



## INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE, ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT

### CONTENTS

Sr. No.	TITLE & NAME OF THE AUTHOR (S)	Page No.
1.	ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF POPULATION EXPLOSION ON GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT <i>DR. BREHANU BORJI AYALEW</i>	1
2.	AN EVALUATION OF PATIENTS' SATISFACTION WITH HEALTH CARE SERVICES AT RALEIGH FITKIN MEMORIAL HOSPITAL IN SWAZILAND <i>DR. INNOCENT NGWARATI &amp; DR. MOHAMED SAYEED BAYAT</i>	5
3.	A COMPARISON STUDY OF STOCK MARKET RETURNS GIVEN BY THE NEWSWEEK 500 GREEN COMPANIES AND BROAD MARKET INDICES IN US <i>DR. VIMALA SANJEEVKUMAR</i>	9
4.	INFLATION AND EXCHANGE RATE, AND ITS IMPACT ON TRADE IN PAKISTAN (1980-2010) <i>DR. ABDUL QAYYUM KHAN</i>	17
5.	PSYCHOLOGICAL MAPPING OF STUDENTS TOWARDS COSMETIC BRANDS: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY <i>DR. D.S. CHAUBEY, JYOTI SHARMA &amp; PRABHAT RANJAN PRASAD</i>	21
6.	ECONOMIC VIABILITY OF MICRO-FINANCE FOR DAIRY ENTERPRISE <i>SURESH, K. &amp; MUNDINAMANI, S.M.</i>	28
7.	ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE THROUGH FOREST CARBON SEQUESTRATION IN TAMILNADU, INDIA <i>K. S. SHOBA JASMIN &amp; DR. V. DHULASI BIRUNDHA</i>	32
8.	PROBLEMS OF WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF VELLORE (INDIA) AND THIMPHU (BHUTAN) <i>DR. KASAMSETTY SAILATHA</i>	37
9.	VOLATILITY OF STOCK RETURN OF THE SELECT BANKING COMPANIES LISTED AT BOMBAY STOCK EXCHANGE <i>DR. V. K. SHOBHANA &amp; DR. R. KARPAGAVALLI</i>	41
10.	FINANCIAL STRUCTURE OF MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS AND THE DEMAND FOR WORKING CAPITAL: SOME EMPIRICAL FINDINGS <i>DR. A. VIJAYAKUMAR</i>	45
11.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC DETERMINANTS OF RURAL INDUSTRIALISATION IN EASTERN UTTAR PRADESH <i>RACHNA MUJOO</i>	51
12.	INDIAN BANKING INDUSTRY – BASICS TO BASEL <i>M. GURUPRASAD</i>	59
13.	QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AMONG BANK PROFESSIONALS: A STUDY UNDERTAKEN AT INDIAN BANK, CHENNAI <i>PREMA MANOHARAN</i>	69
14.	INDIAN PATENT (AMENDMENT) ACT 2005 BOON OR BANE TO SMALL SCALE DRUG INDUSTRY IN INDIA <i>DR. G. SHANMUGASUNDARAM</i>	75
15.	A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RETURN ON INVESTMENT OF SELECTED PUBLIC SECTOR AND PRIVATE SECTOR COMPANIES IN INDIA <i>DR. SANTIMOY PATRA</i>	79
16.	TOY PURCHASES THROUGH ORGANISED RETAIL OUTLETS IN KERALA-AN EMPIRICAL STUDY <i>DR. ANDEZ GEORGE</i>	85
17.	WOMEN EMPOWERMENT THROUGH MICRO ENTERPRISES DEVELOPMENT IN TAMIL NADU <i>BALU. A, DR. M. CHANDRAN &amp; S. VENNILAASHREE</i>	90
18.	STRUCTURED CANOPY OF US RECESSION: PERCEPECTING POSITIVITY <i>DR. MANJU KHOSLA</i>	93
19.	ACCESS TO MICRO-HEALTH INSURANCE SERVICES FOR THE RURAL POOR: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY IN ANDHRA PRADESH <i>G. A. NARASIMHAM &amp; DR. D. NAGAYYA</i>	97
20.	REVISED CONSOLIDATED FDI POLICY 2011: BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN DOMESTIC PARTICIPANTS AND FOREIGN PLAYERS <i>NITI SAXENA</i>	107
21.	MAPPING MOTIVATIONAL ORIENTATION: APPROACH-AVOIDANCE MOTIVE & PERSONALITY <i>DR. EKTA SHARMA</i>	110
22.	ROLE OF CONSUMERS FORUM IN CONSUMERS EMPOWERMENT: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF BASRUR CONSUMERS FORUM IN UDUPI DISTRICT OF KARNATAKA <i>MUSTHAF</i>	117
23.	ECONOMIC IMPACT OF MICRO FINANCE ON RURAL POOR IN ANDHRA PRADESH <i>DR. NANU LUNAVATH</i>	119
24.	POST-MERGER PROFITABILITY OF SELECTED BANKS IN INDIA <i>K ANTONY AKHIL</i>	133
25.	A STUDY ON MANAGING DIVERSIFIED WORKFORCE-AND IT'S IMPACT ON ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS WITH REFERENCE TO BHEL/BAP, RANIPET <i>IRSHAD AHMED.Y</i>	136
	REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK	149

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

Indexed & Listed at: [Ulrich's Periodicals Directory](#) ©, [ProQuest, U.S.A.](#), [The American Economic Association's electronic bibliography, EconLit, U.S.A.](#),

[EBSCO Publishing, U.S.A.](#), [Index Copernicus Publishers Panel, Poland](#), [Open J-Gate, India](#) as well as in [Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A.](#)

Circulated all over the world & Google has verified that scholars of more than Hundred & Eighteen countries/territories are visiting our journal on regular basis.

Ground Floor, Building No. 1041-C-1, Devi Bhawan Bazar, JAGADHRI – 135 003, Yamunanagar, Haryana, INDIA

[www.ijrcm.org.in](http://www.ijrcm.org.in)

**CHIEF PATRON**

**PROF. K. K. AGGARWAL**

Chancellor, Lingaya's University, Delhi  
Founder Vice-Chancellor, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi  
Ex. Pro Vice-Chancellor, Guru Jambheshwar University, Hisar

**PATRON**

**SH. RAM BHAJAN AGGARWAL**

Ex. State Minister for Home & Tourism, Government of Haryana  
Vice-President, Dadri Education Society, Charkhi Dadri  
President, Chinar Syntex Ltd. (Textile Mills), Bhiwani

**CO-ORDINATOR**

**DR. BHAVET**

Faculty, M. M. Institute of Management, Maharishi Markandeshwar University, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana

**ADVISORS**

**DR. PRIYA RANJAN TRIVEDI**

Chancellor, The Global Open University, Nagaland

**PROF. M. S. SENAM RAJU**

Director A. C. D., School of Management Studies, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

**PROF. M. N. SHARMA**

Chairman, M.B.A., Haryana College of Technology & Management, Kaithal

**PROF. S. L. MAHANDRU**

Principal (Retd.), Maharaja Agrasen College, Jagadhri

**EDITOR**

**PROF. R. K. SHARMA**

Professor, Bharti Vidyapeeth University Institute of Management & Research, New Delhi

**CO-EDITOR**

**DR. SAMBHAV GARG**

Faculty, M. M. Institute of Management, Maharishi Markandeshwar University, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana

**EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD**

**DR. RAJESH MODI**

Faculty, Yanbu Industrial College, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

**PROF. SIKANDER KUMAR**

Chairman, Department of Economics, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

**PROF. SANJIV MITTAL**

University School of Management Studies, Guru Gobind Singh I. P. University, Delhi

**PROF. RAJENDER GUPTA**

Convener, Board of Studies in Economics, University of Jammu, Jammu

**PROF. NAWAB ALI KHAN**

Department of Commerce, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, U.P.

**PROF. S. P. TIWARI**

Department of Economics & Rural Development, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Avadh University, Faizabad

**DR. ANIL CHANDHOK**

Professor, Faculty of Management, Maharishi Markandeshwar University, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana

**DR. ASHOK KUMAR CHAUHAN**

Reader, Department of Economics, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

**DR. SAMBHAVNA**

Faculty, I.I.T.M., Delhi

**DR. MOHENDER KUMAR GUPTA**

Associate Professor, P. J. L. N. Government College, Faridabad

**DR. VIVEK CHAWLA**

Associate Professor, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

**DR. SHIVAKUMAR DEENE**

Asst. Professor, Government F. G. College Chitguppa, Bidar, Karnataka

***ASSOCIATE EDITORS***

**PROF. ABHAY BANSAL**

Head, Department of Information Technology, Amity School of Engineering & Technology, Amity University, Noida

**PARVEEN KHURANA**

Associate Professor, Mukand Lal National College, Yamuna Nagar

**SHASHI KHURANA**

Associate Professor, S. M. S. Khalsa Lubana Girls College, Barara, Ambala

**SUNIL KUMAR KARWASRA**

Principal, Aakash College of Education, Chander Kalan, Tohana, Fatehabad

**DR. VIKAS CHOUDHARY**

Asst. Professor, N.I.T. (University), Kurukshetra

***TECHNICAL ADVISORS***

**MOHITA**

Faculty, Yamuna Institute of Engineering & Technology, Village Gadholi, P. O. Gadholi, Yamunanagar

**AMITA**

Faculty, Government M. S., Mohali

***FINANCIAL ADVISORS***

**DICKIN GOYAL**

Advocate & Tax Adviser, Panchkula

**NEENA**

Investment Consultant, Chambaghat, Solan, Himachal Pradesh

***LEGAL ADVISORS***

**JITENDER S. CHAHAL**

Advocate, Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh U.T.

**CHANDER BHUSHAN SHARMA**

Advocate & Consultant, District Courts, Yamunanagar at Jagadhri

***SUPERINTENDENT***

**SURENDER KUMAR POONIA**

## CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to recent developments & practices in the area of Computer, Business, Finance, Marketing, Human Resource Management, General Management, Banking, Insurance, Corporate Governance and emerging paradigms in allied subjects like Accounting Education; Accounting Information Systems; Accounting Theory & Practice; Auditing; Behavioral Accounting; Behavioral Economics; Corporate Finance; Cost Accounting; Econometrics; Economic Development; Economic History; Financial Institutions & Markets; Financial Services; Fiscal Policy; Government & Non Profit Accounting; Industrial Organization; International Economics & Trade; International Finance; Macro Economics; Micro Economics; Monetary Policy; Portfolio & Security Analysis; Public Policy Economics; Real Estate; Regional Economics; Tax Accounting; Advertising & Promotion Management; Business Education; Business Information Systems (MIS); Business Law, Public Responsibility & Ethics; Communication; Direct Marketing; E-Commerce; Global Business; Health Care Administration; Labor Relations & Human Resource Management; Marketing Research; Marketing Theory & Applications; Non-Profit Organizations; Office Administration/Management; Operations Research/Statistics; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Organizational Development; Production/Operations; Public Administration; Purchasing/Materials Management; Retailing; Sales/Selling; Services; Small Business Entrepreneurship; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation; Tourism, Hospitality & Leisure; Transportation/Physical Distribution; Algorithms; Artificial Intelligence; Compilers & Translation; Computer Aided Design (CAD); Computer Aided Manufacturing; Computer Graphics; Computer Organization & Architecture; Database Structures & Systems; Digital Logic; Discrete Structures; Internet; Management Information Systems; Modeling & Simulation; Multimedia; Neural Systems/Neural Networks; Numerical Analysis/Scientific Computing; Object Oriented Programming; Operating Systems; Programming Languages; Robotics; Symbolic & Formal Logic and Web Design. The above mentioned tracks are only indicative, and not exhaustive.

Anybody can submit the soft copy of his/her manuscript **anytime** in M.S. Word format after preparing the same as per our submission guidelines duly available on our website under the heading guidelines for submission, at the email addresses: [infoijrcm@gmail.com](mailto:infoijrcm@gmail.com) or [info@ijrcm.org.in](mailto:info@ijrcm.org.in).

## GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT

1. **COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION:**

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

**THE EDITOR**

IJRCM

**Subject:** SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT IN THE AREA OF \_\_\_\_\_.

(e.g. Computer/IT/Engineering/Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Management/other, please specify).

**DEAR SIR/MADAM**

Please find my submission of manuscript titled '\_\_\_\_\_ ' for possible publication in your journals.

I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore, it has neither been published elsewhere in any language fully or partly, nor is it under review for publication anywhere.

I affirm that all author (s) have seen and agreed to the submitted version of the manuscript and their inclusion of name (s) as co-author (s).

Also, if my/our manuscript is accepted, I/We agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of journal & you are free to publish our contribution in any of your journals.

**NAME OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

Designation:

Affiliation with full address, contact numbers & Pin Code:

Residential address with Pin Code:

Mobile Number (s):

Landline Number (s):

E-mail Address:

Alternate E-mail Address:

2. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be in a 12 point Calibri Font. It should be bold typed, centered and fully capitalised.

3. **AUTHOR NAME (S) & AFFILIATIONS:** The author (s) **full name, designation, affiliation (s), address, mobile/landline numbers**, and **email/alternate email address** should be in italic & 11-point Calibri Font. It must be centered underneath the title.

4. **ABSTRACT:** Abstract should be in fully italicized text, not exceeding 250 words. The abstract must be informative and explain the background, aims, methods, results & conclusion in a single para. Abbreviations must be mentioned in full.
5. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by list of keywords, subject to the maximum of five. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stops at the end.
6. **MANUSCRIPT:** Manuscript must be in **BRITISH ENGLISH** prepared on a standard A4 size **PORTRAIT SETTING PAPER**. It must be prepared on a single space and single column with 1" margin set for top, bottom, left and right. It should be typed in 8 point Calibri Font with page numbers at the bottom and centre of the every page. It should be free from grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors and must be thoroughly edited.
7. **HEADINGS:** All the headings should be in a 10 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.
8. **SUB-HEADINGS:** All the sub-headings should be in a 8 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.
9. **MAIN TEXT:** The main text should follow the following sequence:

**INTRODUCTION****REVIEW OF LITERATURE****NEED/IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY****STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM****OBJECTIVES****HYPOTHESES****RESEARCH METHODOLOGY****RESULTS & DISCUSSION****FINDINGS****RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS****CONCLUSIONS****SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH****ACKNOWLEDGMENTS****REFERENCES****APPENDIX/ANNEXURE**

It should be in a 8 point Calibri Font, single spaced and justified. The manuscript should preferably not exceed 5000 words.

10. **FIGURES & TABLES:** These should be simple, centered, separately numbered & self explained, and **titles must be above the table/figure. Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure.** It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text.
11. **EQUATIONS:** These should be consecutively numbered in parentheses, horizontally centered with equation number placed at the right.
12. **REFERENCES:** The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript and they are supposed to follow **Harvard Style of Referencing**. The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per following:
  - All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.
  - Use (ed.) for one editor, and (ed.s) for multiple editors.
  - When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc, in chronologically ascending order.
  - Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.
  - The title of books and journals should be in italics. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.
  - For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parentheses.
  - The location of endnotes within the text should be indicated by superscript numbers.

**PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:****BOOKS**

- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.
- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio," Ohio State University.

**CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS**

- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

**JOURNAL AND OTHER ARTICLES**

- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

**CONFERENCE PAPERS**

- Garg Sambhav (2011): "Business Ethics" Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19–22 June.

**UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS AND THESES**

- Kumar S. (2011): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

**ONLINE RESOURCES**

- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

**WEBSITE**

- Garg, Bhavet (2011): Towards a New Natural Gas Policy, Political Weekly, Viewed on December 17, 2011 <http://epw.in/user/viewabstract.jsp>



## MAPPING MOTIVATIONAL ORIENTATION: APPROACH-AVOIDANCE MOTIVE & PERSONALITY

DR. EKTA SHARMA  
ASST. PROFESSOR  
AMRUT MODY SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT  
AHMEDABAD UNIVERSITY  
GUJARAT

### ABSTRACT

*Personality and motives – Approach & avoidance might be associated. Extraversion, for instance, is associated with a tendency to be optimistic and having a positive attitude towards problems. Extraverted individuals may be motivated to keep their optimism and confidence in themselves. The objective of the article is to map the motivational orientation of the individuals in reference to the personality traits and to find out if there is any difference on any of these variables as per the gender. The type of motivators required for people with different personality and motives are different. So, it would be beneficial for the organizations to map the motivational orientation of their employees as per their personality and motive to put in an effort. The result of the study shows approach and avoidance motive are not gender dependent but is dependent on personality traits.*

### KEYWORDS

Personality, Approach, avoidance, Five factor model, achievement motivation.

### INTRODUCTION

In recent years, a great deal of research on personality characteristics has suggested that five basic personality factors account for most of the variance in personality (Allik & McCrae, 2004; Barrick & Mount, 1991; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; McCrae & Costa, 1997, 1999, 2008; Scott & Colquitt, 2007). The Big Five Factors are generally labeled Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability or Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 2008). Extraversion is frequently associated with being sociable, gregarious, assertive, talkative, and active. Agreeableness is associated with being courteous, flexible, trusting, good-natured, cooperative, forgiving, soft-hearted, and tolerant. Conscientiousness incorporates volitional characteristics, such as hardworking, achievement-oriented, and persevering. Neuroticism is associated with being anxious, depressed, angry, embarrassed, emotional, worried, and insecure. Finally, Openness to Experience is associated with being imaginative, cultured, curious, original, broad-minded, intelligent, and artistically sensitive (Barrick & Mount, 1991; McCrae & Costa, 2008).

Although concerns about the number of factors, theoretical underpinnings, and empirical evidence supporting the FFM have been expressed by a number of scholars (Block, 1995; Carroll, 2002; Merenda, 2008), a general consensus has emerged that the FFM provides a useful framework for describing the emotional, interpersonal, experiential, and motivational styles of individuals (Allik & McCrae, 2004; Barrick & Mount, 1991; Costa & McCrae, 1988; Goldberg & Saucier, 1995; McCrae & Costa, 1997, 1999, 2008; McCrae, Jang, Livesley, Riemann, & Angleitner, 2001; Scott & Colquitt, 2007). Moreover, as noted above, strong claims have been made about the universality of personality traits and the FFM. McCrae and Costa (1997) argue that the personality structure of the FFM is a human universal that can be found in all cultures. Nonetheless, the way in which these characteristics are expressed is shaped by culture and experience (McCrae, 2001, 2002; McCrae & Costa, 2008).

Personality and motives – Approach & avoidance might be associated. Extraversion, for instance, is associated with a tendency to be optimistic and having a positive attitude towards problems. Extraverted individuals may be motivated to keep their optimism and confidence in themselves.

The five-factor model (FFM) includes motivational aspects of personality (McCrae & Costa, 1997), and previous research has shown a relationship between personality traits and motive dispositions (Piedmont, McCrae, & Costa, 1991). In particular, dispositional achievement motives are considered to be useful for research on job performance and academic achievement (Heggstad & Kanfer, 2000; Judge & Ilies, 2002). But the theoretical relationship between traits and motives has been debated (e.g. Pervin, 1994), and attempts to empirically relate personality with motivational variables have produced inconsistent results (Gellatly, 1996).

In recent decades, the five factor model (FFM) of personality traits, as measured by means of the NEO PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992), has proven to be the most widely accepted structure of personality. This model has been replicated in many studies (Goldberg, 1990) across cultures and measures (John & Srivastava, 1999), and there is evidence of substantial heritability of these traits (Loehlin, 1992).

Mitchell & Daniels (2003) claimed that research on personality is now the fastest growing area in the motivation literature. After the influence of situational factors on motivation dominated the 1970s and early 1980s, there has been a renewed interest in stable motive disposition. Heggstad and Kanfer (2000) identified two main sources of this renewed interest: first, research on the underlying structure of personality has examined the effects of traits as predictors of academic achievement and job performance/motivation, in particular the positive motivational effect of conscientiousness and the negative effect of neuroticism. Second, goal theories of motivation assume that stable motive dispositions are rooted in personality and affect more proximal motivational processes through their influences on particular goals that individuals adopt in an achievement situation (e.g. Elliott & Church, 1997).

Motivation may be defined as the energization (i.e., instigation) and direction of behavior. Approach and avoidance motivation differ as a function of *valence*: In approach motivation, behavior is instigated or directed by a positive/desirable event or possibility; in avoidance motivation, behavior is instigated or directed by a negative/undesirable event or possibility (Elliot, 1999). We contend that approach-avoidance is not just an important motivational distinction, but that it is fundamental and basic, and should be construed as the foundation on which other motivational distinctions rest.

The approach-avoidance distinction has a long and rich history in intellectual thought. The origin of the approach-avoidance distinction may be traced back to the ancient Greek philosophers Democritus (460–370 B.C.) and Aristippus (435–356 B.C.), who espoused an ethical hedonism that proscribed the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of pain as the central guide for human behavior. The first thinker to straightforwardly articulate a psychological hedonism, in which the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of pain not only represented an ethical proscription but also a description of how humans actually tend to behave, was the British philosopher Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832). Bentham (1779/1879) offered the following strong dictum in his *Introduction to the Principles and Morals of Legislation*: “Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we should do: they govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think” (p. 1). In his classic *Principles of Psychology* (vol. 2), James (1890) discussed pleasure and pain as the “springs of action,” noting that pleasure is a “tremendous reinforcer” and pain a “tremendous inhibitor” of behavior (pp. 549–559). Freud (1915) presumed that humans, like lower animals, continuously seek pleasure and avoid pain, and viewed this hedonistic tendency as the motivational foundation of psychodynamics. Jung (1921) noted that the fundamental difference between extroverts and introverts is that in the former there is a movement of interest toward social objects, whereas in the latter there is a movement of interest away from social objects. Pavlov (1927) identified two types of reflexive responses in his work on classical conditioning, an orienting response toward the stimulus and a defensive response away from the stimulus. Thorndike (1911) laid the groundwork for reinforcement theory by proposing the “law of effect” which states that a response leading to “satisfaction” is strengthened, whereas a response leading to “discomfort” is weakened. Skinner (1938) sought to extricate “mentalism” from the law of effect, opting to declare that observable reinforcers increase the likelihood of subsequent behavior and observable punishers decrease the likelihood of subsequent behavior. In his purposive behaviorism, Tolman (1925) posited that a complete description of behavior must include reference to the end (i.e., goal) toward

which or away from which the organism is moving. In his field theory, Lewin (1935) stated that goal-objects in the life space possess positive valences that attract and negative valences that repel. Miller (1944) drew on Freudian and Lewinian concepts in detailing the various dynamic conflicts that can result from incompatible valences (e.g., being attracted to and repelled by the same goal-object). Hull (1943) posited two distinct types of conditioned drives, conditioned appetitive drives that develop through association with states such as hunger for food or thirst for water, and conditioned aversive drives that develop through association with unpleasant events such as shock or loud noise. Murray (1938) differentiated positive or "adient" needs that "force the organism in a positive way toward other objects" from negative or "abient" needs that "force the organism to separate itself from objects" (pp. 79–80). In his social learning theory, Rotter (1954) proposed that the nature of an individual's expectancies and values is largely a function of his or her prior rewards and punishments. Maslow (1955) identified two distinct types of needs in his humanistic conceptualization of the person: deficit needs which seek to reduce a negative state of tension, and growth needs which seek to increase positive stimulation. In his biologically based analysis of basic traits, Eysenck (1967) posited that introverts are "stimulus shy" because of high baseline levels of cortical arousal, whereas extroverts are "stimulus hungry" because of low baseline levels of cortical arousal. Bowlby (1969) proposed two primary styles of attachment: a secure type that promotes exploration and challenge seeking, and an insecure type that impels caution and a concern with safety and protection. Cognitive theorists have utilized approach-avoidance concepts, albeit often at the periphery of their conceptualizations. Heider (1958), for example, summarized the difference between his concepts of "can" and "may" by stating that the former implies that if a person tries, he or she will succeed, whereas the latter implies that if a person tries, he or she will not be punished. From this overview of thinkers and theorists, it is clear that the approach-avoidance distinction has deep intellectual roots, has been utilized from the advent of psychology as a scientific discipline, and is present in each of the major theoretical traditions in psychology (psychoanalytic, behaviorist, humanistic, cognitive, biological, etc.).

In particular, Jeffrey Gray's work (1970; 1987; 1994) has generated considerable attention. Gray posited distinct appetitive and aversive motivational systems, referred to as the Behavioral Activation System (BAS) and the Behavioral Inhibition System (BIS), respectively. Gray's model outlines personality as a function of individual differences in the two systems which have neuroanatomical and neuro-physiological correlates. Specifically Gray (1987) describes BAS as a function of the limbic circuits and dopaminergic pathways; and the BIS system as rooted in circuits in the hippocampus and the septum and related structures. The appetitive system (BAS) activates behavior in response to signals of reward and non-punishment, whereas the aversive system (BIS) inhibits behavior in response to signals of punishment, no reward, and novel stimuli. Gray's (1994) theory also links motivation to emotion: BAS is associated with feelings of hope and approach behaviors, whereas activation of the BIS is associated with feelings of anxiety and avoidance behaviors (Gray, 1990).

In the domain of achievement, Elliot (1997) has made the distinction between approach and avoidance, describing approach motives as those consisting of the need for achievement and avoidance motives as those focused on a fear of failure.

One reason the approach and avoidance distinction has been so prevalent throughout the years is because it has important implications for understanding perception, cognition, emotion, behavior, health, and well-being (e.g., Derryberry & Reed, 1994; Elliot & Sheldon, 1998; Higgins, Shah & Friedman, 1997). For example, Derryberry and Reed (1994) found that individuals with strong approach motives were biased toward cues indicating gain, and those with strong avoidance motives were biased toward negative cues indicating loss in a basic visual target detection task. Higgins and colleagues (1997) have shown that promotion-focused goals produce cheerfulness-dejection responses (success = cheerful; failure = dejection) and prevention-focused goals produce quiescence-agitation responses (success = quiescence; failure = agitation). And, Elliot and Sheldon (1998) found that higher numbers of avoidance personal goals predicted lower well-being and greater physical symptom reports, both prospectively and retrospectively.

The objective of the study is to map the motivational orientation of the individuals in reference to the personality traits and to find out if there is any difference on any of these variables as per the gender.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

In the article titled, "Personality Traits and achievement motives: Theoretical and Empirical Relations between the NEO Personality Inventory- Revised and the achievement motives scale," Age Diseth and Oyvind Martinsen (2009) have investigated theoretical and empirical relations between personality traits and motive dispositions by comparing scores of 315 undergraduate psychology students on the NEO Personality Inventory-Revised and the Achievement Motives Scale. Analysis showed all NEO Personality Inventory-Revised factors except agreeableness were significantly correlated with the motive for success and the motive to avoid failure. A structural equation model showed that motive for success was predicted by Extraversion, Openness, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism (negative relation), and motive to avoid failure was predicted by Neuroticism and Openness (negative relation). Although both achievement motives were predicted by several personality factors, motive for success was most strongly predicted by Openness, and motive to avoid failure was most strongly predicted by neuroticism. These findings extended previous research on the relations of personality traits and achievement motives and provided a basis for the discussion of motive dispositions in personality. The results also added to the construct validity of the Achievement Motives Scale.

Andrew J. Elliot and Martin V. Covington (2001), in the research paper "Approach and Avoidance Motivation," published in Educational Psychology Review, have introduced a conceptual foundation for the distinction between approach and avoidance motivation. They have primarily explicated several reasons why the approach-avoidance distinction should be viewed as fundamental and basic to the study of human behavior. In addition, they have compared and contrasted the "approach-avoidance" designation with other designations that have been used in the motivational literature to cover the same or similar conceptual ground.

In the study Associations of Culture and Personality With McClelland's Motives: A Cross-Cultural Study of Managers in 24 countries" by Hetty van Emmerik, William L. Gardner, Hein Wendt, and Dawn Fischer (2010), authors explored the interrelationships between McClelland's motives and specific aggregate-level cultural dimensions and personality factors. The results reveal significant relationships between the Achievement, Affiliation, and Power Motives, and the cultural dimensions of Performance Orientation, Humane Orientation, and Power Distance, respectively. Support for posited relationships between the managers' motives and aggregate-level personality, as measured by the Big Five factors, was also obtained. Finally, the results demonstrate that the relationships between McClelland's motives and managers' aggregate-level Big Five factors are moderated by the cultural dimensions of Performance Orientation, Humane Orientation, and Power Distance.

## MEASURES

**PERSONALITY:** The revised NEO Personality Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992) is a 240 item inventory measuring the five major personality dimensions of neuroticism (anxiety, angry hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsivity, vulnerability to stress), extraversion (warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement seeking, positive emotions), openness (fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, activity, ideas, values), agreeableness (trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty, tender-mindedness) and conscientiousness (competence, order, dutifulness, achievement, self-discipline, deliberation) by means of statements. Studies have shown that internal consistency estimates for the five domains of the NEO PI-R have ranged from 0.86 to 0.95, and it has been shown to have good content, criterion-related, and construct validity (McCrae and Costa, 1996). The present Norwegian version of this inventory has replicated the factor structure and it has shown good internal consistency (alpha) as compared to international research (Martinsen, Nordvik, & Østbø, 2003). The participants indicate their relative agreement with statements by setting a mark along a 5-point scale with anchors of 1: Strongly Disagree and 5: Strongly Agree. A principal component analysis (Varimax rotation) of data in the present study produced the expected five factor solution (Eigenvalue > 1) accounting for 58.3 % of the variance.

**APPROACH-AVOIDANCE MOTIVES:** The approach and avoidance motives are assessed on the basis of Motivational Analysis of Organizations- Behavior (MAO-B), developed by Udai Pareek. It contains 60 items, 5 for each dimension (approach & avoidance) of each of the sub motives: affiliation, achievement, extension, influence, control and dependency. (Udai Pareek and Surabhi Purohit, 2010)

**SAMPLE:** The sample comprises of people in the age group of 20-40 years. The total sample size is 388, out of which, 285 are males and 103 are females.

## HYPOTHESIS

1. Extraversion and achievement motive are positively related. Because Extraversion is described as the extent to which people are assertive, dominant, and energetic (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 2008), it appears to be linked to the Achievement Motive. Support for this prediction is provided by Costa and McCrae's (1988) finding that the assertiveness and activity facets of the Big five extraversion scale are significantly correlated with Murray's (1938) need for achievement as measured by the Personality Research Form (PRF; Jackson, 1984).
2. Neuroticism and achievement motive are negatively related. The anxiety and insecurity embodied by Neuroticism appears to be inconsistent with Achievement Motives (Zhao & Seibert, 2006), suggesting a negative relationship. This assertion is supported by Costa and McCrae's (1988) finding that Neuroticism correlates negatively with Murray's Need for Achievement as measured by the Personality Research Form.
3. Influence motive is positively related to the extraversion. As Extraversion is described as the extent to which people are assertive, dominant, and energetic (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 2008), it appears to be linked to the Influence Motive.
4. Control motive is positively related to neuroticism. The anxiety and insecurity embodied by Neuroticism suggests a negative relationship with the control Motive.
5. Control motive is positively related to Extraversion. Individuals who have a high Need for Power tend to be extravert (Thomas, Dickson, & Bliese, 2001), as suggested by the facet scales of assertiveness and activity (McCrae & Costa, 2008).
6. Affiliation motive is positively related to Extraversion. The description of Affiliation appears relevant to predict the relationship between each of the Big Five factors and the Affiliation Motive. One of the most obvious aspects of Extraversion is sociability (Judge & Cable, 1997). This may signify a positive relationship between Extraversion and Affiliation Motive.
7. Males are higher on extraversion than females. Schmitt et al. (2008) discovered sexual differentiation in the extraversion dimension in the manner that women scored significantly higher than men. Other studies then again revealed the reverse result with men being more extravert than women. These opposing results can be attributed to the combination of feminine and masculine aspects in the extraversion dimension, namely dominance and nurturance facets (Costa et al., 2001).
8. Females are higher on neuroticism than males. Repeatedly, research had demonstrated a clear distinction between the sexes on this particular dimension, with women scoring significantly higher than their counterpart (Costa et al., 2001; Schmitt et al., 2008). As previously depicted, women tend to suffer from a lower self-esteem in relation to men when assessing features critical to one's self-identity (Schmitt, 2008). This stereotype threat fear could explain why females continually consider themselves as more neurotic than men. Therefore, the present study believes the following hypothesis would hold:
9. Approach & avoidance motive of females and males are significantly different. It is generally stated that the behavior and motives differ across the gender. So, it seems that approach and avoidance motive might differ too.
10. Females are high on affiliation motive than males. Female students had a higher need for affiliation and a higher need for power than male students. Consistent with Turner's (1996) study, females are more concerned with relationships and influence than are males. However, there was not a significant difference in the need for achievement between male and female students

## RESULTS

### HYPOTHESIS TESTING

#### **Hypothesis 1: Extraversion and Achievement motivation are positively related.**

As Per Table 1, the hypothesis is accepted. There is a significant positive correlation between Extraversion and achievement motivation (0.132)

#### **Hypothesis 2: Neuroticism & Achievement motivation are negatively related.**

Neuroticism and achievement motivation are significantly negatively correlated. (-0.159)(Refer Table 1). So, the hypothesis is accepted.

#### **Hypothesis 3: Extraversion and influence motive are positively related.**

Although the hypothesis is accepted, but there is no significant correlation. (0.077) (Table 1)

#### **Hypothesis 4: Control motive is positively related to neuroticism.**

The hypothesis is accepted at 0.335 significant correlations between control motive & neuroticism.

#### **Hypothesis 5: Control motive is positively correlated to extraversion.**

The hypothesis is accepted. The correlation between the control motive and extraversion is 0.147. (Table 1)

#### **Hypothesis 6: Affiliation motive is positively related to Extraversion**

The null hypothesis is rejected as Table 1 shows negative but not significant correlation between Affiliation and Extraversion.

#### **Hypothesis 7: Males are higher on extraversion than females.**

Table 4 shows that the mean of extraversion for males (25.75) is lower than the mean of females (26.21). Although the difference is not significant as we can see Table 5, significance for t-test is 0.378 which is more than 0.05. Still, null hypothesis stand rejected.

#### **Hypothesis 8: Females are higher on neuroticism than males.**

The mean of neuroticism for males (21.79) is lower than the mean of females (22.24) (Table 4). Although the difference is not significant as we can see Table 5, significance for t-test is 0.437 which is more than 0.05. So, null hypothesis is accepted.

#### **Hypothesis 9: Approach & avoidance motive of females and males are significantly different.**

The hypothesis is rejected. From Table 4, it's evident that the mean of approach motive for males (78.97) is lower than the mean of females (79.35) (Table 4). Although the difference is not significant as we can see Table 5, significance for t-test is 0.648 which is more than 0.05.

The mean of avoidance motive for males (80.86) is lower than the mean of females (80.93) (Table 4). Although the difference is not significant as we can see Table 5, significance for t-test is 0.940 which is more than 0.05.

#### **Hypothesis 10: Females are high on affiliation motive than males.**

The mean of affiliation for males (26.47) is lower than the mean of females (26.71) (Table 4). Although the difference is not significant as we can see Table 5, significance for t-test is 0.544 which is more than 0.05. So, null hypothesis is accepted.

## CONCLUSION

One and All can not be motivated by the same motivator. The type of motivators required for people with different personality and motives are different. The result of the study shows approach and avoidance motive are not gender dependent but is dependent on personality traits. So, it would be beneficial for the organizations to map the motivational orientation of their employees as per their personality and motive to put in an effort.



APPENDICES

TABLE 1

Correlations

		extraversion	agreeableness	conscientiousness	neuroticism	openness	Achievement	Influence	Extension	Control	Affiliation	Dependence
extraversion	Pearson Correlation	1	.316**	.206**	.168**	.042	.132**	.077	.004	.147**	-.053	.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.001	.409	.009	.132	.931	.004	.302	.977
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
agreeableness	Pearson Correlation	.316**	1	.454**	.197**	.200**	.034	.053	.046	.078	-.003	-.007
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.505	.299	.365	.127	.957	.895
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
conscientiousness	Pearson Correlation	.206**	.454**	1	.169**	.274**	.035	-.160**	.018	-.024	-.179**	-.017
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.001	.000	.496	.002	.719	.635	.000	.733
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
neuroticism	Pearson Correlation	.168**	.197**	.169**	1	.072	-.159**	.095	.026	.335**	-.026	-.139**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.001		.154	.002	.060	.612	.000	.610	.006
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
openness	Pearson Correlation	.042	.200**	.274**	.072	1	-.006	-.093	.034	.137**	-.011	.063
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.409	.000	.000	.154		.914	.066	.509	.007	.831	.217
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
Achievement	Pearson Correlation	.132**	.034	.035	-.159**	-.006	1	.220**	.457**	.345**	.240**	.492**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.505	.496	.002	.914		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
Influence	Pearson Correlation	.077	.053	-.160**	.095	-.093	.220**	1	.378**	.333**	.317**	.380**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.132	.299	.002	.060	.066	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
Extension	Pearson Correlation	.004	.046	.018	.026	.034	.457**	.378**	1	.198**	.320**	.428**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.931	.365	.719	.612	.509	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
Control	Pearson Correlation	.147**	.078	-.024	.335**	.137**	.345**	.333**	.198**	1	.094	.369**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.127	.635	.000	.007	.000	.000	.000		.065	.000
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
Affiliation	Pearson Correlation	-.053	-.003	-.179**	-.026	-.011	.240**	.317**	.320**	.094	1	.418**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.302	.957	.000	.610	.831	.000	.000	.000	.065		.000
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
Dependence	Pearson Correlation	.001	-.007	-.017	-.139**	.063	.492**	.380**	.428**	.369**	.418**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.977	.895	.733	.006	.217	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388	388

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

TABLE 2

Correlations

		extraversion	agreeableness	conscientiousness	neuroticism	openness	Approach	Avoidance
extraversion	Pearson Correlation	1	.316**	.206**	.168**	.042	.047	.086
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.001	.409	.358	.090
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
agreeableness	Pearson Correlation	.316**	1	.454**	.197**	.200**	-.039	.109*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.444	.031
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
conscientiousness	Pearson Correlation	.206**	.454**	1	.169**	.274**	.008	-.133**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.001	.000	.872	.009
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
neuroticism	Pearson Correlation	.168**	.197**	.169**	1	.072	.074	-.024
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.001		.154	.143	.639
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
openness	Pearson Correlation	.042	.200**	.274**	.072	1	.053	.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.409	.000	.000	.154		.297	.880
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
Approach	Pearson Correlation	.047	-.039	.008	.074	.053	1	.590**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.358	.444	.872	.143	.297		.000
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388
Avoidance	Pearson Correlation	.086	.109*	-.133**	-.024	.008	.590**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.090	.031	.009	.639	.880	.000	
	N	388	388	388	388	388	388	388

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

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

TABLE 3

## Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
extraversion	388	11	37	25.87	4.557
agreeableness	388	19	40	29.45	4.013
conscientiousness	388	14	38	28.38	4.845
neuroticism	388	12	33	21.91	5.106
openess	388	17	42	30.98	3.935
Achievement	388	19	34	26.62	3.701
Influence	388	17	34	26.47	3.463
Extension	388	19	35	26.41	3.346
Control	388	17	33	25.33	3.371
Affiliation	388	18	34	26.54	3.363
Dependence	388	19	37	28.58	3.979
Approach	388	64	98	79.07	7.091
Avoidance	388	56	99	80.88	8.826
Valid N (listwise)	388				

TABLE 4

## Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
extraversion	0	285	25.75	4.554	.270
	1	103	26.21	4.571	.450
agreeableness	0	285	29.33	3.905	.231
	1	103	29.80	4.299	.424
conscientiousness	0	285	27.91	4.735	.280
	1	103	29.68	4.931	.486
neuroticism	0	285	21.79	5.143	.305
	1	103	22.24	5.011	.494
openess	0	285	30.88	3.813	.226
	1	103	31.24	4.262	.420
Achievement	0	285	26.58	3.642	.216
	1	103	26.74	3.873	.382
Influence	0	285	26.59	3.407	.202
	1	103	26.16	3.610	.356
Extension	0	285	26.41	3.277	.194
	1	103	26.41	3.549	.350
Control	0	285	25.29	3.370	.200
	1	103	25.43	3.389	.334
Affiliation	0	285	26.47	3.431	.203
	1	103	26.71	3.177	.313
Dependence	0	285	28.48	4.043	.239
	1	103	28.84	3.803	.375
Approach	0	285	78.97	7.053	.418
	1	103	79.35	7.222	.712
Avoidance	0	285	80.86	9.015	.534
	1	103	80.93	8.321	.820

**TABLE 5**  
Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
extraversion	Equal variances assumed	.356	.551	- .883	386	.378	-.463	.524	-1.493	.568
	Equal variances not assumed			-.881	179.975	.379	-.463	.525	-1.499	.573
agreeableness	Equal variances assumed	1.669	.197	-1.011	386	.313	-.466	.461	-1.373	.441
	Equal variances not assumed			-.966	166.599	.335	-.466	.483	-1.419	.487
conscientiousness	Equal variances assumed	1.506	.220	-3.211	386	.001	-1.767	.550	-2.850	-.685
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.150	174.339	.002	-1.767	.561	-2.875	-.660
neuroticism	Equal variances assumed	.659	.418	-.778	386	.437	-.457	.587	-1.611	.698
	Equal variances not assumed			-.787	184.834	.432	-.457	.580	-1.601	.688
openness	Equal variances assumed	.757	.385	-.792	386	.429	-.359	.453	-1.248	.531
	Equal variances not assumed			-.752	164.596	.453	-.359	.477	-1.300	.583
Achievement	Equal variances assumed	.469	.494	-.381	386	.703	-.162	.426	-1.000	.675
	Equal variances not assumed			-.371	171.342	.711	-.162	.438	-1.028	.703
Influence	Equal variances assumed	.369	.544	1.091	386	.276	.434	.398	-.348	1.217
	Equal variances not assumed			1.061	171.838	.290	.434	.409	-.373	1.241
Extension	Equal variances assumed	.862	.354	.016	386	.987	.006	.385	-.751	.764
	Equal variances not assumed			.016	168.765	.988	.006	.400	-.783	.796
Control	Equal variances assumed	.109	.742	-.341	386	.733	-.132	.388	-.895	.630
	Equal variances not assumed			-.340	179.704	.734	-.132	.389	-.900	.635
Affiliation	Equal variances assumed	.277	.599	-.607	386	.544	-.235	.387	-.996	.526
	Equal variances not assumed			-.630	193.765	.530	-.235	.373	-.971	.501
Dependence	Equal variances assumed	.339	.561	-.795	386	.427	-.364	.458	-1.264	.536
	Equal variances not assumed			-.818	190.864	.414	-.364	.445	-1.241	.513
Approach	Equal variances assumed	.001	.969	-.463	386	.644	-.378	.816	-1.982	1.227
	Equal variances not assumed			-.458	176.897	.648	-.378	.825	-2.006	1.251
Avoidance	Equal variances assumed	.488	.485	-.075	386	.940	-.076	1.016	-2.073	1.922
	Equal variances not assumed			-.078	194.340	.938	-.076	.978	-2.006	1.854

**REFERENCES**

Allik, J., & McCrae, R. R. (2004). Toward a geography of personality traits: Patterns of profiles across 36 cultures *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 13-28.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.

Bentham, J. (1779/1879). *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Block, J. (1995). A contrarian view of the Five-Factor approach to personality description. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 187-215.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment*, Basic Books, New York.

Carroll, J. B. (2002). The Five-Factor Personality Model: How complete and satisfactory is it? In H. I. Braum, D. N. Jackson & D. E. Wiley (Eds.), *The role of constructs in psychological and educational measurement* (pp. 97-126). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1988). From catalog to classification: Murray's needs and the Five-Factor Model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 258-265.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: The NEO Personality Inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 5-13.

Costa, P. T., Jr., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 322-331.

Derryberry, D., & Reed, M. A. (1994). Temperament and attention: Orienting toward and away from positive and negative signals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 1128-1139.

Diseth A, Martinsen (2009). Personality traits and achievement motives: theoretical and empirical relations between the NEO Personality Inventory-Revised and the Achievement Motives Scale. *Psychological Reports*. 2009 Apr;104(2):579-92.

Elliot, A. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educ. Psychol.* 34: 169-189.

Elliot, A. J., & Church, M. A. (1997) A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 218-232.

Elliot, A & Covington. (2001). Approach and Avoidance Motivation. *Educational Psychology Review*, Vol. 13, No. 2.

Elliot, A. J., & Sheldon, K. M. (1998). Avoidance personal goals and the personality-illness relationship. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 75,

1282–1299.

- Emmerik, H., Gardner, Wendt and Fischer. (2010). Associations of Culture and Personality with McClelland's Motives: A Cross-Cultural Study of Managers in 24 Countries. *Group & Organization Management* 35(3) 329–367
- Eysenck, H. (1967). *The Biological Basis of Personality*, Charles Thomas, Springfield, IL.
- Freud, S. (1915). Repression. In the standard edition of Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Vol. XIV, Hogarth, London, 1957.
- Gellatly, I. R. (1996) Conscientiousness and task performance: Test of cognitive process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 474-482.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1990) An alternative "Description of Personality": The Big-Five Factor Structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1216-1229.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1990) An alternative "Description of Personality": The Big-Five Factor Structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1216-1229.
- Goldberg, L. R., & Saucier, G. (1995). What do you propose we use instead? A reply to Block. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 221-225.
- Gray, J. A. (1970). *The psychophysiological basis of introversion-extraversion*. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 8, 249–266.
- Gray, J. A. (1987). *The psychology of fear and stress* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gray, J. A. (1990). Brain systems that mediate both emotion and cognition. *Cognition and Emotion*, 4, 269–288.
- Gray, J. A. (1994). Framework for a taxonomy of psychiatric disorder. In S. H. M. van Goozen, N. E. van de Poll, & J. A. Sergeant (Eds.), *Emotions: essays on emotion theory* (pp. 29–59). Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Heggestad, E. D. & Kanfer, R. (2000) Individual differences in trait motivation: development of the Motivational Trait Questionnaire. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 33, 751-776.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Higgins, E. T., Shah, J., & Friedman, R. (1997). Emotional responses to goal attainment: Strength of regulatory focus as moderator. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 515–525.
- Hull, C. (1943). *Principles of Behavior*, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York.
- Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 869-879.
- Jackson, D. N. (1984). *Personality Research Form manual* (3rd ed.). Port Huron, MI: Research Psychologists Press.
- James, W. (1890). *The Principles of Psychology* (Vol. II), Henry Holt & Co., New York.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999) The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford. Pp. 102-138.
- Jung, C. (1921). Psychological types. In *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, Vol. 6, Princeton University Press, 1971, Princeton, NJ.
- Judge, T. A., & Cable, D. M. (1997). Applicant personality, organizational culture, and organization attraction. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 359-394.
- Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R. (2002) Relationship of personality to performance motivation: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 797-807.
- Lewin, K. (1935). *A Dynamic Theory of Personality*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Loehlin, J. C. (1992) *Genes and environment in personality development*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Martinsen, Nordvik, H., & stb, L. E. (2003) Norske versjoner av NEO-PI-R og NEO FFI [Norwegian versions of NEO-PI-R and NEO FFI]. *Tidsskrift for Norsk Psykologforening [Journal of the Norwegian Psychological Association]*, 42, 421-422.
- Maslow, A. (1955). Deficiency motivation and growth motivation. In Jones, M. (ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1996). Conceptions and correlates of openness to experience. In R. Hogan, J. A. Johnson, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 825–847). New York: Academic Press.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human uni-versal. *The American Psychologist*, 52, 509-516.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1999). A Five-Factor Theory of personality. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 139-153). New York: Guilford Press.
- McCrae, R. R. (2001). Trait psychology and culture: Exploring intercultural comparisons. *Journal of Personality*, 69, 819-846.
- McCrae, R. R. (2002). NEO-PI-R data from 36 countries: Further intercultural comparisons. In R. R. McCrae & J. Allik (Eds.), *The Five-Factor Model of Personality across cultures* (pp. 105-125). New York, NY: Kluwer
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2008). Empirical and theoretical status of the Five-Factor Model of personality traits. In G. J. Boyle, G. Matthews, & D. H. Saklofske (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of personality theory and assessment: Vol. 1. Personality theories and models* (pp. 273-294). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- McCrae, R. R., Jang, K. L., Livesley, W. J., Riemann, R., & Angleitner, A. (2001). Sources of structure: Genetic, environmental, and artifactual influences on the covariation of personality traits. *Journal of Personality*, 69, 511-535.
- Merenda, P. (2008). Update on the debate about the existence and utility of the Big Five: A ten-year follow-up on Carroll's "The Five-Factor Personality Model: How complete and satisfactory is it?" *Psychological Reports*, 103, 931-942.
- Miller, N. (1944). Experimental studies of conflict. In McV. Hunt, J. (ed.), *Personality and the Behavioral Disorders*, Vol. 1, Ronald Press, New York, pp. 431–465.
- Mitchell T. R., & Daniels D. (2003) Motivation. In W.C. Borman, D.R. Ilgen, & R.J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology*, Vol. 12: Industrial Organizational Psychology, New York: Wiley. Pp. 225–254.
- Murray, H. (1938). *Explorations in Personality*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Pareek, U and Purohit. (2010). *Training Instruments in HRD and OD*. Third Edition. Tata Mc Graw hill publishing House. Pp. 269-273.
- Pavlov, I. (1927). *Conditioned Reflexes: An Investigation into the Physiological Activity of the Cortex* (G. Anrep, trans.), Dover, New York.
- Pervin, L. A. (1994) A critical analysis of current trait theory. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5, 103-113.
- Rotter, J. (1954). *Social Learning and Clinical Psychology*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Piedmont, R. L., McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1991) Adjective check list scales and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 630-637.
- Scott, B. A., & Colquitt, J. A. (2007). Are organizational justice effects bounded by individual differences? An examination of equity sensitivity, exchange ideology, and the Big Five. *Group & Organizational Management*, 32, 290-325.
- Schmitt, D., Realo, A., Voracek, M., & Allik, J. (2008). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Sex differences in big five personality traits across 55 cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94 (1), 168-182
- Skinner, B. F. (1938). *The Behavior of Organisms: An Experimental Analysis*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Thomas, J. L., Dickson, M. W., & Bliese, P. D. (2001). Values predicting leader performance in the U.S. Army Reserve Officer Training Corps Assessment Center: evidence for a personality-mediated model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 181-196.
- Thorndike, E. (1911). *Animal Intelligence*, Macmillan, New York.
- Tolman, E. (1925). Behaviorism and purpose. *J. Philosophy* 22: 35–41.
- Turner, J.P. (1996). *The motivational needs of students enrolled in agricultural education programs in Georgia*. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia's 1996).
- Zhao, H., & Seibert, S. E. (2006). The Big Five personality dimensions and entrepreneurial status: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 259-271.



## **REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK**

**Dear Readers**

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Commerce, Economics & Management (IJRCM) acknowledges & appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to request you to supply your critical comments and suggestions about the material published in this issue as well as on the journal as a whole, on our E-mails i.e. **infoijrcm@gmail.com** or **info@ijrcm.org.in** for further improvements in the interest of research.

If you have any queries please feel free to contact us on our E-mail **infoijrcm@gmail.com**.

I am sure that your feedback and deliberations would make future issues better – a result of our joint effort.

Looking forward an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

**Academically yours**

Sd/-

**Co-ordinator**