained 33% of the total variance in self-efficacy (Yilmaz Bingöl, Vural Batik, Hoşoğlu, & Kodaz, 2018). Although self-efficacy is the dynamic cognitive construct, research in recent years showed that personality traits contribute as antecedents to several domain-specific kinds of self-efficacy. E.g., career self-efficacy (Hartman & Betz, 2007; Bullock-Yowell, Andrews, & Buzzetta, 2011), professional choice self-efficacy (Ambiel & Noronha, 2016), vocational self-efficacy (Larson & Borgen, 2006), leadership self-efficacy (Huszczo & Lee Endres, 2017), computer self-efficacy (Saleem, Beaudry, & Croteau, 2011), creative self-efficacy (Karwowski, Lebuda, Wisniewska, & Gralewski, 2013), entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Şahin, Karadağ, & Tuncer, 2019), self-efficacy in selecting a high school major (Brown & Cinamon, 2016). These findings are essential in light of the integration of trait/dispositional and social-cognitive perspectives. Reciprocal influences of traits and self-efficacy are still incompletely understood (Stajkovic, Bandura, Locke, Lee, & Sergent, 2018).

According to motivation, Bandura says that self-efficacy beliefs play a crucial role in the self-regulation of motivation through cognition. He distinguishes three different forms of cognitive motivators: casual attributions, outcome expectancies, and cognized goals. Self-efficacy works with all three forms of cognitive motivators. It causes the difference in mental performance between children with the same level of cognitive ability but a different level of self-efficacy. The research in university students' samples proved the mediational role of self-efficacy on achievement motivation and learning strategies (Yusuf, 2011a) and a considerable correlation between self-efficacy and achievement motivation

(Yusuf, 2011b). More research studies empirically confirm a positive association between self-efficacy and achievement motivation (Mouloud & Elkader, 2016; Mohamadi et al., 2014; Habibah, Noordin, & Mahyuddin, 2010; Zhang et al. 2015; Abbasianfard, Bahrami, & Ahghar, 2010).

However, when speaking about achievement and motivation, we cannot forget dispositional theories. From that point of view, achievement motivation is a personality variable that explains individual differences in various contexts. It is a complex construct consisting of different layers of dimensions, something as onion. Schuler & Prochaska (2011) view the achievement motivation model as an onion model. Layers of onion are layers of personality: background variables (neuroticism, conscientiousness), theoretical compounds (locus of control, attribution style, self-confidence), peripheral facets (independence, status orientation), core facets (hope of success, goal setting, persistence). Therefore "it is regarded as a general orientation of the person towards the achievement" (p.9).

According to the stated recent research, we conclude that self-efficacy constructs grow from situational and dispositional roots.

2.1. Objectives

We expect a significant relationship between the stable characteristics of personality and self-efficacy constructs. When considering the power of the situation in the case of domain-specific self-efficacy constructs, we expect that the relationship between stable personality characteristics (achievement motivation, personality traits) and generalized efficacy will be more significant than between stable personality characteristics (achievement motivation, personality traits) and career self-efficacy.

3. METHODS

Six hundred and ninety university students and adults participated in the research. All participants took achievement motivation inventory and career efficacy questionnaire, 600 of them fulfilled the five-factor personality inventory, and 268 general self-efficacy scale. The research participants participated in the research study by the snowball method. The first contact - psychology students collected the data, and they received the credits for a research practice course. The data were collected and processed anonymously. Participation in the research was voluntary.

Achievement motivation inventory (LMI; Schuler & Prochaska, 2011) in the Slovak language contains 170 items in a 7-point Likert format from (1) "Does not apply at all" to (7) "Applies fully to me." The final questionnaire consists of 17 dimensions - fearlessness, flexibility, independence, preference for difficult tasks, confidence in success, dominance, goal setting, eagerness to learn, competitiveness, compensatory effort, engagement, pride in productivity, status orientation, flow, internality, persistence, self-control.

Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES) is an independent cultural questionnaire in 25 countries globally (Luszczynska, Scholz, & Schwarzer, 2005; Scholz, Gutiérrez-Doña, Sud, & Schwarzer, 2002). For the research purpose, we used the Slovak version of the GSES (Košč, Heftyová, Schwarzer, & Jerusalem, 1993). It contains ten items in a 4-point Likert format from (1) "Not true" to (7) "The truth."

The Career Decision Self-Efficacy scale–Short Form (CDSES-SF; Betz, Klein, & Taylor in O'Brien, 2003) is a self-report, 25-item inventory developed to assess confidence in career-related decisions and engagement in tasks related to career decision making. A 5-point continuum, ranging from no confidence at all (1) to complete confidence

(5), was used. All items sum in the total score on the CDSES–SF. High scores reflect intense levels of confidence in completing career-related tasks.

NEO, the five-factor personality inventory NEO-FFI represents a shortened version of the five-factor personality theory questionnaire (Ruisel & Halama, 2007) that measures five main personality traits: neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (McCrae & Costa, 2006). The dimensions represent the sum of answers for 12 questions using ratings from 1 to 5.

The data were analyzed by JASP 0.11.1.0 (correlation, and regression analysis).

4. RESULTS

Correlation analysis showed small to large correlation coefficients between self-efficacy, personality traits, and achievement motivation dimensions (Table 1 a,b).

Most of the strong relationships among personality traits and achievement motivation scales exist in neuroticism and conscientiousness. The most related to neuroticism are fearlessness, independence, perseverance, confidence in success, flexibility, and internality. Also, dominance and preference for difficulty indicate a clear relationship to neuroticism (negative). The conscientiousness factor correlates with the dimensions of self-control, perseverance, confidence in success, engagement, pride in productivity, and independence. These results are consistent with the background theories of the current research.

Except for two, all correlations between self-efficacy and personality traits plus motivation dimensions are statistically significant

Table 1a.
Correlations and Cronbach' alphas for measured variables - continue.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 CDSES	0.91											
2 GSES	0.648 ***	0.88										
3 N	-0.381 ***	-0.456 ***	0.82									
4 E	0.386 ***	0.464 ***	-0.409 ***	0.78								
5 O	0.162 ***	0.212 ***	-0.042	0.207 ***	0.68							
6 P	-0.004	-0.158 *	-0.178 ***	0.154 ***	0.100 *	0.71						
7 S	0.424 ***	0.456 ***	-0.366 ***	0.298 ***	0.036	0.229 ***	0.85					
8 PE	0.392 ***	0.421 ***	-0.478 ***	0.301 ***	0.003	0.045	0.531 ***	0.74				
9 DO	0.461 ***	0.548 ***	-0.348 ***	0.475 ***	0.241 ***	-0.214 ***	0.263 ***	0.415 ***	0.84			
10 EN	0.248 ***	0.266 ***	-0.126 **	0.180 ***	0.032	-0.080	0.410 ***	0.449 ***	0.396 ***	0.76		
11 CS	0.514 ***	0.592 ***	-0.452 ***	0.394 ***	0.180 ***	0.007	0.427 ***	0.534 ***	0.594 ***	0.409 ***	0.83	
12 FX	0.458 ***	0.493 ***	-0.425 ***	0.460 ***	0.257 ***	0.035	0.306 ***	0.447 ***	0.495 ***	0.208 ***	0.559 ***	0.73
13 FL	0.219 ***	0.238 ***	-0.050	0.159 ***	0.213 ***	-0.070	0.224 ***	0.243 ***	0.345 ***	0.446 ***	0.398 ***	0.320 ***
14 F	0.427 ***	0.423 ***	-0.575 ***	0.280 ***	0.110 **	0.003	0.320 ***	0.603 ***	0.377 ***	0.195 ***	0.490 ***	0.539 ***
15 IN	0.310 ***	0.180 **	-0.395 ***	0.172 ***	0.150 ***	0.254 ***	0.359 ***	0.441 ***	0.165 ***	0.125 ***	0.285 ***	0.351
16 CE	0.115 **	0.084	0.121 **	-0.026	0.012	0.008	0.256 ***	0.155 ***	0.178 ***	0.394 ***	0.274 ***	0.057 ***
17 PP	0.279 ***	0.245 ***	-0.064	0.194 ***	0.120 **	0.039	0.411 ***	0.296 ***	0.404 ***	0.421 ***	0.475 ***	0.319 ***
18 EL	0.394 ***	0.301 ***	-0.230 ***	0.209 ***	0.334 ***	0.008	0.332 ***	0.349 ***	0.471 ***	0.443 ***	0.519 ***	0.471 ***
19 PT	0.392 ***	0.455 ***	-0.380 ***	0.245 ***	0.178 ***	-0.051	0.371 ***	0.556 ***	0.484 ***	0.482 ***	0.628 ***	0.602 ***
20 ID	0.461 ***	0.528 ***	-0.508 ***	0.326 ***	0.167 ***	-0.020	0.401 ***	0.534 ***	0.531 ***	0.322 ***	0.539 ***	0.566 ***
21 SC	0.260 ***	0.167 **	-0.255 ***	0.086 *	0.016	0.207 ***	0.613 ***	0.543 ***	0.159 ***	0.402 ***	0.307 ***	0.198 ***
22 OS	0.226 ***	0.235 ***	0.024	0.242 ***	0.117 ***	-0.243 ***	0.050	0.069	0.478 ***	0.245 ***	0.348 ***	0.249 ***
23 CO	0.132 ***	0.084	0.093 *	0.178 ***	0.064	-0.313 ***	0.008	0.074 *	0.456 ***	0.304 ***	0.255 ***	0.142 ***
24 GS	0.407 ***	0.382 ***	-0.157 ***	0.264 ***	0.226 ***	-0.037	0.328 ***	0.282 ***	0.467 ***	0.426 ***	0.492 ***	0.451 ***

Table 1b.
Correlations and Cronbach' alphas for measured variables.

	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
13 FL	0.320 ***	0.78										
14 F	0.539 ***	0.044	0.82									
15 IN	0.351 ***	0.124 ***	0.476 ***	0.66								
16 CE	0.057	0.373 ***	-0.218 ***	-0.010	0.76							
17 PP	0.319 ***	0.593 ***	-0.006	0.186 ***	0.578 ***	0.77						
18 EL	0.471 ***	0.391 ***	0.297 ***	0.217 ***	0.287 ***	0.408 ***	0.66					
19 PT	0.602 ***	0.491 ***	0.537 ***	0.296 ***	0.193 ***	0.349 ***	0.547 ***	0.85				
20 ID	0.566 ***	0.283 ***	0.626 ***	0.416 ***	0.007	0.260 ***	0.409 ***	0.584 ***	0.67			
21 SC	0.198 ***	0.131 ***	0.318 ***	0.398 ***	0.274 ***	0.283 ***	0.267 ***	0.313 ***	0.298 ***	0.67		
22 OS	0.249 ***	0.344 ***	-0.059	-0.077 *	0.372 ***	0.527 ***	0.345 ***	0.209 ***	0.129 ***	-0.012	0.85	
23 CO	0.142 ***	0.384 ***	-0.068	-0.098 **	0.373 ***	0.445 ***	0.287 ***	0.221 ***	0.099 **	-0.018	0.666 ***	0.81
24 GS	0.451 ***	0.406 ***	0.201 ***	0.182 ***	0.361 ***	0.517 ***	0.547 ***	0.475 ***	0.379 ***	0.232 ***	0.578 ***	0.445 *** 0.65

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

CDSES = career self-efficacy; GSES = general self-efficacy; N = neuroticism; E = extraversion; O = openness to experience; A = agreeableness; C = conscientiousness; F = fearlessness; FX = flexibility; ID = independence; PT = preference for difficult tasks; CS = confidence in success; DO = dominance; GS = goal setting; EL = eagerness to learn; CO = competitiveness; CE = compensatory effort; EN = engagement; PP = pride in productivity; OS = status orientation; FL = flow; IN = internality; PE = persistence; SC = self-control.

4.1. Prediction of general self-efficacy (GSE)

All five personality traits significantly predict GSE (table 2). The regression model explains 51,9 % of GSE score variability ($R = 0,721; R2 = 0,519$; F (5 252) = 54,473; $p < .001$).

Table 2.
Linear Regression (dependent variable: GSE; independent variables: personality traits).

Model		Unstandardized	Standard Error	Standardized	t	p
1	(Intercept)	30.595	2.405		12.722	< .001
	Neuroticism	-0.255	0.038	-0.329	-6.783	< .001
	Extraversion	0.211	0.043	0.241	4.947	< .001
	Openness	0.198	0.038	0.230	5.133	< .001
	Agreeableness	-0.323	0.045	-0.327	-7.217	< .001
	Conscientiousness	0.272	0.037	0.346	7.443	< .001

Five achievement motivation dimensions predict GSE: dominance, confidence in success, flexibility, competitiveness, and goal setting (table 3). The regression model explains 48,3 % of GSE score variability ($R = 0,695; R2 = 0,483$; F (17 240) = 13,192; $p < .001$).

All five personality traits in combination with four dimensions of achievement motivation (dominance, confidence in success, self-control, and competitiveness) significantly predict GSE (table 4). The regression model explains 61,3 % of GSE score variability ($R = 0,783; R2 = 0,613$; F (22 226) = 16,297; $p < .001$).

Table 3.
Linear Regression (dependent variable: GSE; independent variables: achievement motivation dimensions).

Model		Unstandardized	Standard Error	Standardized	t	p
1	(Intercept)	14.284	3.110		4.592	< .001
	Dominance	0.174	0.043	0.291	4.072	< .001
	Confidence in Success	0.193	0.051	0.279	3.789	< .001
	Flexibility	0.099	0.052	0.129	1.896	0.059
	Competitiveness	-0.088	0.038	-0.150	-2.288	0.023
	Goal Setting	0.093	0.051	0.125	1.822	0.070

Table 4.
Linear Regression (dependent variable: GSE; independent variables: achievement motivation dimensions, and personality traits).

.

Coefficients Model		Unstandardized	Standard Error	Standardized	t	p
1	(Intercept)	24.841	3.671		6.768	< .001
	Conscientiousness	0.281	0.046	0.354	6.116	< .001
	Agreeableness	-0.227	0.051	-0.229	-4.477	< .001
	Neuroticism	-0.138	0.045	-0.179	-3.094	0.002
	Openness	0.124	0.042	0.144	2.947	0.004
	Dominance	0.111	0.041	0.184	2.679	0.008
	Confidence in Success	0.108	0.048	0.154	2.269	0.024
	Extraversion	0.105	0.048	0.119	2.159	0.032
	Self-Control	-0.087	0.041	-0.123	-2.105	0.036
	Competitiveness	-0.083	0.035	-0.140	-2.363	0.019

4.2. Prediction of career decision self-efficacy (CDSE)

All five personality traits significantly predict CDSE (table 5). The regression model explains 31,3 % of CDSE score variability ($R = 0,560; R2 = 0,313$; F (5 570) = 51,973; $p < .001$).

Table 5.
Linear Regression (dependent variable: CDSE; independent variables: personality traits).

Model		Unstandardized	Standard Error	Standardized	t	p
1	(Intercept)	71.282	4.788		14.889	< .001
	Neuroticism	-0.383	0.074	-0.204	-5.150	< .001
	Extraversion	0.448	0.085	0.209	5.289	< .001
	Openness	0.241	0.077	0.112	3.138	< .001
	Agreeableness	-0.385	0.088	-0.158	-4.386	< .001
	Conscientiousness	0.618	0.074	0.320	8.361	< .001

Nine achievement motivation dimensions (dominance, confidence in success, flexibility, fearlessness, internality, eagerness to learn, preference for difficult tasks, competitiveness, and goal setting) significantly predict CDSE (table 6). The regression model explains 39,7 % of CDSE score variability ($R = 0,630; R2 = 0,397$; F (17 655) = 25,380; $p < .001$).

Three traits of personality (extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) with six achievement motivation dimensions (dominance, engagement, confidence in success, fearlessness, competitiveness, and goal setting) significantly predict CDSE score (table 7). The regression model explains 44,4 % of CDSE score variability ($R = 0,666; R2 = 0,444$; F (22 537) = 19,467; $p < .001$).

Table 6.
Linear Regression (dependent variable: CDSE; independent variables: achievement motivation dimensions).

Coefficients Model		Unstandardized	Standard Error	Standardized	t	p
1	(Intercept)	30.192	4.179		7.225	< .001
	Dominance	0.242	0.063	0.180	3.860	< .001
	Confidence in Success	0.307	0.076	0.196	4.020	< .001
	Flexibility	0.138	0.076	0.081	1.799	0.072
	Fearlessness	0.183	0.070	0.139	2.624	0.009
	Internality	0.126	0.067	0.072	1.878	0.061
	Eagerness to Learn	0.129	0.071	0.075	1.822	0.069
	Preference for Difficult Tasks	-0.145	0.069	-0.108	-2.097	0.036
	Competitiveness	-0.110	0.061	-0.080	-1.785	0.075
	Goal Setting	0.261	0.077	0.152	3.369	< .001

Table 7.
Linear Regression (dependent variable: CDSE; independent variables: achievement motivation dimensions, and personality traits).

Model		Unstandardized	Standard Error	Standardized	t	p
1	(Intercept)	34.836	6.625		5.259	< .001
	Dominance	0.215	0.073	0.154	2.931	0.004
	Engagement	-0.107	0.064	-0.078	-1.682	0.093
	Confidence in Success	0.167	0.084	0.105	1.991	0.047
	Fearlessness	0.195	0.078	0.147	2.480	0.013
	Competitiveness	-0.160	0.068	-0.113	-2.346	0.019
	Goal Setting	0.284	0.086	0.164	3.313	< .001
	Extraversion	0.304	0.092	0.144	3.310	< .001
	Agreeableness	-0.230	0.096	-0.095	-2.381	0.018
	Conscientiousness	0.368	0.092	0.191	4.014	< .001

5. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Recent research results show that various dispositional traits could determine the various domain-specific models of self-efficacy. As Stajkovic et al. (2018) mentioned, we need to look for ways to use limited resources effectively. There is a need to explore these relationships to develop the selected domain-specific self-efficacies adequately. Future research, therefore, may bring the theoretical or empirical model which integrates dispositional and social-cognitive approaches (Hartman & Betz, 2007; Larson & Borgen, 2006). There are some suggestions for applied research aims in the field. Because of dispositional antecedents of self-efficacy, the applied research could focus on the right way of self-efficacy development. E.g., to explore how to choose the goals of performance concerning individual dispositions, or what kind of performance is suitable/more comfortable for an individual. The chosen goals should reflect the dispositional conditionality of the personality. For example, if an individual has a higher score of dominance, competitiveness, and disagreeableness, he or she should choose appropriate career goals and performance. Strategies for the development of self-efficacy could depend on the nature of the personality. For example, agreeable people may consider solutions uncomfortable for them due to the risk of interpersonal conflicts and non-acceptance on their path to success/performance. People with low achievement motivation may look for goals/performances that bring them, above all, joy and fulfillment, because they will not be able to rely on the driving force of the desire for success.

The limit of the current study could lay in the type of research group. The research participants were people mostly with university education. The results could depend on the composition of the research sample. Some studies suggest the critical nature of gender in regression models of self-efficacy (Huszczo & Lee Endres, 2017; Saleem, Beaudry, & Croteau, 2011). However, in the current study, we did not confirm the differences in regression models between men and women.

The self-efficacy is currently in focus as the mediator in the relationship between performance and personality traits (Stajkovic et al., 2018). Some other moderator variables are in these analyses important too, e.g., work task complexity (Judge, Jackson, Shaw, Scott, & Rich, 2007), extreme groups (Ambiel & Noronha, 2016); potentially traumatic event (Bosmans, van der Knaap, & van der Velden, 2015). For further research, we recommend verifying relationships between self-efficacy constructs, performance, and attachment (Klanduchová & Greškovičová, 2019; Greškovičová & Hírešová, 2019).

6. DISCUSSION

Stable traits and achievement motivation dimensions significantly predict both general and career self-efficacy. They had more significant predictive power when speaking about general self-efficacy (62%) than about domain-specific career self-efficacy (44%).

Personality traits alone explain 52% of GSE score variability. The achievement motivation dimensions alone explain 48% of GSE score variability. After combining personality traits with achievement motivation dimensions, these dispositional traits explain up to 62% of GSE score variability. Within the big five, positive conscientiousness and negative agreeableness and neuroticism contribute the most. The more conscientious, emotionally stable, disagreeable, open, and extraverted an individual is, the higher his GSE level. Within the achievement motivation, dimensions of dominance, confidence in success, self-control, and competitiveness proved to be important as predictors combined with personality traits. The coefficient of stability (3 months distance) in these dimensions

ranged between the values of 0.78 by 0.84 (Schuler & Prochaska, 2011). These stable dimensions altogether express independence. It represents general confidence in striving for success. They are typical for efforts to achieve the objective, and in particular, for their inner source of confidence to succeed even in unknown situations. The individuals with a high level of these qualities manifest themself independently and dominantly with others. They reject attempts at dominance by other people and in social contacts. They are motivated by competitive situations (Schuler & Prochaska, 2011).

Five personality traits all alone significantly predict CDSE (31,3%). When speaking only about achievement motivation, nine achievement motivation dimensions (dominance, confidence in success, flexibility, fearlessness, internality, eagerness to learn, preference for challenging tasks, competitiveness, and goal setting) significantly predict CDSE (39,7 %). When combining the personality traits with achievement motivation dimensions, three traits of personality - extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (Ambiel & Noronha, 2016) with six achievement motivation dimensions (dominance, engagement, confidence in success, fearlessness, competitiveness, and goal setting) significantly predict CDSE score (44%). The more conscientious, extraverted, and disagreeable, the more convinced about their dominance, confidence in success, fearlessness, competitiveness, engagement, and future orientation individuals are, the higher their level of career decision self-efficacy. Less number of dispositional variables in the combined regression model of career decision self-efficacy than the GSE regression model speaks for Bandura's (1993) statement that domain-specific efficacy constructs depend more on the situation. Dimension fearlessness was significant in both CDSE predictive models, and it was not significant in the GSE regression model. Fearlessness expresses a lack of fear of failing at difficult tasks of being judged by others (Schuler & Prochaska, 2011), and it has a strong correlation with neuroticism (-0,575). Openness was not a significant predictor. The added achievement motivation dimensions are characteristics of an ambition. They mean future orientation (goal setting) and desire to be regularly engaged in an activity (engagement).

When speaking about personality traits, the most significant predictor of GSE and CDSE is conscientiousness (Stajkovic et al., 2018). Conscientiousness and neuroticism are the most relevant predictors of GSE, similar as in other research studies (Stajkovic et al., 2018; Judge & Ilies, 2002).

Dominance, confidence in success, and competitiveness as the achievement motivation dimensions can be general motivational predictors of self-efficacy, whether general or career. These motivational dimensions of the LMI questionnaire belong to the most stable ones (Schuler & Prochaska, 2011). Dominance reflects a tendency to exercise power and influence others. Confidence in success reflects a tendency to achieve success even when there are obstacles to overcome. This phenomenon described Bandura (1993) as a critical behavioral strategy of highly efficient thinking. Competitiveness expresses the desire to win and be better and faster than others (Prochaska & Schuler, 2011).

Research studies showed a significant relationship between self-efficacy and achievement motivation. Small to a medium correlation between self-efficacy and achievement motivation exist (Liqin & Lesen, 2018; Harahsheh, 2017; Jalal, Mansor, & Arshadi, 2016), but also no significant correlation (Sharma, 2015; Zhang et al., 2015). The stable nature of LMI achievement motivation dimensions and their medium to strong correlations with either conscientiousness or neuroticism in the current study could be the reason for the regression models' considerable predictive power. Researchers also analyzed relationships between self-efficacy and achievement motivation in the context of various variables, e. g. negligence (Jalal et al., 2016), self-identity, and hope (Liqin & Lesen, 2018).

6.1. Conclusion

The results of this study, as well as other authors' studies, confirm that self-efficacy is significantly related to dispositional personality traits, whether they are big five traits (Brown & Cinamon, 2016; Huszczo & Lee Endres, 2017; Ambiel & Noronha, 2016; Karwowski et al., 2013) or achievement motivation (Liqin & Lesen, 2018; Harahsheh, 2017; Jalal et al., 2016). Personality matters in general and career self-efficacy (Larson & Borgen, 2006; Hartman & Betz, 2007). The results further confirm the importance of taking into account innate dispositions in defining the goals/performances that one wants to achieve, in a general sense or career decision-making (Larson & Borgen, 2006). We agree with the findings of Stajkovic et al. (2018) that individual differences in traits are more effective in achieving performance with the active participation of social cognition.

The results support the importance of integrating the personality and social-cognitive approach in explaining self-efficacy. Knowledge of personality characteristics could be essential for a choice of goals. People are not the same in orientation to achievement. People with lower levels of personality traits toward performance could profit from the social-cognitive approach when achieving their goals. The new results about collective efficacy, for example, could offer the answer on how to increase the individual level of self-efficacy beliefs (Veiskarami, Ghadampour, & Mottaghinia, 2017).

REFERENCES

Abbasianfard, M., Bahrami, H., & Ahghar, GH. (2010). Relationship Between Self-Efficacy with Achievement Motivation in Pre-University Girl Students. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 4*(1), 95-109.

Ambiel, R.A.M., & Noronha, A.P.P. (2016). Professional choice self-efficacy: predicting traits and personality profiles in high school students. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica, 29*(30), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41155-016-0021-0

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84* (2), 191- 215.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanisms in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37*(2), 122–147.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28* (2), 117-148.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Bartimote-Aufflick, K., Bridgeman, A., Walker, R., Sharma, M., Smith, L. (2016). The study, evaluation, and improvement of university student self-efficacy. *Studies in Higher Education, 41* (11), 1918–1942.

Bosmans, M. W. G., van der Knaap, L. M., & van der Velden, P. G. (2015). Personality traits as predictors of trauma-related coping self-efficacy: A three-wave prospective study. *Personality and Individual Differences, 76*, 44-48.

Brown, D., & Cinamon, R. G. (2016). Personality traits' effects on self-efficacy and outcome expectations for high school major choice. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance, 16*(3), 343–361.

Bullock-Yowell, E., Andrews, L., & Buzzetta, M. E. (2011). Explaining career decision-making selfefficacy: Personality, cognitions, and cultural mistrust. *Career Development Quarterly, 59* (5), 400–411.

Greškovičová, K., Hírešová, I. (2019). Resilience and Bonding. In M. McGreevy & R. Robert (Eds.), *CER Comparative European Research 2019 (Vol. 11, pp. 122–125).* London: Sciemcee Publishing.

Habibah, E., Noordin, N., & Mahyuddin, R. (2010). Achievement Motivation and Self-Efficacy in Relation to Adjustment among University Students. *Journal of Social Sciences, 6*(3), 333-339.

Harahsheh, A. H. (2017). Perceived Self-Efficacy and Its Relationship to Achievement Motivation among Parallel Program Students at Prince Sattam University. *International Journal of Psychological Studies, 9*(3), 21-34.

Hartman, R.O., & Betz, N.E. (2007). The five-factor model and career self-efficacy: General and domain-specific relationships. *Journal of Career Assessment, 15*(2), 145–161.

Huang, M.C., Hung, C.H., Huang, Y.W., & Yang, S.C. (2019). Predictors of Self-Efficacy in Administering Insulin Injection. *Clinical nursing research*, 1054773819858484. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/1054773819858484

Huszczo, G., & Lee Endres, M. (2017). Gender differences in the importance of personality traits in predicting leadership self-efficacy. *International Journal of Training and Development, 21*(4), 304-317.

Jalal, P., K., Mansor, M. S., Arshadi, F. K. (2016). The Relationship between Self-Efficacy, Achievement Motivation and Negligence in Students. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies, 6* (3), 1788-1799.

Judge, T.A. & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 797-807.

Judge, T.A., Jackson, C. L., Shaw, J. C., Scott, B. A., & Rich, B. L. (2007). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: The integral role of individual differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 107-127.

Karwowski, M., Lebuda, I., Wisniewska, E., Gralewski, J. (2013). Big Five Personality Traits as the Predictors of Creative Self-Efficacy and Creative Personal Identity: Does Gender Matter? *Journal of Creative Behavior, 47*(3), 215-232.

Klanduchová, E., & Greškovičová, K. (2019). Time perspective and bonding. In M. McGreevy & M. Robert (Eds.), *CER Comparative European Research 2019 (Vol. 11, pp. 118–121).* London: Sciemcee Publishing.

Košč, M., Heftyová, E., Schwarzer, R., Jerusalem, M. (1993). Slovakian Adaptation of the General Self-Efficacy Scale. Retrieved from: http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~health/slovak.htm

Larson, L.M., & Borgen, F.H. (2006). Do Personality Traits Contribute to Vocational Self-Efficacy? *Journal of Career Assessment, 14*(3), 295-311.

Liqin, L., & Lesen, Ch. (2018). The Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Achievement Motivation in Adolescents: A Moderated Mediating Model of Self-Identity and Hope. *Psychology and Behavioral Sciences, 7* (3), 69-76.

Luszczynska, A., Scholz, U., Schwarzer, R. (2005). The general self-efficacy scale: Multicultural validation studies. *The Journal of Psychology, 139*(5), 439-457.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2006). *Personality in Adulthood: A Five-Factor Theory Perspective.* New York, London: The Guilford Press.

Mohamadi, E., Bana Derakshan, H., Borhani, F., Hoseinabadi Farahani, M., Pour Hoseingholi, M., & Naderi Ravesh, N. (2014). Relationship between Nursing Students' Achievement Motivation and Self-efficacy of Clinical Performance. *Iran Journal of Nursing, 27* (90-91), 33-43.

Mouloud, K., & Elkader, B. A. (2016). Self-efficacy and Achievement Motivation among Football Player. *The Swedish Journal of Scientific Research, 3*(11), 13-19.

O'Brien, K. M. (2003). Measuring career self-efficacy: Promoting confidence and happiness at work. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Positive Psychological Assessment: A Handbook of Models and Measures* (109-126). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

Ruisel, I., & Halama, P. (2007). *NEO-FFI: NEO päťfaktorový osobnostný inventár* [NEO-FFI: NEO five-factor personality inventor]. Praha: Hogrefe - Testcentrum.

Şahin, F., Karadağ, H., Tuncer, B. (2019). Big five personality traits, entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intention: A configurational approach. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 25*(6), 1188-1211.

Saleem, H., Beaudry, A., Croteau, A. M. (2011). Antecedents of computer self-efficacy: A study of the role of personality traits and gender. *Computers in Human Behavior, 27*(5), 1922-1936.

Scholz, U., Gutiérrez-Doña, B., Sud, S., Schwarzer, R. (2002). Is general self-efficacy a universal construct? Psychometric findings from 25 countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 18*(3), 242-251.

Schuler, H., & Prochaska, M. (2011). *Dotazník motivácie k výkonu – LMI* [Achievement motivation inventor - AMI]. Praha: Hogrefe - Testcentrum.

Sharma, K. (2015). A study of self-efficacy and achievement motivation of prospective teachers in relation to their attitude towards teaching. *Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies, 3*(18), 53-57.

Stajkovic, A. D., Bandura, A., Locke, E. A., Lee, D., & Sergent, K. (2018). Test of three conceptual models of influence of the big five personality traits and self-efficacy on academic performance: A meta-analytic path-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 120*, 238-245.

Veiskarami, H.A., Ghadampour, E., & Mottaghinia, M. R. (2017). Interactions among School Climate, Collective Self-Efficacy, and Personal Self-Efficiency: Evidence from Education Institutions. *International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 11*(1), 481-488.

Yilmaz Bingöl, T. (2018). Determining the Predictors of Self-Efficacy and Cyber Bullying. *International Journal of Higher Education, 7*(2), 138-143.

Yilmaz Bingöl, T., Vural Batik, M., Hoşoğlu, R., & Kodaz, A. (2018). Psychological Resilience and Positivity as Predictors of Self-Efficacy. *Asian Journal of Education and Training, 5*(1), 63-69.

Yusuf, M. (2011a). The impact of self-efficacy, achievement motivation, and selfregulated learning strategies on students' academic achievement. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15*, 2623–2626.

Yusuf, M. (2011b). Investigating relationship between self-efficacy, achievement motivation, and self-regulated learning strategies of undergraduate Students: a study of integrated motivational models. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15*, 2614–2617.

Zarei, A. A., & Taheri, S. (2013). Multiple Intelligences as Predictors of Self-efficacy. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 4* (1), 125-136

Zhang, Z.-J., Zhang, Ch.-L., Zhang, X.-G., Liu, X.-M., Zhang, H., Wang, J., Liu, S. (2015). Relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and achievement motivation in student nurses. *Chinese Nursing Research, 2*(2-3), 67-70.

ADDITIONAL READING

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kodden, B. (2020). The Impact of Self-efficacy. In: *The Art of Sustainable Performance* (s. 31–38). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46463-9_5

Lazarides, R., & Warner, L.M. (2020). Teacher Self-Efficacy. In: *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.890

Letovancová, E., Lisá, E., & Hennelová, K. (2011). *Dotazník motivácie k výkonu - LMI SK*. Praha: Hogrefe-Testcentrum.

Lisá, E. (2009). Sebaúčinnosť v kontexte školskej úspešnosti [Self-efficacy in the context of school success]. In: *Premeny psychológie v európskom priestore* (429-431). Bratislava: Stimul.

Medveďová, Ľ., & Lisá, E. (2010). Školská sebaefektívnosť vo vzťahu s prospechom, zvládaním záťaže a sebaocenením [School self-effectiveness in relation to achievement, coping and self-esteem]. *Psychológia a patopsychológia dieťaťa, 45*(4), 291-308.

Penn, L.T., & Lent, R.W. (2019). The Joint Roles of Career Decision Self-Efficacy and Personality Traits in the Prediction of Career Decidedness and Decisional Difficulty. *Journal of career assessment, 27*(3), 457-470. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072718758296

Wu, S.Y., Zhang, K., Zhou, S.Y., & Chen, W. (2020). Personality and career decision-making self-efficacy of students from poor rural areas in China. *Social behavior and personality, 48*(5), https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.8753

E. Lisá

KEY TERMS & DEFINITIONS

Self-efficacy: the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce outcomes.

Career self-efficacy: the confidence in one's ability to manage career development and work-related tasks.

Career decision self-efficacy: the confidence in career-related decisions and engagement in tasks related to career decision making.

Achievement motivation: the general orientation of the person towards the achievement.

Personality traits: dimensions of individual differences in tendencies to show consistent patterns of thoughts, feelings, and actions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Full name: Elena Lisá
Institutional affiliation: Institute of Applied Psychology, Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Comenius University
Institutional address: Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Comenius University, Mlynské luhy 4, 821 05 Bratislava, Slovakia
Short biographical sketch: Elena Lisá is an associate professor at the Institute of Applied Psychology, Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Comenius University. Her research focused on well-being, coping, motivation, psychometrics, and personality at work. She is the author of the program for children's social competences development, books about psychometrics in HR, or psychological aspects of employers' expectations on graduates' competencies and psychological aspects of graduates' employability skills. In the HR field, she helped with the implementation of new organizational projects (e.g., performance management, employee engagement surveys, selection, and development processes). More recently, she focuses her research on self-efficacy, leadership, workplace attachment, and personality.