



doi 10.5281/zenodo.6965809

Vol. 04 Issue 07 July - 2021

Manuscript ID: #0465

PROACTIVE PERSONALITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY IN A COMPETITIVE INDUSTRY IN NIGERIA

***Dr. Wegwu, Macaulay Enyindah**

Lecturer Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt
Alonge, Beatrice Bosede

M.sc Student Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt

Corresponding author: *Dr. Wegwu, Macaulay Enyindah
Email : enyiwemac@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to examine proactive personality as an important component of organizational productivity in the manufacturing industry in Nigeria. From a population of 105 employees, a sample of 92 managers was drawn for the study. A total number of 92 copies of the questionnaire was distributed and fully returned which formed the basis for analysis. Data were generated through primary and secondary sources and analysed with the use of the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient. It was revealed that proactive personality is a strong component of organizational productivity in the manufacturing industry in Nigeria. The paper, therefore, concluded that managers in the manufacturing industry should find appropriate employees with the right characteristics of proactive behaviour during the hiring process to be accepted as part of their in-role behaviour required for the fulfilment of their job requirements in order to achieve organizational productivity.

KEYWORDS

Organizational productivity, Personality, Proactive personality



INTRODUCTION

As work becomes more dynamic and decentralized, proactive behaviour and initiative become even more critical determinants of organizational productivity. For example, as new forms of management are introduced that minimize the surveillance function, companies will increasingly rely on employees' personal initiative to identify and solve problems (Frese, Fay, Hilburger, Leng, & Tag, 1997). Proactive personality can be a high-leverage concept rather than just another management fad, and can result in increased organizational effectiveness (Bateman & Crant, 1999). Companies must focus on identifying and correcting policies and systems that minimize and mitigate individual initiative (Frohman, 1997). Proactive behaviour at work has received considerable scholarly research attention over the past fifteen years. It has not, however, emerged as an integrated research stream in the organizational behaviour literature. There is no single definition, theory, or measure driving this body of work; rather, researchers have adopted a number of different approaches toward identifying the antecedents and consequences of proactive behaviour, and they have examined them in a number of seemingly disconnected literatures. For example, Potential and actual job performance (Ashford & Northcraft, 1992; Crant, 1995), on leadership (Cram & Bateman, 2000; Deluga, 1998), on work teams (Kirkman & Rosen, 1999),

Proactive personality as taking initiative in improving current circumstances or creating new ones involves challenging the status quo rather than passively adapting to present conditions. Employees can engage in proactive activities as part of their in-role behaviour in which they fulfil basic job requirements. For example, sales agents might proactively seek feedback on their techniques for closing a sale with an ultimate goal of improving job performance. Extra-role behaviours can also be proactive, such as efforts to redefine one's role in the organization. For example, employees might engage in career management activities by identifying and acting on opportunities to change the scope of their jobs or move to more desirable divisions of the business.

Also, there is a growing significance in the selection and hiring processes of organizations. The reason for this can be found in the changing nature of work in the 21st century where work becomes more dynamic and decentralized, where it gets more and more important that employees are able to control changes in their work environments (Crant, 2000). Proactive personality, which is considered an antecedent to proactive behaviour, provides the skills for an individual to engage in active changing of the work environment. Furthermore, proactive individuals show the initiative to persist until change occurs (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Additionally, some people identify problems on their own and solve them to advance their personal and organizational environment (Leavitt, 1988). This is why proactive personality skills are described as critical determinants of organizational productivity (Crant, 2000) and also determinants which leads to increased organizational effectiveness (Bateman & Crant, 1999).

Another important factor for companies is not only finding the appropriate employees with the right characteristic of proactive personality, but also to keep those talented employees (Mitchell, Flolton & Lee, 2001). Therefore, it is important to determine the relationship between proactive personality and organizational productivity. Accordingly therefore, the purpose of the study was to establish the fact that proactive personality is a strong determinant of organisational productivity in manufacturing industry in Nigeria

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Foundations

The roots of the proactive personality concept in *proactive behaviour lie in the interactionist perspective*; this means that people are able to create their own environments. Behaviour of people is viewed as being both internally and externally influenced and situations which influence them are as much a function of person as vice versa (Schneider, 1983).

Conceptual Review

Proactive personality:

Proactive personality refers to individuals' disposition toward engaging in active role orientation, such as initiating change and influencing their environment (Bateman & Cram, 1993) Proactive people initiate changes, take action, and persevere until meaningful change occurs in the achievement of their goals, in contrast to passive people who just adapted to their undesirable circumstances (Crant, 2000). The author further noted that proactive people actively worked to manipulate their environment and seek out new information and practices in order to improve their performance. In a similar vein, Seibert, Crant and Kraimer (2001) stated that proactive people attempted to promote their career prospect rather than passively reacted to the job situation as it was presented. They were also more likely to suggest new ways of doing tasks to achieve their goals and generated new ideas in order to improve performance in comparison to passive ones.

In addition, proactive people are more likely to identify opportunities and act on them by exceeding normal job expectations (Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001; Van Dyne & IePine, 1998). As a result, proactive individuals tend to actively engage in updating their knowledge and skills and identifying new work processes- The display of initiatives and surpassing normal job expectations usually done by proactive people, appeared to have positive effects on creativity and productivity.

People who are able to change their environments are seen to be more effective in work performances. To prove this Bateman and Crant (1993) developed the Proactive Personality Scale which measures the construct of proactive personality. The Proactive Personality Scale was used in several studies to identify the effects of proactive personality on different work outcomes. Outcome variables like individual job performance (Crant, 1995), career outcomes (for example career success, salary, number of promotions) (Seibert, Crant & Kraimer, 1999), leadership (Crant & Bateman, 2000), organizational innovation (Parker,1998), team performance (Kirkman & Rosen, 1999) and entrepreneurship (Becherer & Maurer, 1999) were studied and positive correlations were found. This confirms that proactive personality is an important variable in the effectiveness of performance and achievement for organizations and individuals. Bateman and Crant (1993) are of the view that not all effects of proactive personality are positive and as it can also lead to negative outcomes. In a study about proactive personality and its outcomes, Chan (2006) shows that situational judgment skills are important moderators of proactive personality and if lacking it could lead to maladaptive outcomes. In this study we will concentrate on the proactive personality and organizational productivity. This could be interesting for an organization with the idea that a proactive employee leads to more positive work outcomes.

More so, a lot of literature can be found over personality traits and their relationship with variables in the work field. For example, a lot of studies have been done on the relation between personality traits

and work outcomes for example job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work performance (Judge, Heller & Mount 2002; Barrick, & Mount, 1991). One of the most used models referring to personality traits is the five-factor model, also called the Big Five (Goldberg, 1990), consisting of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness and Conscientiousness. These five factors are considered the fundamental dimensions of personality (McCrae & John, 1992) and were researched in various frameworks measures, occupations and cultures (Barrick & Mount, 1991; De Raad & DoddemaWinsemius, 1999; John & Srivastava, 1999, Liao & Chuang, 2004). There is strong evidence that personality traits are related to job-related attitudes and behaviours (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge et al., 2002; Tokar, Fisher & Subich 1998). Although the significance of the five factor model has been acknowledged in the literature, as there were also findings about personality traits such as proactive personality, which are predictors of criterion variables. Also, personality was developed to measure the personal disposition towards proactive behaviour. It is used to identify the differences between people's tendency to influence their environment. Prototypically people with proactive personality are described as being relatively unconstrained by situational forces and have a great effect on changing the environment (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Their skills are to identify and use opportunities, to show initiative and to persist until meaningful changes are achieved (Bateman & Crant, 1993). People with low proactive personality tend to the opposite. They do not identify opportunities, cannot use them to cause changes and behave only passive and reactive on situational forces. They rather accept and adapt circumstances than change them (Crant, 1995).

Managers highly regard workers that intentionally and directly engage in behaviours to improve work processes (Cram, 1996; Grant et al, 2009). However, individuals differ in the extent to which they tend to take action to impact their circumstances (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Thus, Bateman and Cram (1993) established the proactive personality trait and defined it as the tendency to be relatively unconstrained by situational forces and to take action to change one's environment. Further descriptions of proactive personality include the tendency to be self-development focused (Antonacopoulou, 2000), behave more confidently, actively work to control one's environment, seek out information (KammeyerMueller & Wanberg, 2003), transform the organization's mission(s), find, and solve problems, and feel responsible to impact the world around oneself (Seibert et al., 1999). Additionally, individuals with proactive personalities tend to set high standards and acquire all available resources to meet those standards (Crant 1996). In contrast, employees low in proactive personality pass up opportunities, fail to take initiative, and passively adapt to their environments (Cram & Bateman. 2000) Thus, in the context of training where the goal is to improve employees' work situations, proactive personality poses as an important antecedent to motivation to learn and subsequent training transfer

Dimensions of Proactive Personality

Proactive personality is a unique and distinct compound personality trait that is a prominent predictor of a variety of important work outcomes (Fuller & Mailer, 2009).

Personal initiative:

Personal initiative is a behavioural pattern whereby individuals take an active, self-starting approach to work and go beyond formal job requirements (Frese et al. 1996, 1997). It is characterized by five components: 1) it is consistent with the organizational mission; 2) it takes a long-term focus; 3) it is action-oriented and goal directed; 4) it is persistent in the face of obstacles; and 5) it is self-starting

and proactive (Frese, Crant & Kraimer, 1996) believes that Personal initiative can be measured using interview methods than using questionnaire, because using questionnaire as measures alone can be problematic. These authors advocated an interview-based approach for measuring personal initiative. They collected three kinds of data: objective facts, interviewer judgments of behaviour, and a narrative based on the interaction (Frese, et al., 1996). Results of a longitudinal study showed that the interview technique had strong psychometric properties, and triangulated with other measures of initiative, such as self-reported and spouse-completed paper-and-pencil measures (Frese et al., 1997), the data showed that personal initiative is a unidimensional construct.

Socialization:

Socialization is the process whereby newcomers learn the behaviours and attitudes necessary for becoming effective organizational participants (Fisher, 1986). Until recently, most work in this area portrayed newcomers as passive and reactive. The role of the organization in the socialization process, such as formal orientation and training programmes, was the primary focus of recent works. However, scholars also acknowledged that newcomers can take a more active role as they adjust to work and become comfortable with their new roles.

Three conceptual contributions are particularly noteworthy. First, Jones (1983) argued that early research on the socialization process neglected the active role that newcomers can play. He offered an interactionist perspective, taking into account the idea that individual differences may affect newcomers' adjustments to organizations and may moderate the effects of socialization tactics on their personal role outcomes. The upshot of this line of thought is a stage model of the socialization process whereby newcomers become more proactive in each subsequent stage. Ultimately, both the newcomers' interpretation of the context and the intentions of the socializing agents influence their responses and activity levels.

A study of 102 newcomers across 96 firms provided empirical support for this perspective (Jones, 1986). This work was grounded in both Jones theory (Jones, 1983) and the conceptual work of Van Maanen and Schein (1979) regarding how various socialization tactics might affect one outcome of socialization, role orientation. Individualized, informal socialization tactics (rather than collective and formal tactics) lead to proactive, innovative role orientations. Institutionalized tactics, such as formal, collective programs featuring common learning experiences, lead to custodial role orientations in which newcomers accept the status quo and passively assume role requirements. An individual difference variable, self-efficacy, moderated the relationship between socialization tactics and role orientations.

A second conceptual contribution used is a symbolic interaction perspective to explain the socialization process (Reichers, 1987). According to this perspective, verbal and symbolic interactions between people are the primary vehicles through which people ascribe meaning and significance to events. Reichers (1987) noted that both newcomers and insiders vary in the extent to which they proactively engage in behaviors that facilitate the socialization process, such as initiating lunch engagements and asking for feedback. She theorized that the highest rate of socialization occurs when both the newcomers and insiders are highly proactive.

Organizational Productivity

Organizational productivity is about assessing and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of public and private sector in an organization. It is the capacity of an organization, institution, or business to produce desired results *with a* minimum expenditure of energy, time money, personnel, or material. Productivity is anything that makes an organization function better” and productivity improvement is “doing the right thing better”.

According to Farlex (2012) it is the actual output/results of an organization obtained when measured against its intended outputs (goals and objectives). Richard et al. (2009) propose that organizational performance encompasses three specific areas of organizations ‘outcomes on financial performance (profits, return on assets, return on investment. etc.); product market performance (sales, market share, etc.) and shareholder return performance (total shareholder return, economic value added, etc.), which are the three primary outcomes of corporate organisations being analyzed.

Measures of organizational productivity

Job satisfaction:

According to Arnold and Feldman (1996), there are a variety of factors that make people feel positive or negative about their job. Moreover, some employees may be satisfied with few aspects of their work but dissatisfied with all other aspects, (Mullins, 2002). In terms of working conditions, the workers would rather desire working conditions that will result in greater physical comfort and convenience. The absence of such working conditions, amongst other things, can impact poorly on the workers mental and physical well-being (Baron & Greenberg, 2003). Robbins (2001) advocates that working conditions will influence job satisfaction, as employees are concerned with a comfortable physical work environment. In turn this will render a more positive level of job satisfaction. Arnold and Feldman (1996) shows that factors such as temperature, lighting, ventilation, hygiene, noise, working hours and resources are all part of working conditions. Employees may feel that poor working conditions will only provoke negative performance, since their jobs are mentally and physically demanding. However, Arnold and Feldman (1996) warned that if working conditions are too favourable or the extreme, this could be taken for granted or ignored by most employees.

Career Outcomes:

The relationship between proactive personality and a number of career-related outcomes has also been explored. In a sample of 496 employees from a diverse set of occupation and organizations, proactive personality was positively associated with two measures of objective career success, salary, and the number of promotions over the span of one’s career (Seibert et al., 1999). Proactive personality was also correlated with subjective career success, operationalized as one’s overall level of satisfaction with the career. After controlling several variables that have previously been found to predict career outcomes (e.g., demographic, motivational and organizational variables), proactive personality explained additional variance in both objectives and subjective career success. These findings were consistent using both self-ratings and significant-other ratings of proactive personality. From the foregoing, the following hypotheses are developed.

H1: There is significant relationship between personal initiative and organisational profitability.

H2: There is significant relationship between socialisation and organisational profitability.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design:

In this study, the cross-sectional research design which is a type of quasi- experimental design was used. The choice was because of the adoption of one-time observation, and the constraints involved in studying the entire population

Population for the Study:

The study was conducted based on sampled population which consisted of ninety-two upper, middle, and lower level employees from thirty two manufacturing firms in Rivers State. The total number of staff that participated in the study was one hundred and five only. The manufacturing firms are located within Trans Amadi, Borokiri and Rumuolumeni axis of Port Harcourt which formed the accessible population for this study. The selected companies are easily accessible and have track records of their merchandising activities for over ten years of production activities.

Sampling technique: The research adopted the probability sampling technique which ensured that all members in the study group had equal chances of being selected.

Sources of Data:

The researcher made use of primary data. For this current study, the primary data was gathered basically through the use of questionnaire using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). The questionnaire was designed to address demographic data, and proactive personality variables like personal initiative and socialization. The demographic section contained basic items like tenure in the firm, gender, age, educational qualification, marital status, etc.

Methods of Data Collection:

The data used in this study was generated from both the primary and secondary sources of data. The primary data was collected through the use of questionnaire, which was organized in a close ended and multiple-choice question format. The questionnaire was divided into four sections. Section A has to do with questions measuring personal profile and demographic representation of the respondents. While section B, C, & D included questions to generate respondents' opinion relating to the variables under study.

Validity of instrument:

The validity of the research instrument was achieved through face and content validity

Reliability of Instrument:

The Cronbach's alpha was used to perform the test based on the SPSS software because of its applicability in assessing the degree of the relationship between the dimensions of proactive personality and measures of organizational productivity of manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. The result of reliability analysis showed a Cronbach's Alpha with a value of .784. The value is an indication that the measurement scales were reliable and the data could be used for analysis.

Measurement Scale

The predictor variable:

proactive personality was operationalized using two dimension further measured on 6 items and 5 items instruments respectively and scaled on the 5 – point Likert scale.

Presented below on table 4.5 and figure 4.6 is the analysis on the predictor variable (proactive personality), its dimensions (personal initiative and socialization) and corresponding indicators.

The criterion variable: Organizational Productivity was operationalized using two measures, namely job satisfaction and career outcomes with each measure further measured on 5 items instruments and scaled on the 5 points Likert scale.

Method of Data Analysis: The Pearson Correlation was used to test the hypotheses developed for the study. The choice of it was because of its ability to reveal the relationship between the two dimensions of proactive personality (personal initiative and socialisation) and organizational productivity with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS).

Questionnaire distribution: One hundred and five copies of drafted questionnaire was administered to the study group, out of which, ninety-two copies were duly filled, returned, and used for analysis.

Table 1: Age distribution of respondents

AGE				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
18 -25 Years	5	5.4	5.5	5.5
26 -35 Years	41	44.6	45.1	50.5
Valid 36 -45 Years	16	17.4	17.6	68.1
46 - 55 Years	7	7.6	7.7	78.8
56 and Above	22	23.9	24	100.0
Total	91	98.9	2	
Missing System	1	1.1	100.0	
Total	92	100.0		

Source: SPSS output (2021)

The distribution according to age classification: This classification revealed that a higher proportion and frequency percentage of the participants are within 26-35 years category (44.6%), while the category with the least frequency percentage is within 18 -25 years category (5.4%).

Table 2 Gender distribution of respondents

GENDER				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	55	70.7		
Valid Female	26	28.3	71.4	71.4
Total	91	98.9	28.6	100.0
Missing System	1	1.1	100.0	
Total	92	100.0		

Source: Survey data (2021)

The distribution according to gender classification: the classification according to gender reveals that a majority of the participants are of the male gender category (70.7%) as compared to the female gender category (28.3%). The results imply a greater proportion of the workers and elements in the target organization are male, probably as a result of the industry (manufacturing) and the nature of work carried out which may emphasize on physical strength.

Table 3: Marital status distribution of respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Single	2	2.2	2.2	2.2
Married	86	94.5	94.5	96.7
Valid Separated	1	1.1	1.1	97.8
Divorced	1	1.1	1.1	98.9
Widowed	1			
Total	91	1.1	1.1	100.0
Missing System	1	100.0	100.0	
Total	92			

The distribution according to marital status classification: The Classification according to marital status indicated that majority of the participants, based on the frequency percentage of the distribution, are married (93.5) while the category with the least frequency percentage contains participants who are divorced, separated, and widowed (1.1% respectively). The data revealed that most of the participants are settled and have family lives outside work schedules, implying a form of stability and sense of job security. This further corroborated with age classification.

Table 4: Educational Qualification distribution of respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
OND	8	8.7	8.8	8.8
HND	78	84.8	84.7	94.5
Masters	4	4.3	4.4	98.9
PhD	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
Total	91	98.9	100.0	
Missing System	1	1.1		
Total	92	100.0		

Source: Survey data (2021)

The distribution according to educational qualification classification: The classification of participants based on the distribution according to educational qualification revealed that most of the participants have obtained first (bachelors) degree (84.8%); while the category with the least frequency percentage is attributed to participants with Ph.D. (1.1%). The result of this analysis implies an overall moderate level of education given the category (bachelors) which has the highest frequency.

Test of Research hypotheses

DECISION RULE

If $PV < 0.05$ = Supported

$PV > 0.05$ = Not Supported

Hypothesis 1: Relationship between personal initiative and organisational profitability

H1: There is significant relationship between personal initiative and organisational profitability.

Table 5: Correlation Analysis showing the relationship between personal initiative and organisational profitability.

		Personal Initiative	Organisational Profitability
Personal Initiative	Pearson Correlation	1	.380**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	92	92
Organisational Profitability	Pearson Correlation	.380**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	92	92

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).*

Table 5 above shows the result of the Pearson Correlation analysis which indicates that there is a weak and positive correlation between personal initiative and organisational profit ability in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt Rivers State, Nigeria with $r=.380$. The p value =.000 which is less than 0.05, meaning that the correlation is significant. Consequently, the hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 2: Relationship between socialisation and organisational profitability

H2: There is significant relationship between socialisation and organisational profitability.

Table 5: Correlation Analysis showing the relationship between socialisation and organisational profitability.

		Socialisation	Organisational Profitability
Socialisation	Pearson Correlation	1	.571**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.000
	N	92	92
Organisational Profitability	Pearson Correlation	.571**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	
	N	92	92

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).*

Table 6 above shows the result of the Pearson Correlation analysis which indicates that there is a moderate and positive correlation between socialisation and organisational profitability in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt Rivers State, Nigeria with $r=.571$. The p value $=.000$ which is less than 0.05, meaning that the correlation is significant. Consequently, the hypothesis is supported.

The evidence from the analysis revealed that there is a significant level of manifestation based on the $p_v = 0.000$ ($p < 0.05$). As such, giving the evidence presented, it was ascertained that the participants are of the opinion that proactive personality is a predictor of organisational productivity in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. The two hypotheses were supported.

Discussion of Findings

Personal Initiative and Organizational Productivity

Personal Initiative uses an active approach that is characterized by self-starting and proactive nature and by overcoming difficulties that arises in the pursuit of a goal. It implies that the goals are not given nor assigned by someone else, but the person took a stand and developed the goals and ensures productivity. The analysis reveals that there is a significant relationship between personal initiative and organizational productivity; this implies that personal initiative is a behavioural syndrome that results in an individual taking an active and self- starting approach to work goals and task and persisting in overcoming barriers and setbacks (Frese, Pay. Hilburger, Leng & Tag 1997; Frese, Kring, Soose, & Zempel, 1996)

Socialization and Organizational Productivity

The result of the analysis revealed that socialization is significantly associated with organizational productivity; this implies that socialization is considerably important in boosting organizational productivity. It is also essential to examine the socialization needs of employees under unsteady circumstances and also establishing the activities that are important in order to make sure that these needs are met. Wu, Turban and Cheung (2012) described social exchange as an individual's voluntary actions towards another person that are motivated by an expected return from another person. Social skills among employees allow them to effectively communicate with each other to enable a concerted effort towards accomplishing organizational goals. Schein (2006) asserts that a shared value is a set of social norms that define the rules of framework for social interaction and communication behaviour of society's members.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study, reveals that there is a significant relationship between proactive personality and organizational productivity. There is also a significant relationship between the dimensions of proactive personality (personality initiative and socialization) and the measures of organizational productivity (job satisfaction and career outcomes) in the manufacturing industry.

From the findings of this study on the relationship between the predictor variable (proactive personality) and the criterion variable (organizational productivity), there is a strong evidence that personality traits are related to job related attitudes and behaviours (Liao & Chuang, 2004). Managers highly regard workers that intentionally and directly engage in behaviours to improve work process (Grant et al, 2009). Further descriptions of proactive personality include the tendency to be self-developed focused, behave more confidently, and actively work to control one's environment

Antonacopoulou, (2000). Seek out information (Kammeyer et al, (2003), transform the organisation's missions, find, and solve problems, and feel responsible to impact the world around oneself (Seibert et al, 1999). It was also established in course of this research that personal initiative which is a dimension of proactive personality is a behavioural pattern in which individuals take an active, self-starting approach to work and go beyond formal job requirements. The researcher concluded that the development of socialization in the organization would further enhance outcomes related to job satisfaction and career outcomes. Proactive people initiate changes, take action, and persevere until meaningful change occurs in the achievement of their goals, in contrast to passive people who just adapt to their undesirable circumstances (Crant, 2000). The author further noted that proactive people actively work to manipulate their environment and seek out new information and practices in order to improve their performance.

In addition, proactive people are more likely to identify opportunities and act on them by exceeding normal job expectations (Seibert et al, 2001; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). As a result, proactive individuals tended to actively engage in updating their knowledge and skills and identifying new work processes. The display of initiatives and surpassing normal job expectations, usually done by proactive people appears to have positive effects on creativity and productivity.

Recommendations Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made.

- i. Managers in manufacturing firms in Rivers State needs to find appropriate employees with the right characteristics of proactive behaviour during hiring process to be accepted as their in- role behaviour required for the fulfilment of their job roles in order to achieve organizational productivity.
- ii Managers in manufacturing industry should embark on an effective and formal training and career development to enhance employees' proactive personality traits for the realization of the organisation's productivity.
- iii. Managers in manufacturing Industry in Rivers State should adopt an effective orientation and training programmes involving socialization for new comers to learn the behaviours and attitudes necessary for becoming effective organizational participants.
- iv. Managers in manufacturing industry in Rivers State should ensure that job satisfaction is a considerable motivational factor to employees to ensure improved productivity.

REFERENCES

- Arnold, H. J., & Feldman, D. C. (1986). Organisational behavior. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, vol.3, no. 4
- Antonacopoulou, E. P. (2000). Employee development through self-development. *Personnel review*, vol. 29 no.4
- Ashford, S J., & Northcraft, G. B. (1992). Conveying more (or less) than we realize: The role of impression management in feedback-seeking. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 53: 310—334.
- Baron, A. R., & Greenberg, J. (2003). *Behaviour in organization*. Understanding and managing the human side of work. 7thedn. Canada, Prentice Hall
- Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis *personnel psychology*, 44(1), 1-26
- Bateman, T. S., & Cram, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13: 103—118
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1999). May-June. Proactive behavior: Meanings, impact, and recommendations. *Business Horizons*, 63—70
- Becherer, R. C. & Maurer, J. O. (1999). The proactive personality disposition and entrepreneurial behavior among small company presidents. *Journal of Small Business Management* 38(1):28-36.
- Buss, D. M. (1987). Selection, evocation, and manipulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53: 1214—1221
- Crant, J. M. (1995). The proactive personality scale and objective job performance among real estate agents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80: 532—537
- Crant, J. M., & Bateman, T. S. (2000). Charismatic leadership viewed from above: The impact of proactive personality. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21:63-75
- Crant, J. M., Kraimer, (1999). Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84 (3).416-427
- Deluga, R. (2000). American presidential proactivity, charismatic leadership, and rated performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9: 265—291
- De- Raad Doddema-winsemius (1999). Instinct and personality. *Personality and individual differences*, vol.27, (2)
- Farlex,inc. (2012).The learning tool: The free dictionary.
- Fisher, C. D. (1986). Organization & socialization: An integrative review. In K. M. Rowland & O. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management* (vol. 4): 101—145. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Frese, M., Fay, D., Hilburger, T Leng, K., & Tag, K. (1997). The concept of personal initiative: Operationalization, reliability and validity in two German samples. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* vol.70, 139—161.
- Harold, J. L., & Homa, B. (1998). *Managerial psychology: Managing behaviours in organisations*. 5thedn. The University of Chicago press
- Jones, G. R. (1983). Psychological orientation and the process of organizational socialization: An interactionist perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 8: 464—474.
- Jones, I. R. (1985). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers' adjustments to organization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29: 262-279
- Judge, T. A., Fisher, C. D. & Subich, L.M. (2002). Relationship between Personality traits and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, vol. 7, no.
- Kammerer-Mueller, J. D., & Wanberg, C. R. (2003). Unwrapping the organisational entry process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 779-794
- Kirkman, B. L. & Rosen, B. (1999). Beyond self-management: *Antecedents and consequences of team empowerment*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42: 58--74.
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to five factor model and its application. *Journal of Personality*, 60(2), 175-215

- Mullins, E. L. (2010). *Management and organizational behavior*. Financial times, Prentice Hall
- Parker, S. K. (1998). Enhancing role breadth self-efficacy. The roles of job enrichment and other organizational interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83: 835—852.
- Reichers. A. E. (1987). An interactionist perspective on newcomer socialization rates. *Academy of Management Review*, 12: 278—287
- Richard, P. J. (2009). Measuring organizational performance toard methodological best practices. *Journal of Management* 35 (3)
- Robbins, R.W.(2001). A longitudinal study of personality change in young adulthood. *Journal of Personality* 64(4), 617-640
- Schein, E. H. (2006). Organisational culture and leadership: The flow of management knowledge in the banking kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Issues in Information Systems*, vol. 17 (1), 221-230
- Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M., &Krairner, M L.(1999). Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84: 416—427
- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Crant, J. M. (2001). What Do Proactive People Do? A Longitudinal Model Linking Proactive Personality and Career Success. *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 845-874.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00234.x>
- Schneider, B. (1983). International psychology and organizational behavior. In L. L Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*(vol. 5): 1—31 *Greenwich, CT: JAI Press*
- Srivastava Liao Z., & Cheung, H. D. (2004). A critical review of online consumers' purchase intentions. *Advances in business related scientific research conference*
- Van Dyne, L., &Lepin, J. A. (1998). Helping and voive extra role behaviours: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Jpurnal*, vol. 41. No. 1
- Van, Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In 8. M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior* (vol. I): 209—264, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press
- Wu, S. Y. H., turban, D. B.,cheung, Y. (2017). Linking extraversion proactive personality to career success. *Journal of Career Development*, vol. 44 (1), 3-19