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Abstract
The purpose of this study was to construct a career meta-competency model for sustained employability in the contemporary world of work. This study explored a convenience sample (N = 304) of early career employees’ personality preferences (measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator), self-esteem (measured by the Culture-free Self-esteem Inventories for Adults) and emotional intelligence (measured by the Assessing Emotions Scale), as a composite set of their personality attributes, in relation to their employability attributes (measured by the Employability Attributes Scale). The participants comprised 81% blacks and 64% females employed in the business management field in managerial/supervisory (53%) and staff (28%) level positions. Their ages ranged between 25 and 40 years (early adulthood and establishment phase) (79%). The correlations, canonical correlations and multiple regression results indicated that the participants’ personality attributes were significantly and positively related to their employability attributes. Structural Equation Modelling indicated a moderate fit between the theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency model and the empirically tested structural model. The results indicated job level as a significant moderator of the relationship between the participants’ personality and employability attributes. Middle management level was associated with an inverse relationship between the personality and employability attributes. Staff and middle managers did not significantly differ regarding their mean scores on these variables. On a theoretical level, the study deepened understanding of the cognitive, affective, conative and interpersonal behavioural dimensions of the hypothesised career meta-competency model. On an empirical level, the study produced an empirically tested career meta-competency model in terms of the various behavioural dimensions. On a practical level, career
counselling and development interventions for guiding employees’ sustained employability in terms of the career meta-competency behavioural dimensions were recommended.

*Keywords:* Contemporary world of work; career meta-competencies; personality attributes; personality preferences; self-esteem; emotional intelligence; employability attributes; career counselling; career development; sustained employability.
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9.1.2 The second aim: To conceptualise the personality attributes constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence and the employability attributes construct.
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9.1.2.3 The third research aim: To determine whether the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables.
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between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables, to assess whether a good fit exists between the elements of the empirically manifested structural model and the theoretically hypothesised model.

9.1.2.5 The fifth research aim: To determine whether the biographical variables (age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status) significantly moderate the relationship between the personality attributes construct and employability attributes construct variables.
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CHAPTER 1: SCIENTIFIC OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH

This research focuses on the development of a career meta-competency model for sustained employability. The constructs of relevance are personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence (as a composite set of personality attributes) in relation to individuals' employability attributes. The aim of this chapter is to provide the background to and motivation for the intended research which led to the formulation of the problem statement and research questions. The aims of the research are stated next. The paradigm perspectives that guide the research are discussed and the research design and research method, both of which lend structure to the research process, are formulated. Finally, the manner in which the chapters will be presented is described. The chapter concludes with a summary of the scientific overview.

1.1 BACKGROUND TO AND MOTIVATION FOR THE RESEARCH

The context of this research is career development and counselling for sustained employability in the contemporary world of work. More specifically, the research focuses on identifying and proposing a career meta-competency model for enhancing individuals' employability by investigating the relationship between individuals' personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence (as a composite set of personality attributes) and their employability attributes.

People entering the contemporary world of work are faced with a number of challenges, such as decreased employment opportunities, diminished job security, fast-changing technology and an increasing personal responsibility for keeping up with an evolving body of knowledge in their field of specialisation, keeping their skills updated, and sustaining their employability by adopting an attitude of continuous learning (Marock, 2008; Pool & Sewell, 2007). Ferreira (2010) noted that employability as opposed to employment is increasingly becoming a source of psychological security. Marock (2008) highlights the importance of developing employability skills for school leavers and graduates in order to help them to progress in their careers. Many organisations are concerned with their employees' employability these days. Anyone who wishes to gain an advantage at the organisational and individual level has a responsibility to develop and enhance his or her skills in order to increase and sustain employability (Marock, 2008).
Hillage and Pollard (1998, p. 2) define employability as the capability to get and keep fulfilling work. They furthermore note that employability includes the ability to be self-sufficient in the world of work and realise one’s potential through sustainable employment. Pool and Sewell (2007, p. 278) define employability as the possession of a range of skills, knowledge and personal attributes that help people not only to secure a position, but also to be successful in their chosen occupation. To sum up, employability refers to a person’s ability to obtain and sustain an appropriate form of employment.

More and more researchers currently working and studying in the field of career development suggest that individuals need to be more conscious of their work-related capability and career meta-competencies or psychological career resources (Baruch, 2004; Blickle & Witzki, 2008; Hess, Jepsen & Dries, 2011; Hoekstra, 2011; Puffer, 2011; Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). These competencies or resources influence individuals’ general employability. Furthermore, these competencies or resources could play a more vital role than career development planning within the professional environment since technology and knowledge are changing rapidly, the world is becoming more and more global every day, and demographic labour forces and organisational structures are continually changing (Coetzee, 2008).

The term “career meta-competencies” refers to a set of psychological career resources which are critical in career development. Psychological career resources include personal attributes and abilities such as behavioural adaptability, self-knowledge, career orientation awareness, sense of purpose, self-esteem and emotional literacy, which allow individuals to be self-sufficient learners and to manage their own careers in a businesslike manner (Briscoe & Hall, 1999; Coetzee, 2008; Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2007; Hall & Chandler, 2005; Herr, Cramer & Niles, 2004). People who possess a wide range of psychological career resources are generally better able to adapt to changing career circumstances and tend to demonstrate higher levels of employability (Fugate, Kinicki & Ashforth, 2004; Griffen & Hesketh, 2005). De la Harpe, Radloff and Wyber (2000) voice the concern that graduates who enter the workplace do not have the necessary interpersonal skills. Harvey and Bowers-Brown (2004) express the same concern in stating that there is a growing need for a model of personality and employability attributes in order to prepare people more effectively for the world of work.

Zinser (2003) states that employability skills include a range of personality attributes as well as work-related skills. Personality attributes generally include displaying emotional intelligence, high levels of self-esteem and self-confidence, personality preferences and
proactive career-related behavioural attributes. Zinser (2003) argues, furthermore, that people seeking employment need some basic career readiness skills, which include academic, technical and social skills. As far back as the 1950s, Becker and Strauss (1956) noted that age affects employability. Everybody starts at the bottom of the ladder and moves up as they get older. The skill and experience gained as one moves up the career ladder should improve one’s employability. Cole, Field, Giles and Harris (2009) and Harvey (2001) also found that all biographical data, such as age, gender and race, influence a person’s employability. Cranmer (2006) found that employability skills can be taught effectively. All career counselling and career development interventions should include employability-enhancing content in order to increase people’s employability skills at an early stage and therefore improve their chances of obtaining employment (Cranmer, 2006).

According to the cognitive social learning paradigm, and in particular the cognitive-affective theories of Mischel (1999), Rotter (1982) and Worline, Wrzesniewski and Rafaeli (2002), behaviour is shaped by personal dispositions in conjunction with a person’s specific cognitive and affective processes, which may include perceptions of and feelings about themselves in a particular situation that is meaningful to them. Personality traits, together with the situation, predict the behaviour of an individual (Coetzee, 2005). However, personal qualities (such as people’s beliefs about what they can do, their plans and strategies for enacting behaviours, their expectations of success, their self-concept, their positive and negative feelings about themselves, their needs based on their personality preferences and their self-regulating strategies) will override their behaviour in certain circumstances (Coetzee, 2005).

Kerka (1998) suggests that career development is influenced by various factors, such as personality and self-esteem. Industrial psychologists, human resource practitioners and career counsellors should therefore consider these factors when providing career counselling. In addition, many researchers are increasingly emphasising the importance of emotional intelligence in influencing behaviour. Behaviour influences employability. Emotional intelligence could therefore also influence employability (Brown, George-Currant & Smith, 2003; Lambert et al., 2010; Pool & Sewell, 2007).

The concept of personality preferences seems to be partly responsible for explaining people’s career behaviour. Keirsey and Bates (1984) describe personality type as the innate preference of human behaviour, which dictates individual beliefs and behaviour. Myers (1987) argues that an environment that encourages and supports individual innate capacities or preferences supports healthy development. Conversely, a climate that stresses conformity
and rejects nonconformity thwarts the process of personality development. This thwarting process results in a lack of confidence in one’s own personality type. The resulting negative influence on one’s self-esteem results in low self-esteem (Pidduck, 1988).

According to Sharf (1997), various career development theories are derived from theories of personality. Analytical psychology emphasised balance, harmony and wholeness as the aim of personality development. Jung (1921, 1959) states that people differ in the way they react to the external world. Quenk (1996) bears this out by postulating that people use psychological energy differently; they gather information differently, they come to conclusions in a different manner and relate differently to the outside world. People therefore use their minds differently as well. Ford and Collins (2010), and similarly Klimstra, Luysckz, Frijns, Lier and Meeus (2010), found that age, gender and ethnicity do not have a significant influence on personality preferences. It can therefore be generally accepted that people all use their minds differently, irrespective of age, gender or ethnicity. Quenk (1996) notes that people have an inborn, natural preference for a pair of opposite mental functions and attitudes. These preferences create uniquely different personality types. Although people do use all their mental functions, the time and energy they devote to each of the opposite mental functions and attitudes differ from person to person.

Personality type theory explains individuals’ differences in learning and communication styles, conflict management and interpersonal relating styles. The psychological type theory of Myers (1987) explains how the use of four mental functions (sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling) and attitudes (extraversion-introversion, perceiving-judging) can aid a person’s personality development and growth. As previously mentioned, Quenk (1996) states that a person can use all four mental functions effectively, but anyone tends to develop and overuse a dominant mental functioning according to his or her personality type preference. In the process they neglect the development of the other four mental functions which might influence their ability to demonstrate emotional intelligence. Cole et al. (2009) found that personality plays a role in the selection of an employee. They also recognise that a relationship exists between personality preferences and employability. Higgs (2001) suggests that people could develop their weaker personality function and thereby deliver more rounded behaviour, which could possibly influence employability.

As already indicated, a negative personality development may result in low self-esteem. Baumeister (1997, p. 681) defines self-concept as the sum of the inferences that an individual has drawn about himself or herself. These inferences generally refer to an individual’s personality traits and schemas, but they could include an understanding of social
roles and relationships. He also notes that the term self-esteem refers to the evaluative
dimension of the self-concept. Greenwalk, Belleza and Banaji (1998) corroborate this in their
article in which they say that self-esteem is an essential characteristic and one of the most
important elements of the self-concept. Sherman et al. (2009, p. 745) describe self-esteem
as the process by which individuals sustain a sense of self-integrity, which includes a
perception of themselves as globally moral, sufficient and effective when they confront
threats to a valued self-image. According to Kim, Cohen and Au (2010), one can know
oneself both from the inside and from the outside. Baumeister (1997) found that self-esteem
has two sources: One is the evaluative feedback that a person receives from others
(however distorted it may be), and the other is the direct experience of failure or success.

According to Maslow (1970), people have a need for a positive self-esteem (to feel good
about themselves), a need for esteem from others and a need for belongingness (that is, a
sense that others also feel positive about them and that they are accepted by the group). To
develop a positive self-esteem, individuals strive for achievement and mastery of their
sociocultural environment (Coetzee, 2005). In order to be accepted by the group and gain
respect from others, they behave in ways intended to gain them recognition, appreciation
and prestige. People tend to feel confident, competent, strong, useful and needed by others
when their self-esteem needs have been satisfied. On the other hand, when an individual’s
need for self-esteem has not been satisfied, he or she tends to feel inferior, anxious, worried,
depressed, weak and helpless. Orth, Robins and Trzesniewski (2010) found that middle-
aged people have a slightly higher self-esteem than older adults. However, several other
studies have failed to show any significant age-related differences (Brandstader & Greve,
1994; Demo, 1992). Orth et al. (2010) suggest that gender moderates the trajectory of self-
estime across the life span. It appears that gender differences are greater in adolescence
and young adulthood but that the average trajectories of men and women converge in old
age. However, Xu, Farver, Yu and Zhang (2009) reported no gender differences with regard
to self-esteem. Orth et al. (2010) also found that blacks have a higher self-esteem than
whites when they are younger but that these trajectories cross at some point in adulthood
and that blacks experience a much steeper decline in self-esteem than whites in old age.

The humanistic perspectives of Rogers (1980) and Maslow (1970) place particular emphasis
on the motivational aspect of self-esteem and positive self-regard. People conform to social
expectations in order to receive the approval of others, thereby enhancing self-esteem. They
associate with others selectively, choosing those who will provide or confirm a positive self-
evaluation. Self-esteem is enhanced when a person is able to draw favourable comparisons
with other people or with an ideal self, and also when the person is functioning effectively in
his or her physical or social environment (Battle, 1992; Damon, 1995; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1983; Hewitt, 2002; Owens, 1995; Rosenberg, 1979, 1981; Sherman et al., 2009; Swann, 1996; Wills, 1981).

Brockner and Guare (1983) and Kerka (1998) found that a person with a low self-esteem is more likely to perform poorly and achieve less than a person with a high self-esteem. Baumeister (1997) also found that people with a low self-esteem do not seem to have a clear sense of who and what they are and are not confident of succeeding at anything they try. It therefore seems as if people with a low self-esteem would be less likely to have well-developed employability skills than people with a high self-esteem. Brocker and Guare (1983) and Smoll, Smith, Barnett and Everett (1993) found that low self-esteem can be altered through training. It can therefore be concluded that self-esteem could also be taught to graduates and employment seekers through training.

Brown et al. (2003a) found that students with a higher self-esteem display a higher emotional intelligence. They also found that when people possess a high emotional intelligence and self-esteem, they are more likely to perform well in career-related tasks (which could include higher employability skills). Most career counsellors have difficulty with the more complex issues of career counselling such as locus of control, identity formation and emotion (Emmerling & Cherniss, 2003). If emotional intelligence is introduced into the counselling relationship, clients can be helped to understand their own emotions and the way their emotions could influence their behaviour and career-related choices. Emotional intelligence represents a set of dispositional attributes (such as self-awareness, emotional management, self-motivation, empathy and relationship management) for monitoring one’s own feelings, beliefs and internal states and those of others in order to provide useful information to guide one’s own thinking and actions and those of others (Day, 2000; Goleman, 1995, Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Wong & Law, 2002). Salovey and Mayer (1990, p. 185) describe emotional intelligence as the extent to which individuals are able to tap into their feeling and emotions as a source of energy to guide their thinking and actions. Salovey and Mayer (1990) noted that emotional intelligence consists of four interrelated abilities which include perceiving emotions, using emotions to facilitate thoughts, understanding emotions and managing emotions to enhance personal growth.

According to Brown et al. (2003a) and Young, Paselluikho and Valach (1997), the action theory approach to career development explains the role of emotion in career building. According to these authors, emotion motivates and energises actions and behaviour. Ashkanasy and Daus (2005), Dulewicz and Higgs (1999) and Locke (2005) state that
emotional intelligence is a tool for predicting behaviour and is something that develops over a person’s whole life span, but that it can be enhanced through training and, as Jeager (2003) states, through teaching and learning in the educational context. Ford and Collins (2010) reported no age, gender or ethnicity differences with regard to emotional intelligence. Dulewicz and Higgs (1999) also reported no gender and ethnic difference but found a slight age-related difference in this area. Brown et al. (2003a) found that women display higher emotional intelligence than men. The role of emotional intelligence and gender differences needs to be taken into consideration when attempting to teach any person to enhance their emotional intelligence. Coetzee and Beukes (2010) and Kidd (2008) note that very little research appears to have been done on the relationship between emotional intelligence and employability. Ashkanasy and Daus (2002) note the influence of emotional intelligence on the selection of employees and the management of their performance. This suggests a relationship between emotional intelligence and an individual’s employability. Pool and Sewell (2007) and Yorke and Knight (2004) also recognise emotional intelligence as an important attribute of an individual’s employability.

Ciarrochi, Chan and Caputi (2000) and Schutte, Malouff, Simunek, Hollander and McKenley (2002) report a positive correlation between self-esteem and emotional intelligence. The humanistic personality theories of Rogers (1959, 1963) and Maslow (1970) emphasise the need to belong as a strong motivational need, which affects people’s emotional responses to their social life. Baumeister and Leary (1995) note that both the positive and the negative emotions that people experience are linked to the need to belong. It therefore seems as if the psychological type theory of Jung (1921, 1959), the personality type theory of Myers and Briggs (1987), which is an extension of Jung’s theory, and the social cognitive learning theories of Mischel (1999) and Worline et al. (2002) may provide a possible explanation as to why people differ in the demonstration of emotionally intelligent behaviour. The humanistic and social psychology perspectives on the motivational importance of self-esteem in interaction with the social environment may provide additional information on why people differ in their self-evaluations of their emotional intelligence.

In addition, Orth et al. (2010) found a positive relationship between self-esteem and the personality trait of emotional stability. Higgs (2001) found a positive relationship between the personality types outlined in the Myers-Briggs theory (1987) and emotional intelligence. Ciarrochi et al. (2000) also found a number of relationships between emotional intelligence and personality. However, they question whether there is a relationship between self-esteem and both these variables. Given the argument that personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence can be taught and learnt, and the fact that there is a growing need to
develop and enhance employability skills, a career meta-competency model constituting individuals’ personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and their employability attributes would be a valuable resource in career counselling. The outcomes of this research could potentially serve as a guideline to assist industrial psychologists, human resource professionals and career guidance practitioners involved in career counselling in guiding individuals towards managing and sustaining their employability in the contemporary turbulent and uncertain career context.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

In view of the foregoing, this research study aims to extend research on career development and career counselling concerned with enhancing individuals’ employability by investigating the relationship dynamics between their personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence (as a composite set of personality attributes) and their employability attributes. It is proposed that investigating this relationship may assist with the design of a career meta-competency model for sustained employability in the career counselling context. It is evident from the theoretical background discussed above that an understanding of how individuals’ personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) relate to their employability attributes may potentially influence their employability and help to increase their chances of obtaining, creating and sustaining employment.

A review of the current literature on the personality attributes of personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes points to the following research problems:

- Theoretical models do not clarify the relationship between personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes in a single study.
- Industrial and organisational psychologists lack knowledge of the theoretical and empirical relationship between personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes, particularly in the South African multicultural context.
- The specific nature of the relationship between personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes and the implications for career counselling practices aimed at enhancing individuals’ employability is not known in full, particularly in the South African context—hence the need for investigation. These constructs may be used to develop a career meta-competency
model that could inform career counselling practices aimed at helping individuals develop and sustain their employability.

It would appear that research on the relationship dynamics between personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence (as a composite set of personality attributes) and individuals' employability attributes will make a significant contribution to the discipline of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, particularly with regard to career counselling practices. Finally, empirical results could add to the body of knowledge concerned with facilitating the possible emergence of a new genre of career counselling practices to cultivate proactive, self-directed career behaviour in the contemporary work context.

The problem statement gave rise to the following general research question, from which the specific research questions outlined below were derived:

What are the relationship dynamics between individuals’ personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, and emotional intelligence) and their employability attributes, and can an overall career meta-competency profile be constructed to inform career counselling practices in the multicultural South African organisation context?

From the above, the following research questions were formulated in terms of the literature review and empirical study:

1.2.1 Research questions with regard to the literature review

In terms of the literature review, the specific research questions are as follows:

**Research question 1:** How does the literature conceptualise the contemporary employment context in the 21st century?

**Research question 2:** How are the personality attributes constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence and the employability attributes construct conceptualised and explained by theoretical models in the literature?

**Research question 3:** What is the nature of the theoretical relationship between the personality attributes constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence and the employability attributes construct, and how can this relationship be explained in terms of an integrated theoretical model?
Research question 4: Can a conceptual career meta-competency model be proposed based on the theoretical relationship dynamics between the personality attributes constructs (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct?

Research question 5: What are the implications of the theoretical career meta-competency model for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices and specifically career counselling practices in the contemporary employment context?

1.2.2 Research questions with regard to the empirical study

In terms of the empirical study, the specific research questions are as follows:

Research question 1: What is the nature of the statistical interrelationships between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables as manifested in a sample of respondents in a typical South African organisational setting?

Research question 2: What is the nature of the overall statistical relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) as a composite set of independent latent variables and the employability attributes construct variables as a composite set of dependent latent variables?

Research question 3: Do the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables?

Research question 4: Based on the overall statistical relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables, is there a good fit between the elements of the empirically manifested structural model and the theoretically hypothesised model?

Research question 5: Do the biographical variables (age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status) significantly moderate the relationship between the personality attributes construct and the employability attributes construct variables?
**Research question 6:** Do significant differences exist between the subgroups of biographical variables that acted as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and the employability attributes construct variables as manifested in the sample of respondents?

**Research question 7:** What recommendations can be formulated for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices, specifically career counselling practices, and for possible future research based on the findings of this research project?

### 1.3 AIMS OF THE RESEARCH

From the above research questions, the following aims were formulated:

#### 1.3.1 General aim of the research

The general aim of this research was to determine the relationship dynamics between individuals' personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and their employability attributes, and establish whether an overall career meta-competency profile can be constructed to inform career counselling practices in the multicultural South African organisation context. The study further aimed to determine whether individuals from different age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status groups differ significantly with regard to their personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and their employability attributes.

#### 1.3.2 Specific aims of the research

The following were the specific aims for the literature review and the empirical study:

**1.3.2.1 Literature review**

In terms of the literature review, the specific aims are:

**Research aim 1:** To conceptualise the contemporary employment context in the 21st century.
**Research aim 2:** To conceptualise the personality attributes constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence and the employability attributes construct.

**Research aim 3:** To conceptualise the nature of the theoretical relationship between the personality attributes constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem, and emotional intelligence and the employability attributes constructs, and explain the relationship in terms of an integrated theoretical model.

**Research aim 4:** To construct a conceptual career meta-competency model based on the theoretical relationship dynamics between the personality attributes constructs (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct.

**Research aim 5:** To outline the implications of the theoretical career meta-competency model for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices and specifically career counselling practices in the contemporary employment context.

**Research aim 6:** To investigate whether significant differences exist between the subgroups of the biographical variables that acted as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and employability construct variables as manifested in the sample of respondents.

**Research aim 7:** To formulate recommendations for the discipline of Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices and specifically career counselling practices and make recommendations on possible future research based on the findings of this research project.

### 1.3.2.2 Empirical study

In terms of the empirical study, the specific aims are:

**Research aim 1:** To empirically determine the nature of the statistical interrelationships between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables as manifested in a sample of respondents in a typical South African organisational setting.
Research aim 2: To empirically assess the nature of the overall statistical relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) as a composite set of independent latent variables and the employability attributes construct variables as a composite set of dependent latent variables.

Research aim 3: To determine whether the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables.

Research aim 4: Based on the overall statistical relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables, to assess whether a good fit exists between the elements of the empirically manifested structural model and the theoretically hypothesised model.

Research aim 5: To determine whether the biographical variables (age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status) significantly moderate the relationship between the personality attributes construct and employability attributes construct variables.

Research aim 6: To determine whether significant differences exist between the subgroups of biographical variables that acted as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and the employability attributes construct variables as manifested in the sample of respondents.

Research aim 7: To formulate conclusions based on the findings, and make recommendations for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices, specifically career counselling practices and for possible future research based on the findings of this research project.

1.4 STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence (as a composite set of personality attributes) appear to have an influence on a person’s employability attributes. No integrated theoretical and empirical model explaining the relationship dynamics between the personality attributes and employability attributes constructs has yet been researched. This research is a starting point in looking for a relationship between these constructs in the South African employment context.
This study may prove useful on a theoretical, empirical and practical level.

1.4.1 Contribution on a theoretical level

On a theoretical level, if readers of this study develop a better understanding of the constructs of personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and employability attributes and the way these relate to individuals’ sustained employability in the contemporary world of work, then the outcomes are significant enough to justify the pursuit of this study. Positive outcomes from the proposed research could include raising awareness of the fact that individuals in the workplace have different personalities and differ with regard to their self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes, and that these constructs are important in career counselling practices aimed at helping individuals to sustain their employability in a turbulent and uncertain employment context.

Where relationships are found between the variables, the findings may prove useful to future researchers in exploring the possibility of effectively creating a career counselling intervention to develop a person’s personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes in order to increase their employability. Furthermore, the research results could contribute to the body of knowledge concerned with psychological factors that may possibly increase a person’s employability.

If no relationships are found, then the usefulness of this study is restricted to the elimination of a relationship between the personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and employability attributes, and energy can be transferred to other research studies and avenues that could yield significant evidence that could help to answer the question of what attributes are important in career counselling concerned with individuals’ employability.

1.4.2 Contribution on an empirical level

On an empirical or methodological level, this study may prove useful because of the empirical interrelationships found between firstly, the set of personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence), secondly, the personality attributes construct and the employability attributes construct, and thirdly, whether individuals’ biographical characteristics (age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status) moderate the relationship between the personality attributes and employability attributes constructs. If significant relationships are found, then the findings will be useful in
informing industrial psychologists, career counsellors and human resource practitioners what psychological and biographical aspects play a role in people’s employability. These results could prove valuable in constructing an empirically tested career meta-competency model that can be used in career counselling and development practices in the contemporary employment context.

1.4.3 Contribution on a practical level

On a practical level, the study could establish whether individuals from different age, gender and cultural groups differ in terms of their personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and employability attributes. Considering the current organisational context which is characterised by cultural and generational diversity, the results may be valuable in the career development and career counselling context.

In terms of both the personality and employability attributes constructs, a career-competency model could point to an ideal personality and employability attributes profile on a cognitive, affective, conative and interpersonal behavioural level that may potentially enhance a person’s employability. Industrial psychologists, human resource practitioners and career guidance counsellors and whoever else is involved in career counselling and development could use such a model during their counselling to point out areas for further development to increase employability.

In summary, industrial psychologists, career counsellors and human resource practitioners could be more aware of various factors that influence individuals’ employability. Cultural differences with regard to personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes could be explored. Furthermore, industrial psychologists or career counsellors could use this information during career counselling to help an employee or potential applicant to increase their employability.

This research is breaking new ground because, as of date, there is no existing study on the relationship dynamics between personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence (as a composite set of personality attributes) and individuals’ employability attributes as an integrated set of career meta-competencies. Although studies have been done with regard to the relationship between personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional competencies, the relationship has never been tested in relation to the employability attributes construct in the South African organisational and career counselling context.
1.5 RESEARCH MODEL

The research model of Mouton and Marais (1996) was employed as the framework for this research. It aims to incorporate the five dimensions of social science research, namely the sociological, ontological, teleological, epistemological and methodological dimensions, and to systematise them within the framework of the research process. The five dimensions are aspects of one and the same process, namely research.

The assumption of this model is that it represents a social process. According to Mouton and Marais (1996), social sciences research is a collaborative human activity in which social reality is studied objectively with the aim of gaining a valid understanding of it. The model is described as a systems theoretical model with three subsystems which are interrelated and are related to the research domain of a specific discipline—in this case Industrial Psychology. The subsystems represent the intellectual climate, the market of intellectual resources, and the research process itself.

1.6 PARADIGMATIC PERSPECTIVE OF THE RESEARCH

A paradigm in the social sciences includes the accepted theories, models, body of research and the methodologies of a specific perspective (Mouton, 2001). Their origin is mainly philosophical and is neither testable nor meant to be tested. The present study was conducted in the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology.

1.6.1 The intellectual climate

The literature review was presented from the perspective of the analytical (psychodynamic) paradigm, the humanistic paradigm and the cognitive social learning paradigm. The empirical study was presented from the positivist research paradigm.

1.6.1.1 Literature review

The literature review was presented from the following paradigmatic perspectives:

(a) The analytical paradigm (psychodynamics)

The basic assumptions of the analytical paradigm are the following (Feist & Feist, 2009):
Humans are complex beings with many opposite poles. No one is completely introverted or totally extraverted; all male or all female; solely a thinking, feeling, sensing, or intuitive person; and no one proceeds invariably in the direction of either progression or regression.

People are motivated partly by conscious thoughts, partly by images from their personal unconscious, and partly by latent memory traces inherited from the ancestral past. Their motivation comes from both causal and teleological factors.

All people have some limited capacity to determine their lives. Through their will and with great courage, they can explore the hidden recesses of their psyche. People can recognise their shadow as their own, become partially conscious of their feminine or masculine side, and cultivate more than a single mental function.

The purpose of personality development is individuation or self-realisation, the goal of bringing the opposing forces into balance.

Thematically this paradigmatic perspective relates to the variable personality preferences.

**The humanistic paradigm**

The basic assumptions of the humanistic paradigm are the following (Quitmann, 1985):

- People are responsible beings with the freedom of will to choose between various options.
- People are involved in a dynamic and ongoing growth process, in which they try to realise their potential and to be truly themselves.
- Individuals should be studied as an integrated whole.
- Individuals should be seen as dignified beings.
- The nature of humans is positive; individuals participate actively in determining their own behaviour.
- Human existence is intentional. This forms the basis of human identity.

Thematically this paradigmatic perspective relates to the variables of self-esteem and employability attributes.

**The cognitive social learning paradigm**

The basic assumptions of the cognitive social learning paradigm are the following (Mischel, 1999):
Humans have the capacity to exercise control over the nature and quality of their lives. People are forward-looking, purposive, unified, cognitive, affective, and social animals who are capable of evaluating present experiences and anticipating future events on the basis of the goals they have chosen for themselves.

People are the producers as well as the products of social systems. They shape their social and cultural environments through their individual efforts, by proxy, and by their collective efforts.

Personality is moulded by an interaction of behaviour, personal factors (especially cognition), and the environment. People have the capacity to think, anticipate, plan, and evaluate their actions. Although the environment may help shape behaviour, cognitive and behavioural factors interact with environmental forces to produce human performance.

People have the capacity for reflective self-consciousness; not only can they think but they can think about thinking.

Cognitive factors, such as expectancies, subjective perceptions, values, goals, and personal standards, play an important role in shaping personality.

Behaviour stems from relatively stable personal dispositions and cognitive-affective processes interacting with a particular situation.

Apparent inconsistencies in a person’s behaviour are due neither to random error nor solely to the situation. Rather, they are potentially predictable behaviours that reflect stable patterns of variation with a person. A person’s behaviour will change from situation to situation but in a meaningful manner.

According to Mischel (1999), cognitive-affective units include people’s encoding strategies, or their way of constructing and categorising information; their competencies and self-regulatory plans; their expectancies and beliefs about the perceived consequences of their actions; their goals and values; and their affective responses.

Thematically this paradigmatic perspective relates to the variable of emotional intelligence.

1.6.1.2 Empirical research

The empirical research will be presented from the positivist research paradigm.

According to the positivists, there is a straightforward relationship between the world (objects, events, phenomena) and an individual's perception and understanding of it (Willig,
Positivists are of the opinion that it is possible to describe what is out in the world and to get it right. This belief suggests that phenomena directly determine our perception and that a direct correspondence exists between things and their representation. This is also referred to as the correspondence theory of truth (Willig, 2001). According to Kirk and Miller (1986) and Willig (2001), the following are the important assumptions of the positivist research paradigm:

- The external world itself determines the only correct view that can be taken of it, independent of the process or circumstances of viewing.
- The goal of research is to produce objective knowledge.
- Observation and description are necessarily selective and an individual’s perception and understanding of the world is therefore partial at best.

Thematically, the empirical study will deal with the relationship dynamics between two sets of variables, namely a set of independent variables which comprises personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence (as a composite set of personality attributes) and employability attributes as the dependent variables.

1.6.2 Market of intellectual resources

The market of intellectual resources refers to the collection of beliefs that have a direct bearing on the epistemic states of scientific statements (Mouton & Marais, 1996). For the purpose of this study the following are presented: the theoretical models, metatheoretical statements, conceptual descriptions about personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence (as the set of personality attributes) and employability attributes, central hypothesis and theoretical and methodological assumptions.

1.6.2.1 Metatheoretical statements

The metatheoretical statements represent an important category of assumptions underlying the theories, models and paradigms of this research. Metatheoretical values and beliefs have become part of the intellectual climate of each particular discipline in the social sciences (Mouton & Marais, 1994:21). Metatheoretical statements are presented on the following disciplines:
**a) Industrial and Organisational Psychology**

This study is undertaken in the context of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, which is conceptually described as the application of psychological principles, theory and research to the work setting. It includes a study of the factors that influence work behaviour, such as sociocultural influences, employment-related legislation, personality, gender, race/culture, and life span development (Landy & Conte, 2004). The study examines the relationship between people’s personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence (as a set of personality attributes) and their employability attributes.

The industrial psychologist recognises the interdependence of individuals, organisations and society and the impact of factors such as increasing government influences, growing consumer awareness, skills shortages, and the changing nature of the workforce. The industrial psychologist facilitates responses to issues and problems involving people at work by serving as an adviser and catalyst for business, industry, labour, public, academic, community, and health organisations. The industrial psychologist is a scientist who derives principles of individual, group and organisational behaviour through research; a consultant and staff psychologist who develops scientific knowledge and applies it to solve problems at work; and a teacher who trains in the research and application of Industrial and Organisational Psychology (Landy & Conte, 2004).

The relevant subfields of Industrial and Organisational Psychology included in this research are Career Psychology, Personnel Psychology and Psychometrics.

**b) Career Psychology**

Career psychology is the study of career development and career behaviour as an integral part of human development. According to Greenhaus, Callanan and Godshalk (2010), career development refers to an ongoing process by which an individual progresses through a series of stages, each of which is characterised by a relatively unique set of issues, themes or tasks. This study has relevance in the field of career psychology because it supports the need for an overall conceptual framework for career development. The influence of people’s personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence on their employability attributes will be investigated from a thematic perspective.
Within the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, the study of Personnel Psychology is concerned with the measurement of the personality characteristics of individuals. The study of personality focuses on the characteristics of individuals and the similarities and differences between people (John & Gross, 2004).

Personnel Psychology focuses on the psychological elements of the employee (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2010). Differences between people’s personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes will be investigated.

This branch of Psychology relates to the principles and practices of psychological measurement, such as the development and standardisation of psychological tests and related statistical procedures (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2010). Psychometrics enables researchers to measure behaviour in various forms, providing different explanations for inter- and intrapersonal functioning.

In this study, questionnaires are used to measure individuals’ personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes.

The theoretical beliefs which are described here are testable statements about the what (prescriptive) and why (interpretive) of human behaviour and social phenomena. These include all statements which form part of hypotheses, typologies, models, theories and conceptual descriptions (Mouton & Marais, 1996).

In this research the theoretical models will be based on the following:

The literature review on personality preferences will be presented from the perspective of the Psychological Type theory of Jung (1921, 1959) and the Personality Type theory of Myers and Briggs (1987).

In terms of the literature review on self-esteem and employability, the specific theories that will be reviewed are Roger's (1959, 1963) and Maslow's (1970) conceptualisation of self-
esteem, classical and contemporary viewpoints on self-esteem and related constructs such as self and social identity. The self-esteem model of James Battle (1992) will apply to this research. The underlying strength of this model is its applicability to the work setting.

The literature review on emotional intelligence will be presented from the perspective of the cognitive-affective personality system of Mischel (1999) and the dynamic self-regulation system of Worline et al. (2002). The emotional intelligence model of Mayer and Salovey (1990) will apply in this research.

The literature review on employability attributes will be presented from the employability attributes model of Bezuidenhout (2010), which was developed in the South African context. The models of Fugate et al. (2004), Van der Heijde and Van der Heijden (2006) and Beukes (2010) will also be briefly discussed.

1.6.2.3 Conceptual descriptions

The following conceptual descriptions serve as points of departure for discussions in this research:

(a) Employability attributes

In the context of the present study, employability is regarded as a psychosocial construct representing the career-related characteristics or attributes which promote adaptive cognition, behaviour and affect, and enhance an individual’s suitability for appropriate and sustained employment opportunities (Bezuidenhout 2010; Coetzee, 2010; Fugate et al 2004; Yorke & Knight 2007). The construct employability attributes refers to a set of eight attributes that are regarded as important for individuals to develop to manage and sustain their employability. These constructs include the following: career self-management, cultural competence, self-efficacy, career resilience, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy (Coetzee, 2010).

(b) Emotional intelligence

Mayer, Caruso and Salovey (2004) define emotional intelligence as the set of abilities that account for the way people’s emotional perceptions and understanding vary in accuracy. Emotional intelligence is seen as the ability to perceive and express emotions, to understand
emotion in thought and to assimilate and reason with emotion. In addition, emotional intelligence is the ability to regulate emotions in oneself and in others.

(c) **Personality attributes**

In this context of this study the term personality attributes is used to refer to the construct of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence.

(d) **Personality**

Personality refers to the human psyche as defined by Jung (1959, 1971). The psyche is seen as a complex network of systems interacting with each other. Psychic energy flows continually from one system to another, in a constant striving for harmony. Personality development is viewed as a dynamic process, which takes place throughout life as the primary development task of a person’s individuation or self-actualisation (Jung, 1959, 1971).

(e) **Personality preferences**

Personality preferences are defined as patterns in the way people prefer to perceive and make judgments (Jung, 1971, 1990). Apart from a dominant attitude, each person uses the mental functions of perception and judgment (or decision-making) consciously, and in a specific way, when observing his or her world and assigning meaning to the experience (Jung, 1971, 1990).

Based on Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971, 1990) theory of psychological types and Myers and Briggs’ (Myers, 1987) theory of personality types, personality preferences are defined for the purposes of this research as the dominant and conscious attitude or predisposition to either act (in the case of a dominant extraverted attitude) or react (in the case of a dominant introverted attitude) in a characteristic direction when (a) observing one’s outer world (which may be directed towards either seeking sensory data or being guided by inspirational hunches) and (b) assigning meaning to each experience (which may entail either the subjective evaluation of experiences in terms of emotions or the objective, logical and reasonable interpretation of people, things and events).
Self-esteem

Self-esteem, in the context of this research, is defined as a socially constructed emotion denoting feelings and perceptions about one’s multiple self-concepts and self-images, which are based on the psychological need for acceptance and belonging within one’s social group, the desire for efficacious and authentic functioning, competence and achievement in comparison to other members of one’s group (Battle, 1992; Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Hewitt, 2002; Maslow, 1970).

1.6.2.4 Central hypothesis

The central hypothesis of the research can be formulated as follows:

The overall relationship dynamics between an individual’s personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and employability attributes constitutes a career meta-competency profile that informs career counselling practices aimed at helping individuals to sustain their employability. Individuals from different age, gender, cultural, marital status, job level and employment status groups will differ significantly with regard to their personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes.

1.6.2.5 Theoretical assumptions

Based on the literature review, the following theoretical assumptions are addressed in this research:

- There is a need for basic research that seeks to isolate individuals’ employability attributes in relation to their personality attributes: (a) personality preferences, (b) self-esteem and (c) emotional intelligence.
- Personality type development, self-esteem development, the development of emotional intelligence and employability attributes are a process, not an end product.
- Environmental, biographical and psychological factors such as sociocultural background, race/ethnicity, gender, life span development, personality, self-esteem and emotional intelligence will influence an individual’s employability attributes.
• Poor personality type development is a major underlying reason for low self-esteem and low emotional intelligence, both of which may negatively influence the development and expression of employability attributes.
• High self-esteem is a major underlying reason for overestimation in self-evaluation and emotional intelligence.
• The construct of self-esteem is multidimensional and can be modified by external factors.
• Knowing an individual's personality preferences, particularly the dominant and non-preferred functions, will increase understanding of his or her global personality profile and level of employability attributes.
• Personality preferences reveal themselves in a bipolar mode along a continuum.

1.6.2.6 Methodological assumptions

Methodological assumptions are beliefs concerning the nature of social science and scientific research. Methodological beliefs are more than methodological preferences, assumptions and presuppositions about what ought to constitute good research. There is a direct link between methodological beliefs and the epistemic status of research findings (Mouton & Marais, 1996). The following main epistemological assumptions are the methodological assumptions that affect the nature and structure of the research domain; they relate to methodological choices, assumptions and suppositions that make for good research.

(a) Sociological dimension

The sociological dimension conforms to the requirements of the sociological research ethic, which draws on the research community for sources of theory development. Within the bounds of the sociological dimension research is experimental or non-experimental, analytical and exact, since the issues that are being studied are subject to quantitative research and analysis (Mouton & Marais, 1996). This research will be non-experimental in nature and will focus on the quantitative analysis of variables and concepts that will be described in chapters 7 (empirical research) and 8 (research results).
(b) **Ontological dimension**

The ontological dimension of research encompasses that which is investigated in reality. It relates to the study of human activities and institutions whose behaviour can be measured. This research measures properties of the constructs of personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes.

(c) **The teleological dimension**

This dimension suggests that research should be systematic in nature and goal-directed. It is important, therefore, to state the problem being investigated and relate it to the research goals. The research goals are explicit in this research, namely to assess the relationship between the personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes constructs. Furthermore, in practical terms the teleological dimension of this research project aims to further the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology by contributing knowledge that can enable an individual to make himself/herself more employable.

(d) **The epistemological dimension**

According to Mouton and Marais (1996), this dimension relates to the quest for truth. A primary aim of research in the social sciences is to generate valid findings that approximate reality as closely as possible. This research attempts to achieve this truth through a good research design and the achievement of reliable and valid results.

(e) **The methodological dimension**

Methodological assumptions are beliefs concerning the nature of social science and scientific research. Methodological beliefs are more than the methodological preferences, assumptions and presuppositions about what ought to constitute sound research (Mouton & Marais, 1996). An optimal research design incorporating relevant methods will be used to test the theoretical hypothesis. Research methodologies can be classified as qualitative and/or quantitative.

In this research, both methods are used. Qualitative (exploratory) research is presented in the form of a literature review on personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence
and employability attributes. Quantitative (descriptive and explanatory) research is presented in the empirical study.

1.7 RESEARCH DESIGN

According to Terre Blanche and Durrheim (2002), research design is a strategic framework which serves as a bridge between research questions and the execution of the research. The research design is discussed with reference to the types of research conducted, and this is followed by a discussion of validity and reliability.

1.7.1 Exploratory research

According to Mouton and Marais (1996), the object of exploratory research is to gather information from a relatively unknown field. The key issues are to gain new insights, establish central concepts and constructs, and then establish priorities. This research is exploratory in that it compares various theoretical perspectives on personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes.

1.7.2 Descriptive research

Descriptive research refers to the in-depth description of the individual, situation, group, organisation, culture, subculture, interactions or social objects (Mouton & Marais, 1996). Its purpose is to classify systematically the relationships between variables in the research domain. The overriding aim is to describe issues as accurately as possible.

Descriptive research refers to the in-depth description of the individual, situation, group, organisation, culture, subculture, interactions or social objects (Mouton & Marais, 1994, pp. 43-44). In the empirical study, descriptive research is provided in terms of the biographical characteristics of the sample of participants and their mean scores on the various measuring instruments.

1.7.3 Explanatory research

Explanatory research goes further than merely indicating the relationship that exists between the variables (Mouton & Marais, 1996). It indicates the direction of the relationship in a causal relationship model. The researcher seeks to explain the direction of the relationship. This form of research was applied in the empirical study of the relationship between the
personality attributes construct (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the construct of employability attributes as manifested in a group of adult subjects.

The end goal of the research is to formulate a conclusion on the relationship dynamics between the constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence (as a composite set of personality attributes) and employability attributes with the view to construct an empirically tested career meta-competency model. This research will therefore aim to fulfil the requirements for explanatory research as outlined above.

1.7.4 Validity

The aim of research design is to plan and structure the research project in a way that ensures that the literature review and empirical study are valid in terms of the variables in the study (Mouton & Marais, 1996). According to Terre Blanche and Durrheim (2002), both internal and external validity are important and desirable in a research design. For research to be internally valid, the constructs must be measured in a valid manner and the data measured must be accurate and reliable.

Ensuring validity requires making a series of informed decisions about the purpose of the research, theoretical paradigms that will be used in the research, the context within which the research will take place and the research techniques that will be used to collect and analyse data (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2002).

1.7.4.1 Validity with regard to the literature review

The validity of the literature review will be ensured by using literature that is relevant and up to date in terms of the research topic, problem statement and aims. Every attempt will be made to search for and make use of the most recent literature sources, although both classical and contemporary mainstream research publications may be referred to, because of their relevance to the conceptualisation of the constructs that are relevant to this research.

1.7.4.2 Validity with regard to the empirical research

In the empirical research, validity was ensured through the use of appropriate and standardised measuring instruments. The measuring instruments were critically examined for their criterion-related validity (to ensure accurate prediction of scores on the relevant
criterion), content validity and construct validity (the extent to which the measuring instruments measure the theoretical constructs they purport to measure).

### 1.7.5 Reliability

Reliability is the extent to which a test is repeatable and yields consistent results as indicated by what is measurable. Reliability in the literature review was addressed by using existing literature sources, theories and models that are available to researchers (Foxcroft & Roodt, 2005). Reliability of the empirical study was ensured through the use of a representative sample.

In this research, disturbance variables were minimised through the sampling procedure and through the inclusion of instruments whose reliability has been proven by previous research.

### 1.7.6 The unit of research

In the social sciences, the most common object of research is the individual human being (Mouton & Marais, 1996). The unit of analysis distinguishes between the characteristics, conditions, orientations and actions of individuals, groups, organisations and social artefacts (Mouton & Marais, 1996). In terms of individual measurement, the unit of analysis is the individual. In terms of investigating the difference between biographical groups, the unit of analysis is the subgroup.

### 1.7.7 The variables

This research attempted to measure the relationship between a composite set of personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) as the independent variables, and a set of employability attributes as the dependent variables.

The research also attempted to measure the interrelationship between the variables that constitute the set of personality attributes and the relationship between each of the personality attributes variables and the employability attributes variables:

- Personality preferences (independent variable) and self-esteem (independent variable).
- Personality preferences (independent variable) and emotional intelligence (independent variable).
• Personality preferences (independent variable) and employability attributes (dependent variable).
• Self-esteem (independent variable) and emotional intelligence (independent variable).
• Self-esteem (independent variable) and employability attributes (dependent variable).
• Emotional intelligence (independent variable) and employability attributes (dependent variable).

The research also attempted to assess whether age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status act as moderating variables of the relationship between personality attributes (independent variables) and employability attributes (dependent variables).

Figure 1.1 provides an overview of the core research variables and the relationships investigated.

According to Terre Blanche and Durrheim (2002), an independent variable is the element considered, manipulated or chosen by the researcher to establish its relationship with a practical phenomenon, the dependent variable.

In order to measure the relationship between the dependent and independent variables, criterion data on independent and dependent variables were collected by means of the criteria forms (the measuring instruments) selected for the purpose of this research.
The study was confined to research dealing with the relationship between two core constructs, namely personality attributes and employability attributes, each consisting of a set of variables. The personality attributes construct comprises the variables of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence. The employability attributes construct comprises the variables of career self-management, cultural competence, career resilience, sociability, self-efficacy, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy. In an attempt to transverse factors that could influence an individual’s personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes, the variables used as control variables were limited to age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status.
No attempt has been made to manipulate or classify any of the information, results or data on the basis of family or spiritual background. Factors relating to disability or illness, physical or psychological, have not been included in any classification process either. The study is intended as a ground research project that restricts its focus to the relationship between the personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and employability attributes. If such a relationship is indeed identified, the groundwork information could be useful to future researchers in addressing other issues relating to the constructs. The selected research approach is not intended to establish the cause and effect of the relationship, but is merely an endeavour to investigate whether such a relationship does in fact exist and whether the relationship between the various constructs is influenced by variables such as age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status.

1.7.9 Ethical considerations

According to De Vos, Delport, Fouche and Strydom (2011), ethics is defined as a set of moral principles which refer to the quality of research procedures with regard to adherence to professional, legal and social obligations to the research participants. The procedures that are followed in the proposed research adhere to all the ethical requirements that are necessary to ensure ethical responsibility.

To ensure that the researcher meets the ethical requirements, the following ethical principles were adhered to (De Vos et al., 2011):

- Research was conducted within recognised parameters.
- Approval was obtained from the host institution.
- Permission was obtained from the research ethics committee of the particular organisation.
- Both classical and recent resources were used to analyse and describe the concepts.
- Experts in the field of research were consulted to ensure a scientific research process.
- All sources were cited.
- An informed agreement was entered into with the participants.
- Participants were informed about the results of the research.
- Access to appropriate information on the research was provided by reporting the research process and findings in the form of a thesis.
1.8 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted in two phases, each consisting of different steps.

PHASE 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

*Step 1: The contemporary employment context*

An evaluation was made of the contemporary world of work in the 21st century and the changing employment context. Emphasis was placed on individual accountability as a response to the changing context. Finally, the background for the construction of a career meta-competency model for sustained employability was provided.

*Step 2: Personality preferences*

A critical evaluation was made of Jung’s (1921, 1959) psychological type theory and research relating to the construct of personality preferences (Myers, 1987) and other related constructs. Based on this conceptualisation of the construct of personality preferences, a conceptual model was put together to illustrate the principles and concepts discussed in the literature. Finally, the implications for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices, and specifically career counselling and development practices, were discussed.

*Step 3: Self-esteem*

A critical evaluation was made of Humanistic, classical and contemporary Social Psychology theories and research relating to the construct of self-esteem. Based on these conceptualisations of the construct of self-esteem, a conceptual model was put together to illustrate the principles and concepts discussed in the literature. Finally, the implications for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices, and specifically career counselling and development practices, were discussed.

*Step 4: Emotional intelligence*

A critical evaluation was firstly made of cognitive social learning theories relating to the understanding and conceptualisation of emotional intelligence. Based on these perspectives, a conceptual model was put together to illustrate the philosophical principles and concepts relevant to emotional competence. Finally, the implications for Industrial and Organisational
Psychology practices, and specifically career counselling and development practices, were discussed.

Step 5: Employability attributes

A critical evaluation was made of theories on the construct of employability attributes in the career psychology literature. Based on these conceptualisations of the construct of employability, a conceptual model was put together to illustrate the principles and concepts discussed in the literature. Finally, the implications for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices, and specifically career counselling and development practices, were discussed.

Step 6: Constructing a theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency model by an integration of the constructs of personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and employability attributes

This step relates to the theoretical integration of the constructs of personality attributes (personality preference, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes with the formulation of a theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency profile that may be used to inform career counselling and development practices. The implications for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices, and specifically career counselling and development practices, were also explored.

PHASE 2: THE EMPIRICAL STUDY

The research took the form of a quantitative survey design comprising the nine steps outlined below. Some of the advantages of a survey design are that it is cost-effective and a large number of respondents can be surveyed.

Step 1: Determination and description of the sample

Chapter 7 discusses the determination and description of the sample in more detail.

Step 2: Choosing and motivating the psychometric battery

A biographical questionnaire containing data regarding age, gender and race was used in addition to the four quantitative instruments. The instruments used were the Myers-Briggs
Type Indicator (MBTI) Form M (Myers, 1987); the Culture-free-self-esteem Inventories for Adults (CFSEI – AD) (Battle, 1992); Assessing Emotions Scale (Schutte, Mallouf & Bhullar, 2007) and the Employability Attributes Scale (Bezuidenhout & Coetzee, 2011).

Step 3: Administration of the psychometric battery

Chapter 7 discusses the administration of the psychometric battery in more detail.

Step 4: Scoring the psychometric battery

The responses of subjects to each of the items in the four questionnaires were captured in an electronic spreadsheet format. All data were analysed by means of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, 2008) and Statistical Analysis Software (SAS, 2008).

Step 5: Formulation of research hypotheses

The research hypotheses are formulated in order to achieve the objectives of the study.

Step 6: Statistical processing of data

Chapter 7 discusses the statistical processing of the data in more detail.

Step 7: Reporting and interpreting the results

Results are presented in tables, diagrams and/or graphs and the discussion of the findings are presented in a systematic framework, ensuring that the interpretation of the findings was conveyed in a clear and articulate manner. Chapter 8 reports on and discusses the results.

Step 8: Integration of the research findings

The findings relating to the literature review have been integrated with the findings from the empirical research to create integrated overall findings.

Step 9: Formulation of conclusions, limitations, and recommendations

The final step relates to conclusions based on the results and their integration with theory. The limitations of the research are discussed, and recommendations are made in terms of
personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes as they relate to career counselling and development for sustained employability.

1.9 CHAPTER DIVISION

The chapters are presented in the following manner:

Chapter 2: Metatheoretical framework: The contemporary employment context

This chapter serves to contextualise the present study by outlining the metatheoretical context that forms the definitive boundary of the research. The literature review therefore focuses on the changing work context and the 21st century world of work.

Chapter 3: Personality preferences

The literature review focuses on the conceptualisation of personality preferences. The development of personality preference theory is outlined, together with the emerging types and models of personality preferences. Lastly, the implications of personality preferences and their relationship with self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes and the implications for career counselling and development are outlined.

Chapter 4: Self-esteem

The literature review focuses on the conceptualisation of the construct of self-esteem. The development of self-esteem theory is outlined, together with the emerging types and models of the construct of self-esteem. Lastly, the implications of self-esteem and its relationship with personality preferences, emotional intelligence and employability attributes and the implications for career counselling and development are outlined.

Chapter 5: Emotional intelligence

The literature review focuses on the conceptualisation of emotional intelligence. The development of emotional intelligence theory is outlined, together with the emerging types and models of emotional intelligence. Lastly, the implications of emotional intelligence and its relationship with personality preferences, self-esteem and employability attributes and implications for career counselling and development are outlined.
Chapter 6: Employability attributes

The literature review focuses on the conceptualisation of employability attributes. Various employability models as explained in the career literature are discussed. Lastly, the implications of employability attributes and their relationship with personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence and the implications for career counselling and development are outlined.

Integration of the literature review: constructing a theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency model

The purpose of the theoretical integration of the constructs of personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes is to formulate a conceptual framework describing the theoretical relationship between these constructs and to propose a theoretical career meta-competency model for career counselling purposes to enhance people’s employability. The implications for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices regarding career counselling and development are highlighted.

Chapter 7: Empirical research

The purpose is to describe the empirical research. Firstly, the aims of the empirical research are stated and an overview of the population and sample of the study is presented. The measuring instruments are discussed and the choice of each justified, followed by a description of the data gathering and processing. Finally, the research hypotheses are formulated.

Chapter 8: Research results

This chapter discusses the statistical results of this study and integrates the empirical research findings with the literature review. The statistical results are reported and interpreted in terms of descriptive, explanatory and inferential statistics. The limitations of the study are explained and recommendations made for the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology and for further research. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary and integration of research results.
Chapter 9: Conclusions, limitations and recommendations

In this final chapter the results are integrated and conclusions reached. The limitations of the study are explained and recommendations made for the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, both as applied in practice and in terms of further research. Finally, the chapter ends with concluding remarks on the integration of the research.

1.10 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The background to and motivation for the research, the problem statement, the objectives of the study, paradigm perspectives, and the research design and research methodology of the study are discussed in this chapter. The motivation for this study is that an exploration of the relationship that exists between individuals’ personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and their employability attributes may aid in the formulation of a theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency model that can be empirically tested. On a practical level, the empirically tested career meta-competency model can be used by companies and industrial psychologists in career counselling to help individuals sustain their employability in the contemporary employment context.

Chapter 2 addresses the first research aim of the literature review, namely to conceptualise the contemporary employment context in the 21st century.
CHAPTER 2: METATHEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: THE CONTEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT CONTEXT

This chapter serves to contextualise the present study by outlining the metatheoretical context that forms the definitive boundary of the research. People entering the world of work deal with a number of challenges, such as decreased employment opportunities, diminished job security, fast-changing technology and an increasing personal responsibility to keep up with these changes, to upskill themselves, and sustain their employability (Marock, 2008; Pool & Sewell, 2007). The new relationship between the worker and the world of work has created a need to develop career counselling and development interventions that assist individuals to reflect on their career meta-competencies as key resources in sustaining their employability (Coetzee, 2008; Savickas, Nota & Rossier et al., 2009). The foregoing trends necessitate an understanding of the world of work and the changing nature of careers in the 21st century in comparison to the traditional career.

2.1 THE CHANGING EMPLOYMENT CONTEXT

According to Baruch (2004), change has always been present. It seems, however, as if the pace of change is increasing rapidly. All businesses, whether they are private firms, not-for-profit organisations or public organisations, feel the effects of rapid developments in a variety of areas such as the economy, technology and society in general. All of these changes have a significant impact on the management of people at work as well as the managing and planning of careers (Savickas et al., 2009).

As illustrated in Table 2.1, several authors have emphasised the changes taking place in the work context in the 21st century. Collin and Young (2000) note that changes in the market and work expectations have been the most prominent changes in the world of work. Hall and Associates (1996) and Sennett (1998) identified the decrease of stability and security in careers as the most important career change in the 21st century. Richardson (2000) explored the influence of globalisation on 21st century careers and found that globalisation presents both new opportunities and new threats in the workplace. A threat typically includes increasing competition from more efficient capital-rich economies and therefore decreasing employment opportunities and job security.

Amundson (2006) identified globalisation, the increasing use of new technology and communication techniques as well as the development from industrial to information sciences as the key forces driving change in the 21st century work context. Blickle and
Witzki (2008) confirmed these findings and added mergers and acquisitions to the list of driving forces. Burke and Ng (2006) also mentioned downsizing, business restructuring and subcontracting as aspects that influenced the changes that have taken place in the 21st century. Table 2.1 summarises the key drivers for change during the 21st century.

Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Drivers for Change in the 21st Century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased globalisation and national economies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergence of new technology and communication technologies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development from industrial to information societies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The application of new managerial strategies (mergers, acquisitions, downsizing, business restructuring and subcontracting)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the 1980s until the 21st century, the radical and unpredictable changes in the world of work have caused people to move away from what was once known as stable careers and adopt a more dynamic approach to working (Baruch, 2006; Jones & DeFillipi, 1996; King, 2004; Landry et al., 2006). Most people have experienced career transitions and moved away from the traditional career into a new way of doing things, referred to as the boundaryless career or protean career. Boundaryless careers are a variety of job opportunities that stretch beyond the boundaries of a single employment setting (Sullivan, 1999).

Arthur and Rousseau (1996) define the traditional career as a job embedded within a strict hierarchical position and rules. Sullivan (1999) describes the traditional career as professional advancement within only one or two organisations. Traditional careers are therefore strongly focused on hierarchy and people typically only work for one or two organisations during their lives. Sullivan (1999) notes that the traditional career dominated
industrial employment because the organisational structures supported it. However, as a result of the flattening structures and the elimination of entire layers, career paths have become faint, different types of careers are emerging and career success has a wider meaning (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Sullivan, 1999).

As a result of the changes in the employment context and world of work, several authors have attached a new meaning to the concept of career. The traditional career was linked to progress in the hierarchy, whereas the new career is viewed as the unfolding cycle of any person’s work experience over a period of time (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Baruch & Rosenstein, 1992). Table 2.2 summarises the differences between traditional careers and boundaryless careers.

Several authors focus on the change from a long-term career relationship to a transactional, shorter career relationship between employees and employers (Baruch, 2004; Blickle & Witzki, 2008; Cox & King, 2006; De Vos & Soens, 2008; Hall, 2004). In the past, individuals were expected to work for one or two organisations during their whole life span and to serve these organisations by giving everything they had. Recently, the focus has shifted to employees’ expecting organisations to serve them and individuals moving to various organisations during their life span (Baruch, 2004). As a result of changes in the type of loyalty offered and the shorter working relationship, the psychological contract as well as the employees’ and employers’ expectations have also changed. Under the old contract, employees were loyal workers and in return they enjoyed a sense of job security. However, under the new type of contract employees exchange performance for continuous learning and development (Baruch, 2006; Clarke, 2008; De Vos & Soens, 2008; Sullivan, 1999).
Table 2.2

*Differences between Traditional and Boundaryless Careers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Boundaryless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment relationship</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baruch (2004); Baruch (2006); Blickle &amp; Witzki (2008); Sullivan (1999)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Job security for loyalty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundaries</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baruch (2004); Blickle &amp; Witzki (2008); De Vos &amp; Soens (2008); Schabracq &amp; Cooper (2000); Sullivan (1999)</strong></td>
<td><strong>One or two firms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cox &amp; King (2006); Sullivan (1999)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Firm specific</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success measured by</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baruch (2004); Baruch (2006); De Vos &amp; Soens (2008); Hall (2004); Sullivan (1999)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pay, promotion, status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility for career management</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baruch (2004); Blickle &amp; Witzki (2008); Cox &amp; King (2006); Hall (2004); Sullivan (1999)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organisations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baruch (2004); Sullivan (1999)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Formal training programmes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestones and career choices made</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amundson (2006); Baruch (2004); Sullivan (1999)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Age-related</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Once, at the early career age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment characteristic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baruch (2004); Blickle &amp; Witzki (2008); De Vos &amp; Soens (2008)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career horizon (time)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baruch (2004); De Vos &amp; Soens (2008); Schabracq &amp; Cooper (2000)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landry *et al.* (2006) and Schabracq and Cooper (2000) found that with the changes the new careers either changed to make use of technological tools, or gave people space to be very creative in their work and therefore allowed for significant freedom. As a result of the changes that have taken place, people require significantly more skills and very different abilities in order to succeed in their careers.

Fallows and Steven (2000) note that in today's challenging world of work knowledge of an academic subject is no longer enough. It is increasingly important and necessary for graduates and employees to develop those skills that will increase their chances of finding employment; the focus has therefore shifted to training people in employability skills rather than training them to secure employment. People can no longer depend solely on education or on the organisation to direct and conduct their career planning and development for them. Cox and King (2006) point out the dissatisfaction of industry in the UK, and the British parliament, with the quality of graduates entering the world of work. The concern that graduates are entering the world of work without the necessary skills is a worldwide issue (De La Harpe *et al.*, 2000). According to Cox and King (2006), graduates lack a certain set of essential skills.

Cox and King (2006) cluster the skills which individuals entering the workplace need into transferable skills (those relevant throughout working life) and subject skills (those related to a specific career). Cox and King (2006) also identify the need for individuals to invest in transferable skills. Holmes (2001) suggests that is not only transferable and subject skills that employers are looking for, but that they are looking for certain behaviours and characteristics in individuals as well. He refers to these behaviours as characteristics or attributes that should serve as complementary skills to the traditional subject knowledge skills (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996).

The skills are referred to as the “know why”, a concept which includes values, attitudes, internal needs, identity and lifestyle, the “know how”, which includes career competencies, skills, expertise, capabilities, tacit and explicit knowledge, the “know whom”, which includes
networking, relationships and knowing how to find the right people, the “know when”, which includes timing of choices and activities, the “know what”, which includes opportunities, threats and requirements, and lastly the “know where”, which includes entering, training and advancing (Arthur, Claman & DeFillippi, 1995; Baruch, 2004).

Changing organisational structures, rising career patterns, decreasing job security and focus on transferable skills have resulted in increased emphasis on employability (Clarke, 2008). According to Naute, Van Viaven, Van Der Heijden, Van Dam & Willemsen (2009), employability is an essential ingredient for organisations wishing to compete in the competitive environment of the 21st century as well as for people who are aiming for career success. Baruch (2004) also identified employability as a key ingredient of survival in the ever-changing world of work. Clarke (2008) notes that advanced transferable skills (and behaviours) characterise the new notion of employability and increase the competitive advantage of an organisation. Therefore, an employable workforce would contribute towards sustaining a competitive advantage in a world of megacompetition (Naute et al., 2009).

Employability is the continuous fulfilling, acquiring and creating of work through the optimal use of one’s competencies (Van der Heijde & Van der Heijden, 2006). Naute et al. (2009) consider employability to be the alternative to job security and therefore emphasise the importance of developing employability skills through lifelong learning and personal development. Sullivan (1999) adds that individual characteristics such as a person’s age, gender, race, marital status and personality could have an influence on outcomes such as career success and career development, which in turn also influence an individual’s employability.

As a result of the changes in and focus on employability, individuals need to equip themselves with a wider variety of skills in order to be more flexible to enable them to meet the needs of organisations and customers. The onus therefore rests on the individual to continuously undergo training to upskill him/herself. This will ensure continued employment in a fast-changing world where 21st century careers constantly present new challenges. Fallows and Steven (2000) emphasise the fact that higher education plays a pivotal role in helping graduates gain the skills they require to be more employable. As a result, employability has become a concern for both providers of educational services and for those individuals who want to enter the world of work (Cox & King, 2006).

In conclusion, changing circumstances have created the need for people to equip themselves with the skills, competencies and attributes they require to be employable and thereby create their own employment opportunities. An upskilled workforce will in return
provide the organisation with the qualified, committed and motivated workforce required in order to increase its competitive advantage (Richardson, 2000). Amundson (2006) and King (2004) are both of the opinion that challenges in the world of work also influence career counselling practices. A more dynamic approach should be followed during career counselling. Career counselling frameworks need to address people’s responsibility, and the skills and attributes they require to sustain their employability. Amundson (2006) and King (2004) note that the extent of the changes has forced people entering the world of work to critically reflect upon the current assumptions. This in turn will have an influence on the direction in which career counselling practices are developing. Emphasis is placed on the increased responsibility of individuals in career development and the interpersonal skills that every individual entering the world of work needs. As a result of the ongoing changes taking place in the economic and social environment, it is becoming essential to focus on career decision making and career development as a lifetime practice (Amundson, 2006).

2.2 INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTABILITY AS A RESPONSE TO THE CHANGING CONTEXT

In order to increase its competitive advantage, an organisation needs to focus on the upskilling of its workforce as a valuable resource (Clarke, 2006). Although the organisation may play a minor role in an individual’s career development, it is the responsibility of the individual to engage in upskilling activities such as attending training and workshop sessions (Raabe, Frese & Beehr, 2007). Career counselling and career guidance are methods that can help individuals to identify areas of strength and weakness and thereby identify areas for upskilling (Allfred et al., 1996; Baruch, 2004; 2006; Clarke, 2008; Harvey, 2001; King, 2004). As a result, the individual needs to display a high level of personal initiative (Raabe et al., 2007).

In the traditional career context, the organisation took sole responsibility for the individual’s career. But in the new world of work, the responsibility has shifted to individuals to market themselves and to increase their employability skills (Hall, 2004). Most of the responsibility for career management is therefore shifting from the employer to the employee (Raabe et al., 2007). The new psychological contract which has originated in the 21st century world of work implies that the employer does not automatically promise the individual lifetime employment and steady career advancement (De Vos & Soens, 2008; Forrier & Sels, 2003). People determine their own destiny and thus manage their own careers (Baruch, 2006). Individuals need to think for themselves and think of themselves as self-employed rather than being employed (Clarke, 2008; London & Smither, 1999; Schein, 1996). Individuals, and
specifically individuals entering the workplace, need to be encouraged to embrace career development activities and self-management rather than relying on organisations and educational institutions to do it for them. Career self-management typically includes career guidance, career counselling and engaging with learning opportunities (Clarke, 2008). Individuals need to develop an awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses. Career development activities could help individuals to overcome their weaknesses and use their strengths to take advantage of the opportunities presented by the new world of work (Ghulam & Bagley, 1999).

When individuals proactively engage in career self-management and career-development activities, they experience greater control over their careers and as a result increase their employability (Clarke, 2008). According to Harvey (2000), the challenge is not solely how to accommodate change and increase employability; emphasis is also placed on the shift in responsibility from the education provider to the individual to increase employability.

2.3 TOWARDS A CAREER META-COMPETENCY MODEL FOR SUSTAINED EMPLOYABILITY

Individuals need a certain set of skills and competencies to make them more employable in the new world of work (ACCI, 2002). These skills include the ability to work with others and with teams, and problem-solving and interpersonal skills or attributes. At a higher education level, there has been increasing pressure to align the outcomes of the higher education institution to learning courses to include “graduate attributes” (Clarke, 2008). The graduate attributes are referred to as soft skills and include personality attributes (ACCI, 2002). In addition to these skills, there is a growing focus on the competencies that individuals need in the new challenges presented by the world of work (Clarke, 2008; Morley, 2001).

The competencies that individuals need in the new world of work can be divided into management, behavioural and organisational competencies (Sparrow, 1995). Soft skills are clustered into the behavioural competency dimension (ACCI, 2002). Soft skills are typically associated with individual characteristics such as personality traits, self-image and social roles. Hillage and Pollard (1998) added biographical details such as age, gender, race, marital status and family responsibility to these individual characteristics. Although biographical details (such as age, gender and race) cannot be changed, soft skills and thus behaviour can be fostered and enhanced through training and development (King, 2004).
Soft skills and individual characteristics have been found to have a significant impact on employee motivation, career success and employability (Clarke, 2008). In addition, Eby et al. (2003) predict that possessing the required competencies should promote career success. Required competencies refer to the capacity of individuals to adjust to constantly changing situations and adapt their behaviour accordingly (Eby, et al. 2003). The ability to adapt to changing circumstances reflects a high level of emotional intelligence. Eby, et al. (2003) also found that having a proactive personality is important for success in a boundaryless career context. Coetzee (2010) regards people in the 21st century as competency traders whose employability is determined by knowledge, transferable skills, unique attributes and accomplishments. As a result, people need to continuously fulfil, acquire or create work through the use of career meta-competencies.

Career meta-competencies are a set of psychological career resources which are critical in career development (Coetzee, 2008). These psychological career resources include attributes and abilities such as behavioural adaptability, self-knowledge, career orientation awareness, sense of purpose, self-esteem and emotional literacy, which allow individuals to be self-sufficient learners and down-to-business agents in the management of their own careers (Coetzee, 2008; Briscoe & Hall, 1999; Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2007; Hall & Chandler, 2005; Herr et al., 2004). People who possess a wide range of psychological career resources are generally better able to adapt to changing career circumstances and tend to demonstrate higher levels of employability (Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004; Griffin & Hesketh, 2005). Table 2.3 outlines the career meta-competencies that are relevant to the current research.

The new relationship between the worker and the world of work has created the need to develop career interventions that help individuals to take ownership of their careers and be proactive agents in managing their careers (Baruch, 2004; Coetzee, 2008; Fugate et al., 2004). In addition, individuals need to reflect about their career meta-competencies as key psychological resources in sustaining their employability (Coetzee, 2008; Savickas, et al., 2009). Douglas and Chandler (2005) identified identity, self-awareness and adaptability as career meta-competencies that can assist people in the continuous learning of new career skills. De Vos and Soens (2008) and Eby, Butts, and Lockwood (2003) identified personal identity and self insight as the two most important career meta-competencies that people need in their careers as additional sources in order to be ready for the new challenges of the world of work. Pool and Sewell (2007) found that self-esteem and emotional intelligence are essential career meta-competencies for career success and therefore for increased employability. More and more researchers currently working and studying in the field of
career development suggest that individuals need to be more conscious of their own work-related capability as well as their career meta-competencies as these competencies influence general employability (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Brockner & Gaure, 1983; Brown et al., 2003; Pool & Sewell, 2007; Yorke & Knight, 2004).

As noted earlier, a gap has been identified between what the industry requires from individuals and what academia teaches individuals (Nabi & Bagley, 1999; Neumann & Banghart, 2001). In order to bridge the gap, a model of generic and soft skills could prove valuable in assisting individuals to develop the necessary skills and competencies required by the world of work (Harvey & Bowers-Brown, 2004). According to Arthur and Rousseau (1996), skills are best transferred through formal learning environments, which include practices such as career development and counselling. Career development can be defined as a lifelong psychological and behavioural process. Contextual factors also influence the shaping of a person’s career over their entire career life span (Niles & Harris-Bowsley, 2009). Career guidance and counselling involve a formal relationship where a professional (such as an industrial psychologist, psychometrist, career counsellor or human resource practitioner) assists clients to cope more effectively with issues concerning their careers. Such issues might include making a career choice, coping with career transitions, coping with career stress or job searching (Niles & Harris-Bowsley, 2009). Career counselling is an essential ingredient in assisting an individual to upskill himself or herself (Bimrose, 2006). In the absence of adequate advice and guidance, the likelihood of individuals making a suboptimal decision increases significantly, which in turn leads to a significant level of suboptimal outcomes. Suboptimal outcomes typically include unemployment or a lower employability level (Keep & Brown, 2005).

Byrne, Dik and Chiaburu (2008) identified mentorship as a method of facilitating professional development and assisting individuals to engage in career development activities. Additional methods such as career counselling can also be effective in assisting individuals to develop the necessary skills to enter the world of work and to boost their careers. Career counselling is therefore one method of increasing employability levels (Byrne et al., 2008). Career counselling and development activities can be undertaken by people who are on the verge of embarking on their careers as well as those who are already working in the field and simply want to engage in continuous professional development (Bimrose, 2006).
Table 2.3

*Career meta-competencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career meta-competency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality preferences</td>
<td>Personality refers to the human psyche. The psyche is seen as a complex network of systems interacting with each other. Psychic energy flows continually from one system to another, in a constant striving for harmony. Personality development is viewed as a dynamic process, which takes place throughout life as the primary development task of a person’s individuation or self-actualisation (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk &amp; Hammer, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>The process by which people maintain a sense of self-integrity, that is, a perception of themselves as globally moral, adequate, and efficacious when they confront threats to a valued self-image (Sherman <em>et al.</em>, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>The extent to which individuals are able to tap into their feelings and emotions as a source of energy to guide their thinking and actions (Salovey &amp; Mayer, 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employability attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career-related attributes and dispositions that promote adaptive cognition, behaviour and affect as well as enhance an individual’s suitability for appropriate and sustained employment opportunities. These attributes include: career self-management, cultural competence, career resilience, sociability, self-efficacy, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy (Coetzee, 2011).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is therefore evident that changes in the world of work have a tremendous influence on career counselling and development activities. The external environment (such as globalisation and technology) has a big impact on people in the world of work as well as on career development activities and career counselling (Richardson, 2002). Traditional models of career counselling are therefore no longer adequate. New career counselling models need to be incorporated into the career counselling process to help individuals to sustain their employability in the contemporary employment context (Richardson, 2002).

Although employability does not guarantee employment, it increases the likelihood of being able to embark on a suitable career (Clarke, 2008). Recently, the question is no longer “what is employability” but rather “how to manage employability” (Clarke, 2008). This is further evidence of the importance of identifying a career meta-competency model that can inform career counselling and guidance practices in the contemporary world of work. Supporting individuals’ employability by means of appropriate and relevant career counselling frameworks may prove to be a powerful tool in creating and sustaining competitive advantage and an efficient way to balance the needs of the organisation and the individual within the current labour market context (Clarke, 2008).

2.4 CONCLUSION

It is evident from the literature that the work context has changed dramatically during the 21st century. As a result of changes in the context, careers have also changed and moved away from what used to be known as the traditional career to the boundaryless career. The changes taking place within the career context have furthermore influenced the skills and competencies required of people entering the world of work. A higher qualification or technical skills are no longer enough to secure a job. Individuals need to increase their employability by developing their career meta-competencies. The present study will focus on personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence (as a set of personality attributes) and employability attributes as career meta-competencies influencing individuals’ continued employability in the contemporary workplace.

In order for individuals to acquire the necessary skills and competencies, they need to take responsibility for upskilling themselves. Individuals can engage in career counselling and development activities in order to identify their strengths and weaknesses. Career counselling and development can also be a tool to help individuals develop their career meta-competencies to better manage and develop their employability. A career meta-competency model would therefore be a powerful tool that industrial psychologists, human
resource practitioners and career counsellors could use in order to enhance the confidence of individuals to display employability attributes.

2.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY

Chapter 2 outlined the metatheoretical context that formed the definitive boundary of the research. The changing employment context was outlined and the increasing accountability of individuals as career agents as a response to the changing context was discussed. As a result of the changing career context, employers no longer require technical skills alone from individuals; they also demand additional career meta-competencies such as awareness of one’s personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes. It is suggested that a career meta-competency model that can assist individuals in the career counselling and development process to increase their employability be developed.

The following literature research aim was achieved in this chapter:

**Research aim 1**: To conceptualise the contemporary employment context in the 21st century.

Chapters 3, 4 and 5 will address research aims 2 and 3. Chapter 3 discusses the construct of personality preferences according to the paradigmatic perspective of Analytical Psychology and more specifically according to the personality type theory of Carl Jung (1921, 1959, 1971, 1990) and Myers and Briggs (1987) with the aim of providing further clarification on the second research question.
CHAPTER 3: PERSONALITY PREFERENCES

This chapter focuses on the construct of personality preferences as a variable that influences the employability of individuals. Personality preferences will be discussed within the context of the paradigmatic perspective of Analytical Psychology and more specifically from the vantage point of the personality type theory of Carl Jung (1921, 1959, 1971, 1990) and the personality type theory conceptualised by Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987). The aim is to determine which aspects of personality make certain individuals more employable than others. This is in line with step 2 of phase 1 of the research method as identified in chapter 1 of this study.

This chapter also aims to address the second literature review research aim, which is to theoretically conceptualise the construct of personality preferences as a career meta-competency. This chapter therefore focuses on explaining the concept of personality preferences by exploring the basic literature and research on personality and personality preferences. An integrated model of personality preferences from the Analytical Psychology perspective is proposed in order to explain the theoretical relationship between the variables of personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes. In addition, the theoretical research implications for career counselling and the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology are discussed.

3.1 THEORETICAL MODELS

Two theories of personality are discussed, namely Jung’s (1971) theory of psychological types and the Myers-Briggs (Myers 1987) theory of personality type. In the following section, use was made of the account by Coetzee (2005).

3.1.1 Jung’s theory of psychological types

Jung (1921, 1959, 1971, 1990) used information from a wide spectrum of disciplines such as psychology, psychiatry, theology, philosophy, biology, physics, chemistry, archaeology, literature, history, anthropology and mythology in order to understand the psychological functioning of an individual. Furthermore, Jung’s (1971) theory of personality is very influential and complex (Feist & Feist, 2009; Meyer, Moore, & Viljoen, 1997). Jung (1921, 1959, 1971) recognised three dimensions in any person. Firstly, there is the psychological dimension, which postulates that all physical aspects (such as breathing, hunger, thirst and sex) are important for the survival of any human being. Secondly, there is the social
dimension, which includes interaction with other people. Lastly, there is the psychic dimension, which includes the acceptance and rejection of irrational experiences. Irrational experiences are any experiences that cannot be explained by human beings. Jung (1921) developed three dimensions by which to explore individual cognitive styles. These included: (i) the manner in which an individual approaches life, (ii) the manner in which an individual becomes aware of the world and, lastly, (iii) the manner in which an individual comes to a conclusion about the world (Higgs, 2001). Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) theory is based on dichotomies. The dichotomies will be discussed in greater detail in the sections that follow. Figure 3.1 outlines the dichotomies of Jung’s (1971) theory. Jung (1971) suggested that every individual has an inborn, natural preference for one of the opposites on each of the first three dichotomies. Myers (1987) added the Judging-Perceiving dichotomy to the theory.

![Figure 3.1. Jung’s dichotomies](http://www.16-personality-types.com/mbti_dichotomies.htm)

**3.1.1.1 Basic assumptions**

Jung (1921) articulated various assumptions during the development of his personality theory framework. These assumptions include the following:

- Each opposite pole in the dichotomy is important and at times essential in its own area of operation. All types can deal successfully with life in general and with life in their own areas of potential talent in particular (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk & Hammer, 2003).
• All types are required in a multifaceted world that relies on diversity and specialisation to progress towards important personal and societal goals (Myers et al., 2003).

• True preferences exist and can be more effectively identified in persons with a good type development than in persons with an inadequate type development. However, any measure of preferences must optimise the probability that people who are unsure about their preference will be correctly assigned to their type (Myers et al., 2003).

• Any person can directly or indirectly indicate their preference on a self-report inventory (Myers et al., 2003).

• Past experiences, and expectations about the future, influence behaviour and personality (Higgs, 2001).

• Individuals are able to develop constantly and creatively (Higgs, 2001).

• Personality is an open system and is receptive to inputs and exchanges (Higgs, 2001).

3.1.1.2 The structure of personality

Jung (1921, 1959, 1971) believed that every individual is motivated both by their personal experiences and by emotionally toned experiences from the past. Jung (1921, 1959, 1971) labelled these past experiences the collective unconscious, which he considered to include those elements that we have never experienced ourselves but which have come down to us from our ancestors. Jung (1921, 1959, 1971) noted furthermore that some elements of the collective unconscious are highly developed; he referred to these as the archetypes. Quenk (1993) described the archetypes as universal human experiences and patterns of responses to experiences such as birth, death, mother, father and hero. These archetypes unite humans and their ancestors and provide a vital link to the past, present and future of individuals as a species. The most inclusive archetype is the notion of self-realisation. Self-realisation can only be achieved by attaining a balance between various contrasting forces of personality. Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) theory is thus a theory of opposites. People are both extraverts and introverts, rational and irrational, male and female, conscious and unconscious and while they are pushed by past events they are also pulled by future expectations.
(a) **Conscious**

According to Jung (1921, 1959, 1971), the centre of one’s field of consciousness is the ego and consciousness is essential for the development of the ego. The ego is what humans refer to as the “I” and includes all conscious aspects of functioning, including sensations, observations, feelings, thoughts, evaluations and memory. The ego is not the whole personality, but must be complemented by the more comprehensive self, the centre of personality that is largely unconscious. In a psychologically healthy person, the unconscious self takes the primary position and the ego takes the secondary position. The consciousness therefore plays a small role in analytical psychology, and an overemphasis on expanding one’s conscious psyche may lead to a psychological imbalance. It therefore seems that psychologically healthy individuals are in contact with their conscious world while also allowing themselves to experience their unconscious selves. This helps them achieve individuation. Individuation is a process whereby a person becomes a complete individual, in other words, unique and different from other individuals or groups. The individuation process is a lifelong process and involves the gradual integration of unconscious elements into consciousness (Quenk, 1993).

The ego functions within an internal and an external world (Jung, 1960; Meyer et al., 1997). In external functioning, the ego helps the individual to structure reality through the senses and therefore to facilitate interaction with the external world. It is the ego that not only enables an individual to recognise the physical and social world, but also to function within the physical and social world. When functioning within the internal world, the ego structures a person’s self-recognition in order to give the person an individual identity (Quenk, 1993).

(b) **Personal unconscious**

Every individual has a unique personal unconscious, which is seen as the personal store for individual experiences and interactions with the world as well as the interpretations of these experiences. It therefore houses all the forgotten memories, all the repressed and unacceptable desires, thoughts, feelings, experiences and impulses (McGuiness, Izard, & McCrossin, 1992). The content of the personal unconscious is usually accessible to the conscious and a continuous interaction takes place between the personal unconscious and the ego. However, some images in the personal unconscious can be accessed easily, whereas others can be recalled only with difficulty or may not even be recalled at all, therefore may be beyond the reach of the conscious mind (Jung, 1921, 1959, 1971; Meyer, Moore, & Viljoen, 1997).
The contents of the personal unconscious are referred to as complexes. A complex is an emotionally toned mass of connected ideas. For example, a person’s experience with the father may become grouped around an emotional core so that the person’s own father, or even the word “father” triggers an emotional response that blocks the smooth flow of thought. Complexes are usually personal, but it is possible that they may be partly derived from humanity’s collective experience. In the example, the father complex stems not only from an individual’s personal experience but also from all human experience with the father figure. In addition, the father complex is partly formed by a person’s conscious image of a father. Therefore, complexes may be partly conscious and may stem from both the personal and the collective unconscious (Jung 1928, 1960).

(c) **Collective unconscious**

In contrast to the personal unconscious, which is the product of individual experiences, the collective unconscious is the product of the inherited experiences of the entire human species. It is a sort of blueprint which is not individual but rather universal for all humanity and is therefore more or less the same for people in all cultures (Jung 1921, 1959).

The contents of the collective unconscious do not remain concealed; the collective unconscious is rather active and has an influence on a person’s thoughts, emotions and reactions. The collective unconscious does not mean that people inherit ideas from the past, but rather that any human has an inborn tendency to react in a particular way whenever their experiences stimulate a biologically inherited response tendency. In other words, humans come into the world with inherited predispositions to act or react in a particular way if their present experiences touch on these biologically based predispositions. According to Jung (1921, 1959), people have as many of these inherited tendencies as they have typical situations in life. Numerous repetitions of these situations made them part of the human biological creation. In the beginning, they are forms without content which merely represent the possibility of a certain type of perception and action. As more and more repetitions occur, they develop into independent archetypes.

Archetypes are ancient or archaic images that derive from the collective unconscious (Jung, 1921, 1959). They are similar to complexes in that they are emotionally toned collections of associated images. However, archetypes are universal and originate from the contents of the collective unconscious whereas complexes are individualised components of the personal unconscious. Archetypes themselves cannot be directly represented, but when
activated, they express themselves through several mediums, such as dreams, fantasies and delusions (Jung, 1921, 1959).

Although many archetypes exist, only a few have developed to the point where they can be conceptualised. The most notable of these include the persona, the shadow, the anima, the animus, the great mother, the wise old man, the hero and the self. The persona is the side of personality that people show to the world. The shadow represent the archetype of darkness and repression. It relates to those qualities that people do not wish to acknowledge and attempt to hide from others and even from themselves. Jung (1921, 1959, 1971) believed that all humans are psychologically bisexual and therefore possess both a masculine and a feminine side. The feminine side of men originates in the collective unconscious as an archetype and remains very resistant to entering the conscious mind. A very small proportion of men become well acquainted with their anima because it requires great courage to do so; it is even more difficult than becoming familiar with their shadow.

The masculine archetype in women is called the animus. The anima represents irrational moods and feelings, while the animus symbolises thinking and reasoning. The great mother and the wise old man are derivatives of the anima and the animus. Every individual (man and woman) possesses a great mother archetype. The concept of the great mother is seen as both positive (fertility and nourishment) and negative (power and destruction). The wise old man archetype is seen as wisdom and meaning, as well as deceptiveness, and symbolises human preexisting knowledge of the mysteries of life. The hero is an unconscious image of a person who conquers an evil enemy but who also has a tragic flaw. Finally, Jung believed that each person has an inherited tendency to move towards growth, perfection and completion, which is the self and the true centre of the personality (Jung, 1954). This structure of the psyche is visually displayed in Figure 3.2:

3.1.1.3 Development of personality

According to Jung (1956), personality develops through a series of stages that result in individuation, or self-realisation. Jung (1956) focused on the period after age 35–40, when an individual has the opportunity to bring together the different aspects of personality and to achieve self-realisation. However, the potential for disintegration or rigid reactions is also present during this time. The psychological health of middle-aged people is associated with their ability to achieve a balance between the poles of the various opposing processes. This ability is proportional to the success achieved in journeying through the previous stages of life (Jung, 1956).
Figure 3.2. Jung’s conception of personality (Feist & Feist, 2009, p.112)

(a) **Self-actualisation**

Self-actualisation is a very rare phenomenon and is only achieved by a handful of individuals. Self-actualisation is reached when a person is able to incorporate their unconscious into their total personality. Self-actualised people are able to assert both their external and their internal worlds (Jung, 1959).

(b) **Stages of personality development**

Jung (1969) grouped the stages of life into four general periods, namely childhood, youth, middle life and old age. Jung (1931, 1960) argued that values, ideals and modes of
behaviour suitable for the early part of life are not suitable for the second part of life. People must therefore learn to find new meaning in their declining years.

(i) Childhood

Childhood can be divided into three substages, namely the (1) anarchic, (2) monarchic and (3) dualistic stages. The anarchic phase is typically characterised by chaotic and sporadic consciousness. “Islands of consciousness” may exist, but there is no link between the islands. Experiences of this stage may at times enter the consciousness as a primitive image, but are not accurately verbalised (Jung, 1960).

The monarchic phase is characterised by the development of the ego. This is also the stage during which logical and verbal thinking begins. During this stage, children see themselves objectively and may refer to themselves in the third person. The island of consciousness becomes larger and more islands appear. A primitive ego is present on these islands. Although the ego is recognised as an object, it is not yet aware of itself as the perceiver (Jung, 1960).

The ego as the perceiver only arises during the dualistic phase of childhood. The ego is then divided into the objective and the subjective. Children are now aware of their existence as separate individuals and refer to themselves in the first person. During this stage, the islands of consciousness become a continuous land, inhabited by an ego-complex that recognises itself as both object and subject (Jung, 1960).

(ii) Youth

This stage extends from puberty to midlife. Young people strive towards independence from their parents, find a partner, start a family and make their own place in the world. It is characterised by a period of increased activity, maturing sexuality, growing consciousness and also the realisation that the problem-free stage of childhood is now over. Jung also identified the conservative principle, which is the desire of a person to live in the past because he or she is clinging to childhood. A middle-aged or elderly person who is trying to hold onto their youthful values faces a crippled second half of life. They will be unable to achieve full self-realisation and will be unable to establish new goals and to seek new meaning in life (Jung, 1960; Myers & Kirby, 1994).
(iii) Midlife

According to Jung (1960), midlife begins at approximately 35 or 40 years of age. Their advancing age can cause middle-aged people a lot of anxiety, but this is also a period of great opportunity. If middle-aged people hang onto the social and moral values of their early life, they may become rigid and fanatical in trying to hold onto their physical attractiveness. This phase is characterised by the expansion of the conscious through new experiences and knowledge. The focus furthermore shifts from the conscious to the unconscious. Individuals in this phase typically begin to pay attention to those inner aspects of themselves which they had previously neglected. Their task in this phase is to gain insight into those dimensions of themselves of which they had been unaware of (Jung, 1960).

(iv) Old age

According to Jung (1960), this stage begins at approximately 60 or 65 years of age. During this phase, the individual has a great opportunity for individuation. Because these individuals have experienced a lot of situations during the stages they have passed through, they develop a balance or harmony by reconciling the opposite forces. This harmony (and thus self-realisation) also arises from the reconciliation of the opposites of life and death (Jung, 1960).

3.1.1.4 Theory of psychological type

Apart from the levels of psyche and the dynamics of personality, Jung (1960) also recognised various psychological types that grow out of a union of two basic attitudes which include introversion and extraversion, as well as four different functions, including thinking, feeling, sensing and intuiting.

(a) Attitudes

Attitude is a tendency to act or react in a characteristic direction (Jung, 1921, 1971). Every individual has both an introverted and an extraverted attitude, although one of the attitudes may be conscious and the other one unconscious. Introversion and extraversion are opposing forces and serve to complement one another. Jung believed that his theory is balanced and able to accommodate both the objective and the subjective (Feist & Feist, 2009).
(i) **Introversion**

Introversion is inward psychic energy with a direction towards the subjective. Introverts are oriented into their inner worlds, with all their biases, fantasies, dreams and individualised perceptions. Although introverts do perceive the outer world, they do so very selectively and from their own subjective viewpoint (Jung, 1921, 1971).

(ii) **Extraversion**

In contrast to introversion, in extraversion the psychic energy is directed outwards towards the objective. Extraverts are more influenced by their surroundings than by their inner world and they tend to focus on the objective attitude rather than on the subjective attitude (Jung, 1921, 1971).

(b) **Functions**

The psychological type theory proposed by Jung (1921, 1971, 1990) is concerned with the conscious use of the functions of perception and decision making (or judgment), as well as the areas of life in which these functions are used. In addition to having a dominant attitude (introversion or extraversion), each person has a particular way in which he or she observes the world and assigns meaning to each experience. The conscious mental functions that a person uses to assign meaning to something are the two judgment processes (Thinking or Feeling), and the two perception processes (Sensing and Intuition). Introversion and extraversion can both be combined with any or several of the four functions (Jung, 1921, 1971, 1990). These combinations go to make up eight possible orientations or types. The four functions can briefly be defined as follows:

(i) **Thinking**

Thinking is a judgment function and is the logical intellectual activity that produces a chain of ideas (Feist & Feist, 2009). Depending on a person’s basic attitude, the thinking may be either introverted or extraverted. Extraverted people typically rely on concrete thoughts, but they may make use of abstract ideas if the ideas have been passed on to them from outside, for example by their teacher or parents (Jung, 1921, 1971). Introverted people react to external stimuli, but the interpretation and meaning they attach to events are based more on the internal meaning they supply themselves than on the facts (Jung, 1921, 1971).
(ii) **Feeling**

Thinking is also a judgment function and refers to the process of evaluating an idea or event (Jung, 1921, 1971). Feist and Feist (2009) are of the opinion that valuing is a more appropriate word to use as it is less likely to be confused with either sensing or intuiting. For example, when someone says a surface feels smooth, they are using their sensing function. However, when a person says he is feeling lonely today, he is intuiting, not feeling. Feeling should furthermore be distinguished from emotion. Feeling is the evaluation of every conscious activity, even activities rated as indifferent. Most of the evaluations have no emotional connotation; however, emotion may be involved if a person increases the intensity to the point of stimulating internal psychological changes (Feist & Feist, 2009).

Extraverted feeling people typically use objective data to make evaluations. They are guided by external values and commonly acceptable standards of judgment rather than by their subjective opinion. They are probably relaxed and comfortable in social situations and typically know what to say, when to say it and how to say it. People usually like extraverted feeling people, but in their attempts to conform to social standards, they may appear to be shallow, fake and unreliable (Jung, 1921, 1971). In contrast, introverted feeling people tend to base their value judgments on subjective perceptions rather than objective facts. These people typically ignore traditional opinions and beliefs and other people often feel uncomfortable around them because of their virtual indifference to the objective world (including people) (Jung, 1921, 1971).

(iii) **Sensing**

Sensing is the function whereby people receive physical stimuli and transmit them to perceptual consciousness. The information received through sensing is not always exactly the same as the physical stimulus, but rather the individual’s perception of the sensory impulses. These perceptions do not depend on logical thinking or feeling; they merely exist because of the unconditional, basic facts within each person. Extraverted sensing people perceive the external stimuli very objectively, very much as they exist in reality. Their sensations are therefore not much influenced by their subjective attitudes (Jung, 1921, 1971). Introverted sensing people are greatly influenced by their subjective sensations. They are guided by their interpretations of the stimuli and not by the stimuli themselves (Jung, 1921, 1971).
Intuition involves perception beyond the working of consciousness. Intuition (like sensing) is based on the perception of total basic facts, ones that provide the raw material for thinking and feeling. However, intuition differs from sensing in that it is more creative, often adding or subtracting elements from conscious sensation. Extraverted intuitive people tend to be oriented towards facts in the external world. They merely perceive the facts subliminally, rather than fully sensing them. Because strong sensory stimuli interfere with intuition, intuitive people suppress many of their sensations and are directed by hunches and guesses that are contrary to the sensory data (Jung, 1921, 1971). Introverted intuitive people are guided by the unconscious perception of facts that are practically subjective and bear little or no resemblance to external reality. Their subjective intuitive perceptions are often extremely strong and capable of motivating decisions to a great degree. Jung believed that introverted intuitive people may not understand their own motivations, but they are nevertheless intensely encouraged by them (Jung, 1921, 1971).

Jung (1921, 1971, 1990) refers to Thinking and Feeling as rational functions because they involve evaluation. In contrast, Sensing and Intuition are referred to as irrational functions as they involve passively recording, but not interpreting experience.

The four functions typically appear in a hierarchy, where one function occupies a superior or dominant position, a second function occupies a secondary position and the other two functions occupy inferior positions. Most people develop only one function, so they typically approach a situation relying on their dominant or superior function. Some people develop two functions but very few develop three. Only a person who has theoretically achieved self-realisation or individuation would have all four functions highly developed (Feist & Feist, 2009). Figure 3.2 illustrates the four functions, which are like the points of a compass, with the self in the centre facing a given direction, but with all four points being used as guides (Jung, 1971).

Table 3.1 provides an overview of the eight dominant types as defined by Jung (1921, 1959, 1971):
Figure 3.3. The four opposite functions (Quenk, 1993, p.3)

Table 3.1
The Eight Dominant Jungian Functions (Myers et al., 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Function</th>
<th>Sensing Perception</th>
<th>Thinking Judgment</th>
<th>Feeling Judgment</th>
<th>Intuitive Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominant extraverted</td>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant introverted</td>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant extraverted</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant introverted</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant extraverted</td>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant introverted</td>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant extraverted</td>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant introverted</td>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Dominant extraverted sensing**
   - Directing energy outwardly and acquiring information by focusing on a detailed, accurate accumulation of sensory data in the present.

2. **Dominant introverted sensing**
   - Directing energy inwardly and storing the facts and details of both external reality and internal thoughts and experiences.

3. **Dominant extraverted intuition**
   - Directing energy outwardly to scan for new ideas, interesting patterns, and future possibilities.

4. **Dominant introverted intuition**
   - Directing energy inwardly to focus on unconscious images, connections, and patterns that create inner vision and insight.

5. **Dominant extraverted thinking**
   - Seeking local order to the external environment by applying clarity, goal-directedness, and decisive action.

6. **Dominant introverted thinking**
   - Seeking accuracy and order in internal thoughts through reflecting on and developing a logical system for understanding.

7. **Dominant extraverted feeling**
   - Seeking harmony through organising and structuring the environment to meet people’s needs and their own values.

8. **Dominant introverted feeling**
   - Seeking intensely meaningful and complex inner harmony through sensitivity to their own and others’ inner values and outer behaviour.
Jung (1921, 1959, 1971) based his theory on clinical observations and consequently portrays each mental process in the sharpest focus and with maximum contrast between extraverted and introverted forms.

3.1.2 Myers and Briggs’ theory of personality types

According to Myers (1987), a personality theory must portray and explain people just as they are. The personality type theory of Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) is based on Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) theory of psychological types. Although the Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) personality type theory is based on Jung’s theory, there are nevertheless differences. Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) made significant changes to the theory. For example, the theory of Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) ignores Jung’s concept of the unconscious and its relation to the superior and auxiliary functions. The personality type theory of Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) also ignores the development of compensatory processes in the unconscious (Pittenger, 1993). However, there are various similarities between the psychological type theory of Jung (1921, 1959, 1971) and the theory of Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987). Both theories are typologies that categorise people by their attitudinal, judgmental and perceptual functions. Each of these functions consists of two opposing poles, one superior pole and one inferior pole (Myers, 1987).

In developing the personality type theory, Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) used the dynamic character of the psychological type model as their foundation. They extended Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) model by adding the Judging (J) Perceiving (P) dichotomy, thereby making clear one aspect of the theory that was obscured and undeveloped in Jung’s theory (Myers et al., 2003). They specifically built upon Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) description of an auxiliary function that supported and complemented the dominant function in every type. In consequence they effectively redefined Jung’s model in order to incorporate 16 personality types (Myers et al., 1998; Spoto, 1995).

In terms of the personality type theory of Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987), perception refers to all the ways of becoming aware of things, people, events or ideas. It includes information gathering, the seeking of sensation or of inspiration, and the selection of stimuli to attend to. Judgment, on the other hand, refers to all the ways of reaching conclusions about the exact nature of what was perceived. It includes evaluation, choice, decision making and the selection of a response after perceiving a stimulus. Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) model was therefore redefined by Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) in order to have 16 possible
personality preference types (Myers et al., 1998). Table 3.2 provides an overview of the 16 personality preference types.

Table 3.2

*Sixteen Personality Preference Types (Myers et al., 2003)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Sensing and auxiliary Thinking</td>
<td>ESTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Sensing and auxiliary Feeling</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Sensing and auxiliary Thinking</td>
<td>ISTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Sensing and auxiliary Feeling</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Intuition and auxiliary Thinking</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Intuition and auxiliary Feeling</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Intuition and auxiliary Thinking</td>
<td>INTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Intuition and auxiliary Feeling</td>
<td>INFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Thinking and auxiliary Sensing</td>
<td>ESTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Thinking and auxiliary Intuition</td>
<td>ENTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Thinking and auxiliary Sensing</td>
<td>ISTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Thinking and auxiliary Intuition</td>
<td>INTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Feeling and auxiliary Sensing</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Feeling and auxiliary Intuition</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Feeling and auxiliary Sensing</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Feeling and auxiliary Intuition</td>
<td>INFP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every individual has a dominant function and an auxiliary function (Jung, 1921, 1971). People need to achieve a sufficient development of a second process, not as an opponent to the dominant process, but rather as a welcome auxiliary (Myers, 1987; Spoto, 1995). The auxiliary function supplies balance. If, for instance, the dominant function is a perceiving function (Sensing or Intuition), the auxiliary function would be a judging function (Thinking or Feeling). Likewise, if the dominant function is a judging function, then the auxiliary function would be a perceiving one (Myers & Kirby, 1994). The auxiliary is therefore always formed in a different dimension from the dominant process.

For anyone to have a healthy personality type development, the auxiliary process must complement the dominant process in the following ways. The auxiliary function provides a
balance between an extraverted attitude and an introverted attitude. With the auxiliary function, a person becomes comfortable with and able to live in both the outer and the inner world. When there is a lack of a balance between the dominant and the auxiliary function, the individual is unbalanced, withdrawing into their preferred world and consciously or unconsciously afraid of the other world (Myers & Kirby, 1994; Myers et al., 2003). In addition, the auxiliary function also provides a balance between perception and judgment. When using this auxiliary function effectively, an individual is in control of both perception and judgment, and is therefore able to take in information and make a decision (Myers et al., 2003).

3.1.2.1 The four bipolar preferences

The four dichotomies of the personality type theory (Myers, 1987) are described in the following sections and outlined in Table 3.3.

(a) Extraversion (E) versus Introversion (I)

The E-I dichotomy reflects whether a person prefers extraversion or introversion as described in Jung’s (1921, 1971) theory. Extraverts (E) are directed towards the outer world and as a result focus their energy on people and objects. Introverts (I) are primarily directed towards their inner world and thus focus their energy on concepts and ideas. Jung (1921,1959 1971) regarded extraversion and introversion as equally harmonising attitudes whose differences create the tension that both the individual and society need to sustain life.

(b) Sensing (S) versus Intuition (N)

The S-N dichotomy is specifically designed to indicate a person’s preference regarding two different ways of perceiving. A person may observe facts and happenings primarily by relying on his or her five senses (S) (touch, sight, taste, hearing and smell), or a person may place more reliance upon the less obvious process of intuition (N), which gives weight to meanings, relationships and possibilities that have been worked out beyond the reach of the conscious mind (Jung, 1921,1959 1971).

(c) Thinking (T) versus Feeling (F)

This T-F dichotomy is intended to reflect a person’s preference regarding two contrasting ways of making a judgment. A person may make a decision primarily on the basis of logical
consequences. This is a very impersonal way of making a decision and relates to the thinking (T) process. On the other hand, a person may rely primarily on feeling (F) to make a decision, which would then be based on personal or social values. In both Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) and Myers (1987) approaches, the term thinking should not be confused with intelligence and the term feeling should also not be confused with emotion. Intelligence and emotional expression are independent of psychological typology (Jung, 1921, 1959, 1971).

(d) Judging (J) versus Perceiving (P)

The J-P dichotomy is designed to reflect the way in which a person deals with the outer world, that is, the extraverted part of life. A person who prefers using a Judging (J) process usually prefers to rely on their Thinking (T) or Feeling (F) processes of judging when dealing with the outer world. On the other hand, a person who prefers using a Perceiving (P) process, typically uses either Sensing (S) or Intuition (N) processes when dealing with the outer world (1921, 1959, 1971).

Table 3.3
The Four Dichotomies of the Personality Type Theory (Myers et al., 2003, p.6)

| Extraversion – Introversion Dichotomy (attitudes or orientations of energy) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Extraversion (E)            | Introversion (I)            |
| Directing energy mainly toward the outer world of people and objects | Directing energy mainly toward the inner world of experiences and ideas |

| Sensing – Intuition Dichotomy (functions or processes of perception) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Sensing (S)                 | Intuition (N)               |
| Focusing mainly on what can be perceived by the five senses | Focusing mainly on perceiving patterns and interrelationships |

| Thinking – Feeling Dichotomy (functions or processes of judging) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Thinking (T)                | Feeling (F)                |
| Basing conclusions on logical analysis with a focus on objectivity and detachment | Basing conclusions on personal or social values with a focus on understanding and harmony |

Judging – Perceiving Dichotomy
Preferring the decisiveness and closure that result from dealing with the outer world using one of the Judging processes (Thinking or Feeling)

Preferring the flexibility and spontaneity that result from dealing with the outer world using one of the Perceiving processes (Sensing or Intuition)

3.1.2.2 The sixteen personality types

Personality type is not merely a combination of different functions or attitudes; instead it is a dynamic system and each type is an integrated system (Myers & Kirby, 1994). Brief descriptions of each of the sixteen personality types are given in Table 3.4. Table 3.5 explains the contribution that each of the preferences (attitudes and functions) makes to each of the types.

Table 3.4
Brief Descriptions of the Sixteen Personality Types (BSM Consulting Inc, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISTJ</th>
<th>ISFJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious and quiet, interested in security and peaceful living. Extremely thorough, responsible, and dependable. Well-developed powers of concentration. Usually interested in supporting and promoting traditions and establishments. Well-organized and hard working, work steadily towards identified goals. Usually accomplish any task once they have set their mind to it.</td>
<td>Quiet, kind, and conscientious. Can be depended on to follow through. Usually put the needs of others above own needs. Stable and practical, value security and traditions. Well-developed sense of space and function. Rich inner world of observations about people. Extremely perceptive of other's feelings. Interested in serving others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFJ</th>
<th>INTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quietly forceful, original, and sensitive. Tend to stick to things until they are done. Extremely intuitive about people, and concerned for their feelings. Well-developed value systems which they strictly adhere to. Well-respected for perseverance in doing the right thing. Likely to be individualistic, rather than leading or following.</td>
<td>Independent, original, analytical, and determined. Have an exceptional ability to turn theories into solid plans of action. Highly value knowledge, competence, and structure. Driven to derive meaning from their visions. Long-range thinkers. Have very high standards for their performance, and the performance of others. Natural leaders, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>Quiet and reserved, interested in how and why things work. Excellent skills with mechanical things. Risk-takers who live for the moment. Usually interested in and talented at extreme sports. Uncomplicated in desires. Loyal to peers and to internal value systems, but not overly concerned with respecting laws and rules if they get in the way of getting something done. Detached and analytical, they excel at finding solutions to practical problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>Quiet, serious, sensitive and kind. Do not like conflict, and not likely to do things which may generate conflict. Loyal and faithful. Extremely well-developed senses, and aesthetic appreciation for beauty. Not interested in leading or controlling others. Flexible and open-minded. Likely to be original and creative. Enjoy the present moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>Quiet, reflective, and idealistic. Interested in serving humanity. Well-developed value system, which they strive to live in accordance with. Extremely loyal. Adaptable and laid-back unless a strongly held value is threatened. Usually talented writers. Mentally quick, and able to see possibilities. Interested in understanding and helping people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>Logical, original, creative thinkers. Can become very excited about theories and ideas. Exceptionally capable and driven to turn theories into clear understandings. Highly value knowledge, competence and logic. Quiet and reserved, hard to get to know well. Individualistic, having no interest in leading or following others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>Friendly, adaptable, action-oriented. &quot;Doers&quot; who are focused on immediate results. Living in the here-and-now, they're risk-takers who live fast-paced lifestyles. Impatient with long explanations. Extremely loyal to their peers, but not usually respectful of laws and rules if they get in the way of getting things done. Great people skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>People-oriented and fun-loving, they make things more fun for others by their enjoyment. Living for the moment, they love new experiences. They dislike theory and impersonal analysis. Interested in serving others. Likely to be the center of attention in social situations. Well-developed common sense and practical ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>Enthusiastic, idealistic, and creative. Able to do almost anything that interests them. Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>Creative, resourceful, and intellectually quick. Good at a broad range of things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTJ</strong></td>
<td>Practical, traditional, and organized. Likely to be athletic. Not interested in theory or abstraction unless they see the practical application. Have clear visions of the way things should be. Loyal and hard-working. Like to be in charge. Exceptionally capable in organizing and running activities. &quot;Good citizens&quot; who value security and peaceful living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESFJ</strong></td>
<td>Warm-hearted, popular, and conscientious. Tend to put the needs of others over their own needs. Feel strong sense of responsibility and duty. Value traditions and security. Interested in serving others. Need positive reinforcement to feel good about themselves. Well-developed sense of space and function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENFJ</strong></td>
<td>Popular and sensitive, with outstanding people skills. Externally focused, with real concern for how others think and feel. Usually dislike being alone. They see everything from the human angle, and dislike impersonal analysis. Very effective at managing people issues, and leading group discussions. Interested in serving others, and probably place the needs of others over their own needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENTJ</strong></td>
<td>Assertive and outspoken—they are driven to lead. Excellent ability to understand difficult organisational problems and create solid solutions. Intelligent and well-informed, they usually excel at public speaking. They value knowledge and competence, and usually have little patience with inefficiency or disorganisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5
Contributions made by each Preference to each Type (Myers et al., 2003, p.38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sensing Types</th>
<th>Intuitive Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Thinking</td>
<td>With Feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I Depth of concentration</td>
<td>I Depth of concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S Reliance on facts</td>
<td>S Reliance on facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T Logic and analysis</td>
<td>F Warmth and sympathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I Depth of concentration</td>
<td>I Depth of concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S Reliance on facts</td>
<td>S Reliance on facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T Logic and analysis</td>
<td>F Warmth and sympathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P Adaptability</td>
<td>P Adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E Breadth of interests</td>
<td>E Breadth of interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S Reliance on facts</td>
<td>S Reliance on facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T Logic and analysis</td>
<td>F Warmth and sympathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P Adaptability</td>
<td>P Adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.2.3 Identifying type dynamics

Type dynamics refers to the interaction of the attitudes and functions for each type (Quenk, 1996). Each four-letter type stands for a complex set of dynamic relationships among functions (S, N, T, and F), the attitudes (E and I), and the attitude or orientation towards the outer world (J and P). In order to elucidate the dynamic relationship within each of the sixteen personality four-letter MBTI personality types, the sequence of the letters will first be explained. The first letter in the combination is the person’s attitude. This is either the letter E, which refers to extraverts, or the letter I, which refers to introverts. The two middle letters are the preferred mental tools and are therefore the dominant and the auxiliary functions. The second letter in the combination refers to how a person gathers information, their preferred perceiving function. This letter may be either S for sensing or N for intuition. The third letter may be either T (for thinking) or F (for feeling). These functions are related to a person’s preferred judging function. The last letter in the combination refers to a person’s judging/perceiving attitude towards the outer world. This letter may be either J (for judging) or P (for perceiving). The middle two letters identify the dominant and auxiliary functions (Myers et al., 2003). Table 3.6 summarises the position of the preferences.

Table 3.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-I</th>
<th>S-N</th>
<th>T-F</th>
<th>J-P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Perceiving functions</td>
<td>Judging functions</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion or Introversion</td>
<td>Sensing or Intuition</td>
<td>Thinking or Feeling</td>
<td>Judging or Perceiving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People use all of the basic mental tools. Type develops because every individual has an inborn natural preference for one of the four functions (Myers et al., 2003). The function most
frequently preferred is known as the dominant function. Therefore, the function to which people want to allocate their attention and activities most of the time is referred to as the dominant function. This may be either an individual’s preferred form of judgment (which is either thinking or feeling), or an individual’s preferred form of perception (which is either sensing or intuition). People usually use their dominant function together with their preferred attitude (which is either introversion or extraversion). For example, if a person’s dominant function is thinking, and the person’s preferred attitude is extraversion, then the person will most probably enjoy spending much of his or her time making logical judgments, reaching conclusions, and accomplishing things out in the world. In contrast, if a person’s dominant function is intuition and the person’s preferred attitude is extraversion, then such a person would typically enjoy coming up with new ideas and possibilities or projects in the outer world and would enjoy letting others know about his or her enthusiasisms (Myers et al., 2003).

In addition, the auxiliary function complements the dominant function in two ways. Firstly, the auxiliary function always comes from another pair of functions. If the dominant function comes from the judging functions (Thinking or Feeling), then the auxiliary will be from the perceiving functions (Sensing or Intuition) and the other way around. Secondly, it is likely to function mainly in the less preferred attitude (which is either extraversion or introversion). In other words, if the dominant attitude is extraverted, then the auxiliary attitude will be introverted and the other way around (Myers et al., 2003). The judging and perceiving function refers to a person’s attitude towards the outer world. In other words, it refers to whether the preferred perceiving function (either Sensing or Intuition) or the preferred judging function (Thinking or Feeling) is used when a person is extraverting, regardless of whether extraversion is the person’s preferred attitude (Quenk,1996).

3.1.2.4 Personality type groupings

Myers et al. (1998) provided the following descriptions of the personality type groupings pertaining to combinations of the four attitudes (Extraversion and Introversion with Judging and Perceiving) and combinations of Extraversion and Introversion with each of the four mental functions Sensing (S), Intuition (N), Thinking (T) and Feeling (F).

(a) **Combinations of the four attitudes (IJ, IP, EP, EJ)**

The combination of the two attitudes (E and I) and the two attitudes towards the outer world (J and P) identify the particular type dynamics. The extraverted judging types (namely the EJ
types: ESTJ, ENTJ, ESFJ and ENFJ) are those whose dominant function is an extraverted judging dominant type (ET or EF). The introverted perceiving types (namely the IP types: ISTP, INTP, ISFP, INFP) are those whose dominant function is an introverted judging function (IT or IF). The dominant function of the ET types (ESTP, ESFP, ENTP, ENFP) is an extraverted perceiving function (ES or EN). Lastly, the IJ types (ISTJ, ISFJ, INTJ, INFJ) have a dominant introverted perceiving function (IS or IN) (Myers, et al., 2003).

(b) Combinations of attitudes of energy and functions of Perception: IS, ES, IN , EN

The grouping of IN, EN, IS and ES combine the functions of perception (S or I) with the attitudes (E or I) (Myers et al., 2003). Introverts with sensing (IS) types typically like to test ideas in order to ascertain whether they can be supported by facts. They typically like to deal with real and factual information in a careful, unhurried way. Regardless of whether their Sensing is dominant or introverted (ISTJ, ISFJ), or auxiliary and extraverted (ISTP, ISFP), they avoid leadership roles and will probably experience discomfort when they find themselves in such a role. Introverts with Intuition (INs) are reflective and intellectual. They are interested in knowledge for its own sake, as well as ideas, theory and depth of understanding. Regardless of whether their Intuition is dominant and introverted (INFJ, INTJ) or auxiliary and extraverted (INFP, INTP), people of this kind usually enjoy the company of others. They typically feel affirmed in their intellectual or philosophical interests and in their disinterests (Myers et al., 2003).

The extraverts with Sensing (ES) types are active, realistic doers and are the most practical of all types. They typically enjoy the material world and pay attention to the appearance of things, both aesthetically and from a practical, functional perspective. Regardless of whether their Sensing is extraverted and dominant (ESTP, ESFP) or introverted and auxiliary (ESTJ, ESFJ), this type usually appears confident of their relationship with the world and all it contains. Extraverts with Intuition (EN) types usually see the possibilities with which they are confronted as challenges to make things happen. They typically have a wide range of interests and like to see new patterns and relationships. Regardless of whether their Intuition is dominant and extraverted (ENFP, ENTP) or auxiliary and introverted (ENFJ, ENTJ), these four types share a vision of future potentialities in the world, whether for people, structures, institutions, or the general future of human activities (Myers et al., 2003).
This grouping, like that of the E and I with the Perceiving functions, does not identify dynamic entities, but rather identifies the combination of an attitude with a judging function, which may either be the dominant or the auxiliary function (Myers et al., 2003). Extraverts with thinking (ETs) are usually active and energetic. They are objective and like to make things happen in a reasoned, analytical and logical way. Regardless of whether their thinking is dominant and extraverted (ESTJ, ENTJ) or auxiliary and introverted (ESTP, ENTP), these four types share an expectation that they themselves and those around them should be confident, competent and effective. Extraverts with feelings (EFs) are sociable, friendly and sympathetic individuals. They typically like to make things happen for the pleasure and welfare of others. Regardless of whether their Feeling is dominant and extraverted (ESFJ, ENFJ) or auxiliary and introverted (ESFP, ENFP), these types typically try to resolve arguable situations or mediate among people who are at odds with each other (Myers & McCaulley, 1998).

Introverts with Feeling (IFs) are quiet and caring. They typically have a concern for deep and lasting values, as well as for people and the way people feel. Regardless of whether their Feeling is dominant and introverted (ISFP, INFP) or auxiliary and extraverted (ISFJ, INFJ), people of this kind feel things very intensely and in a manner that can sometimes be confusing to others. Introverts with Thinking (ITs) are quiet and thoughtful. The typically have a concern for the basic principles that explain causes and consequences of events or the workings of things. Regardless of whether their Thinking is introverted and dominant (ISTP, INTP) or auxiliary and extroverted (ISTJ, INTJ), people of this kind are natural and enthusiastic critics of whatever is being presented. A type table with type groupings will indicate the contribution that each preference grouping makes to the sixteen personality types, regardless of the unique dynamics of each of the sixteen types. Table 3.7 shows the eight dominant functions and the eight combinations that combine E and I with each of the four functions.
### Table 3.7

**Terminology for Describing Combinations of Preferences (Myers et al., 2003, p. 38)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynamic Combinations</th>
<th>E-I with the functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESP Types</strong></td>
<td>Extraverts with Sensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two dominant extraverted Sensing types – ESTP and ESFP</td>
<td><strong>ES Types</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISJ Types</strong></td>
<td>Introverts with Sensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two dominant introverted Sensing types – ISTJ and ISFJ</td>
<td><strong>IS Types</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENP Types</strong></td>
<td>Extraverts with Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two dominant extraverted Intuitive types – ENTP and ENFP</td>
<td><strong>EN Types</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INJ Types</strong></td>
<td>Introverts with Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two dominant introverted Intuitive types – INTJ and INFJ</td>
<td><strong>IN Types</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETJ Types</strong></td>
<td>Extraverts with Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two dominant extraverted Thinking types – ESTJ and ENTJ</td>
<td><strong>ET Types</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITP Types</strong></td>
<td>Introverts with Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two dominant introverted Thinking types – ISTP and INTP</td>
<td><strong>IT Types</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFJ Types</strong></td>
<td>Extraverts with Feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two dominant extraverted Feeling types – ESFJ and ENFJ</td>
<td><strong>EF Types</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IFP Types</strong></td>
<td>Introverts with Feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two dominant Introverted Feeling types – ISFP and INFP</td>
<td><strong>IF Types</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2.5 **Personality type development**

A very important aspect of Jung’s (1971) theory is the focus on the development of personality throughout the life span. A hierarchy of functions describes an individual’s personality at any stage of life. This hierarchy of dominant, auxiliary, tertiary and inferior functions permits and motivates the kind of development and adaptation that is likely to be most useful to an individual at each stage of life (Myers et al., 2003). In Jungian typology the
optimum use of the four functions is not obtained through equal development of the functions, but rather through selective development of each function in proportion to both its relative importance to the individual and its useful relationship to the other functions (Myers et al., 2003).

Type development is a lifelong process of achieving better control over the functions and attitudes. According to Myers et al. (2003), for each type, two of the four functions are thought to be more exciting and more likely to be consciously developed and used. The two less preferred functions are assumed to be less exciting and are expected to be somewhat neglected. Development comes from striving for excellence in those functions that attract the most attention and from becoming acceptable in the other less attractive but essential functions.

According to the type theory, children are born with a preference for one function over the other (Myers et al., 2003). In addition, children are more concerned with their preferred function. They are encouraged to use their dominant function and to a lesser extent their auxiliary function. This will enable a child to become more skilful, proficient and differentiated in their use of the dominant function. A differentiated function is a function that is disconnected and exists by itself. In other words, the function can operate on its own without being mixed up with or tainted by any other function (Jung, 1959, 1971). When a function is executed well, a feeling of capability arises, and with the reinforcement of constant practice in these functions, these functions become more controlled and trustworthy. According to Myers et al. (2003), the satisfaction of using preferred functions generalises the other activities requiring use of the functions and leads to the acquisition of a set of surface traits, behaviours and skills that grow out of the basic preferences. As a result of the development of preferred functions, the opposite functions are neglected.

The primary task in youth and adulthood is to develop the dominant and auxiliary functions. The theory assumes that these instinctive, natural functions are appropriate in helping a person find his or her comfortable and effective place in the world. People claim their place in the world by making certain choices that develop some parts of themselves at the expense of others. During the first half of people’s lives, it is therefore appropriate that they devote most of their energy to developing their dominant and auxiliary functions. People in their first half of life specialise in establishing a distinct sense of identity (Myers et al., 2003).

As expected, people in their middle years appear to be motivated towards rounding off their personalities by slowly adding the previously abandoned tertiary and inferior functions to the
sphere of operation (Myers & Kirby, 1994). As a result, in the second half of life, it is proper to be a “generalist” and not a “specialist”. Development of this kind allows individuals to add new perspectives and experiences that they did not previously find very rewarding. Less energy and attention is given to the dominant and auxiliary function and greater energy is directed to the tertiary and inferior functions. None of this redirecting of energy results in a change in an individual’s personality type. Instead, the expression of the type may differ in accordance with different stages of life and different life circumstances (Myers et al., 2003). The transition therefore does not change the psychological type preferences of an individual, nor does it mean that all the mental functions become equally developed. However, the transition does result in a gradually more skilful use of the previously underdeveloped functions and the ability to use them to accomplish the purpose of the dominant function as assisted by the auxiliary function (Myers & Kirby, 1994). No one (or very few people) achieves a point of development where he or she is able to use all four functions effectively according to what the situation requires. Although a very limited number of people will ever reach such a stage, striving for a comfortable and effective expression of the four mental functions is an interesting challenge for most people (Myers et al., 2003).

3.2 VARIABLES INFLUENCING THE EXPRESSION OF PERSONALITY PREFERENCES

A psychological type is more than just the expression of the combined functions and attitudes or preferences (Myers et al., 2003). Each of the sixteen possible types is a unique combination based on the interactions between the preferences within that type. Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) model of type development is a theory which is a hypothesis based on observations. Real personality development takes place within an environment and a context. Each person’s development is influenced by multiple factors (Myers & Kirby, 1994).

The most common and important environmental influences on development include:

- Cultural values and expectations (Feingold, 1994; Myers & Kirby, 1994, Myers et al., 2003)
- Family and friends (Jung, 1921; Myers & Kirby, 1994, Myers et al., 2003; Roberts, 2009)
- Environmental influences (Myers & Kirby, 1994, Myers et al., 2003; Roberts, 2009)
- Gender (Feingold, 1994; Myers & Kirby, 1994)
- Individual factors that require or encourage development of skills and behaviours (Myers & Kirby, 1994, Myers et al., 2003)
- Education (Myers & Kirby, 1994, Myers et al., 2003)
- Religion (Myers et al., 2003)
- Profession (Myers et al., 2003)

According to Myers et al. (2003), the increasing evidence with regard to the biological basis of psychological type lends credibility to Jung’s (1959) theory that the personalities of all human beings are structured in accordance with type dichotomies. Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) and Jung (1959) identified significant underlying patterns of functioning that are common to everyone. Personality preferences can be measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, 1987), also referred to as the MBTI. The theories of Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) and Jung (1959) are supported by the fact that the MBTI and translations of the MBTI are being used successfully by various cultures. It is evident that all four dichotomies and all sixteen types are recognised in other countries and cultures. However, the various dichotomies may be differently expressed in other countries and cultures (Myers et al., 2003).

3.2.1 Environmental influences

Environmental influences can either foster the development of an individual’s inborn preferences, or they can discourage development by reinforcing activities that are less comfortable, satisfying and motivating. The reinforcement of the activities makes it difficult to gain confidence and skills in one’s natural preferences. Environmental influences in type development can even distort or suppress a person’s natural type. As a result, such a person may become more skilful in using another, less preferred function, which will make the person feel less comfortable, confident and in touch with their best traits (Myers et al., 1998; Myers & Kirby, 1994; Roberts, 2009). The Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) personality type theory may not necessarily reveal the extent to which natural development has been reinforced or distorted. For example, an individual may have difficulty in choosing between the expectations of his/her parents and his/her own preferences. A child may have grown up in a family that values Sensing types. However, the child’s natural preference is for the Intuition type, but because he or she has been taught at home to value the Sensing type, such a person may report on the Sensing type in the indicator (Myers & Kirby, 1994; Roberts, 2009).
3.2.2 Cultural influences

According to Hofstede (1991), culture can be referred to as the patterns of thinking, feeling and acting. Figure 3.4 depicts the operating system of the human mind as described by Hofstede.

![Diagram of three levels of uniqueness in human mental programming (Hofstede, 1991, p.3)](image)

Jung (1921, 1959, 1971) and Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) believed that the psychological type provides a basic structure similar to the structure of Hofstede’s operating system. These researchers believed that human nature and culture all play a role in the shaping of an individual’s personality. Myers and McCaulley (1985) conducted a study with African American students in the USA and with Japanese students in Japan. They found evidence that supported Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) psychological type theory and Myers and Briggs’ personality type theory (Myers, 1987), namely that personality types are similar throughout the human race. Several researchers conducted validity studies on the personality type theory of Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) as a personality measure among various cultures. Similar results have been recorded in Canada (Anderson, 1992), the United Kingdom (Lidgard & Bates, 1998; Oswick, Mahoney, & Steyn, 1994), the United States of America and Australia (Anderson, 1992; Lidgard & Bates, 1998) as well as South Africa (Zietsmann, 1996).

Personality type theory (Myers, 1987) may not be successful in identifying type preferences in cultures in which group or communal identity is a central value. These cultures are
typically known as the collectivists (Myers et al., 2003). Collectivist values may make it difficult for individuals within these cultures to respond to the personality type theory instruments for the following reasons:

- The centrality and importance of group identity and cultural norms can make it difficult for individuals to recognise and report their natural individual preferences. Broad cultural norms can also influence a person’s need and ability to find their own underlying preferences.
- Type preferences are expressed very differently in collectivist cultures from the way in which they are expressed in individualistic cultures. For example, Introversion may not be expressed by finding time alone within cultures that expect and value regular group/family interaction. Instead, individuals who prefer Introversion may find other alternative ways that are acceptable in their culture in order to support their need for internal processing time.

Cultural psychologists also believe that the concept of personality is an expression of the individualistic nature of Western cultures, while in collectivist cultures (where group orientations and situations are stronger determinants of social behaviour), personality is less prominent (Bergh & Theron, 2003). Cultural membership is important in that it often implies historical and immediate mega-environments which prescribe certain behaviours. The cultural group to which a person belongs at a certain stage of life may create roles and other identities with related ways of behaving. In many ways culture determines how people think and feel and what they do. This in turn influences a person’s preferences for a certain function or attitude (Bergh & Theron, 2003).

People’s personality types are assessed with the aid of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). When a decision has to be made as to whether the MBTI would be an appropriate measuring tool for clients from a collectivist culture, practitioners need to assess degrees of acculturation. Clients from a primarily collectivist culture may find taking the MBTI very unhelpful or even offensive. Those clients who are bicultural or whose primary reference is the majority culture are less likely to experience such difficulties (Myers et al., 2003). Practitioners should therefore always be aware of the cultural influence that may play a role in the administration of the MBTI. Caution should therefore also be exercised when interpreting the results of preferences, specifically for individuals in the collectivists cultures.

Almost every culture for which reported type data are available has been found to have a predominance of the Sensing Judging types, and the majority have reported STJ as the
modal type in the culture (Myers et al., 2003). De Beer (1997) analysed the type preferences in South Africa and found that black people seem to display a preference for Feeling rather than Thinking. This Feeling preference is based on the Ubuntu values characteristic of black South African culture. However, the South African database (which consists of 6452 respondents) reported ESTJ and ISTJ as the most common preference for black as well as white South Africans. A cultural-neutral description of the STJs describes them as factual and reality-based types. They usually take reality as a given and internalise the history and traditions of their culture as “the way things are”. They typically enjoy being part of a group and feel a great degree of loyalty towards that group’s past, present and future. A primary value for them is to preserve the culture and tradition of the group. A thorough grasp of cultural influences is essential in order to understand the underlying type pattern and to explore how that pattern is expressed in each culture (Myers et al., 2003).

3.2.3 Gender influences

Expectations associated with gender roles can have a significant impact on type development. In certain cultures, the socially acceptable behaviour is Thinking oriented for a boy and Feeling oriented for a girl. Social values concerning gender-appropriate behaviour can be very difficult for girls who have a natural preference for the Thinking function, and for boys who have a natural preference for the Feeling function (Myers & Kirby, 1994).

Females have been found to be more extraverted than males, preferring the Intuition function to the Sensing function and reporting that they preferred feeling to thinking (Avdeyeva & Church, 2005; Feingold, 1994; Furnham & Stringfield, 1993).

3.2.4 Influence of individual circumstances

A person’s developmental course may be influenced by various life choices, or possibly by an accident or by fate. Unexpected changes in family and financial responsibilities are some of the factors that can influence the individual’s circumstances and thereby influence his or her development. In addition, marriage to a spouse with opposite preferences may well influence the course of development, at least for a time. Working in a certain kind of job that requires skills in the person’s least preferred functions may delay the development of the dominant and auxiliary functions (Myers & Kirby, 1994). A child may be born with a certain preferred function or attitude, but when the mother exhibits an abnormal preference for a specific function or attitude, the child may alter his or her preferences as a result of the influence of the mother (Jung, 1921).
3.2.5 Personality development over the life span

Although personality types develop over a person’s life span, type development could occur during various life stages. Table 3.8 illustrates life span stages and type development with the aid of Super, Savickas and Super’s (1996) life span model.

Table 3.8

*Merging Super’s Life Span Stages with Type Development (Myers et al., 2003, p. 319)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super’s stages/ages</th>
<th>Super’s Career Development Tasks</th>
<th>Hypothesised Type Development Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth (4-13)</strong></td>
<td>Becoming aware of the future. Finding ways to develop competencies and to achieve, in order to increase control over one’s life.</td>
<td>Dominant (1) function emerges and becomes guiding force in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exploration (14-24)</strong></td>
<td>Crystallising, specifying, and implementing an occupational choice.</td>
<td>Auxiliary (2) function develops and helps balance dominant function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establishment (25-44)</strong></td>
<td>Stabilising, consolidating, and possibly advancing in career(s).</td>
<td>Dominant and auxiliary functions are working together well. Tertiary (3) function may begin to emerge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance (45-65)</strong></td>
<td>Holding on (stagnating or plateauing). Keeping up (updating or enriching). Innovating (changing).</td>
<td>Tertiary function may be drawn in to keep those who are holding on from stagnating. For those who are keeping up or innovating, tertiary function may provide new directions and behaviours. Inferior function (4) may emerge in importance and also help provide new directions and behaviours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 EVALUATION

In the remainder of this chapter, personality type theory will be evaluated according to its usefulness as a personality theory; criticisms of the theory will also be discussed. In addition, the difference between trait and type theory will be discussed.

3.3.1 Usefulness of personality type theory

Myers et al. (2003) report using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), which uses measures to determine people’s dominant personality types) in various settings, such as counselling and psychotherapy, career counselling, education, organisations and in multicultural settings.

Analytical psychology (like all other theories) needs to be evaluated against certain criteria in order to be proven useful. Firstly, a useful theory should generate testable hypotheses and descriptive research, and secondly, it must have the capacity to be either verified or disproved. Unfortunately, Jung’s theory is impossible to verify or disprove. As a result many people are sceptical about the validity of Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) typology theory. In addition, the collective unconscious, which is the core of Jung’s theory, remains a difficult concept to test empirically. A significant amount of evidence for the concepts of archetypes and the collective unconscious came from Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) own inner experiences, and therefore could not be empirically tested. The acceptance of this theory therefore relies more on faith than on scientific proof (Feist & Feist, 2009; Meyer, Moore, & Viljoen, 1997). In addition to his own inner experiences, Jung (1921, 1959, 1971) also drew on other sources such as theology and mystery. Various people criticised him because he used such sources, but Jung explained that he had used these sources to gain a better understanding of the unconscious, not because he necessarily believed in any of these fields (Meyer, et al., 1997). Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) theory was also criticised for being unclear, incomprehensible and contradictory. These criticisms were, however, based on parts of Jung’s theory. The critics had not studied Jung’s theory as a whole and therefore did not see the whole picture (Meyer et al., 1997).

On the other hand, the part of Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) theory that relates to functions and attitudes can be studied and empirically tested. As a matter of fact, a lot of research has been done to determine the validity of the theory.
A third criterion that a useful theory should meet is that the theory should have the ability to organise observations into meaningful frameworks. Analytical psychology is unique in that it adds a new dimension to personality theory, namely the collective unconscious. Those aspects of the human personality that deal with the occult, and with the paranormal aspects of psychology are not touched on by most other personality theories. Although the collective unconscious is not the only possible explanation for these phenomena, and other concepts could possibly account for them, Jung (1921, 1959, 1971) is the only modern personality theorist to have made a significant attempt to include such a broad scope of human activity within a single theoretical framework. A fourth criterion to determine whether a theory is useful is its practicality. Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) theory and the personality type theory (Myers & Briggs, 1987) are used by many professional people and as such are used to solve everyday problems. A final criterion for a useful theory is parsimony. Jung's (1921, 1959, 1971) psychology is not simple, but the human personality is not a simple concept either. Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) proclivity for searching for data from a variety of disciplines and his willingness to explore his own unconscious, even beneath the personal level, contribute to the great complexity and the broad scope of this theory.

3.3.2 Personality type theory versus trait theory

Human behaviour is characterised by enduring and consistent patterns of behaviour described as dimensions, traits, factors and types (Bergh & Theron, 2003). Traits are described as a neuropsychic structure inside a person’s body and mind or a variable-centred approach which is aimed at delineating quantitative characteristics that are used to describe the personality of all individuals (Avdeyeva & Church, 2005). Traits are universal and unique; however, people differ in the strength of the trait they possess. Most current personality measurements hypothesise the existence of one or more psychological traits. In the trait model, a person is assumed to have a number of these characteristics. The instruments designed to assess traits are intended to measure how much of the particular characteristic a person possesses. According to the trait theory, one end of the trait dimension is usually considered to be a good trait whereas the other end of the dimension is considered to be a bad trait. In addition, in many trait models, having too much or too little of a characteristic can be viewed as being neurotic. For example, a valuable amount of dominance is a good thing, but too much dominance may become a bad trait (Quenk, 1993).

Myers’ (1987) theory of personality (as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator) has specifically been designed not to measure traits, but rather to sort people into equal-value groups to which (in accordance with Jung’s theory) they already belong. The type theory is
therefore based on a person-centred approach and is designed to identify a number of discrete, qualitative types or configurations of personality (Avdeyeva & Church, 2005).

### 3.4 IMPLICATIONS FOR CAREER COUNSELLING

One of Myers’ (1987) original motives for developing the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) as a measure of personality type was to use the instrument during career counselling in order to help people find meaningful and productive work (Friedman & Slatt, 1988; Pittenger, 1993; Saunders, 1991). The MBTI is probably the most widely used instrument in career counselling (Furnhan & Stringfield, 1993). Exploring one’s type could also assist in career exploration, managing change, decision making strategies and implementing changes (Myers et al., 2003). Career counselling encourages individuals to play an active part in altering or creating work environments to better suit their personal preferences (Chartrand, 1991). Self-knowledge of one’s own type can therefore help one identify what is likely to be satisfying and suggest strategies for changing a work environment so that it is better suited to one’s type. Career counselling focuses on various aspects, such as personality types, values, self-esteem and interests (Myers et al., 2003). It is within this framework that this study focuses on personality preferences as a career meta-competency that enables one to become more employable and to sustain one’s employability.

Cole et al. (2009) found that personality plays a role during the selection of employees. They further recognise that a relationship exists between personality preferences and employability. Higgs (2001) proposed that an individual could develop their weaker personality function and therefore deliver more rounded behaviour, which could possibly influence the expression of their employability attributes.

As previously discussed, the nature of work and career is changing, and hence the essence of career counselling must change as well. One needs to identify and understand one’s own temperament as one of the keys to success in the new world of work (Bridges, 1994; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991). Type (as a developmental component) gives individuals the ability to adapt to new situations, using all the parts and functions of their personalities. Counsellors (and all those involved in career counselling) can use type to help individuals to identify the more satisfying roles and situations as well as to help individuals to adapt to those that seem to be a stretch for them (Myers et al., 2003). Career counselling is therefore vital in assisting individuals to adapt their types in order to increase their employability. For example, Intuition judgment may be someone’s preference but the type of job that the person wants to apply for values Sensing judgment more highly. Career counsellors could
help such individuals to adapt and develop their Sensing judgment more, which would ultimately help them to become more employable (for that specific job type). Individuals can benefit by identifying their dominant function and then working on developing their weaker function in order to deliver more rounded behaviour (Myers & McCaulley, 1998). Career counselling is one method used to help individuals to identify their dominant and weaker functions.

3.5 THEORETICAL INTEGRATION

Jung's (1921, 1959, 1979) psychological types theory and the personality type theory (Myers, 1987) are relevant to this research because these theories provide a theoretical understanding of individual differences. Personality types are measured using four bipolar scales, each dealing with individual differences. The four bipolar scales consist of four opposite attitudes (Extraversion – Introversion and Judgment – Perception) and four mental functions (Sensing – Intuition and Thinking – Feeling). Sixteen different personality types can be derived from these combinations. This study is particularly concerned with the combinations of the two attitudes (Extraversion and Introversion) and the two attitudes towards the outer world (Judging and Perceiving) with each of the four mental functions (Sensing, Intuition, Thinking and Feeling). These combinations identify particular personality dynamics and are useful to researchers and practitioners (Myers, et al., 2003). Extraverted Judging (EJ) types (ESTJ, ENTJ, ESFJ, ENFJ) are those whose dominant function is an extraverted judging one (ET or EF). Introverted Perceiving (IP) types (ISTP, INTP, ISFP, INFP) have a dominant introverted judging function (IT or IF). The dominant function of the EP types (ESTP, ESFP, ENTP, ENFP) is an extraverted perceiving function (ES or EN) and lastly, the IJ types (ISTJ, ISFJ, INTJ, INFJ) have a dominant introverted perceiving function (IS or IN) (Myers, et al., 2003).

People typically only develop their dominant functions (especially at a younger age) and tend to neglect their inferior functions. Any person can learn to use all four mental functions consciously by gaining knowledge and understanding of their own and other people's personality type dynamics. The conscious effort to gain knowledge and understanding of how to use all four mental functions will assist people in recognising their own (and other people's) typical reactions, and help them to develop emotionally intelligent ways of dealing with their responses (Quenk, 1993).

Based on the theories of Jung (1921, 1959, 1971, 1990) and Myers (1987), personality preferences are defined for the purpose of this research as the dominant and conscious
tendency to either act (having a dominant extraverted attitude) or react (having a dominant introverted attitude) in a specific way, firstly when observing one’s outer world (which could be directed towards either seeking sensory data or being guided by inspirational hunches), and secondly by assigning meaning to every experience (which may involve either subjective evaluation of experiences in terms of emotions, or objective evaluation in terms of logic and reasonable interpretation of people, things and events).

Table 3.9

*Theoretical Integration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of personality</th>
<th>Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) theory of psychological type</th>
<th>Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) theory of personality type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The theory of Jung divides the psyche into three distinct parts.</td>
<td>Personality refers to the human psyche. The psyche is seen as a complex network of systems interacting with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The ego (identifies with the conscious mind)</td>
<td>Psychic energy flows continually from one system to another, in a constant striving for harmony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Personal unconscious (includes anything which is not presently conscious, but could be)</td>
<td>Personality development is viewed as a dynamic process, which takes place throughout life as the primary development task of a person’s individuation or self-actualisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Personal unconscious (includes both memories and those that have been suppressed for some reason)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core constructs</th>
<th>Extraversion vs Introversion Sensing vs Intuition Thinking vs Feeling</th>
<th>Extraversion vs Introversion Sensing vs Intuition Thinking vs Feeling Judging vs Perceiving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Core personality types (Typology) | 1. Extraversion with Thinking and Sensation | ESTJ, ENTJ, ESFJ, ENFJ ISTP, INTP, ISFP, INFP ESTP, ESFP, ENTP, ENFP |
| Variables influencing personality development | Environmental influences
| | Cultural influences
| | Gender influences
| | Individual circumstances
| | Life span development
| Measurement | Jung Personality Questionnaire
| | Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)
| Evaluation (Advantages vs limitations of theory) | The theory can be used in various settings such as counselling and psychotherapy, career counselling, education, organisations and in multicultural settings.
| | That part of Jung's (1921, 1959, 1971) theory which is concerned with the functions and attitudes can be studied and empirically tested.
| | Those aspects of the human personality that deal with the occult, mysterious and the parapsychological aspects are not touched on by most other personality theories. Even though the collective unconscious is not the only possible explanation for these phenomena, and other concepts could also possibly account for them, Jung (1921, 1959, 1971) is the only modern personality
| | ISTJ, ISFJ, INTJ, INFJ
| | Thinking and Intuition
| | 3. Extraversion with Feeling and Sensation
| | 4. Extraversion with Feeling and Intuition
| | 5. Introversion with Thinking and Sensation
| | 6. Introversion with Thinking and Intuition
| | 7. Introversion with Feeling and Sensation
| | 8. Introversion with Feeling and Intuition
|
Chapter 3 aimed to conceptualise the constructs of personality and personality preferences from the theoretical perspective of Analytical Psychology. The theory and constructs underlying the Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) personality theory were discussed as a theoretical framework that forms the basis for studying the construct of personality preferences.

The theoretical implications for career counselling were discussed. Finally, the limitations and critique of Jung’s (1921, 1959, 1971) typology and the Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) personality theory were identified. Part of the first research aim has been achieved by this chapter as it has conceptualised the construct of personality and personality preferences from a theoretical perspective.

The following literature research aim was partly achieved in this chapter:

Research aim 2: To conceptualise the personality attributes constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence and the employability attributes construct.

Chapter 4 focuses on the discussion of the second variable of self-esteem from the perspective of the humanistic and social psychology paradigms, with the aim of providing further clarity on the second research question.
CHAPTER 4: SELF-ESTEEM

This chapter focuses on the discussion of self-esteem as a career meta-competency that influences the employability of individuals. Self-esteem will be discussed from the humanistic and social psychology perspective with reference to the development of the self as a concept, along with its related constructs. This will enable the researcher to develop a conceptual framework for exploring the relationship between the variables of personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes from the various paradigmatic perspectives which form the foundation of the proposed integrated model.

This chapter therefore aims to explore the construct of self-esteem and the related theoretical models. The variables influencing self-esteem and the implications for career counselling will also be discussed.

4.1 CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

According to the humanistic personality theories and social psychology, the paradigmatic foundation for the conceptualisation of the concept of self includes the self-concept, self-identity, self-perception, self-regard, self-esteem and self-efficacy. Figure 4.1 provides an overview of the various constructs that conceptualise the concept of self-esteem. Each of these constructs will be discussed in more detail.
4.1.1 Conceptualisation of self

It was only during the period between the 1500s and 1800s that people became aware of their inner selves (Baumeister, 1997). The self is a concept that is used every day. It encompasses the direct feeling that a person has of confidential access to his or her own thoughts and feelings (Baumeister, 1997).

The theoretical rationale for the construct of self-esteem originates in the work of James (1890), who was the first psychologist to develop a theory regarding self-esteem. James (1890) differentiated between the self as the subject and the self as the object. James (1890) categorised the self as either the me (also called the empirical ego) or the I (the pure ego). In addition, James (1890) divided the history of the self into three different parts, namely its constituents (the material self, the social self, the spiritual self and the pure ego); the feelings

Figure 4.1. The conceptual foundations of self-esteem (Coetze, 2005, p.112)
and emotions they arouse (self-feelings); and the actions which they prompt (self-seeking and self-preservation).

Cooley (1902) researched the self almost a decade later and found that the self-conception grew out of social interaction. He was of the opinion that people adopt a reflected appraisal based on the imagined appraisal of others. Therefore, if a person imagines that another person has a negative view of him or her, he or she will also have a negative view of him/herself (Strauss & Coethals, 1991). James’s (1890) distinction between the self as the knower and the self as the known and Cooley’s (1902) concept of the looking glass were major contributions that marked the turn of the century and the exploration of the concept of self (Strauss & Coethals, 1991).

Freud (1917) added to the literature on the concept of self through his use of the related terms ego, narcissism, well-being, self-regard and self-esteem. In Freud’s (1917) view, the ego invests libido in the self, thereby creating narcissism, and identities with other people as a means of resolving conflict and managing the id, the superego and reality. To Freud (1917), the most basic part of the mind was the it (translated into English as the id), the I (translated as the ego) and the over-I (translated as the superego) (Feist & Feist, 2009). The existence of the self and the self-concept are clearly suggested by these concepts (Strauss & Coethals, 1991). Freud’s (1917) theory was based on his seduction theory (Oedipus complex theory), pleasureable/unpleasurable principle (Baker & Baker, 1987), reality principle (Feist & Feist, 2009) and the moralistic principle (Feist & Fesit, 2009). The id has no contact with reality, but it continuously strives to reduce tension by satisfying basic needs. Its sole funciton is therefore to seek pleasure and the id therefore serves the pleasure principle. The ego or the I is in contact with reality. It grows out of the id during infancy and becomes a person’s only source of communication with the external world. The ego is therefore governed by the reality principle. Lastly, the superego represents the moral and ideal aspects of the self and is guided by the moralistic and idealistic principles as opposed to the pleasure principle (guided by the id) and the realistic principle (guided by the ego) (Feist & Feist, 2009).
Figure 4.2 represents the schematic presentation of the self, personality and ego

![Schematic presentation of the self, personality and ego](image)

**Figure 4.2.** The schematic presentation of the self, personality and ego (Battle, 1982, p. 35)

Jung (1921) expanded on the theory of the self; he described the self as an archetype that becomes the centre of the personality over the course of development (Feist & Feist, 2009). The self as an archetype draws other archetypes together and unites them in the process of self-realisation. Both personal and collective unconscious images are incorporated in the self, which should not be confused with the ego, which represents consciousness only. Jung’s (1921) view of the self has already been discussed extensively in chapter 3.

Sullivan (1953) acknowledged his roots in Freudian theory, but expanded the theory and added (as Cooley did in 1902) that one’s sense of self is also influenced by the responses of others. People therefore develop a sense of self within a social context. Sullivan (1953) focused on issues of self-acceptance and the management of anxiety or insecurity that threatens one’s self-esteem.

Kohut (1971) added the nuclear self to Freud’s (1917) tripartite id, ego and superego. The nuclear self is affected by parental treatment and by ambitions and goals that develop from interaction with parents. Infants start to develop an indistinct concept of self when their experiences become personalised and differentiated in awareness as “I” or “me” experiences. As soon as infants establish a basic self structure, their tendency to actualise the self begins to develop (Baumeister, 1997; Brett & Swann, 1989; Rogers, 1963).

In summary, most theorists see the self as being representative of the individual’s perception of him/herself. A person’s perception of the self influences the way in which the person behaves, how the person acts and also the way in which the person perceives him/herself (Battle, 1982). People’s views about themselves are the building blocks of self-esteem (Pelham & Swann, 1989). In addition, most theorists differentiate between the self as the
subject or agent and the self as the object of a person’s own knowledge and evaluation (Symonds, 1951). The construct of self includes self-esteem and self-concept (Pelham & Swann, 1989). Self-concept inclines individuals towards behaviour that is in line with their personal beliefs. Self-esteem on the other hand is seen as a predictor of human behaviour; it influences the way those beliefs are put into action (Rosemary, Blash, & Unger, 1995). According to Pelham and Swann (1989), the concepts of self-esteem and self-concept are used interchangeably.

The Johari Window (Luft, 1969) describes the self as being composed of aspects known and unknown by the self as well as aspects that are known and unknown by others. The uneven nature of self-concept development is also evident from this model. Figure 4.3 provides an overview of the Johari Window:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known to self</th>
<th>Not known to self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Known to others</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not known to others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Open</td>
<td>2. Blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Private</td>
<td>4. Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.3. The Johari Window (Luft, 1969, p. 13)*

Area 1 represents the open area and includes aspects of the self that are known to the individual and to others. This area includes three basic aspects of human behaviour, namely thoughts, feelings and behaviours. This area has the greatest potential for growth because if an individual has an awareness of self, he or she can channel energy into nurturing, maintaining or changing parts of the self. In addition, the person can also benefit from feedback from others. Area 2 represents the blind area where feelings, thoughts and behaviours are known to others but not to the individual. Accuracy of self-perception is related to the accuracy of perception of significant others.

Area 3 represents the private area. Thoughts, feelings and behaviours are known to the individual but hidden from others. This area also allows for change, however, inasmuch as an awareness is present on the part of the individual. This area will shrink as trust and acceptance are developed in interpersonal behaviour. Lastly, area 4 represents the unknown area. In this area, thoughts, feelings and behaviours are not known by anyone. These aspects of the self may have been known at some point in a person’s life, but have been forgotten or repressed or have not permitted knowledge of self in a particular area.
The four areas in the Johare Window are typically different in size. During healthy human interactions, area 1 increases (thereby causing changes in the other quadrants as well). The Johare Window represents the whole self. Areas 1, 2 and sometimes area 3 represent the self-concept, which consists of those thoughts, feelings and attitudes that are regarded as being representative of who the person is (Frey & Carlock, 1989).

4.1.2 Conceptualisation of self-concept

James (1890) emphasised the multifaceted and hierarchical nature of the self. He organised the self into two distinct categories, namely the Me-self and the I-self (as noted earlier). The Me-self is the observed self that interprets the world and relationships. The interpretations are used to create an identity of the self. The Me-self is regarded as the self-concept of the modern world of psychology (Rosenberg, Schooler, Schoenbach, & Rosenberg, 1995).

Self-concept was first defined by Rogers (1951) as a global perception of oneself and one’s self-esteem reactions. Rogers (1959) postulated two self subsystems that include the self-concept and the ideal self. Rogers (1959) described the self-concept as one’s being and one’s experiences that are perceived in awareness by the individual. These perceived experiences are not always accurate (Feist & Feist, 2009). Once people have formed their self-concept, they find change and significant learning very difficult. The experiences that are not consistent with their self-concept are normally either denied or accepted only in distorted forms. Feist and Feist (2009) noted that change is not impossible, it is merely difficult. Change occurs more easily in an atmosphere of acceptance by others. This would allow an individual to reduce anxiety levels and to take ownership of past rejected experiences. Rogers (1959) described the ideal self as one’s view of self as one would wish to be. If a large gap exists between the ideal self and the self-concept this tends to produce an unhealthy personality. Psychologically healthy individuals perceive very few or no differences between their self-concept and their ideal self.

Baumeister (1997) defined self-concept as the total sum of inferences that a person has made about him/herself. These refer to a person’s personality traits and schemas, but they could also involve an understanding of one’s social roles and relationships. Furthermore, self-concept is based on behavioural principles and the interaction between behaviour and the environment (Battle, 2002). Self-concept includes qualities, capabilities and ways of thinking that typically define a person. Self-esteem is part of self-concept and includes self-evaluations (Baumeister, 1997; Young, 2004). Both self-concept and self-esteem are
important concepts in the social learning and psychological process (Schaufer, 1994). A positive link exists between improving self-concept and self-esteem (Dohnt & Tiggemann, 2006; Kerr & Kurpius, 2004). Bracken (1992) used a diagram with the global self in the middle. The other circles represent specific domains of the self-concept that overlap and make an equal contribution to the global self-concept. The domains include physical self-concept, competence self-concept, academic self-concept, affective self-concept, family self-concept and social self-concept. Global self-concept consists of two dimensions, namely an individual’s belief in his or her own virtue or moral worth on the one hand, and the individual’s sense of competence, efficacy or personal control on the other (Huges & Demo, 1989).

In summary, self-concept consists of organised structures with essential attributes which, because of their exceptional accessibility, serve to guide the interpretations of behaviours and characteristics of oneself and of others (Sedikides & Spencer, 2007).

4.1.3 Conceptualisation of self-identity

Baumeister (1997) referred to self-identity as the definitions that are created for and superimposed on the self. Self-identity is similar to individuality and represents the way people differ from each other (Buss, 2001). The distinction between personal and social identity had its roots in an early theory of personality (Angyal, 1951). According to Angyal (1951), every individual has two strong and at times conflicting motives. Individuals want to pursue their individual goals free of social constraints and this clearly separates one individual from another (personal identity). However, at the same time, every individual desires to become part of something that is greater than him/herself (Buss, 2001). This desire contributes to a social identity. An individual’s self-identity therefore includes both personal and social identities (Banaji & Holmes, 1994; Turner, Oakes, Haslam & McGarty, 1994). Brewer and Gardner (1996) divided social identities into three levels, namely individual, interpersonal and group or collective social identities.

4.1.3.1 Individual level

At the individual level, interpersonal comparisons are emphasised in terms of traits as a means of differentiating oneself from others (Brewer & Gardner, 1996). Global self-worth is based on comparing oneself with another person or group of people (Buss, 2001; Kernis, 2006). Individual level identities promote possible selves that reflect development in terms of personal characteristics, for example by becoming more skilled, wealthier, healthier or better
educated. The comparison and development of the above create a powerful image that sustains and justifies current activities (Lord, Brown & Freiberg, 1999).

4.1.3.2 Interpersonal level

Self-concepts are defined in terms of roles that specify a person’s relationship with other individuals (Brewer & Gardner, 1996). Such relationships could include child-parent relationships, student-teacher relationships or subordinate-manager relationships. According to Lord et al. (1999), mutual benefits and interdependent selves become more significant at this level. Self-worth is reliant on appropriate role behaviour (for example, being a good student or a good teacher). In addition, self-representation depends on an individual’s reflected self, or the person’s self as seen through the reactions of others. Interpersonal level identities propose that the possible selves should be linked to improved role relationship (being loved and understood by one’s parent or spouse and being respected by one’s superior and colleagues).

4.1.3.3 Group or collective level

An individual relates to a particular group (such as a work team or organisation) using that group’s prototype as a standard for intergroup comparisons and self-definition (Lord et al., 1999). The collective welfare of the group is often a key concern at this level. During group-level identification, racial and cultural differences become very important. Furthermore, organisational identities may be very important when the self is defined at the group level (Dutton, Dukerich & Harquail, 1994). If an individual is treated poorly by the group, this poor social treatment communicates to the individual that he or she is not respected or liked by the group. Reflected appraisals are a vital source of self-relevant information at the interpersonal level (Brewer & Gardner, 1996).

4.1.3.4 Multiple identities

The task of developing a self-view as a leader while also maintaining a sense of self that incorporates racial and gender identity is referred to as the development of multiple identities. According to McCauley, Russ and Van Velsor (1998), women in particular find it difficult to develop multifaceted identities in a business world that emphasises the leadership role to the exclusion of others. Another identity-related tension is the task of trying to discover what it takes to fit into an organisation.
4.1.4 Conceptualisation of self-perception

The constructs of self-perception, self-awareness and self-consciousness are often used interchangeably with the concept of self-identity, specifically in the context of self-appraisals (Gray-Little & Hafdahl, 2000). Individuals often conclude their belief by assessing their own behaviour (London & Smither, 1995). A situation of increased, objective self-awareness will result in attitude-behaviour consistency (Coetzee, 2005). Individuals who are in the state of objective self-awareness will view themselves as an observer would view them. There would therefore be an agreement between the behaviour ratings of self and others. Atwater and Yammarino (1992) found that self-ratings are an unreliable indicator of behaviour. They believe that self-ratings are only useful as an indicator of the self-rater’s predisposition. Various authors have found that individuals who rate themselves in a specific way have particular individual characteristics. Leniency bias in self-ratings is related to levels of self-esteem (Fahr & Dobbins, 1989; Greenwald, 1997; Korman, 1971).

Individual characteristics (such as interpersonal orientation, locus of control, intelligence, analytical ability and levels of self-esteem) influence people’s self ratings and therefore their self-perception. In addition, job-relevant experiences can influence assessment data either directly or indirectly and past success or failure in a job also predicts future ratings and self-perceptions. The manner in which people gather, process, store and retrieve information, as well as their attitudes, beliefs and frames of reference (cognitive processes), influences the way in which they rate and perceive themselves and others. Raters tend to use their own preferences as a standard against which they rate other people. Contextual factors (such as familiarity with the respondent, job pressures and political processes) also play a role in the rating process. Lastly, any biographical differences (such as differences in age, gender, educational level, and level in the organisation) relate to stereotyping between the raters and ratees (Theron & Roodt, 2001).
4.1.5 Conceptualisation of self-regard

The need for positive regard is present in all individuals and human beings and continues to be a constant motivator throughout a person’s life (Rogers, 1959). Positive regard is defined as the need to be loved, cared for, noticed and accepted by other people. In addition, positive self-regard includes feelings of self-confidence and self-worth. People value all those experiences that meet their need for positive regard. After the self emerges, people begin to develop self-regard as a result of the frustration or satisfaction of their need for positive self-regard. When a child likes him/herself in general, he or she will develop a positive self-regard. On the other hand, when a child generally dislikes him/herself, that child will develop a negative self-regard (Rogers, 1959).

The origins of self-regard lie in positive signs that other people hold one in regard. Once self-regard is established, it is self-directed and self-perpetuating. Maslow (1970) made a contribution to the literature through the development of his theory. According to Maslow (1970), people need to satisfy their need for love and belongingness before their self-esteem needs can become active. Once people begin to feel confident and worthy, they no longer require a replenishing supply of love and approval from others. In conclusion, self-regard seems to be the affective aspect of self-esteem which includes feelings of self-confidence and self-worth.

4.1.6 Conceptualisation of self-esteem

Self-esteem is an essential psychological construct because it is a central element of any individual’s daily experiences. It refers to the way people feel about themselves, which reflects and affects their interaction with their environment and the people they come into contact with (Kernis, 2003). Self-esteem is regarded as a multidimensional construct. Overall feelings of self-esteem are often referred to as global self-esteem. Global self-esteem incorporates all dimensions of an individual’s talents, capabilities, accomplishments and personality. These dimensions include academic self-esteem, social self-esteem and physical self-esteem (Young, 2004). Fitts (1972) and subsequently Young (2004) associate a number of life factors with self-esteem. School success, feelings of happiness and satisfaction, making healthy lifestyle choices, having rewarding relationships, displaying effective coping skills and successful performance all contribute to a healthy self-esteem (Fitts, 1972; Young, 2004). The role of self-esteem is often expressed in dichotomous terms such as “do people feel they are worthy or good (high or healthy self-esteem) or do people feel they are unworthy and bad (low or unhealthy self-esteem)” (Kernis, 2003).
According to Maslow (1970), people have the need for a positive self-esteem (to feel good about themselves), the need for esteem from others and the need for belongingness (namely that others also feel positive about them and that they are accepted by the group). To develop a positive self-esteem, individuals strive for achievement and mastery of their sociocultural environment (Coetzee, 2005). In order to be accepted by the group and gain respect from others, they behave in ways that will gain them recognition, appreciation, and prestige. People tend to feel confident, competent, strong, useful and needed by others when their self-esteem needs have been satisfied. On the other hand, when an individual’s need for self esteem has not been satisfied, he/she tends to feel inferior, anxious, worried, depressed, weak and helpless.

It has therefore become important for educators, teachers, trainers and career counsellors to find ways of identifying, measuring, improving and sustaining a high self-esteem. Assisting individuals to improve and sustain a healthy and positive self-esteem is a practical application of the knowledge currently available about self-esteem (Coetzee, 2005). Many definitions of the construct of self-esteem exist. The various aspects relating to the construct of self-esteem will now be discussed in more detail.

4.1.6.1 Definitions of self-esteem

Rosenberg (1965) defined self-esteem as a positive or negative attitude that a person has towards him/herself. A high self-esteem reflects one’s feeling that one is good enough whereas a low self-esteem expresses a feeling of not being good enough. Baumeister (1997) identified self-esteem as the evaluative dimension of the self-concept. Battle (2002) described self-esteem as the perception that a person has about his or her own self-worth, which develops regularly and becomes more differentiated with adulthood and interaction with significant others. Gray-Little and Hafdahl (2000) referred to self-esteem as a predictor of human behaviour and an indication of how one might react to certain events. They also regarded self-esteem as an index of psychological well-being. Researchers found that people with a low self-esteem seem to be more vulnerable to influence than people with a high self-esteem (Baumeister, 1997; Brockner, 1983). Lastly, self-esteem refers to a person’s sense of value or self-worth as well as the extent to which a person values, appreciates or likes him/herself (Lane, Lane, & Kyprianou, 2004).

Self-esteem can be described in three different ways, which include global self-esteem, feelings of self-worth and self-evaluation (Kernis, 2006). Global self-esteem is a personality variable that reflects the way people feel about themselves. Feelings of self-worth are self-
evaluative reactions to events. For example, when a person gets a big promotion, their self-esteem might be high, but after a dramatic event such as a divorce, a person might have a low self-esteem. A global self-esteem persists while feelings of self-worth are only temporary (Kernis, 2006). Finally, the term self-esteem is used to refer to the way in which people evaluate their abilities and attributes. Several effective and cognitive aspects contribute to self-esteem at various points in an individual’s life (Pelham & Swann, 1989).

(a) **Cognitive aspects of self-esteem**

As children grow older and develop their belief systems, they structure specific views that add to the relatively undifferentiated sense of self-worth developed earlier. As a child progresses at school and starts to display more intelligence and understanding, his or her self-view also improves (Buss, 2001). Self-views are regarded as the building blocks of self-esteem (Pelham & Swann, 1989).

(b) **Affective aspects of self-esteem**

A number of developmental psychologists (Erickson, 1963; Pelham & Swann, 1989) have focused on the role of early affective experiences (for example treatment by a principal caregiver) in determining a person’s sense of emotional well-being or self-worth. The sense of worthiness not only serves as the foundation of self-esteem, it also affects the way in which adults will later see themselves and their world (Rosenberg, 1986). Individual differences exist in the extent to which people experience positive and negative affective states. Negative and positive affectivity are both independently related to self-esteem (Pelham & Swann, 1989).

(c) **Social aspects of self-esteem**

The social aspects of self-esteem include cognitive self-evaluations and reflexive feelings about being accepted by others based on people’s interpretation of the behaviour of others as well as their perceptions and feelings about the self (Battle, 1992; Hewitt, 2002; Maslow, 1970). The perception of having lots of friends, being liked by others and being popular increases a person’s self-esteem (Buss, 2001). In addition, the social aspect includes self-appraisals and comparisons with other people and the ideal self with regard to accomplishments and effective functioning (Battle, 1992, Maslow, 1970; Rosenberg, 1979). Lastly, the social aspect includes a sense of belonging and acceptance as an active

4.1.6.2 Self-esteem versus self-efficacy

Lane et al. (2004) differentiate between self-esteem and self-efficacy. They refer to self-efficacy as the capability to execute specific tasks or courses of action. Bandura (1997) refers to self-efficacy as a person’s personal judgments about his or her own capability to organise and execute courses of action to achieve certain goals. The outcomes may or may not have any bearing on self-esteem. In other words, if a person has high levels of self-efficacy in a task within his or her occupational field in which the person has invested a lot of self-worth, there is likely to be a positive link between self-efficacy and self-esteem (Lane et al., 2004).

4.1.6.3 Levels of self-esteem

Self-esteem fluctuates during one’s life and it is maintained and supported by selectively interpreting facts, standards and situations (Buss, 2001). An individual’s self-esteem depends not only on how good they think and feel they are, but also on how good they want to be (their ideal self). People draw their self-esteem from their assessments of themselves and those of others. They value what is important to them and what they feel they are good at, and often devalue what they consider they are poor at. Therefore, a low rating on something that the individual has devalued has little effect on his or her self-esteem, whereas a high rating on something that the individual values a lot will have a significant effect on his or her self-esteem (Mruk, 2006).

Self-esteem is important from very early on in life and children display different levels of self-esteem (Baumeister, 1997). The words “good” and “bad” are the words most commonly spoken to children across many cultures. Children therefore start to measure their behaviour against criteria of goodness or badness, including standards of competent performance. The habit of self-evaluation therefore starts very early in one’s life (Kegan, 1981). Self-esteem is a central trait and is one of the most important constructs of the self-concept. A high or low self-esteem therefore influences many other elements (Baumeister, 1997).

Mruk (2006) demonstrated how levels of high and low self-esteem are created. He found that a relationship between competence and worthiness is able to generate types of self-esteem. Figure 4.4 shows that when competence and worthiness are placed in dynamic
relation to one another (as required by the fundamental structure of self-esteem), four quadrants are formed, each of which is qualitatively and quantitatively distinct from the others.

![Self-esteem meaning matrix with basic types of self-esteem (Mruk, 2006, p. 152)](image)

A low self-esteem therefore reflects a low sense of worthiness and low competence. Mruk (2006) associates a low self-esteem with caution, nervousness, lack of initiative, conflict avoidance, insecurity, anxiety and depression. Brockner and Gaure (1983) categorised self-esteem as a personality variable and found that people with a low self-esteem are less apt to choose a job that suits their specific needs and abilities. In addition, low self-esteem individuals possess low self-concept clarity (Cambell et al., 1996; Kernis, 2003). This indicates that a person with a low self-esteem lacks internal consistency and temporal stability and displays very little confidence.

A high level of self-esteem is associated with a positive degree of competence and worthiness. Mruk (2006) associates a high self-esteem with people who feel good about themselves, are relatively open to new experiences and feel accepted and acceptable. Kernis (2003) differentiates between a high self-esteem and optimal self-esteem. Kernis (2003) defines high self-esteem as either fragile or secure (depending on the extent to which it is defensive or genuine), contingent or true, unstable or stable and discrepant or congruent with implied (unconscious) feelings of self-worth. Optimal self-esteem is characterised as qualities which are associated with genuine, true, stable and congruent high self-esteem. A person with a high self-esteem (thus a defensive high self-esteem) may intentionally misrepresent feelings as positive when they are in reality negative, although the person is unwilling to admit to them. A person with an optimal self-esteem (thus a genuine high self-esteem) accurately depicts their feelings of positive self-worth and is willing to admit to any negative characteristics that they may have.

Sigall and Gould (1977) found that it is not that people with low self-esteem lack the ability to perform as well as people with high self-esteem. It is rather a variety of cognitive processes in evaluative achievement situations that decrease the performance of people with low self-esteem. Low self-esteem people therefore often set lower expectations for themselves, which may in turn lead to reduced effort. However, Baumeister (1997) and McFarlin and Blascovich (1981) found that although people with a low self-esteem perform less well than people with a high self-esteem, they desire success just as much as people with a high self-esteem.

In summary, it seems as if people with a high self-esteem surround themselves with positive feelings and place the emphasis on success, whereas people with a low self-esteem focus on their weaknesses and failures (Baumeister, 1997; McFarlin & Blascovich, 1981, Mruk, 2006).

Figure 4.5 illustrates positive and negative self-esteem.

Figure 4.5. The positive and negative self (Frey & Carlock, 1989, pp. 188–189)

4.1.6.4 Stability of self-esteem

Rosenberg (1986) described self-esteem stability and instability in terms of both long-term and short-term fluctuations. Long-term fluctuations reflect changes that occur gradually over a long period and are often referred to as baseline self-esteem (Kernis, 2006). Short-term fluctuations in self-esteem (often referred to as barometric instability) reflect changes in
one’s contextually based global self-esteem. Some people with an unstable self-esteem may experience dramatic short-term shifts from very positive feelings to very negative feelings about themselves. This tendency to display such fluctuations may be viewed as a dispositional trait that interacts with contextual factors to result in specific patterns of fluctuations (Kerniss & Waschull, 1995; Kernis, 2003). According to Kernis and Waschull (1995) and Rosenberg (1986), the tendency to rely heavily on personal and social sources of evaluation as a foundation for determining one’s overall self-worth is an important factor in the development of an unstable self-esteem. An individual who attaches considerable importance to such evaluations would be more vulnerable to short-term fluctuations in perceived self-worth. In addition, an uncertain or poor self-concept could lead an individual to rely on and be more affected by certain evaluative information. This contributes to an unstable self-esteem (Cambell et al., 1996).

The nature of the fluctuations depends firstly upon which aspects of the self are salient and secondly on the valence of recently experienced self-relevant events (Kernis, 2006). Kernis and Warschull (1995) relate instability to persistent emotional and behavioural difficulties among low self-esteem individuals. In contrast, instability in people with a high self-esteem was found to relate to putting increased effort into getting along with other people and to maintaining control over the details of their lives. This enables them to optimise the amount of care and support they receive from others, as well as how well they take care of themselves.

When people have a stable self-esteem, they value and accept themselves and feel good about themselves. In contrast, a person with an unstable self-esteem is unable to combine the various aspects of the self into a stable whole because the person has difficulty in dealing effectively with negative elements perceived in the self. Individuals with an unstable self-esteem generally display a low self-esteem, but are able to view themselves in a flattering way. However, when such people view themselves positively, they take a very positive view but when they view themselves negatively, their view is extremely negative. This casting about for the acceptable self causes the self-concept to remain very fluid and unstable (Frey & Carlock, 1989).

### 4.1.6.5 Self-esteem enhancement

Many theorists argue that a higher self-esteem is not the panacea that many in society believe it to be (Baumeister, Cambell, Krueger, & Vohs, 2003; Damon, 1995; Hewitt, 1998). However, it is generally assumed that a higher self-esteem is desirable. It is therefore
considered very important to enhance an individual’s self-esteem. When considering Coopersmith’s (1967) and Shavelson, Hubner and Stanton’s (1976) definition of self-esteem, it seems as if self-esteem is very stable and resistant to change and can therefore not be enhanced. However, several researchers have found that self-esteem can indeed be altered.

Human interaction with the environment is more likely to influence and therefore enhance self-esteem than interaction without human meaning (Frey & Carlock, 1989). Frey and Carlock (1989) believed that the self (and therefore self-esteem) is constantly changing and striving to improve. Several factors influence the enhancement of the self. Figure 4.6 provides an overview of the self in process.

![Figure 4.6: Self in process (Pietrofesa, 1971, p 88)](image)

According to Kernis (2006), self-esteem can be changed and therefore it can be enhanced. Self-esteem can be enhanced by increasing the importance of domains in which one feels adequate, and decreasing the importance of success in areas where one feels inadequate or less adequate.

Kernis (2006) identified the following as possible solutions in enhancing self-esteem:

- Attributing failures to external or unstable causes, while attributing success to one’s own qualities.
• Selectively remembering all successes, focusing on positive qualities, and spending more time thinking about them.
• Comparing oneself to others who are less successful than oneself.

Kernis (2006) suggests that self-esteem can most easily be changed by positive regard from others. When people feel accepted and reaffirmed by others, they feel secured. The feeling of being accepted and secured results in the person’s starting to feel relaxed and autonomous. People become more open and less defensive, and their self-determination, self-growth and other intrinsic drives are enhanced. In addition, a number of researchers found that taking part in body image programming, improving leadership skills and increasing healthy assertiveness positively influence self-esteem and self-concept (Dohnt & Tiggemann, 2006; Kerr & Kurpius, 2004; Wilgosh, 2001).

Reasoner and Gilberts (1991) found that the academic self-esteem of students can be significantly enhanced. In addition to an increase in levels of self-esteem, students were found to be more cooperative, to engage in less anti-social behaviour, to be more motivated in the classroom, exhibit fewer disciplinary problems and to be absent less frequently. Reasoner and Gilberts (1991) also found that teachers who participated in self-esteem enhancement programmes showed a significant increase in levels of self-esteem, engaged in more sharing of materials, enjoyed teaching more than previously, evaluated their schools more positively, and improved their relationships with their colleagues. Battle (1992) confirmed these findings and reported measures of self-esteem change in both children and adults as a result of intervention. He provides a number of case reports and examples of programmes applied to enhance levels of self-esteem.

Mruk (2006) suggests that an individual’s self-esteem can be enhanced by working with and increasing a person’s competence and feelings of self-worth. In addition, Mruk (2006) found that self-esteem could be more effectively enhanced in a group setting than by trying to enhance an individual’s self-esteem in an individual setting. Mruk (2006) developed a six-week programme to enhance self-esteem for individuals within a group setting. Week 1 is dedicated to the focusing phase. During this phase, a foundation is built for a focused and supportive group. The aim is therefore to facilitate a sense of interest, comfort and purpose so that individuals feel safe and ready to work. Week 2 is the awareness phase (appreciating self-esteem). This week continues the process of increasing awareness as a first step towards enhancing self-esteem. The goal of this week is to raise consciousness concerning the nature of self-esteem, its value, and the sources of this vital psychosocial resource. The third week marks the beginning of the enhancement phase, which consists of two sessions.
(or weeks) of the programme. Individuals start interacting within a group setting and the group typically starts to come together as a therapeutic enterprise at this point. Individuals begin to take some small risks by participating in activities designed to increase worthiness and competence, and therefore self-esteem.

In the fourth week the enhancement phase of the programme is continued, but the focus shifts from working on worthiness to developing competence. In the fifth week two related issues are dealt with. First, the group meetings come to an end, and secondly, the winding up of the group means that its members are no longer able to count on the structure offered by weekly meetings to help them focus their awareness or to reinforce the gains that have been made during the programme so far. The last week is a follow-up week and is optional. A follow-up session could help individuals to strengthen their resolve or to see the progress they have made, both of which could be powerful reinforcers.

In addition to the group programme for enhancing self-esteem, Mruk (2006) also developed a programme for enhancing self-esteem in the individual setting. He used the same programme, but reduced its length. He used one-on-one counselling sessions in order to work on enhancing the self-esteem of individuals. As the programme demonstrates, self-esteem can be enhanced by means of career counselling.

The studies of Battle (1992), Mruk (2006) and Reasoner and Gilberts (1991) prove that self-esteem can indeed be changed and enhanced in both children and adults. Significant contributions were made by these studies. One contribution includes viewing self-reinforcement, modelling and other types of behavioural modification as a link between the self-concept and overt behaviour (Reasoner & Gilberts, 1991). Bandura's (1977) social learning theory is a step towards an operational definition of the self-concept. According to Bandura (1977), a negative self-concept is defined in terms of continuous negative self-reinforcement of one’s behaviour. In contrast, a positive self-concept is reflected in a disposition to engage in high positive self-reinforcement.

This research focuses on adults in higher education and organisational settings. It focuses on whether self-esteem influences the expression of emotionally intelligent behaviour. It is essential to note that efforts aimed at enhancing self-esteem work indirectly on self-esteem by addressing the source of self-esteem (which is internally generated practices). Self-esteem enhancement is encouraged by teaching an individual self-management and emotional intelligence competencies that facilitate the adoption of new beliefs and self-understanding. Once people begin to understand and intentionally integrate self-
management practices into their lives, they usually start to experience an increase in both self-efficacy and self-worth, which increases their self-esteem as well. An increase in self-esteem results in the mastery of emotionally intelligent behaviour.

4.2 THEORETICAL MODELS


4.2.1 Unidimensional theories of self-esteem

The unidimensional theory incorporates the global aspect into self-esteem whereas the multidimensional theory posits that self-esteem is both hierarchical and multifaceted (Sullivan & Guglielmo, 1985). The unidimensional theory is based on Coopersmith’s (1967) theory that total self-esteem develops from an infant’s earliest reception by his or her parents.

Cairns (1990) criticised the unidimensional approach on both theoretical and empirical grounds. He found that this theory excludes the idea that the self-concept is composed of specific aspects as well as a general or total self-concept. In addition, the unidimensional theory excludes the idea that the overall self-concept is fairly independent of the more specific factors of the self-concept.

4.2.2 Multidimensional theories of self-esteem

Watkins and Dhawan (1989) defined the construct of the self-concept as a structured, multifaceted, hierarchical, stable, developmental, differentiable and evaluative dimension. Sullivan and Guglielmo (1985) described the multidimensional theory of self-esteem as one’s total self-esteem and as a composite sum of separate self-evaluations in many specific areas of performance. According to the multidimensional theory, different kinds of self-esteem exist within each individual. These types include physical, social, academic, and general self-esteem. In combination, these types form the global or overall self-esteem. Battle (1982) differentiates these dimensions as general, social, academic and parent-related self-esteem for children, and general, social and personal self-esteem for adults. General self-esteem refers to an individual’s overall perceptions of and feelings about their worth. Social self-esteem is the aspect of self-esteem that is related to an individual’s perceptions of and feelings about the quality of their relationships with peers and personal
self-esteem is related to a person’s most innate perceptions and feelings of self-worth. In combination, three dimensions make up an individual’s overall self-esteem. In addition, each of these components of global self-esteem consists of various factors. Battle (1982) focused on the cognitive factors (self-evaluations, sense of self-efficacy), the affective factors (subjective feelings, mood) and the interpersonal needs (social acceptance by others).

Alridge (1990) categorised four areas upon which individuals may choose to base their self-esteem. These areas include the physical, social, intellectual and spiritual modalities. Furthermore, Alridge (1990) noted that individuals differ in the way they value self-esteem. Many people place great value on all four of the areas of development in determining how they see themselves (cognitive aspect of self-esteem), and how they feel about themselves (affective aspect of self-esteem).

Most researchers seem to agree that the multidimensional approach to self-esteem is the best way to view the construct of self-esteem (Battle, 1992, Schaufer, 1994). The multidimensional approach is based on research done by Shavelson and associates, who argued that any definition of the self-concept will include both the question of what the features of the construct are and how they are linked together (“within-construct specifications”), and how these features of self-concept are related to other constructs (“between-construct specifications”) (Watkins, Mau Kai & Regmi, 1991). For the purposes of this research, the multidimensional approach to self-esteem will be followed as it allows for the measurement of global self-esteem as well as other specific aspects of the self, in particular the personal (intrapersonal) and social (interpersonal) aspects.

4.2.3 Battle’s model of self-esteem

Battle’s (1992) model of self-esteem is applicable in this study by virtue of its underlying principles, which allow the industrial and organisational psychologist to study the construct of self-esteem in a socially embedded context such as the workplace. Battle (1982, 1992) supports the multidimensional theoretical approach to defining the construct of self-esteem.

4.2.3.1 The dimensions of self-esteem

Self-esteem consists of a number of dimensions. As noted earlier, Battle (1982) differentiates these dimensions as general, social, academic and parent-related self-esteem for children, and general, social and personal self-esteem for adults. General self-esteem refers to an individual’s overall perceptions of and feelings about their worth. Social self-
Esteem is the aspect of self-esteem that is related to an individual’s perceptions of and feelings about the quality of their relationships with peers. Personal self-esteem is related to a person’s most innate perceptions and feelings of self-worth. In combination, these three dimensions make up an individual’s overall self-esteem. In addition, each of these components of global self-esteem consists of various factors. Battle (1982) focused on the cognitive factors (self-evaluations, sense of self-efficacy), the affective factors (subjective feelings, mood) and the interpersonal needs (social acceptance by others). Table 4.1 provides an overview of these dimensions and their underlying principles.

Table 4.1
The Dimensions and Principles underlying Self-Esteem according to Battle’s (1992) Model of Self-Esteem (Coetzee, 2005, p.139)

| GENERAL | Sense of psychological well-being  
|         | Self-efficacious functioning in terms of cultural criteria of success and happiness  
|         | Self-acceptance/self-expression |
| SOCIAL  | Acceptance/belongingness  
|         | Evaluation  
|         | Comparison  
|         | Efficacy  
| PERSONAL| Emotional self-awareness  
|         | Mood/state (anxiety, depression, upset, hurt, worry)  
|         | Self-regard (physical)  

(a) The psychological roots of self-esteem

Battle’s (1992) psychological understanding of self-esteem is rooted in four ideas, which include acceptance, evaluation, comparison and efficacy. At first, the self is vague, poorly integrated, and a rather uneven phenomenon, but it becomes increasingly differentiated as a child matures and interacts with significant others. The self therefore represents the result of a person’s inherent make-up and life experiences (Battle, 1992). Once established, cognitive and affective self-evaluations of self-worth and self-efficacy tend to be rather stable and resistant to change (Battle, 1992). These self-evaluations motivate the individual to choose objectives and goals which are consistent with or similar to them. Parents have the greatest influence on self-development (self-esteem) and as a result, the child’s self reflects the
appraisals of his or her parents. The self-system is therefore rooted in interpersonal relationships and is very greatly influenced by reflected appraisals (Battle, 1992).

(b) Self-esteem as a socially constructed emotion

Battle’s (1992) measurement of self-esteem attempts to capture the reality of the experience of the self within a specific social context from the individual’s point of view. Self-esteem, which is described as a socially situated experience, does not consist only of constant or variable psychological states. The socially constructed emotions that either increase or decrease self-esteem occur at predictable times and places under the influence of role requirements. These socially constructed emotions are embedded in a Western societal culture, with its particular notions about status relationships, success or failure in the achievement of socially prescribed goals, and the actual or imagined evaluative judgments of others (Hewitt, 2002). According to Hewitt (2002), this approach makes self-esteem more dependent upon the situation and its demands. It therefore suggests that people manage their self-esteem in a similar manner to that in which they manage their emotions. Thus, within limits, people can lower or raise their self-esteem in response to role requirements, presenting a self with appropriate manifestations.

As a socially constructed and experienced emotion, self-esteem is a sign of well-being rather than a psychological trait. Self-esteem is a measure of the person’s expectations of positive events and therefore the person’s motivation to approach objects and other people. A healthy self-esteem indicates a positive and fundamental personal and social identity, which is a sense that one is situated securely in the social world, capable of meeting its challenges, ready to participate in life with others, and able to balance social demands and personal desires (Battle, 1992; Hewitt, 2002). A positive sense of identity (of which self-esteem is a key measure) is vitally important because it is essential to empathic role taking, the capacity to see and to identify with another person’s point of view (Hewitt, 2002). The understanding of self-esteem in the workplace forges the affective link between the self and others. Discussion of self-esteem in the workplace encourages people to explore the nature and significance of the social bond and the affective link they have with other people (Hewitt, 2002; Kanfer & Klimoski, 2002).

4.3 VARIABLES INFLUENCING THE EXPRESSION OF SELF-ESTEEM

Schaefer (1994) noted that the variables that influence the expression of self-esteem are mostly related to the socialisation process (described in terms of the social identity
According to the social identity approach, a group is defined as a collection of individuals who perceive themselves to be members of the same social entity. A group is made up of various individuals and these individuals define, describe and evaluate themselves in terms of the group norms, values and behaviour (Hoover, 2002). The classification internalisation of a social entity occurs through the social interaction between the group members (Schaefer, 1994). Kinicki and Kreitner (2003) described socialisation within the organisational context as the process during which an individual learns the values, norms and required behaviour from a group in order to allow him to be a member of the specific group. The major socialisation variables that influence an individual’s experience of self-esteem include age, gender, race and socioeconomic status. Each of these variables will be discussed in more detail.

4.3.1 Age influences

Young children have a high self-esteem, which gradually drops as they grow older. Robins and Trzesniewski (2005) ascribe this high self-esteem in children to the fact that children have unrealistically positive views about themselves. As they develop cognitively, they start to base their self-evaluations on external feedback and social comparisons. As a result, they start to form a more realistic self-view (Robins & Trzesniewski, 2005).

Orth, Robins and Trzesniewski (2010) record a drop in self-esteem during adolescence. They explain this drop as the result of conflicting role demands and an increasing complexity in peer and romantic relationships. Robins and Trzesniewski (2005) state that body image, problems with puberty and the ability to acknowledge missed opportunities are the reasons for a drop in self-esteem during adolescence.

Orth et al. (2010) found an increase in self-esteem during midlife. This increase is due to more stable working and family circumstances, established romantic relationships, a peak in achievement and a feeling of control over the self and the environment. Robins and Trzesniewski (2005) add that personality changes also contribute towards the increase in self-esteem during adulthood. Personality changes imply increasing levels of maturity and adjustment, as indicated by higher levels of emotional stability.

Several studies that examined fluctuations in self-esteem during old age found contrasting results. Orth et al. (2010), Robins and Tzesniewski (2005) and Tiggeman and Lynch (2001) found a drop in self-esteem during middle to old age. They state that the high level of instability (empty nests, retirement, obsolete work skills etc.), relationships (spousal death,
decreasing social support) and physical functioning (reduced mobility, declining health, memory loss) as well as a possible drop in socioeconomic status cause the drop in self-esteem. In contrast, Baltes and Mayer (1999) as well as Carstensen, Isaacowitz and Charles (1999) found an increase in self-esteem during old age. Older individuals are better able to withstand the unpleasant effects of various life transitions. Other researchers have found no significant difference at all between individuals in middle and old age (Erdwins, Mellinger, & Tyer, 1981). It therefore appears that the findings with regard to self-esteem during old age are inconsistent.

4.3.2 Gender influences

Women have lower self-esteem than men in young adulthood, but the trajectories of the two sexes converge in old age (Orth et al., 2010). Males and females follow the same trajectory during their life span. Both males and females show high self-esteem during childhood, but self-esteem drops during adolescence, rises again during adulthood and then declines in old age (Josephs, Markus, & Romin, 1992; Robins & Trzesniewksi; 2005). However, Robins, Trzesniewski, Tracy, Gosling and Potter (2002) found a slight difference between male and female self-esteem during adolescence. They found that adolescent boys have a higher self-esteem than adolescent girls. This gender gap persists until adulthood and disappears during old age.

4.3.3 Racial influences

Blacks (in comparison to whites) are found to have a higher self-esteem when younger. However, at some point in adulthood, blacks show a significantly steeper decline in self-esteem than whites (Orth et al., 2010; Robins et al., 2002; Twenge & Crocker, 2002).

4.3.4 Influence of socioeconomic factors

Leary and Baumeister (2000) and Orth et al. (2010) found socioeconomic status (SES) to be a factor influencing self-esteem. People with a high educational status, high income and high occupational prestige typically show higher levels of self-esteem. Battle (1992) reported that underachievers generally come from culturally deprived homes with a lower socioeconomic status. Such families are often characterised by a low income, poor housing, large number of children and working mothers. Underachieving and poor performance are associated with lower levels of self-esteem. High achievers generally come from upper class
and middle class socioeconomic environments and high achievement is associated with people who display a higher level of self-esteem.

4.4 EVALUATION

Various authors emphasised the increased importance of identifying, measuring, enhancing and sustaining a positive level of self-esteem in the workplace (Branden, 1994; Khalsa, 1990). It seems as if an increase in positive beliefs, attributes, thoughts, attitudes, self-regulation and emotional response behaviour could result in an improved self-esteem (Battle, 1992; Branden, 1994; Gist & Mitchel, 1992).

Although numerous definitions of self-esteem exist, most definitions seem to include the cognitive, affective and social aspects of self-esteem. Ideally, a multidimensional approach to the measurement of self-esteem should be followed (Battle, 1992; Reasoner & Gilberts, 1991; Schaefer, 1994). In terms of the multidimensional approach, global self-esteem includes several functioning subsystems of the self as a whole. These subsystems include affective, cognitive and social/interpersonal aspects of effective functioning within the sociocultural domain in which it manifests itself.

In conclusion, the proposed definition of self-esteem attempts to contribute to the study of self-esteem as a socially constructed emotion and a measure of individuals' psychological functioning as members of a particular social group. This approach will allow a study of self-esteem within an organisational context.

4.5 IMPLICATIONS FOR CAREER COUNSELLING

As previously discussed, the nature of work and careers is changing, and hence the essence of career counselling must change as well. One needs to identify and understand one's own temperament as one key to success in the new world of work (Bridges, 1994; Tett et al., 1991).

Kerka (1998) suggests that career development is influenced by various factors, such as personality and self-esteem. Brockner and Gaure, (1983) and Kerka (1998) found that a person with a low self-esteem is more likely to perform poorly and achieve less than a person with a high self-esteem. Baumeister (1997) furthermore found that people with a low self-esteem do not seem to have a clear sense of who and what they are and are not confident that they may succeed in whatever they try. It therefore seems as if people with a
low self-esteem would be less likely to have well-developed employability skills than people with a high self-esteem.

Brocker and Gaure (1983) and Smoll et al. (1993) found that low self-esteem can be altered through training. It can therefore be concluded that self-esteem can also be taught to graduates and employment seekers through training. Industrial psychologists, human resource practitioners and career counsellors should therefore consider these factors during their career counselling. A direct relationship exists between self-esteem and vocational behaviour, which merits attention by counsellors (Smoll et al., 1993). Walsh and Osipow (1995) emphasised the importance of including self-esteem enhancement interventions in the personal counselling section during career counselling. A counsellor should assess the self-esteem of an individual in the course of career counselling, and also assess the emotional state of the client and then engage in appropriate interventions to help the individual internalise his or her accomplishments in order to enhance or increase the person’s self-esteem (Morgan & Brown, 1991).

Given the relationship between a person’s mental health, his work and the influence of self-esteem on employability, it is important that an individual should undergo career counselling that includes some form of personal counselling (Walsh & Osipow, 1995). Figure 4.7 provides an overview of the relationship between career counselling and career interventions and personal counselling.

![Figure 4.7](image)

*Figure 4.7. The relation of career counselling to career interventions and personal counselling (Walsh & Osipow, 1995, p. 220)*

It is within this framework that this study focuses on self-esteem as a career meta-competency that enables people to become more employable and to sustain their employability.
4.6 THEORETICAL INTEGRATION

A multidimensional approach to the study of the construct of self-esteem is proposed. The multidimensional approach proposes that one’s self-esteem is comprised of a sum of separate self-evaluations in many specific areas of performance (Al-Darmaki, 2012; Sullivan & Guglielmo, 1985). Many definitions of self-esteem exist, but all the definitions seem to include the fact that self-esteem is the evaluative component of one’s self-concept and includes an evaluation of the cognitive, affective and social aspects of the self. For the purposes of this research, self-esteem is defined as a socially constructed emotion rooted in four ideas of acceptance, evaluation, comparison and efficacy (Hewitt, 2002; Battle, 1992). Battle’s (1992) model of self-esteem is applicable in this research as the principles underlying the measurement of self-esteem allow the study to conduct the measurement of self-esteem within the context of the workplace. A good self-esteem reflects a positive and integral personal and social identity. It therefore indicates that a person is securely embedded in the social world, competent and able to meet the challenges of the world, ready to participate in life within a social context and able to balance social demands and personal desires (Al-Darmaki, 2012; Hewitt, 1998; Scheff, 1990; Weng & McElroy, 2010). Figure 4.8 outlines the basic principles underlying the dimensions of the construct of self-esteem that will be studied in the context of this research.

![Figure 4.8. An integrated model of self-esteem (Coetzee, 2005)](image)
Table 4.2

*Theoretical Integration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Battle's (1992) theory of self-esteem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition of self-esteem</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process by which people maintain a sense of self-integrity, that is, a perception of themselves as globally moral, adequate and efficacious when they confront threats to a valued self-image (Sherman <em>et al.</em>, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core constructs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/peer related self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variables influencing self-esteem development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture-free Self-esteem Inventory for Adults (CFSEI-AD 2) (Battle, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usefulness in enhancing individuals’ employability in the career counselling process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The higher a person’s self-esteem and self-concept the higher the person’s employability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter explored the concept of self-esteem and related theoretical models. The various factors influencing the development of self-esteem and the implications for career counselling were discussed. Part of the first research aim has now been addressed, namely to conceptualise the construct of self-esteem from a theoretical perspective and to explain the construct by means of a theoretical model.

The following literature research aim was partly achieved in this chapter:

**Research aim 2:** To conceptualise the personality attributes constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence and the employability attributes construct.
Chapter 5 focuses on the discussion of the third variable of emotional intelligence from a cognitive social paradigmatic perspective, with the aim of providing further clarification on the second research question.
CHAPTER 5: EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

The previous chapter focused on the theoretical framework for the conceptualisation of self-esteem from a humanistic and social psychology perspective. This chapter focuses on the discussion of emotional intelligence as a career meta-competency that influences the employability attributes of individuals. Emotional intelligence will be discussed with reference to cognitive social learning theories. This will enable the researcher to develop a conceptual framework for exploring the relationship between the variables of personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes from the various paradigmatic perspectives which form the foundation of the proposed integrated model.

This chapter therefore aims to explore the construct of emotional intelligence and related theoretical models. The variables influencing emotional intelligence and the implications for career counselling will also be discussed.

5.1 CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

The social cognitive theories of Mischel and Shoda (1995, 1998, 1999) and the dynamic self-regulation system of Worline et al. (2002) provide the paradigmatic foundation for the conceptualisation of the concept of emotion and the related concepts of emotional regulation, emotional intelligence and emotional competence. Figure 5.1 provides an overview of the major concepts related to the conceptualisation of emotional intelligence. These concepts include the concepts of emotion, mood, affect, emotional regulation, emotional intelligence and emotional competence, all of which will be discussed below.

5.1.1 Conceptualisation of emotion

Since emotion is a complex issue, it is difficult to define. Emotion should be viewed as an indirect construct and researchers should be careful not to view specific operational definitions as complete in themselves. Emotion, in the scientific sense, carries excess meaning beyond any specific emotional measure (Larsen, Diener & Lucas, 2002).
5.1.1.1 Definition of emotion

According to Young (1936), emotions are an acute disturbance of the whole person, causing a complete loss of cerebral control without any trace of conscious purpose. Leeper (1948) defines emotions as an organising response because emotions adaptively focus cognitive activities and subsequent action. Leeper (1948) prefers to characterise emotions as a motivating force, a process that arouses, sustains and directs activity. Modern theories characterise emotions as directing cognitive activities adaptively (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Emotions are internal events that coordinate many psychological subsystems, including physiological responses, cognitions and conscious awareness (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2000). Mayer and Salovey (1997) also characterise emotions as ordered responses which cross the edge of many psychological subsystems (including the physiological, cognitive, motivational and experiential systems). These organised responses are viewed as adaptive and something that may potentially result in a change of personal and social interaction into enriching experience. Emotions usually occur as a response to an event (internal or external) which affects an individual positively or negatively. Furthermore, emotions normally arise in response to an individual's changing relationships. Emotions belong to the affective
sphere of mental functioning, which includes the emotions themselves, moods, evaluations and other feeling states (such as fatigue or energy). However, emotions are distinguished from the concept of mood, as emotions are briefer and more intense.

Emotion consists of three basic processes, which include the neural substrate, the expressive or motor component, and an experiential component (Izard, 1993). According to Izard (1993), the experience of joy, anger and pain (experiential component) is central to emotions and represents itself as an action, perception, or feeling. Emotions are also viewed as neuropsychological phenomena which are created by normal selection, which arranges and motivates physiological, cognitive and action patterns that aid adaptive responses to the infinite collection of demands and opportunities in the environment (Izard, 1992). Emotions help humans to solve the problems of adaptation and survival.

5.1.1.2 Emotion, mood and affect

The concepts of emotion, mood and affect are differentiated from one another. According to Weiss (2002), mood and emotion are both classified as affect. Figure 5.2 outlines Weiss’s (2002) view of emotions, mood and affect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Evaluative construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Affect states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genus</td>
<td>Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect?</td>
<td>Affect?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5.2. Evaluative construct taxonomy (Weiss, 2002, p. 23)*

In the opinion of Weiss (2002), affect is viewed as a more general term and can refer to either mood or emotion (Lord & Kanfer, 2002). Moods and emotions contain a multicomponential component, entailing physiological, experiential, cognitive and expressive aspects (Kanfer & Kantrowitz, 2002). Moods and emotions typically differ with regard to the focus, duration or directedness of each construct. Moods (as apposed to emotions) are typically diffuse, enduring and persistent, without any readily identifiable precipitating event or stimulus and tend to last longer than emotions (Frijda, 1993). Emotions, on the other hand, are more strongly linked to behaviours (Lord & Kanfer, 2002). According to Morris and
Feldman (1997), emotions and moods also differ with regard to their informational value. Emotions tend to provide more information about the environment, whereas moods provide more information about an individual’s internal state. Underwood (1997) distinguishes between emotions and moods in terms of the actions associated with them. Emotions are often described as powerful, urgent and passionate while moods are hardly ever associated with such states. Emotions are furthermore characterised as affective, short-lived, intense and usually interruptive of thought processes (Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Frijda, 1993; Kanfer & Kantrowitz, 2002).

Various authors suggest that emotions (as opposed to moods) are associated with better use of situation-oriented and behavioural regulation strategies (Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Frijda, 1993; Kanfer & Kantrowitz, 2002). As mentioned previously, emotions involve evaluation of a specific precipitating event. Succeeding emotions may be focused towards modifying the situation or the event. Moods mostly focus on altering the (usually negative) mood state of an individual (Larsen, 2000). Several authors found that affective experience (emotion and mood) has a direct influence on judgment and behaviour (Forgas, 2002; Lambert et al., 2010; Lerner & Keltner, 2000).

Scherer (1994) suggests that emotions are an interface which acts as a mediator between environmental input and behavioural output. This interface helps to ensure that the central needs of the social system are met since it has a significant connection with the motivational implementation system. The emotional interface decouples stimuli and responses and therefore allows individuals more flexibility in their adjustment to environmental differences. Scherer (1994) maintains that flexibility accrues from the combination of two processes. In the first instance, while emotions initiate and energise appropriate responses and action tendencies, the responses are not released immediately. A latency period is provided where alternative information (such as the response of others) is processed and alternative action tendencies are considered. Secondly, in critical situations where stronger emotional responses are produced, preprogrammed responses can be reliably executed.

Emotions exist in a context which is related to the situation, and to a person’s goals, needs and wants. Brown et al. (2003) found three reasons why emotions are important in the workplace. Firstly, emotions motivate a person to act; secondly, emotions control a person’s actions and, lastly, emotions play a vital role in career development and decision making.
5.1.1.3 Emotion states versus emotion traits

Emotions are viewed as both a state and a trait-like component, giving the researcher the opportunity to focus on one component or the other in addressing various research questions (Larsen et al. 2002). Emotions as a state-like component imply that emotions are temporary, are due to events outside the person and have distinct onsets and offsets. Emotions are fluctuating states, but they nevertheless fluctuate around an average level for each individual, and each individual differs with regard to their average level of various emotions.

Emotions are also classified as a trait-like component. This component is due to causes within a person (such as the individual’s personality) (George, 1996). Understanding the causes and consequences and how trait-like emotions work can help industrial and organisational psychologists to predict and explain specific reactions and behaviour within the workplace (Larsen et al., 2002).

5.1.1.4 Phases of emotional development

According to Haviland-Jones, Gebelt and Stapley (1997), three phases of emotional development can be identified, namely acquisition, refinement and transformation.

The acquisition phase includes impulsive affect and character as well as the acquisition of the labels for emotional categories. Almost all of the fundamental acquisitions of emotional process take place during childhood and appear to be almost automatic in all human beings. Infants (either at birth or very shortly afterwards) display a good variety of emotional expressions whose intensity and specific elicitors vary from individual to individual (Haviland-Jones et al., 1997). Every individual has the ability (from infancy) to express emotional reactions and to label emotions. During childhood, children begin to use information about emotions in order to make decisions about their behaviour. For example, a child may typically look at their mother’s facial expression to decide whether they should approach a toy or not (Haviland-Jones et al., 1997).

During the second phase of emotional development (refinement), expressions and feelings are attached to and detached from particular contexts and behaviours. Although the basic meaning of emotions does not change, the manner and place of expression change. A significant change occurs (mostly during adolescence) in the frequency with which specific
emotions are displayed. However, much of this learning and change relies on family and cultural modelling as well as direct training (Haviland-Jones et al., 1997).

During the transformation phase, changes that include two different processes take place in the whole system. The first process involves the specific manner in which a particular emotional state transforms the process of thinking, learning or getting ready to act in that state. Different emotional states elicit different information processing modes. The second process involves the way in which the emotional process itself is altered with experience and knowledge so that the perspective and connotation of emotion emerge as a personal construction. Emotions may either remain very simple, or they could be transformed in order to create a system of thoughts, behaviours and processes (Haviland-Jones et al., 1997).

During the adolescent phase, individuals begin to outline different and intense attachments to ideals, people and careers. In addition, their emotional life is changed and they become aware of emotionality changes. Abstracting the meaning of moods and personality traits from actual experiences seems to be difficult for adolescents. They tend to accept positive moods (such as joy, surprise and interest) more easily. Emotional refinement therefore includes changes in the perceived organisation of social situations that elicit emotions as well as increased awareness of mood changes (especially internally directed ones) (Haviland-Jones et al., 1997).

5.1.1.5 Emotional experience and the self-system

Individuals’ emotional experiences are integrated with their self-system (Saarni, 1997). Without a self capable of reflecting on itself, an individual might have feelings, but will not realise that they themselves are experiencing those feelings. In addition, they will not be able to utilise their own emotional experience as a lead in understanding another person’s feelings.

5.1.2 Conceptualisation of emotional regulation

It is of vital importance to understand emotional regulation as it relates directly to emotional behaviour within an organisation (Weiss, 2002). Emotional regulation refers to the psychological and behavioural processes which involve the self-management of affective response tendencies (Frijda, 1986; Thompson, 1994). Gross (1999) described emotional regulation as the processess through which individuals regulate the experience and expression of their own emotions. Therefore, emotional regulation is the manner in which
individuals influence which emotions they have, when they have them as well as how they experience and express their emotions. Coping should be distinguished from emotional regulation as coping refers to a response to stress, focusing on ways in which to deal with negative and difficult situations. Emotional regulation refers to the regulation of affective experiences, whether they are positive or negative and difficult or easy (Weiss, 2002).

Emotional regulation is also defined as the process of initiating, maintaining, modulating or controlling the occurrence, intensity or extent of internal feelings and emotion-related physiological processes (Eisenberg, Fabes, Guthrie, & Reiser, 2000). Emotional regulation is a process that requires an individual to assess the demands of a situation and to respond flexibly and adaptively to those demands (Walden & Smith, 1997). Coetzee (2005) summarises the definition of emotional regulation in two processes. Firstly, the focus of regulation is the contextualised self. Emotional regulation is therefore one’s emotional process in the context of physiological, cognitive, motivational and environmental pressures. Secondly, emotional regulation is seen as a complex concept involving the management of processes that are generated, regulating the intensity of felt emotion and the expression of emotion-based behaviours.

Emotional intelligence is related to emotional regulation (Kanfer & Kantrowitz, 2002). Emotion regulation only pertains to part of the broad emotional intelligence construct. This research only relates to emotions in a normal, healthy individual. Clinical applications and pathological aspects of emotional management and regulation are beyond the scope of this research.

5.1.3 Conceptualisation of emotional intelligence

Since several researchers disagree with regard to the validity and completeness of general cognitive ability measures in measuring performance and career success; the concept of emotional intelligence has aroused scientific interest (Kanfer & Kantrowitz, 2002). It was found that emotional intelligence affects job performance, job satisfaction and role behaviour (Abraham, 2000; Ashkanasy, 2003; Lopes & Salovey, 2001; Nelis, Quoidbach, Mikolajczak & Hansenne, 2009; Wong & Law, 2002). In addition, Goleman (1995) and Kanfer and Kantrowitz (2002) reported that emotional intelligence affects an individual’s career achievement, physical and mental health. Several South African studies also confirmed that emotional intelligence has an impact on job performance and leadership success (Hayward, Amos, & Baxter, 2008; Murphy & Janeke, 2009; Nel & De Villiers, 2004).
5.1.3.1 Conceptualisation of intelligence

Intelligence is viewed as the capacity to carry out conceptual thought as well as the ability to learn and adapt to the environment (Wechsler, 1997). Wechsler (1958) views intelligence as the collective or global capacity of an individual to act purposefully, to think rationally and to deal effectively with his or her environment. Mayer, Roberts and Barsade (2008) describe intelligence as a set of mental abilities that allow the recognition and learning of, memory for, and capacity to explain a particular form of information. Wade and Tavris (2006) describe intelligence as the ability to gain from experience, obtain knowledge, think conceptually, act purposefully or adjust to changes in the environment. Intelligence therefore allows an individual to understand and solve information-related problems that involve reasoning about abstract relationships. In addition, intelligence enables an individual to store, organise, learn and process material in his or her memory.

Sternberg (1997) defines intelligence as the intentional adaptation to, selection of, and shaping of reality in environments which are relevant to one’s life and abilities. Sternberg (1997) refers to a triarchic theory of human intelligence on the basis of the fact that humans attempt to deal with three different aspects of intelligence during the mental processing of information. These three processes include the metacomponents (the mental processes which are used to plan, monitor and evaluate problem solving), performance components (processes used when deciding upon a strategy to use when executing a task) and knowledge-acquisition (process used to learn how to solve a problem). Sternberg’s (1997) process theory outlines the conceptualisation of intelligence, which he refers to as componential intelligence (relating to the individual’s world). Figure 5.3 outlines Sternberg’s (1988) model of human intelligence.

Mayer et al (2008) categorised intelligence into a hierarchy of mental abilities. Basic, discrete and mental abilities (such as grasping how objects are rotated in space) are at the lowest level of the hierarchy. Broader, organised groups of abilities are at the middle level of the hierarchy. These abilities are generally verbal-comprehension intelligence, which enables an individual to understand and reason about verbal information. General intelligence (or g) is at the highest level of the hierarchy and involves abstract reasoning across all such domains.
According to Sternberg (1988), individuals have the ability to capitalise on their strengths and compensate for their weaknesses. This ability refers to the mental ability of emotional intelligence, whereby individuals are able to gain insight into and awareness of their own strengths and areas for development and potential as they pertain to themselves and others.

Up to the 1970s emotions and intelligence were viewed as two separate constructs. Only after the 1970s did researchers begin to explore emotional intelligence as a construct (Mayer, 2001). Emotional intelligence has only been defined since the beginning of the 1990s (Salovey & Mayer, 1990); however, the interaction between emotions and intelligence has been explored since the 1950s (Jordan, Ashkanasy, & Hartel, 2002).

Emotional intelligence is seen as a class of intelligence which includes social, practical and personal intelligences, also referred to as the “hot” intelligences (Mayer & Mitchell, 1998; Mayer et al., 2000). Social, practical and personal intelligences deal with matters of personal
and emotional importance to the individual, hence the reference to hot cognitions. These concepts all form logical domains that partially relate to emotional intelligence, but divide human abilities in somewhat different ways.

According to Scarr and Carter-Saltzman (1982), the term “intelligence” should be reserved for individual attributes that centre around mental processes (for example reasoning skills, knowledge of one’s culture and social requirements as well as the ability to find innovative solutions to problems). Intelligence should therefore be used to describe cross-situational attributes in individuals that they carry with them into different situations. Social competence refers to an individual’s success in fulfilling social roles and should be distinguished from individual intelligence. The most socially competent people are those people who can fill many social roles well (Scarr & Carter-Saltzman, 1982). People who possess individual intelligence are likely to have greater social competence, because breadth of role options, as well as success in role performance, is related to intelligence. Individuals with less intelligence will have a smaller breadth of options than more intelligent people. In addition, people with a lesser breadth of options will not be able to fill their roles as competently as more intelligent people. Mayer et al. (2008) added that some individuals may have a greater ability than others to carry out more sophisticated information processing about emotions and emotion-relevant stimuli, and to use this information as a guide to thinking and action. Individuals with a higher intelligence are less destructive, more open and motivated and tend to be better in verbal, social and other intelligences (Mayer et al., 2004).

Mayer et al. (1990) suggest that emotional intelligence is a subset of social intelligence and that it refers to an individual’s ability to monitor his or her own feelings and emotions as well as those of other people, the ability to discriminate among these feelings and emotions and to use this information to guide his or her thinking and actions. Gardner (1983) suggests that social intelligence is made up of a person’s intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences. Intrapersonal intelligence refers to the ability an individual displays in dealing with himself or herself, and includes the ability to symbolise complex and highly differentiated sets of feelings. Interpersonal feelings on the other hand refer to an individual’s intelligence in dealing with other people and include the ability to notice and distinguish between other individuals (particulary between their moods, temperaments, motivations and intentions).

Practical intelligence refers to intelligent behaviour within a natural situation and is directed at an individual’s short- and long-term goals. Practical intelligence is employed to solve problems which are important to one’s emotions, well-being, needs, plans, survival and social role performance (Fox & Spector, 2000; Sternberg, 1997).
Intelligence (e.g. emotional intelligence) needs to adhere to three main criteria in order to be regarded as true intelligence. These criteria include conceptual criteria (set of abilities, reflecting mental aptitudes rather than behaviours), correlational criteria (sharing similarities with, yet remaining distinct from other established intelligences) and lastly developmental criteria (developing over life span and experiences up to a point) (Mayer et al., 1999; Mayer et al., 2000, Mayer et al., 2004). According to Mayer et al. (1999), emotional intelligence adheres to all three criteria and can therefore be regarded as a true intelligence.

5.1.3.2 Definitions of emotional intelligence

The construct of emotional intelligence postulates that both the cognitive and the emotional centres of the brain are working together, establishing communication between the rational element and emotion. A person’s brain therefore processes information in relation to emotional self-awareness and efficacy when making any decisions (Brown et al., 2003a).

The concept of emotional intelligence is directed at complementing the traditional view of intelligence by outlining the emotional, personal and social aspects of intelligent behaviour (Gardner, 1983; Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Wechsler, 1958). The term “emotional” in emotional intelligence refers to both mood and emotions (George, 2000). A number of definitions of emotional intelligence exist. All of these definitions aim to explain abilities and traits related to one’s own emotions as well as those of other people (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003). Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2004, p. 306) define emotional intelligence as the ability to reason about emotions, and to enhance thinking. This ability includes the ability to perceive emotions precisely, to access and create emotions in order to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge as well as to reflectively control emotions in order to promote emotional and intellectual growth.

Mayer et al. (2008) view emotional intelligence as an individual’s ability to understand, manage and appraise emotional responses as well as identify emotions in faces, voices, postures and other content. Nelis et al. (2009) found that emotional intelligence refers to individual differences in the perception, processing, regulation and utilisation of emotional information. These differences were found to have a significant influence on an individual’s mental and physical health, work performance and social relationships. Mayer, Dipaolo and Salove (1990) maintain that emotional intelligence refers to the accurate appraisal and expression of emotions in oneself and others as well as the regulation of emotions in a way that enhances living.
Emotional intelligence is also conceptualised as the self-regulatory routines in which individuals employ emotions and behavioural control (Martinez-Pons, 2000). Individual differences in emotional intelligence represent individual differences in self-regulatory effectiveness. Furthermore, emotional intelligence taps into the extent to which an individual’s cognitive abilities are informed by emotions as well as the extent to which emotions are cognitively managed (George, 2000; Mayer & Salovey, 1997). In other words, the mental processes of an individual include (i) the appraisal and expression of emotions in the self and others, (ii) regulation of emotions in the self and others and (iii) using emotions in an adaptive way. People express the willingness and ability to monitor, evaluate and regulate their emotions. In addition, individuals differ in their ability to control their own emotions in order to solve problems.

Most definitions of emotional intelligence include four major domains, namely self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship management. For the purposes of this study, Mayer and Salovey’s (1997, p.10) definition will be adopted, namely “the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth”. This definition applies to this study because it encompasses the major aspects of emotional intelligence and provides the most accurate definition based on the literature.

5.1.3.3 Emotional intelligence and employability

Both Coetzee and Beukes (2010) and Kidd (2008) note that little research appears to have been done on the relationship between emotional intelligence and employability. Ashkanasy and Daus (2002) note that emotional intelligence has an influence on the selection of employees and the management of their performance, thus recognising that emotional intelligence may be related to an individual’s employability. Pool and Sewell (2007) and Yorke and Knight (2007) also recognise emotional intelligence as an important attribute of an individual’s employability. Cherniss (2000) posits that emotional intelligence provides the foundation for important competencies in almost any job.

Brown et al. (2003a) found that people with a high emotional intelligence perform better in career-related tasks than individuals with a low emotional intelligence. According to Brown et al. (2003a) and Young et al. (1997), the action theory approach to career development explains the role of emotion in the construction of the career. According to these authors,
emotion motivates and energises actions and behaviour. Ashkanasy and Daus (2005), Dulewicz and Higgs (1999) and Locke (2005) state that emotional intelligence is a tool for predicting behaviour and is something that develops over a person’s whole life span, but that it can be enhanced through training and, as Jeager (2003) states, teaching and learning in the educational context.

5.1.4 Conceptualisation of emotional competence

The concept of emotional competence is closely linked to the concept of emotional intelligence. Both are used in the workplace where individual learning, development and performance are emphasised. Various authors note that emotional intelligence is a developable trait or competency (Cooper, 1997; Goleman, 1996; Hopfl & Linstead, 1997; Martinez, 1997; Steiner, 1997).

Emotional competence can be defined as the expression of self-efficacy in emotion-eliciting social transactions. The application of the idea of self-efficacy to emotion-eliciting social transactions refers to how individuals can react emotionally, yet concurrently and intentionally relate their knowledge about emotions and their emotional expressiveness to relationships with others (Saarni, 1997). Worline et al. (2002) define emotional competence as an emotion-related mental construct that involves multifaceted emotional experience as well as some self-reflective cognitive judgments and behavioural responses which equally add up to work performance. In other words, people use their emotional and cognitive presence to monitor the social world and engage in competent behaviour in the workplace.

5.2 THEORETICAL MODELS

Mandell and Pherwani (2003) identified two models of emotional intelligence, namely the ability model and the mixed model (non-cognitive and competency based). According to the ability model, emotional intelligence is a set of abilities which involves perceiving and reasoning abstractly with information that emerges from feelings. This model has been described by Mayer et al. (1999); Mayer et al. (1990); Mayer and Salovey (1993, 1997); and Salovey and Mayer (1990). According to the mixed method model, emotional intelligence can be defined as an ability with social behaviours, traits and competencies. This model incorporates the underlying abilities postulated by the ability model of emotional intelligence. Although emotional intelligence is a domain of human performance, it is best studied with the aid of ability measures (Mayer et al., 2000).
5.2.1 Ability theory of emotional intelligence

The ability model of Mayer and Salovey (1990) suggests that emotional intelligence consists of a number of conceptually related mental processes. These processes include (i) appraisal and expression of emotions in the self and in others, (ii) regulating emotions in the self and others, and (iii) using emotions in adaptive ways when solving problems. Both verbal and nonverbal appraisal and expression of emotions, as well as using emotions (or emotional information) in order to motivate, are subsumed under these mental processes. Figure 5.4 provides an overview of Mayer and Salovey’s model (1990).

![Figure 5.4. Conceptualisation of emotional intelligence (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 190)](image)

Every individual differs in the degree to which they display and express their emotions. Salovey and Mayer (1990) maintain that those individuals who accurately appraise and express their emotions are better understood by the people they work with. In addition, such individuals are likely to have the potential to influence people more effectively as they are able to perceive the emotions of others they interact with. This enables them to comprehend other people’s feelings and reexperience those feelings themselves, thereby developing empathy. The regulation of one’s own emotions results in either a positive or a negative feeling state. Individuals with a high emotional intelligence are able to place themselves in positive affective states. In addition, such individuals are able to experience negative affective states without facing destructive consequences. According to Carmeli (2003), individuals with a high emotional intelligence can induce a positive effect in other people and therefore a powerful social influence. Salovey and Mayer (1990) propose that when individuals understand their own emotional reactions and those of others and facilitate
creative thinking, emotions can help individuals to develop multiple future plans and enhance decision-making processes.

Mayer and Salovey (1990) suggest that expressing and appraising emotions accurately is a vital component of emotional intelligence because those people who accurately perceive and respond to their own emotions can express emotions to others more effectively and quickly. Emotionally intelligent people of this kind are also able to respond more appropriately to their own feelings as a result of the accuracy with which they perceive them.

Therefore, self-regulation skills enable individuals to respond appropriately to others and choose adaptive behaviours in their responses. Such individuals are normally perceived as genuine and warm by others, whereas individuals lacking these skills (therefore possessing a low emotional intelligence) are perceived as ignorant and ill-mannered by others (Mayer & Salovey, 1990). Most individuals are able to regulate emotions in themselves and in others. However, emotionally intelligent individuals are proficient at this process and are therefore able to meet their particular goals (Mayer & Salovey, 1990).

Mayer and Salovey (1997) reformulated their ability model and developed a revised framework within which to study emotional intelligence, namely the four-branch model. This model (as shown in Figure 5.5) presents emotional intelligence as consisting of four different areas, including the ability to: (i) perceive emotion, (ii) use emotion to facilitate thought, (iii) understand emotions, and (iv) manage emotions. Branch 1 represents the perception of emotion and includes the ability to recognise emotion in others’ facial and postural expressions. It involves nonverbal perception and expression of emotion in one’s face, voice and related communication channels. Branch 2 includes the ability of emotions to assist thinking. Branch 3 represents the understanding of emotions. It involves the capacity to analyse emotions, value their probable trends over time, and understand their outcomes. Branch 4 reflects the management of emotion in the context of the individual’s goals, self-knowledge and social awareness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective regulation of emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to stay open to feelings, both to those that are pleasant and those that are unpleasant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to reflectively engage in or detach from an emotion depending upon its judged informativeness or utility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to reflectively monitor emotions in relation to oneself and others, such as recognising how clear, typical, influential or reasonable they are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to manage emotion in oneself and others by moderating negative emotions and enhancing pleasant ones, without repressing or exaggerating information they may convey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding and analysing emotions: employing emotional knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to label emotions and recognise relations among the words and the emotions themselves, such as the relation between linking and loving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to interpret the meanings that emotions convey regarding relationships, such as that sadness often accompanies a loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to understand complex feelings: simultaneous feelings of love and hate, or blends such as awe as a combination of fear and surprise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to recognise likely transitions among emotions, such as the transition from anger to satisfaction, or from anger to shame.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emotional facilitation of thinking (using emotional intelligence)

| Ability to redirect and prioritise thinking on the basis of associated feelings. | Ability to generate emotions to facilitate judgment and memory. | Ability to capitalise on mood changes to appreciate multiple points of view. | Ability to use emotional states to facilitate problem solving and creativity. |

Perception, appraisal and expression of emotion

| Ability to identify emotion in one’s physical and psychological states. | Ability to identify emotion in other people. | Ability to express emotions accurately and to express needs related to them. | Ability to discriminate between accurate/honest and inaccurate/dishonest feelings. |

Figure 5.5. A four-branch model of the skills involved in emotional intelligence (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, 2000, p. 269)
5.2.2 Mixed models of emotional intelligence

The noncognitive and competency-based models of emotional intelligence will be discussed in more detail.

5.2.2.1 Noncognitive model

Bar-On (1997) developed a noncognitive model in which emotional intelligence is described as a collection of noncognitive capabilities, competencies and skills which influence an individual's ability to cope effectively with environmental demands and pressures. Bar-On's model (1997) includes both emotional intelligence and social intelligence.

According to Bar-On and Parker (2000), social and emotional intelligence consists of a combination of intrapersonal and interpersonal competencies and skills that determine effective human behaviour and lead to well-being. Bar-on (2000, p. 47) defines emotional-social intelligence as "a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate with them, and cope with daily demands". BarOn and Parker (2000) explain that emotional intelligence consists of 15 different components which pertain to five different dimensions of emotional and social intelligence. These dimensions include intrapersonal, interpersonal, stress management, adaptability and general mood components. Figure 5.6 outlines Bar-On's (2000) conceptualisation of emotional intelligence.

(a) Intrapersonal and interpersonal component

The intrapersonal component comprises self-regard, emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, independence and self-actualisation. The interpersonal component comprises empathy, social responsibility and interpersonal relationships. Empathy refers to the ability to consider, recognise and appreciate other people's feelings. It means being capable of reading other people's emotions. Social responsibility is the ability to represent oneself as a cooperative, contributing and constructive member of a social group. Finally, interpersonal relations describe the ability to not only establish but also maintain mutually satisfying relationships which are characterised by intimacy and by both giving and receiving affection (Bar-On & Parker, 2000).
(b) Stress management

The component of stress management consists of stress tolerance and impulse control. Stress tolerance refers to the ability to withstand unpleasant events and stressful situations without falling apart by actively and confidently coping with stress. Impulse control, on the other hand, describes one’s ability to resist or delay an impulse, drive or temptation to act (Bar-On & Parker, 2000).

(c) Adaptability

The component of adaptability consists of reality testing, flexibility and problem solving. Reality testing describes the ability to assess the connection between the subjective (what is experienced) and the objective (what exists in reality). Flexibility refers to the ability to adjust to emotions, thoughts and behaviours as a result of changing situations and circumstances. Lastly, problem solving is the ability not only to identify and define problems, but also to produce and implement potentially effective solutions (Bar-On & Parker, 2000).

(d) General mood

The component of general mood consists of optimism and happiness. Optimism can be defined as the ability to look at the positive side of life and to maintain a positive attitude even when things are tough. Happiness refers to the ability to feel happy and satisfied with one’s life, to have fun and to enjoy oneself and the company of others (Bar-On & Parker, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar-On’s model of emotional intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness and self-expression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.6. Bar-On’s (2005) conceptualisation of emotional intelligence
5.2.2.2 Competency-based model

The competency-based model developed by Goleman (2001) has been specifically designed to use in the workplace. Goleman (2001) describes his model as an emotional-intelligence based theory of performance which involves 20 competencies that differentiate individual differences in workplace performance. The competencies imply four general abilities, which include self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship management.

(a) **Self-awareness**

Self-awareness refers to the ability to understand feelings and to self-assess feelings accurately. In addition, it relates to knowing one’s internal states, preferences, resources and intuitions. Knowing one’s emotions is a source of important psychological insights and self-understanding (Goleman, 2001).

(b) **Self-management**

Self-management (also referred to as emotional management or self-regulation) describes a person’s ability to manage internal states, impulses and resources. This component includes self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, innovation, self-monitoring, self-motivation, achievement, drive, commitment and initiative (Goleman, 2001).

(c) **Social awareness**

Social awareness includes the ability to read people and groups effectively and accurately. In addition, social awareness includes empathy (an important social competency), or the awareness of other people’s feelings, needs and concerns. Empathy furthermore involves understanding other people, developing others, having a service orientation, leveraging diversity and possessing a keen political awareness.

(d) **Relationship management**

Relationship management involves the encouragement of favourable responses in others. Relationship management (or social skills) refers to a person’s proficiency in effectively handling interpersonal relationships. This component of emotional intelligence consists of influence tactics, effective communication with other people, effectively dealing with conflict,
collaboration and cooperation skills as well as effective team membership abilities (Goleman, 2001).

5.2.3 Integration of the models of emotional intelligence

All the emotional intelligence models (Bar-On, 2005; Goleman, 2001; Mayer & Salovey, 1990) as discussed in the preceding sections have a number of similarities and differences. All these models view emotional intelligence as the ability to have an awareness of emotions in oneself and in others as well as the ability to regulate emotions. Table 5.1 provides a summary of the main elements of each of the emotional intelligence models discussed.

5.3 VARIABLES INFLUENCING EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Individuals’ emotional responses differ as a result of variables that influence the way individuals react when confronted with a situation presented by external factors such as the environment. The key variables of importance in this research include cross-cultural influences, race/ethnicity, gender, skills, personal influences and life span development changes.

5.3.1 Cross-cultural influences

According to Ekman (1994), variations across different cultures in terms of emotional display are likely to occur. Wierzbicka (1986) maintains that all concepts can be universally defined with reference to three underlying dimensions. These include evaluation (good vs bad), potency (weak vs strong) and activity (fast vs slow). As such, emotions are not a universal category but are based on the universal dimensions of semantic primitives.

Triandis (1994) found that cultures where individuals are more emotionally dependent on each other (collectivists) are more likely to empathise with others and more likely to contain their emotional expression so as not to impose on others in the in-group than are cultures where autonomy over action is afforded to individuals (individualists).

Hofstede (1980) suggests that masculine cultures focus on norms such as accumulation of money and objects, performance and growth, a living-to-work attitude, achievement ideals, independence and decisiveness, excelling and admiration of things that are big and fast. Such individuals are more likely to be stoic and to refrain from experiencing and expressing emotions than those individuals from feminine cultures. Sex roles in such cultures are
clearly differentiated, with men being more assertive and women more caring. In feminine cultures, the emphasis is on quality of life, a working-to-live attitude, the importance of interdependence and intuition, and the view that small and slow are beautiful. Sex roles are more fluid and less differentiated (Hofstede, 1980).

### 5.3.2 Race/ethnicity

Individuals from different cultures approach emotions in a different way. Emotional intelligence may therefore differ from culture to culture (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Hewitt (2002) adds that cultural group membership supplements psychologically intrinsic satisfaction with its own set of approved goals and definitions of positive affect. External events shape affect, mood and emotion. People tend to behave and act in a manner that they believe others require, encourage and make possible for them. Van Rooy, Alonso and Viswesvaran (2005) found a significant relationship between race and emotional intelligence. It was found that minority groups scored higher on general emotional intelligence.

### 5.3.3 Gender influences

Various researchers found that men and women do not differ significantly in terms of general emotional intelligence, but they did find evidence of some differences in terms of specific competencies (Brown et al., 2003a; Ford & Collins, 2010; Pugh, 2002; Singh, 2004; Tapia, 2001). According to Singh (2004), women scored higher than men on the competencies of empathy, interpersonal relationships and social responsibility. Men on the other hand scored higher than women on self-actualisation, assertiveness, stress tolerance, impulse control and adaptability. Mandell and Pherwani (2003) also found significant differences between males and females. These authors predict that females might be better than males at managing their emotions and the emotions of others.

It seems as if women have a higher emotional intelligence than men as a result of the fact that women have to read emotions more carefully because they have less power in society than men. In addition, women tend to be more socialised and pay more attention to emotions than men do (Mayer et al., 2000; Schutte et al., 1998; Tapia, 2001).
### Table 5.1

**Comparison of Emotional Intelligence Models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct definition</strong></td>
<td>A subset of social intelligence that includes the ability to monitor the feelings and emotions of oneself and of others, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's action and thinking.</td>
<td>A cross-section of combined emotional and social competencies and skills that establish how effectively individuals understand themselves and others and expresses themselves. Relating to others and coping with daily demands are included.</td>
<td>An emotional-intelligence based theory of performance which involves 20 competencies that differentiate individual differences in workplace performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Categories/subdimensions** | (1) Appraisal and expression of emotion  
(2) Regulation of emotion in self and others  
(3) Utilisation of emotions | (1) Intrapersonal  
(2) Interpersonal  
(3) Stress management  
(4) Adaptability  
(5) General mood | (1) Self-awareness  
(2) Self-management  
(3) Social awareness  
(4) Relationship management |
| **Characteristics** | Emotional self-awareness, self-regulation, nonverbal perception, verbal appraisals, nonverbal appraisals, empathy, flexible planning, creative thinking, redirected attention and motivation. | Emotional self-awareness, empathy, self-regard, assertiveness, independence, self-actualisation, empathy, social responsibility, interpersonal relationships, stress tolerance, impulse control, reality | Self-awareness, self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, innovation, achievement drive, commitment, initiative, optimism, understanding others, developing others, service |
| Usefulness for career counselling and enhancing employability | Provides individuals with understanding of their emotional intelligence for the identification of potential areas for growth and career decision making. | Provides individuals with understanding of their emotional intelligence and provides for the identification of potential areas for growth. | Designed for workplace application and distinguishes between individual differences in workplace performance. | testing, flexibility, problem solving, optimism and happiness. | orientation, leveraging diversity, political awareness, influence, communication, conflict management, leadership, change catalyst, building bonds, collaboration and cooperation, team capabilities. |
5.3.4 Skills

A skill is the combination of efficient strategy selection and proficiency in applying the strategy. Increased skill in regulating emotions changes the process from a demanding and laborious process to one that is almost automatic. Although well-learned regulation of emotions is initiated consciously, once it has been initiated, it can operate without conscious guidance, attention or monitoring (Wegner & Bargh, 1998). Emotion regulation as a skill is therefore a technique of conscious self-regulation and when this skill is enhanced it can take on the characteristics of an automatic process. The effectiveness of emotion regulation processes varies as a result of two essential factors. These factors are strategy choice (learning which techniques for emotion regulation work and which do not) and control expertise (amount of practice a person has with regulating emotion) (Wegner & Bargh, 1998).

5.3.5 Personal influences

Individual differences lead to different behaviours; personal qualities override situational variables. According to Kanfer and Kantrowitz (2002), emotional regulation is present in individuals with diverse motives and goals, personality traits, cognitive abilities, and self-regulatory capabilities. These diverse personal factors have a marked influence on the generative emotion process (Kanfer & Kantrowitz, 2002). Personal factors mediate various aspects of the emotional process and this results in either positive or negative trends in adaptive functioning. Ekman (1972) found that individuals who score high on the concept of self-monitoring regulate the display of their emotions better. In addition, individuals with a high emotional stamina display desired emotions over longer periods of time.

5.3.6 Life span development changes

Contrasting results have been found in emotional intelligence in terms of age differences. In a recent study, Ford and Collins (2010) found no age difference in emotional intelligence. In contrast, Dulewicz and Higgs (1999) as well as Gardner and Stough (2002) found a slight difference in age with regard to emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence increases from childhood to adulthood (Bar-On, 2000; Fariselli, Ghini, & Freeman, 2008; Mayer et al., 2000; Von Rooy, Alonso, & Viswesvaran, 2005). Adults score higher on emotional intelligence than children and adolescents. Fariselli et al. (2008) suggest that this increase is due to the fact that individuals have more opportunities to learn about emotions and the gradations of emotions as they age. In addition, they experience more diverse life situations, are
presented with the opportunity to increase their emotional vocabulary and receive more feedback, which can be integrated into greater self-awareness.

5.4 EVALUATION

This chapter focused on the conceptualisation of the concepts of emotion, emotion regulation, emotional intelligence and emotional competence. It is clear from the literature that emotion is a very broad topic and can be studied from various perspectives. Keenoy, Oswick and Grant (2003) note that emotional intelligence is still seen as a general intelligence which is focused on emotional phenomena and it needs to be treated as a separate concept.

Emotional intelligence involves a person's ability to identify and perceive emotions (in himself or herself and others), as well as the ability to understand and manage emotions effectively. Emotional intelligence is distinct from (although positively related to) other intelligences. Some people are more emotionally intelligent than other people. Emotional intelligence develops over a person's life span and can be enhanced through training.

In addition, emotional intelligence includes the processes of thinking and judgment that are focused on emotions in order to enhance control over the self and others. According to Fineman (2000), emotional intelligence formulations lack the capacity to grasp the psychoanalytical actuality that people sometimes do not know what emotions are impelling them (which is why they are doing what they are doing) as a result of the diverse defensive, displacement and screening processes that may be associated with aspects of self-esteem and personality preferences, and that complicate and enrich emotional life. From this perspective, many people's emotions defy conscious control and regulation.

5.5 IMPLICATIONS FOR CAREER COUNSELLING

Young et al. (1996) found that emotion is related to an individual's purpose, goals, plans and needs. They note that emotion motivates and energises action. Furthermore, emotions control and regulate actions, and emotions are able to access, orient and develop narratives about careers. Caruso and Wolfe (2001) and Kidd (1998) emphasised that emotion plays a vital role in career development, selection and the workplace. With this in mind, effective regulation of emotions (in oneself and others) and the utilisation of feelings to motivate, plan and achieve career goals are important issues to address during career planning and any attempt to enhance employability. Menhart (1999) found significant relations between
emotional intelligence and career behaviours and emphasised that emotional intelligence is a vital aspect within career counselling and career assessment practices.

Emotional intelligence represents a set of dispositional attributes (such as self-awareness, emotional management, self-motivation, empathy and relationship management) for monitoring one’s own and others’ feelings, beliefs and internal states in order to provide useful information to guide one’s own and others’ thinking and actions (Day, 2000; Goleman, 1995, Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Wong & Law, 2002). Bar-On (2000) states that the components of his emotional and social intelligence model can be improved through training and counselling and that this model relates to the potential for performance, therefore, the potential to enhance employability skills. Emotional intelligence can therefore be taught, learned and developed (Brown et al., 2003; Dulewicz & Higgs, 2004).

Most career counsellors have difficulty with the more complex issues of career counselling, such as locus of control, identity formation and emotion (Emmerling & Cherniss, 2003). If emotional intelligence is introduced into the counselling relationship, clients could be helped to understand their own emotions and the way their emotions can influence their behaviour and career-related choices. Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) noted that emotional intelligence is a useful tool for predicting behaviour and therefore understanding and managing organisational behaviour. Dulewicz and Higgs (1999) noted that enhancing emotional intelligence could have a positive effect on personal development and individual success. The contribution of Mayer et al. (2004) to the literature was that emotional intelligence can be effectively addressed in career counselling sessions to raise emotional awareness, emotional knowledge and emotional intelligence and in consequence change an individual’s behaviour. An individual with a high emotional intelligence will be able to perceive emotions better, use such emotions in their thinking, understand the meaning of emotions, and manage emotions better than other people. In addition, individuals with a high emotional intelligence will probably require less cognitive effort during problem solving. They tend to be slightly higher in verbal, social and other intelligences. Mayer et al. (2004) furthermore found that individuals with a higher emotional intelligence may be more skilful in describing motivational goals, aims and missions. Brown et al. (2003a) found that individuals who have a higher emotional intelligence were more likely to have greater confidence in their career decision making tasks.

During career counselling, individuals access and make use of emotional memories. These emotional memories are used when making judgments on career-related values and interests. However, when individuals are unable to effectively tap into their emotional
memory bank, they will be less likely to make informed career decisions and unlikely to enhance their employability as effectively as those who are able to use their emotional intelligence (Emmerling & Cherniss, 2003). Because the communication of values and interests is an essential ingredient in career counselling, individuals who find it difficult to communicate their values and interests owing to low levels of emotional intelligence need more intensive intervention than those people with a higher emotional intelligence.

Emmerling and Cherniss (2003) suggest that a framework of emotional intelligence should be introduced in the career counselling process as this might help to identify those individuals who have difficulty perceiving and working with emotions. The career counsellor could assist such individuals to better understand their emotional reactions, which influence their career choices. In addition, career counsellors could help such individuals to enhance their emotional intelligence levels and equip them with tools and techniques to increase their emotional self-awareness in order to make better career decisions and ultimately enhance their employability levels.

It is important to take note of the variables that influence emotional intelligence (such as age, gender and race) when attempting to teach any person to enhance their emotional intelligence during career counselling sessions. In short, the enhancement of emotional intelligence is an essential attribute of any individual’s employability and career decision making (Coetzee & Beukes, 2010; Pool & Sewell, 2007).

5.6 THEORETICAL INTEGRATION

Many definitions of emotional intelligence exist, but all the definitions appear to include the following: (i) emotional intelligence (the ability to apply intelligence to the domain of emotions) is distinct from (but positively related to) other intelligences; (ii) some people have a higher emotional intelligence than others; (iii) emotional intelligence develops over a person’s life span and can be enhanced with training; and lastly (iv) emotional intelligence includes the ability to identify and perceive emotions (in oneself and in others), as well as the ability to manage emotions successfully (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005; Locke, 2005).

For the purposes of this study, emotional intelligence is defined as the extent to which individuals are able to tap into their feelings and emotions as a source of energy to guide their thinking and actions (Mayer & Salovey, 1990). According to Mayer and Salovey (1990), emotions help people to create various future plans, improve decision making processes (due to better understanding of emotional reactions), and facilitate creative thinking and
problem solving. Individuals who have the ability to perceive and understand their emotions should be better able to assess their job skills and interests, to set suitable career goals, generate realistic career plans and gain the developmental experiences needed in order to take advantage of appropriate career opportunities (Poon, 2004). Table 5.2 outlines the theoretical integration of the construct of emotional intelligence.

Table 5.2
Theoretical Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salovey &amp; Mayer (1990)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition of emotional intelligence</strong></td>
<td>The extent to which individuals are able to tap into their feelings and emotions as a source of energy to guide their thinking and actions (Salovey &amp; Mayer, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core constructs</strong></td>
<td>Perception of emotion, Managing own emotions, Managing others’ emotions, Utilisation of emotion, Overall emotional intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variables influencing emotional intelligence development</strong></td>
<td>Cross-cultural influences, Race, Gender, Skills, Person influences, Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement</strong></td>
<td>Assessing Emotions Scale (Schutte et al., 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usefulness in enhancing individuals’ employability in the career counselling process</strong></td>
<td>The higher a person’s emotional intelligence, the higher the person’s employability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter explored the concept of emotional intelligence and related theoretical models. The various factors influencing the development of emotional intelligence and the implications for career counselling were discussed. Part of the first research aim has now been addressed, namely to conceptualise the construct of emotional intelligence from a theoretical perspective and to explain the construct by means of a theoretical model.

The following literature research aim was partly achieved in chapter 5:

**Research aim 2:** To conceptualise the personality attributes constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem and *emotional intelligence* and the employability attributes construct.

Chapter 6 focuses on the discussion of the employability attributes construct from a humanistic perspective with the aim of providing further clarification on the second research question.
CHAPTER 6: EMPLOYABILITY ATTRIBUTES

The previous chapter focused on the theoretical framework for the conceptualisation of emotional intelligence from the perspective of cognitive social learning theory. This chapter focuses on the discussion of employability attributes as a career meta-competency construct.

Employability attributes will be discussed from the perspective of the humanistic paradigm. This will enable the researcher to explore the relationship between the variables of personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes from the various paradigmatic perspectives which form the foundation of the proposed integrated model.

This chapter therefore aims to explore the construct of employability attributes and related theoretical models. The variables influencing employability attributes and the implications for career counselling will also be discussed.

6.1 CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

The construct of employability has emerged as a vital factor in determining an individual’s career satisfaction and success within a globally unstable, insecure and chaotic business environment (Coetzee & Beukes, 2010).

According to McQuaid, Green and Danson (2005), employability can be described both from a supply focus and a broader perspective. McQuaid and Lindsay (2005) argue that most researchers adopt a broader perspective on employability which assesses employability in terms of whether an individual is capable of moving into new employment (moving from one job to another or moving from unemployment into a sustainable job). In addition, the broad perspective on employability includes factors such as job search and labour demand conditions, which help determine whether an individual is able to find or change employment, together with the range of employability attributes and skills (the focus of the supply-side concepts of employability) (McQuaid & Lindsay, 2005).

Yorke and Knight (2007) also suggest that employability is influenced by both external and internal factors. External factors (such as employers who discriminate, company policies etc) are all factors that an individual has no control over. However, internal aspects (such as attributes and qualifications) are all factors that an individual can exercise some control over (Yorke & Knight, 2007). With this in mind, this study will focus on individual-level
employability, while still focusing on a broad definition which includes the relevant individual factors that make an individual more employable or less employable in the context of the new world of work.

6.1.1 Definition of employability

Hillage and Pollard (1998) warn that the term employability is used in a number of contexts with a variety of meanings. This can result in a lack of clarity and precision when employability is used as an operational concept.

Nielsen (1999) argues that employability is the balance between the individual’s competencies and skills and the requirements of the labour market. In other words, employability refers to the possibility of employment with an individual’s present skills and competencies. Hartshorn and Sear (2005) criticise this definition and note that this approach to employability implies that the individual would not be contributing work readiness and motivation. This definition therefore excludes the career meta-competencies that form part of employability.

Hillage and Pollard (1998) argue that employability involves an individual’s ability to be employed. It is about gaining initial employment, maintaining employment and obtaining new employment if the need arises. Clarke (2008) views proactive, self-management behaviours and attitudes which are generally associated with self-employment as important employability attributes. Garavan (1999) notes that the changes in the world of work have put increased emphasis on employability as a foundation for contemporary employment relationships. Garavan (1999) suggests that individuals should view themselves as people who are self-employed, even if they are employed by other organisations.

Brown, Hesketh and Williams (2003) define employability as an individual’s ability to (i) find a job; (ii) retain a job, and (iii) move between jobs and organisations if necessary. Employability is therefore the relative chances of an individual of obtaining and maintaining different kinds of employment. This definition also relates to individual differences. Sanders and De Grip (2004) define employability as the ability to move within the labour market in a self-sufficient manner in order to recognise potential through sustainable employment. Employability could be described as the ability and motivation to be and remain attractive in the labour market, by anticipating changes within tasks and the work environment as well as reacting to these changes in a proactive manner. Fugate et al. (2004) refer to employability as a type of work-specific active flexibility that enables individuals to identify and recognise
appropriate job opportunities. Clarke (2008) defines employability as a person’s ability to obtain and keep suitable employment within the present labour market context.

Lee (2001) suggests that employability can be understood as the possession of a set of core skills or generic attributes. Likewise, Moreland (2006) defines employability as a range of skills, knowledge and personality attributes that make individuals more likely to secure and retain a chosen occupation for the benefit of themselves, the organisation and the community. Coetzee (2011) suggests that employability consists in career-related attributes and dispositions which promote adaptive cognition, behaviour and affect. It furthermore enhances an individual’s suitability for appropriate and sustained employment opportunities. It is therefore evident that employability includes generic skill levels, competencies, abilities or attributes that graduates need to enter the labour market (Clarke, 2008).

Most of the definitions suggest that employability is determined by an individual’s characteristics and behaviours, or in other words meta-competencies. In the context of this study, employability refers to the continuous fulfilment of an employment contract, and the acquisition or generation of employment through the optimal use of one’s competencies and attributes (Naute, Van Vianen, Van der Heijden, Van Dam & Willemse, 2009; Van der Heijde & Van der Heijden, 2006).

6.1.2 Employability skills, competencies and attributes

Krieg, Brown and Ballard (1995) note that the possession of a qualification and skills such as tenacity and a willingness to work is no longer sufficient to unlock career opportunities for graduates. Most employers consider graduates to lack the required employability skills. Employers tend to value generic employability skills over specific occupational (technical) skills (Cassidy, 2006). ACCI (2002) reported that these generic skills refer to a range of “soft” skills and personality attributes.

Tomlinson (2007) describes graduate employability as being related to values, driven by identity, relating to an individual’s own dispositions and biographies. Various authors suggest that employability skills and attributes should be integrated into students’ learning experiences (Clarke, 2008; Cranmer, 2006; Morley, 2001). These attributes includes generic skills such as communication, problem solving, interactional skills and efficiency (Leckey & McGuigan, 1997). Sparrow (1995) argues that there is an increasing focus on competencies that graduates need in the new world of work. Sparrow (1995) contends that such competencies include skills, knowledge, attitudes and behaviours. Sparrow (1995)
furthermore notes that behavioural skills include the soft skills associated with underlying individual attributes such as motives, traits, self-esteem and social roles. Individual characteristics and attributes are defined as variables that include self-esteem, self-efficacy, personality factors, risks taking and adaptability (Fugate et al., 2004; King, 2004).

The Australian Education Council (1992) reported on seven key competencies that individuals need in order to enter the labour market. These include collecting, analysing and organising ideas and information, planning and organising activities, working with others, problem solving and utilisation of technology. In addition, the UK, Canada and the USA reported that generic skills such as numeracy, literacy, communication, problem solving, technical and interpersonal skills are essential attributes that graduates need if they want to enter the new world of work successfully (Australian Education Council, 1992). Table 6.1 outlines the generic skills and competencies that people entering the world of work require.

Spill (2002) proposes that generic employability skills include listening skills, speaking, making use of computer tools, problem solving, planning and organising, adaptability and teamwork. Brolin and Loyd (2004) report that customer service, interpersonal and communication skills as well as general computing skills are the most important generic skills for enhancing employability.

The Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ACCI, 2002) found communication, teamwork, problem solving, initiative and enterprise, planning and organising, self-management, learning and technology to be the key employability skills. Table 6.1 is an integrated representation of the commonalities of the employability skills and competencies discussed above.

Barrie (2004) emphasises that graduates should obtain the necessary meta-skills and personality attributes during their time in higher education. According to Tomlinson (2007), students are attaching more value to soft skills and centring their employability on personal and social credentials, while making an effort to accommodate the changing demands of employers. Graduates furthermore increasingly realise that they should take ownership of the responsibility to develop themselves and that acquiring career meta-competencies such as flexibility, adaptability, upskilling and personality attributes is a vital element in career self-management (Tomlinson, 2007).
Table 6.1
Summary of Employability Skills and Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Computing</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>Information technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Working with others</td>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising and planning</td>
<td>Organising and planning</td>
<td>Planning and organising</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employability relates to individuals’ subjective careers and involves a sense of self-directedness or personal agency, directed at securing or retaining a job or form of employment on the basis of personal career-related attributes and dispositions (Rothwell & Arnold, 2005; Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011). As a result, Bezuidenhout and Coetzee’s (2010) employability attributes framework is relevant to this study as it provides clarity about employability attributes. This framework has been specifically designed within the South African higher education context. It is intended for adult students and includes a range of eight core employability attributes which are regarded as vital for increased employability (Bezuidenhout, 2010). These attributes include career self-management, cultural competence, self-efficacy, career resilience, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy.

In the context of the present study, employability attributes are regarded as a psychosocial construct representing career-related characteristics which promote adaptive cognition, behaviour and affect as well as enhancing an individual’s suitability for appropriate and sustainable employment opportunities (Bezuidenhout, 2010; Coetzee, 2011; Fugate et al., 2004; Yorke & Knight, 2007). Similarly, personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes are viewed as career meta-competencies which are presumed to enhance individuals’ employability.

6.2 THEORETICAL MODELS

Bezuidenhout’s (2010) employability attributes model consists of eight career-related attributes and dispositions which promote adaptive cognition, affect and behaviour and enhance an individual’s suitability for appropriate and sustained employment opportunities. The model designed by Fugate et al. (2004) is based on a dispositional approach (which views employability as a disposition that captures relevant individual characteristics). Van der Heijde and Van der Heijden’s (2006) model is based on the competency model approach (which views employability as a set of competencies which enable an individual to be employed). Lastly, Beukes (2010) developed a model based on a self-regulatory approach to employability. Beukes’s self-regulatory model (2010) integrates employability skills into reiterative stages which enable individuals to understand the process involved in managing their career. This provides individuals with a practical operationalisation of employability.
6.2.1 Fugate, Kinicki and Ashforth’s (2004) dispositional approach to employability

Fugate et al. (2004) view employability as a multidimensional collection of individual characteristics that predispose employees to (pro)actively adapt to their work and career environments. Fugate (2006) notes that employability is a disposition that captures individual characteristics which promote adaptive behaviours and positive employment outcomes, and it more precisely describes the action-oriented, proactive and adaptive qualities that employers now promote and seek within the new world of work. Fugate (2006) conceptualises employability as a disposition on account of the high level of uncertainty in the new world of work. Highly uncertain environments are often characterised as “weak circumstances” and any individual can therefore expect individual characteristics to be the primary determinants of behaviour (Fugate, 2006).

According to Fugate et al. (2004), employability consists of three dimensions which include career identity, personal adaptability and social and human capital. Dispositional employability subsumes the similarities between the three dimensions and therefore represents the conceptual and empirical overlap between the dimensions that contributes to proactive adaptability at work (Fugate, 2006). In order to represent the active and adaptable nature of employability, Fugate (2006) developed a model that includes openness to change at work, work and career resilience, work and career proactivity, career motivation, social and human capital, and career identity. Figure 6.1 provides an overview of Fugate’s (2006) dispositional model with its overlapping constructs, and Table 6.2 provides an overview of the elements included in this model.

![Figure 6.1. Dispositional model of employability (Fugate, 2006, p. 3)](image-url)
McArdle, Waters, Briscoe and Hall (2007) researched Fugate et al.’s (2004) dispositional model of employability and found that employability relates positively to self-esteem, job search and reemployment. The findings of their study provide individuals with both theoretical and practical tools that will help them understand employability and assist them during times of unemployment. The positive relationship found between employability and self-esteem, job search and employment emphasises the applicability of a dispositional construct of employability to unemployed individuals (who are therefore outside the organisation).

McArdle et al. (2007) support Fugate et al.’s (2004) findings that employability is determined by more than merely employment status. McArdle et al. (2007) also found that employability impacts significantly on an individual’s mental well-being during periods of unemployment because the self-esteem of individuals who are higher on employability is less likely to suffer during periods of unemployment than that of individuals with a low self-esteem.

Fugate (2006) also found that individuals with a high employability continuously assess their value in the marketplace and compare their skills and experiences with present job opportunities and requirements.

Table 6.2
Overview of the Elements Included in the Dispositional Model of Fugate (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Influence on employability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness to change at work</td>
<td>Individuals who are open to change at work are usually receptive and willing to change. In addition, such individuals feel that most changes are positive once they happen. Flexibility in uncertain circumstances and the facilitation of continuous learning are supported by an individual’s openness to change at work (Fugate &amp; Kinicki, 2008).</td>
<td>Openness is essential to dispositional employability because it supports continuous learning and enables individuals to identify and recognise career opportunities, thereby enhancing their personal adaptability (Fugate &amp; Kinicki, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and career</td>
<td>Individuals who possess work and career resilience have a number of attributes such as</td>
<td>Work and career resilience fosters the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resilience</td>
<td>Optimism about their career and career opportunities, a feeling that they have control over their future and of the direction their careers will take, as well as a feeling that they can make valuable contributions at work. Individuals with career resilience tend to be optimistic about their work and careers and have a high self-evaluation (Fugate &amp; Kinicki, 2008).</td>
<td>Identification and recognition of career opportunities (employability) in the uncertain world of work (Fugate, 2006). Career resilience is a part of an individual's work identity and reflects their dispositional employability (Fugate &amp; Kinicki, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and career proactivity</td>
<td>Individuals with a high level of dispositional employability usually proactively seek information about their work environment. Work and career proactivity is a trait of adaptability. This dimension can be compared to proactive coping. Proactive coping consists of individual efforts to identify stressors and challenges and make an effort to obtain the skills and resources needed to deal with the potential stressors. However, proactive coping generally takes place when specific stressors and challenges are unfamiliar or unexpected. Preparation therefore takes place at a general level (Fugate, 2006). Furthermore, proactivity could be utilised as a form of market feedback whereby individuals are informed of their value, skills and experience in the perception of the market (Fugate, 2006).</td>
<td>Work and career proactivity has an important influence on identifying and recognising career opportunities (Coetzee &amp; Beukes, 2010).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Career motivation | Individuals with a high degree of career motivation usually have specific career plans and strategies. Such people tend to take ownership of their career management and set work/career-related goals for themselves (Fugate & Kinicki, 2008). Career goals, this motivation is a vital determinant of continuous learning and therefore an essential component of employability (Fugate,
Planning and an orientation towards learning are all related to career motivation. In addition, many benefits are associated with career motivation, such as enhanced drive in work-related activities, persistence during times of frustration and boredom and the ability to exert a sustained effort when confronted with challenges. Individuals with a high career motivation are also interested in acquiring new skills and embracing new opportunities (Fugate, 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and human capital</th>
<th>Social capital includes the resources available in the social network which can advance an individual’s interests. Such capital influences an individual’s ability to identify and recognise career opportunities. The size and diversity of an individual’s social network directly influence the amount of information available. Human capital consists of a number of more traditional factors that have an impact on an individual’s career (such as age, education, work experience, training, job performance and organisation tenure) (Fugate, 2006).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career identity</td>
<td>Career identity organises past experiences while also providing the direction for future opportunities and behaviours. Career identity therefore connects past, present and future career experiences and aspirations into an understandable whole (Fugate, 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career identity acts as the cognitive connector which integrates the other dimensions of employability (Fugate, 2006).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.2 Van der Heijde and Van der Heijden’s (2006) competence-based approach to employability

According to Van der Heijden (2002), employability refers to the capacity to be employed within a job. Van der Heijde and Van der Heijden (2006) propose that employability (at employee level) is beneficial for present performance as well as long-term performance (career outcomes), implying a process of adaptation and learning. Besides adaptive behaviour, personal elements (such as personality, attitudes, and ability) are included in the concept of employability (Van der Heijde & Van der Heijden, 2006).

On the basis of this viewpoint, Van der Heijde and Van der Heijden (2006) suggest a competence-based approach to employability and include the following five competencies in their model: occupational expertise, anticipation and optimisation, personal flexibility, corporate sense and balance. The two flexible dimensions include anticipation and optimisation as well as personal flexibility. The first one is evidently a proactive, creative variant whereas the other is more passive and adaptive. Corporate sense refers to the increased emphasis on social competence and balance and represents the ability to unify the various employability elements or aspects. Both employers and employees have an orientation towards the development of human potential. The dimensions of the model (as outlined in Figure 6.2) represent individual competences that are the foundation of behaviour related to both employer and employee outcomes. Table 6.3 summarises the elements included in the competence-based model of employability.

![Figure 6.2. Competence-based employability model (Van der Heijde & Van der Heijden, 2006, p.453)](image-url)
**Table 6.3** Elements within the Competence-based Employability Model of Van der Heijde and Van der Heijden (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational expertise</td>
<td>Occupational expertise is vital for all employees and prospective employees in order to find and retain a job for which they are suitably qualified. Job seekers not only need a high degree of knowledge and skills related to their specific professional domain, they also need to be high performers and professionals (Van der Heijde &amp; Van der Heijden, 2006). The second and third dimensions of employability include adapting to changes and developments (on a job content level and other levels such as the career as a whole), which is important for performance outcomes. Van der Heijde and Van der Heijden (2006) propose two types of adaptation. The first one is a self-initiating proactive variant (anticipation and optimisation) and the second a passive, reactive variant (personal flexibility). Both of these variants are functional for the professional worker in enhancing employability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation and optimisation</td>
<td>This dimension refers to the preparation for future changes in a personal and creative manner, thus striving for the best possible career results. In the new world of work, employees have not only to execute fixed tasks anymore; they also have the opportunity to create the future themselves. It is expected from employees to continuously develop themselves in order to keep their market value as high as possible (Van der Heijde &amp; Van der Heijden, 2006). Further development is also needed on an occupational level in order to anticipate and adapt to future occupational changes. Continuous professional development and lifelong learning are therefore often associated with employability. The anticipation and optimisation of career management and development will result in more positive career outcomes for the individual. An optimal level of career management will be reached when personal preferences and market developments are fine tuned (Van der Heijde &amp; Van der Heijden, 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal flexibility</td>
<td>Personal flexibility includes more than the content level of a job; coping with disappointments is also very important. As a result of changes within the environment (mergers, change in spatial structures of the organisation), greater variation in working time and the workplace becomes apparent. Organisations profit from flexible employees and the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hiring of temporary employees provides an organisation with the security of knowing that it will not lose a lot on personnel costs during difficult times (Van der Heijde & Van der Heijden, 2006).

| Corporate sense | This dimension refers to the expertise gained from participation and performance in various groups (such as a department, organisation, work teams, occupational communities and other networks). In recent days, the number of groups that employees belong to has increased significantly. In the new world of work, stimulating innovation is necessary within groups and teams if they are to survive. Innovation is typically stimulated by means of group interaction (Van der Heijde & Van der Heijden, 2006). |
| Balance | Balance refers to the opposite interests of employers and employees as well as the opposition between these interests. In the new world of work, working life is characterised by competing demands (mostly caused by increased organisational/employee demands, which are not easily balanced). Employability refers to highly self-reliant and self-managing employees. Significant potential within the labour market is offered to employees who engage in self-management and the enhancement of competences throughout their life span (Van der Heijde & Van der Heijden, 2006). |
6.2.3 Beukes’s self-regulatory model of employability

Beukes (2010) developed a self-regulatory model which focuses on the individual as an active agent in developing and sustaining his or her employability through a reiterative series of developmental stages. According to Beukes (2010), employability is the application and ongoing development of a number of supportive competencies and attributes through a series of reiterative developmental stages which increase an individual’s opportunities for obtaining and sustaining employment opportunities. This definition is closely related to that of Pool and Sewell (2007), who define employability as a range of skills, knowledge and personality attributes which makes an individual more likely to choose and secure a job in which they will be satisfied and successful, to their own advantage and that of the workforce and the community. Beukes (2010) notes that these skills, knowledge and personality attributes should be guided in a direction that is most likely to result in maintaining a suitable employment opportunity.

The series of reiterative stages (Beukes, 2010) enables individuals to effectively guide their employability competencies towards obtaining and sustaining employment within the new world of work (characterised by high competition and uncertain situations). The stages include the following five sets of developmental tasks: audit and alignment, career goal clarity, formal and informal learning, self-presentation, and competency trade-off. Each of these developmental stages includes a set of competencies, such as basic skills (audit and alignment), goal-driven behaviour (career goal clarity), creative learning skills (formal and informal learning), communication skills (self-presentation) and business insight (competency trade-off). Figure 6.3 outlines the self-regulatory model of employability and indicates that the effective guidance of the supportive competencies can assist individuals to achieve certain outcomes, resulting in such individuals’ choosing and securing occupations in which they can be satisfied and successful (to their own advantage and that of the workforce, the community and the economy).
Figure 6.3. Model of self-regulatory employability (Beukes, 2010, p.54)

Beukes’s (2010) model consists of five stages (as outlined above), which include the audit and alignment stage, career goal clarity, formal and informal learning, self presentation and competency trade-off.

During the audit and alignment stage, individuals have the opportunity to explore their own competencies, develop a goal orientation and gain an understanding of their market value (based on their competencies and market demands). Once individuals understand their purpose and market value, they are ready to progress to setting more specific and time-bound goals for themselves (Beukes, 2010). These goals result in effective strategic plans for self-development and career development. Based on this, an individual can choose to embark on formal or informal learning or to move straight into the self-presentation stage (if the individual believes that he/she already possesses the required competencies for the job they are applying for).

During the self-presentation stage, individuals negotiate a trade-off agreement from which both parties should benefit. As soon as this agreement is formally in place the actual trade-off begins. Individuals can revert back to this stage (periodically or when the need arises) in
order to restart the whole process (re-conduct a self-audit and realign themselves on the basis of their recently acquired competencies and skills) (Beukes, 2010).

Beukes’s self-regulatory model (2010) gives individuals the opportunity to proactively maintain and manage their own employability. Knowledge of the various stages of this model can help individuals to focus on specific stages and proactively manage and control those stages during their employment process. The model also affords an opportunity for renewal, re-evaluation and development, which helps individuals to maintain their employability (Beukes, 2010). Van der Heijden (2002) emphasises that individuals should act as career agents and manage the development of their own employability competencies (career meta-competencies).

Individuals need to embark on continuous learning, master new skills and enhance the transferability of those new skills, as this is seen as a vital aspect of being a valuable employee in the new world of work (Van der Heijden, 2002). The self-regulatory model includes not only stages for learning but also stages where skills are audited so that they can be more effectively transferred. The reiterative stages of this model allow individuals to develop and channel their employability competencies so that they are able to access and sustain employment in the highly competitive and uncertain labour markets (Beukes, 2010). Beukes (2010) found a significant relationship between the self-regulatory employability competencies and individuals’ emotional intelligence in a South African context. Beukes’s (2010) model is therefore of relevance to this study.

6.2.4 Bezuidenhout’s (2010) employability attributes framework

Bezuidenhout (2010), in collaboration with Coetzee (2010), developed an employability attributes framework specifically for students in the South African higher education context. This framework (visually displayed in Figure 6.4) consists of eight core career-related employability attributes which are important for increasing an individual’s likelihood of securing and sustaining employment opportunities (Bezuidenhout & Coetzee, 2011). Table 6.4 outlines the eight dimensions identified by Bezuidenhout and Coetzee (2011).
Figure 6.4. Conceptual overview of the skills and attributes underlying students’ employability (Adapted from Coetzee, 2011, p.18)
Table 6.4  
*Overview of Employability Attributes (Coetzee, 2011, p.10)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employability attributes</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Skills and attributes (adapted from Bezuidenhout, 2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career self-management</td>
<td>An individual’s ability to sustain employability through constant learning as well as career planning and management efforts (Schreuder &amp; Coetzee, 2011).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ability to reflect one’s career aspirations as well as a clear sense of what one wants to achieve in one’s career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ability to recognise the skills needed to be successful in one’s career as well as the actions to take in order to achieve career goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Having the confidence and determination to pursue and achieve set career goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Continuously engage in development activities to achieve career goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
<td>The metacognitive ability to understand, act and interface successfully within a diverse cultural environment (Bezuidenhout, 2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Knowing the customs of other cultures as well as understanding their beliefs and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Having the confidence to communicate interculturally, as well as finding it easy and enjoyable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Being able to initiate and maintain relationships with individuals from diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>An individual's perception of the extent of difficulty of career-related or performance related tasks which they believe they are going to attempt as well as their perception of how well they will be able to execute the required actions in order to deal with those tasks. In addition, self-efficacy refers to the extent to which their perception will persist, despite obstacles (Schreuder &amp; Coetzee, 2011). Self-efficacy also refers to the estimate that an individual makes of his or her ability to cope, perform and thrive (Bezuidenhout, 2010).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career resilience</td>
<td>An individual's ability to adapt to changing situations by accepting job and organisational changes, looking forward to working with different and new people, being willing to take risks as well as having self-confidence (Schreuder &amp; Coetzee, 2011). Bezuidenhout (2010) describes career resilience as a personal disposition that facilitates a high level of adaptability, self-confidence, competence as well as confidence irrespective of difficult career situations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Functioning independently of others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Making one's one decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Having the confidence to succeed at one's goals and efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being persistent with challenges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enjoying the discovery of creative new solutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Keeping oneself up to date with the newest developments in one's job and career.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High self-regard for own personal qualities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Open to feedback from others with regard to strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-confidence in successfully identifying one's accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Open to (and able to proactively adapt to) changes in one's environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociability</strong></td>
<td>The ability to be open to, establish and maintain social contacts, as well as utilise formal and informal networks for the benefit of one's career (Bezuidenhout, 2010).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building a network of friends who could advance one's career.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Using networks in order to search for and find new job opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Actively seeking feedback from other people in order to progress in one's career.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being willing to take risks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Having self-confidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adapting to various social situations by changing nonverbal behaviour within different sociocultural situations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrepreneurial orientation</strong></td>
<td>An individual's preference for innovation and creativity, a tendency to take risks, a need for achievement, a tolerance for uncertainty as well as a preference for autonomy in the exploitation of opportunities within the career environment and the creation of something valuable (Bezuidenhout, 2010).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being interested in and continuously undertaking new business opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being open to new ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Having a positive attitude towards the implications of changes within one’s workplace or studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being comfortable in uncertain situations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accepting responsibility for the success or failure of one's career.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proactivity</strong></td>
<td>An individual's tendency to engage in active role orientations that lead to future-oriented and self-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taking responsibility for one's decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Setting challenging targets for oneself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
initiated action in order to change oneself and one’s situation (Bezuidenhout, 2010).

| Emotional literacy | An individual’s ability to use emotions adaptively as well as the quality of an individual’s ability to read, understand and control own and other people’s emotions (Bezuidenhout, 2010, Coetzee, 2010). | • Identifying opportunities before others do.  
• Improving on one’s knowledge and skills in order to ensure career progress.  
• Adapting to changing situations.  
• Persisting in spite of difficult career circumstances.  
• Understanding one’s own emotions and feelings.  
• Managing one’s own mood and emotions.  
• Identifying others’ emotions.  
• Defusing an emotionally explosive situation.  
• Cheering sad people up. |
6.2.5 Integration of employability theoretical models

The employability models discussed in the preceding sections (Beukes, 2010; Bezuidenhout, 2010; Fugate, 2004; Van der Heijde & Van der Heijden; 2006) appear to be complementary to each other. All these models share similarities in the sense that they all view employability from the individual perspective and emphasise the active role that individuals play in enhancing their employability. However, Bezuidenhout's (2010) attributes framework of employability is of specific relevance to this study as it has been developed for adults in the South African context. In addition, Bezuidenhout (2010) recognises some career meta-competencies that are of importance in the enhancement of individual employability. Table 6.5 provides a summarised overview of the main elements of each of the four employability models that have been discussed.

It seems as if most employability models recognise that career meta-competencies and attributes are essential for employability, but none of the above models clearly distinguishes between the skills, competencies or attributes needed in order to enhance employability.

Both Bezuidenhout (2010) and Coetzee and Beukes (2010) identified career self-management and emotional literacy as vital career-related employability attributes. Jeager (2003) suggests that emotional intelligence can be enhanced and improved within a higher education setting and as a result, significantly influence academic achievement. Students can be assisted to become well-rounded graduates with all the necessary skills required by employers if career self-management and emotional literacy are included in learning activities (in the curriculum and module or course syllabus).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct definition</strong></td>
<td>A multidimensional collection of individual characteristics that predispose employees to (pro)actively adapt to their work and career environments</td>
<td>An ability to obtain and keep a job within or outside one’s current organisation</td>
<td>The application and continuous development of a set of supportive competencies and attributes through stages of reiterative developmental phases which enhance the individual's opportunities for accessing and sustaining employment opportunities</td>
<td>Career-related attributes and dispositions which promote adaptive cognition, behaviour and affect, and enhance the individual's suitability for appropriate and sustained employment opportunities (Coetzee, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Lifelong learning</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is employability achieved?</td>
<td>Proactive adaptability and flexibility</td>
<td>Proactive adaptability and flexibility</td>
<td>Progressing through reiterative stages of lifelong learning and reflection</td>
<td>Proactive adaptability, flexibility and lifelong learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness for career counselling</td>
<td>Provides useful information on the</td>
<td>Provides useful information on the abilities needed for</td>
<td>Enhanced self-awareness. Practical</td>
<td>Provides useful information on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics needed for employability</td>
<td>employability</td>
<td>tool for an individual in order to understand and develop own employability</td>
<td>personality attributes needed for managing and sustaining employability in the contemporary world of work context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, Pool and Sewell (2007) also found that self-efficacy, self-confidence and self-esteem are significantly related to employability. Coetzee (2008) states that students with a higher self-esteem are more likely to obtain an appropriate position and be successful in whatever occupation they choose because of their self-belief (related to self-esteem). Coetzee (2008) furthermore indicates that everything students do during their time in higher education impacts on their self-confidence and self-esteem, and it is through the development of a positive self-esteem that employability is enhanced. Individuals with a high and positive self-esteem were found to be more realistic about their achievements and committed to lifelong learning (Coetzee, 2009).

In addition, several studies found that personality preferences also have a significant impact on employability (Cole et al., 2009; Higgs, 2001; Orth et al., 2010; Worline et al., 2002). Cole et al. (2009) found that personality plays a role during the selection of an employee. Higgs (2001) proposed that individuals could develop their weaker personality function and therefore deliver more rounded behaviour, which could possibly influence employability.

Although the models described above include competencies, skills and attributes that employers deem necessary for graduates to enter the new world of work, no model appears to include the career meta-competencies of relevance to the present study. A model encapsulating these career meta-competencies should therefore be developed to assist individuals to develop not only the soft skills needed, but also the career meta-competencies relating to their personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes.

6.3 VARIABLES INFLUENCING EMPLOYABILITY ATTRIBUTES

Individuals’ employability differs as a result of certain variables. Specifically, in the South African context, companies tend to discriminate against certain individuals in terms of race, gender and age. Although the South African employment equity legislation allows employers to discriminate on the basis of race and gender, it is important to consider and take note of the reason for discrimination based on gender and race as well as the discrimination based on age. As a result, individuals who are discriminated against will not obtain employment even if those individuals have all the required skills and attributes (McQuaid & Lindsay, 2005). The key variables of importance in this research include age, gender and race.
6.3.1 Age

Various authors have found that age and employability are related. Many older employees find themselves in the same position as new job applicants due to the rapid changes in the market environment which have resulted in retrenchments and job changes for individual workers (Van Rooy et al., 2005). De Armond et al. (2006) and Van der Heijden (2002) found that employability decreases with age, especially when an individual moves into a new job field or to a more senior job in the field concerned. De Armond et al. (2006) found that older workers are probably less likely to search for new challenges, are less flexible, have less desire for variation in their work and are less motivated to learn new skills. These commonly held stereotypes have a negative impact on the employability of older workers when they seek new employment. On the other hand, Lee (2001) argues that graduates are discriminated against on the basis of their age. This perception is based on graduates’ lack of practical experience when applying for new positions.

6.3.2 Gender

Various authors have reported that women are less employable than men; in other words, females tend to have a lower employability than males (Clarke, 2008; Lee, 2001; Scandura & Lankau, 1997). They explained that many organisations discriminate against women because of gender stereotypes and family responsibilities. In addition, organisations tend to perceive women as less committed to their careers and the organisations. Alfrassa (2001) confirms that after graduation males are more likely to obtain employment than females. Lee (2001) reported that women still face the glass ceiling and are therefore disadvantaged in terms of their gender.

6.3.3 Ethnicity/race

Contrasting results were found regarding the influence race has on employability. Rothwell, Jewell and Hardie (2009) found no significant differences in self-perceived employability and ethnicity. Lee (2001) and Mancinelli, Massimiliano, Piva and Ponti (2010) reported that high levels of education have a positive impact on the advancement of minority groups. As a result, such individuals are more likely to obtain satisfying jobs, higher incomes and better career prospects. Beukes (2010) added that macro-economic policy issues, specifically black economic empowerment (BEE), influence ethnic demand in industries and therefore result in ethnic differences in employability.
6.3.4 Geographical position and economic situation

According to McQuaid et al. (2005), geographical positioning influences the access an individual has to employment and training opportunities. According to McQuaid (2006), the level of skills and spatial mismatch in a local labour market depends on the characteristics of the local economy, employers and job seekers. An individual's employability fluctuates in accordance with the economic situation of the time. When there are more jobs than applicants, personality attributes, skills and competencies are less important than when there are more applicants than jobs (Brown et al., 2003).

6.4 EVALUATION

This chapter focused on the conceptualisation of employability skills, competencies and attributes. It is clear from the literature that employability is a very broad topic and one that can be studied from various perspectives.

The emphasis was placed on the discussion of graduate employability, as this study focuses on employability relating to adult students in the new world of work. Findings regarding the concept of generic skills were discussed and the need for attributes that will enable individuals to adapt to the new world of work over and above technical skills was highlighted.

Bezuidenhout's (2010) employability attributes model is of importance to this study as it relates to employability attributes. The dimensions that were identified by Bezuidenhout (2010) include a career self-management drive, cultural competence, self-efficacy, career resilience, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy.

The aspect of generic skills was also discussed and identified as important to employability as these skills provide the means of applying the attributes identified as contributing to the enhancement of the employability of individuals.

It can be concluded from the literature that the definition of employability relates to three main aspects, namely finding an appropriate position, remaining in that position and moving between different appropriate positions. In addition to the attributes, employability can also be influenced by various aspects such as age, gender, race, geographical and economic situation.
6.5 IMPLICATIONS FOR CAREER COUNSELLING

Sustainable employability refers not merely to obtaining a job, but to remaining employable over the long term. To achieve this, individuals need a broader collection of attributes in order to be successful in their career development and their work (Watts, 2006).

For an individual to stand the best chance of obtaining a satisfying job at which he or she could be successful, education in career self-management and career development learning is important (Coetzee & Beukes, 2010; Pool & Sewell, 2007). Career development learning typically includes activities to help individuals to become more self-aware; it gives them a real sense of what they are interested in and enjoy doing, and what motivates them and suits their personalities. Individuals also need to learn how to best present themselves to prospective employers, how to behave in interviews and in a job and how to make considered decisions about their careers (Coetzee & Beukes, 2010). It is therefore essential to assist individuals to enhance their employability skills.

The enhancement of employability attributes should be undertaken by various stakeholders (such as industrial psychologists, human resource practitioners and career counsellors) working in close collaboration. These stakeholders (specialising in career guidance) can play a vital role in assisting individuals to understand, develop and direct their employability skills. Clarke (2008) suggests that a developmental framework should be introduced during the career counselling sessions in order to assist individuals to develop the tools necessary to manage their own employability.

An individual’s background and sociodemographic status (such as family characteristics, socioeconomic status, gender and race), personal characteristics (such as self-esteem, self-awareness, decision making ability, personality preferences, emotional intelligence and employability attributes), experience (such as work, academic experience and hobbies), and initial skill levels (such as cognitive abilities, technical skills and interpersonal skills) are all essential factors in determining an individual’s occupational interests and competencies (Beukes, 2010; Feldman, 2002). Current career counselling practices are being challenged due to the radical changes in people’s lifestyles as well as the technological advancements of the 21st century (Maree & Beck, 2004).

Individuals rely on perceived competencies and interests when deciding on an occupational choice or formulating career goals (Feldman, 2002). Bezuidenhout’s (2010) model of employability attributes appears to be of value in career counselling and guidance as it
provides a framework that can be used in career counselling to help individuals to understand the attributes that are necessary to enhance their employability.

The following literature research aim was achieved in chapter 6:

**Research aim 2:** To conceptualise the personality attributes constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence and the **employability attributes** construct.

### 6.6 THEORETICAL INTEGRATION

The literature review provided a comprehensive overview of the four constructs that are of relevance in this study in an attempt to answer the first research question, namely how the four constructs (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes) are conceptualised and explained by theoretical models in the literature.

The theoretical integration attempts to explore whether a theoretical relationship exists between the four constructs (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes) and how this relationship can be explained in terms of an integrated hypothesised career meta-competency model.

It is evident from the literature that a theoretical relationship does exist between the personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes. Cole *et al.* (2009) and Kerka (1998) found a positive relationship between personality preferences and employability.

Pool and Sewell (2007) found that employability attributes (such as self-esteem) relate significantly to personality attributes and employability. Bandura (1995) explained that individuals’ self-esteem influences the way in which they think, feel, motivate themselves and act. It is furthermore suggested that individuals who feel and think that they can achieve anything are more likely to succeed in whatever occupation they choose than are people who do not have a high self-esteem (Yorke & Knight, 2004). The development of a healthy, high self-esteem therefore relates positively to employability (Coetzee, 2008).

Brown, George-Curran and Smith (2003) found that students with a higher self-esteem display a higher emotional intelligence. They furthermore found that when a person possesses a high emotional intelligence and self-esteem, he or she is more likely to perform
well in career-related tasks (which could include higher employability skills). Bezuidenhout (2010) and Coetzee and Beukes (2010) found that career self-management and emotional literacy are important career-related attributes. Jeager (2003) found that emotional intelligence correlates positively with employability. It therefore appears that Ashkanasy and Daus (2002) recognise the relationship between emotional intelligence and employability attributes. Pool and Sewell (2007) and Yorke and Knight (2007) also recognise emotional intelligence as an important attribute of an individual’s employability.

Figure 6.5 provides a conceptual overview of the four constructs and how they relate to each other on a theoretical level. It is hypothesised that individuals' personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence are significantly related to their employability attributes. Theoretically, the sustained employability of an individual is dependent on the development and demonstration of personal career-related attributes (career meta-competencies) that constitute the employability construct (Cranmer, 2006; Tomlinson, 2007).

![Figure 6.5](image-url)

*Figure 6.5.* Overall hypothesised relationship between the personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and employability attributes constructs.
Enhanced and sustained employability

Personality Preferences

**Definition**
The patterns in the way people prefer to perceive and make judgments (Jung, 1971, 1990). Apart from a dominant attitude, each person uses the mental functions of perception and judgment (or decision-making) consciously when observing his or her world and assigning meaning to the experience (Jung, 1971, 1990).

**Constructs**
Extraversion – Introversion
Thinking – Feeling
Sensing – Intuition
Judging – Perceiving

**Influencing variables**
Environment
Culture
Gender
Individual circumstances
Lifespan development

Self-esteem

**Definition**
The process by which people maintain a sense of self-integrity, that is, a perception of themselves as globally moral, adequate, and efficacious when they confront threats to a valued self-image (Sherman et al., 2009).

**Constructs**
General self-esteem
Social / peer self-esteem
Personal self-esteem

**Influencing variables**
Age
Gender
Race
Socioeconomic factors

Emotional Intelligence

**Definition**
The extent to which individuals are able to tap into their feelings and emotions as a source of energy to guide their thinking and actions (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

**Constructs**
Perception of emotion
Managing own emotions
Managing others’ emotions
Utilisation of emotions
Overall emotional intelligence

**Influencing variables**
Age
Gender
Cross-cultural influences
Skills
Race
Personal influences

Employability Attributes

**Definitions**
Career-related attributes and dispositions which promote adaptive cognition, behaviour and affect, and enhance the individual’s suitability for appropriate and sustained employment opportunities

** Constructs**
Career self-management
Self-efficacy
Entrepreneurial orientation
Cultural competence
Sociability
Emotional Literacy
Career resilience
Proactivity

**Influencing variables**
Age
Race
Gender
Geographical position and economic state

*Figure 6.6.* Integrated overview of hypothesised relationship between personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability
It is important, however, to explore the relationship between the subelements of each of the four relevant constructs as this might also give career counsellors meaningful guidance in terms of the relationship between the various constructs and therefore provide an indication of the necessary interventions to facilitate the enhancement of employability attributes. Based on the literature review, the hypothesised relationships are outlined in Figure 6.6. This model displays the integrated hypothesised relationships between personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes. The model can be utilised by career counsellors to help individuals to develop their less developed personality preferences and enhance their self-esteem and employability attributes in order to improve their employability as a desired outcome. As a further aid to career counsellors, the research has attempted to develop a psychological career meta-competency profile consisting of personality and employability attributes important for individuals to sustain their employability in the contemporary employment context. Table 6.6 and Figure 6.7 illustrate the psychological profile made up of an individual's personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and employability attributes. Because the career meta-competency model constitutes psychological career-related attributes or meta-competencies, they are described in terms of cognitive, affective, conative and interpersonal behavioural attributes.

Table 6.6 and Figure 6.7 summarises the career meta-competencies as divided into cognitive, affective, conative and interpersonal behavioural attributes.
Table 6.6
*Psychological Profile Reflecting Personality Preferences, Self-esteem, Emotional intelligence and Employability Attributes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological dimension</th>
<th>CAREER META-COMPETENCIES</th>
<th>Personality attributes</th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Emotional intelligence</th>
<th>Employability attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personality preferences</td>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>Perception of emotion</td>
<td>Career self-management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal self-esteem</td>
<td>Managing own emotion</td>
<td>Utilisation of emotion</td>
<td>Emotional literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Career resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneurial orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social/peer-related self-esteem</td>
<td>Managing others’ emotion</td>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
<td>Sociability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On a **cognitive level**, individuals’ personality preferences (Cole et al., 2009; Higgs, 2001; Kerka, 1998), general self-esteem (Bandura, 1999; Coetzee, 2008; Pool & Sewell, 2007; Yorke & Knight, 2004), perceptions of their emotions (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Brown, George-Curran & Smith, 2003; Bezuidenhout, 2010; Coetzee & Beukes, 2010; Jeager, 2003; Yorke & Knight, 2002), career self-management (Bezuidenhout, 2010; Coetzee & Beukes, 2010) and self-efficacy (Bezuidenhout, 2010) may influence their ability to create employment opportunities and sustain their employability. Career development support

**Figure 6.7.** Psychological career meta-competency profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>Personality Preferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>Employability attribute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
practices and career counselling should focus on creating self-awareness to make it possible to recognise (and improve) on underdeveloped personality types. Individuals should also be assisted within these interventions to enhance their general self-esteem and engage in managing their own careers. Such interventions could possibly help individuals to enhance their employability attributes on a cognitive level.

On an **affective level**, individuals' personal self-esteem (Bandura, 1995; Coetzee, 2008; Pool & Sewell, 2007; Yorke & Knight, 2004), management of their own emotions, utilisation of emotions and emotional literacy (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Brown, Hesketh & Williams, 2003; Bezuidenhout, 2010; Coetzee & Beukes, 2010; Jeager, 2003; Yorke & Knight, 2002) may influence their ability to adapt to changing situations and therefore sustain their employability. Career development support practices and career counselling should help individuals to gain personal insight. This could enable individuals to improve on their personal self-esteem and not only to manage their own emotions but also to utilise their emotions appropriately within the work context. Having a high personal self-esteem and ability to manage and utilise emotions could prove valuable to individuals in obtaining and sustaining their employability.

On a **conative level**, individuals' career resilience, entrepreneurial orientation and proactivity may influence their ability to adapt to and welcome organisational changes, willingness to take risks and engage in creative problem solving in order to improve themselves, their situation or their employability (Bezuidenhout 2010, Coetzee 2011). These attributes may assist individuals to obtain employment and thereby enhance their employability. Career development support practices and career counselling could possibly help individuals to improve their confidence so that they become more willing to take risks and try creative solutions to problems when confronted with changing situations within the new world of work.

On an **interpersonal level**, individuals' social/peer-related self-esteem (Bandura, 1997; Coetzee, 2008; Pool & Sewell, 2007; Yorke & Knight, 2004), management of others’ emotions (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Brown, George-Curran & Smith 2003; Bezuidenhout, 2010; Coetzee & Beukes, 2010; Jeager, 2003; Yorke & Knight, 2002), cultural competence and sociability (Bezuidenhout, 2010; Coetzee, 2011) may influence their ability to interact and network with others. Effective interaction and networking may create employment opportunities for individuals and thereby enhance their employability. Career development support practices and career counselling could assist individuals to read and understand the emotions of others (in order to respond appropriately to opportunities) as well as to
communicate and connect with people from other cultures or backgrounds. It should be remembered that the new world of work incorporates very diverse cultures.

Variables such as age, gender, race, marital status, job level and current employment status may influence the expression and manifestation of career meta-competencies (Alfrassa, 2001; Clarke, 2008; De Armond et al., 2006; Van der Heijden, 2002; Lee, 2001; Mancinelli et al., 2010; McQuaid & Lindsay, 2005).

6.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter explored the conceptual foundations and models of the construct of employability attributes. Furthermore, it provided an overview of the literature pertaining to the theoretical models that predominantly influence employability. In addition, the chapter provided a theoretical integration of the constructs of employability attributes, and the personality attributes of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence.

The following literature research aims were achieved in chapter 6:

**Research aim 3**: To conceptualise the nature of the theoretical relationship between the personality attributes constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence and the employability attributes construct, and explain the relationship in terms of an integrated theoretical model.

**Research aim 4**: To construct a conceptual career meta-competency model based on the theoretical relationship dynamics between the personality attributes constructs (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct.

**Research aim 5**: To outline the implications of the theoretical career meta-competency model for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices and specifically career counselling practices in the contemporary employment context.

The research aims of the literature review have therefore been achieved in this chapter. Chapter 7 focuses on the empirical research pertaining to this study.
Chapter 7 outlines the empirical investigation with the specific aim of assessing whether an empirically tested psychological career meta-competency profile can be constructed for career counselling purposes. This is done by investigating the statistical strategies that can be employed to investigate the relationship between the composite set of personality attributes variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the composite set of employability attributes variables. In order to achieve the research aims, a non-experimental, ex-post factor quantitative survey design will be used.

Locke, Silverman and Waneen (2004) describe quantitative research as a method using numeric and quantifiable data. Quantitative research can be divided into experimental and non-experimental research. Using a quantitative research method ensures that the results and conclusions are unbiased. Conclusions are therefore based on systematic and objective observations. However, analysing the statistics is a complex and often expensive process. In addition, quantitative methods only rely on a “yes or no” answer and do not allow for “grey area” answers (often required in psychology and the social sciences) (Shuttleworth, 2008). According to Locke et al. (2004), nonexperimental research consists of unmanipulated variables that are studied just as they are. One reason for using non-experimental research is that a lot of variables of interest in social science cannot be manipulated as they are attribute variables (for example gender, socioeconomic status, personality characteristics and attributes).

The use of a survey research approach has the following advantages: less time and money are required, there is no interview prejudice, precise results can be obtained, there is increased confidentiality for the participants and the sample does not have to be large in relation to the population (De Vos et al., 2011). However, the limitation of an ex-post facto survey design is that the results obtained from a survey design can only be generalised to the sample population used at the time of the survey (Babbie & Mouton, 2007).

Research hypotheses regarding the relationship between the personality attributes variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes variables will be formulated. The research hypotheses will be tested with the aid of descriptive, correlational and inferential (multivariate) statistics. The empirical investigation will consist of the following nine steps:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Determination and description of the sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Choosing and justifying the choice of the psychometric battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Administration of the psychometric battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Capturing of criterion data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Formulation of research hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Statistical processing of the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Reporting and interpretation of the results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Integration of the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Formulation of research conclusions, limitations and recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steps 1 to 6 will be addressed in this chapter. Steps 7, 8 and 9 will be discussed in chapters 8 and 9.

### 7.1 DETERMINATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

A population is the total collection of events, things or individuals to be represented. A sample is a subset of the population (the set of actual observations which may include any number of individuals that is less than the population number) (Tredoux & Durrheim, 2002). A sample should have properties that make it representative of the entire population (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995; De Vos, 2003).

A convenience sample was drawn to achieve the objective of the study. This approach was chosen to ensure that the researcher obtained a sufficient number of easily accessible members of the population to participate in the research study (Mouton & Marais, 1996).

Convenience sampling is a cost-effective means of ensuring that a sufficient number of participants are included in the study. However, one limitation of convenience sampling is that sampling can lead to over-representation or under-representation of particular groups within the sample. The sample could therefore be highly unrepresentative (Black, 1999).

The population consisted of adults who were enrolled as distance learning students for a postgraduate business management degree at a South African higher education institution in a particular year (N = 1124). The sample consisted of a group of students who were attending a
one-week study school in that particular year (N = 500). Only 304 usable questionnaires were obtained, yielding a response rate of 60%.

The profile of the sample is described according to the following biographical variables: gender, race, age, marital status, job level and employment status. The decision to include these categories of biographical variables was based on the exploration in the literature review of variables that influence the personality attributes constructs (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes constructs.

7.1.1 Composition of sample by gender group

Table 7.1 and Figure 7.1 illustrate the gender distribution of participants within the sample. Females comprised 63.5% of the sample and males comprised 36.5% of the sample of participants (N=304)

Table 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.1. Sample distribution by gender (N = 304)
7.1.2 Composition of sample by race group

Table 7.2 and Figure 7.2 illustrate the race distribution of the sample (N = 304). The sample consisted of predominantly black participants (69%), comprising Africans (48%), Coloureds (7.6%) and Indians (13.5%). Whites comprised only 30.3% of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.2. Sample distribution by race (N=304)

7.1.3 Composition of sample by age group

The ages of the participants were measured in categories of career development life stages: These stages comprise exploration phase, early adulthood and establishment phase and maintenance phase (Super, 1990). According to Super’s (1987) theory, these individuals are in the early adulthood and establishment phases of their careers. Table 7.3 and Figure 7.3
illustrate the age distribution of the participants in the sample (N=304) according to the career development life stages. Participants under the age of 25 years (early adulthood, exploration stage) comprised 24% of the sample. Participants between the ages of 26 and 40 years (early adulthood, establishment stage) comprised 54.9%. Participants between the ages of 41 and 55 years (middle adulthood, maintenance stage) comprised 20.7% and 0.3% of the participants did not indicate their age. Overall, the sample consisted predominantly of participants in the early adulthood phase of their lives (55%).

Table 7.3
Age Distribution of Sample (N = 304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career development life stages (Super, 1990)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Exploration phase</td>
<td>25 years and younger</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment phase (early adulthood)</td>
<td>26-40 years</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance phase, middle adulthood)</td>
<td>41-55 years</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.3. Sample distribution by age (N=304)
7.1.4 Composition of sample by marital status

Table 7.4 and Figure 7.4 illustrate the marital status distribution of the participants in the sample. The majority of participants were either single (58.2%) or married (34.9%). Only 6.3% of the participants were separated/divorced and 7% of the participants did not include their marital status.

Table 7.4

Marital Status Distribution of Sample (N = 304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Single</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Marital status](image)

Figure 7.4. Sample distribution by marital status (N=304)

7.1.5 Composition of sample by job level

Table 7.5 and Figure 7.5 illustrate the job level distribution in the sample. The distribution of the sample shows that 6.6% of the sample were working at a senior/executive level, 25% were employed at middle management level and 21.4% at first-level supervision level. Further, 27.6% of the sample were employed at staff level. Two percent of the sample were independent contractors; 17.4% of the participants did not indicate a job level.
Table 7.5

*Frequency Distribution: Job Level of the Sample (N = 304)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/executive level</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-level supervision</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent contractor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.5. Sample distribution by job level (N=304)

7.1.6 Composition of sample by employment status

Table 7.6 and Figure 7.6 illustrate the employment status distribution of the sample. The sample consisted of participants who were employed full time (70.7%); 6.3% were employed on a part-time basis and 4.3% were self-employed. Of the sample, 8.6% were studying full time, and 10.2% were unemployed.
Table 7.6
Frequency Distribution: Employment Status Profile of the Sample (N = 304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current employment status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/graduate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employed</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.6. Sample distribution by employment status (N=304)

7.1.7 Summary: biographical profile of the sample

In summary, the biographical profile obtained from the sample shows that the main sample characteristics that need to be considered in the interpretation of the empirical results are the following: the majority of the sample were single (58%) and black (69%) females (64%) between the ages of 26 and 40 (early adulthood, exploration and establishment stage) (76%), in some form of employment (81%) at either staff (28%) or supervisory/management (53%) level.
7.2 CHOOSING AND JUSTIFYING THE CHOICE OF THE PSYCHOMETRIC BATTERY

The selection of the psychometric battery was guided by the literature review. All the instruments chosen were evaluated on the basis of their relevance to the study as well as their validity and reliability. According to De Vos (2003), validity refers to the extent to which the instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. It is important that the constructs are measured truthfully. A construct cannot be considered truthful if another construct is applied as an alternative. The consistency of measures refers to the term “reliability” (Neuman, 2000). Reliability can also be defined as the question whether a particular procedure that is applied repeatedly to the same objective would provide the same end result each time (Tredoux & Durrheim, 2002).

The following measuring instruments were used in this study:

- A biographical questionnaire to obtain the personal information needed for the statistical analysis of the data (gender, race, age, marital status, job level and employment status)
- The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998) to measure the personality preferences construct
- The Culture-Free Self-esteem Inventories for Adults (CFSEI 2-AD) (Battle, 1992) to measure the construct of self-esteem
- The Assessing Emotions Scale (AES), (Schutte, Malouff & Bhullar, 2007) to measure the construct of emotional intelligence
- The Employability Attributes Scale (EAS) (Bezuidenhout & Coetzee, 2011) to measure the construct of employability attributes

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), the Culture-Free Self-esteem Inventories for Adults, the Assessing Emotions Scale and the Employability Attributes scale will be discussed in the following sections.

7.2.1 The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), Form M

The following section will focus on the development and rationale of the instrument, the description of the scales used within the instrument, administration and interpretation as well as
the validity and reliability of the MBTI (Form M). Finally, the researcher will justify the use of the MBTI for this study.

7.2.1.1 Development of the MBTI, form M

As discussed in chapter 3, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Myers, 1987) has been developed to operationalise the Psychological Type theory of Jung (1921, 1959, 1971, 1990) and to identify, by means of self-report, people’s basic preferences with regard to judgment and perception, so that the effects of each preference (whether singly or in combination) can be put to practical use (Myers, *et al.*, 2003). In broad terms, the descriptions of type used in the MBTI are as follows:

- **Sensing perception (S):** Observation by senses. Focus on immediate experience. Enjoy the here and now. Realistic, practical and detailed focus.
- **Thinking judgment (T):** Links ideas by logical connection. Cause and effect analysis. Analytical ability, objective, critical.
- **Feeling judgment (F):** Weighing relative values and merits. Understand relative values. More subjective than objective. Link to values of others. Understand people. Need for affiliation. Tender-minded.
- **Introversion (I):** Focus on inner world of concepts and ideas. Focus on clarity of concepts and ideas. Thoughtful. Self-sufficient.
- **Perceptive attitude (P):** Attuned to information. Focus on realities and/or possibilities. Curious, open, interested, spontaneous, adaptable. Open to new experiences.
- **Judging attitude (J):** Decision focus. Seeking closure. Linked to logical analysis. Closure when enough information. Decisive, organised.

Coetzee (2005) emphasised that the MBTI is designed to implement a theory and is therefore different from other personality instruments.
7.2.1.2 Rationale of the MBTI, Form M

The purpose of the MBTI, Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998), is to assess a person’s personality preferences and an individual’s preferences in regard to the basic functions of perception and judgment that enter into almost every behaviour. The MBTI Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998) was used for this research project to measure the participants’ personality types. The objective of the MBTI is to classify an individual into one of the 16 personality types as shown in Table 7.7 (Myers et al, 2003).

Table 7.7.
Sixteen Personality Preference Types (Myers et al., 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraverts with dominant Sensing and auxiliary Thinking</th>
<th>ESTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Sensing and auxiliary Feeling</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Sensing and auxiliary Thinking</td>
<td>ISTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Sensing and auxiliary Feeling</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Intuition and auxiliary Thinking</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Intuition and auxiliary Feeling</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Intuition and auxiliary Thinking</td>
<td>INTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Intuition and auxiliary Feeling</td>
<td>INFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Thinking and auxiliary Sensing</td>
<td>ESTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Thinking and auxiliary Intuition</td>
<td>ENTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Thinking and auxiliary Sensing</td>
<td>ISTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Thinking and auxiliary Intuition</td>
<td>INTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Feeling and auxiliary Sensing</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Feeling and auxiliary Intuition</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Feeling and auxiliary Sensing</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Feeling and auxiliary Intuition</td>
<td>INFP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.1.3 Description of the scales of the MBTI, Form M

The MBTI, Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998), is a self-reporting instrument and consists of three parts. Part I contains 26 items; part II, 47 items and part III, 20 items. Overall, the individual has to respond to 93 items. The MBTI is a questionnaire-style instrument consisting of items arranged in a forced-choice format. For each item, subjects have two responses to choose from.

The MBTI, Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998), contains four separate indices or scales. Each index reflects one of four basic preferences which, according to Jung’s (1921, 1971, 1990) theory, direct the use of perception and judgment. The preferences affect not only what people attend to in any given situation, but also how they draw conclusions about what they perceive. The indices EI, SN, TF and JP are designed to point in one direction or the other. They are not designed as scales for the measurement of traits or behaviours. The intent is to reflect a habitual choice between rival alternatives (Myers & McCaulley, 1992).

The EI index is designed to reflect whether a person is an extravert or an introvert. The SN scale is designed to reflect a person’s preference regarding two opposite ways of perceiving. One may rely primarily on Sensing (S), which reports observable facts or happenings through one or more of the five senses; or one may place more reliance upon the less obvious process of Intuition (N), which reports meanings, relationships and/or possibilities that have been worked out beyond the reach of the conscious mind (Myers & McCaulley, 1992).

The TF index is designed to reflect a person’s preference regarding two contrasting ways of judgment. A person may either rely primarily on Thinking (T) to decide impersonally on the basis of logical consequences or a person may rely primarily on Feeling (F) to decide on the basis of personal or social values. The JP index is designed to describe the process a person uses primarily in dealing with the outer world, that is, with the extraverted part of life. A person who prefers Judgment (J) has reported a preference for using a judgment process (either Thinking or Feeling) for dealing with the outer world. A person who prefers Perception (P) has reported a preference for using a perceptive process (either Sensing or Intuition) for dealing with the outer world (Myers & McCaulley, 1992).
The preferences on each index scale are independent of the preferences on the other three scales. The scale could therefore yield 16 different combinations or personality types (which are denoted by the four letters for preferences).

7.2.1.4 Administration of the MBTI, Form M

The MBTI, Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998), is self-explanatory. The MBTI, Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998) has no time limit, but the respondents are encouraged to work fast and choose the answer that comes to mind first. MBTI (1987) Form M scoring generates four basic scores. Points are the sum of the “votes” cast for each pole of the four preference scales or indices (EI, SN, TF, JP). For the EI preference, for example, the scores total the answers in the direction of E and the answers in the direction of I. Answers carry weights of 0, 1 or 2. Weights reflect the relative popularity of each answer with those for whom it was intended and with those at the opposite pole of the preference. Points were not intended for further analysis. Preference scores are the basic scores for the MBTI, Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998). They consist of a letter to denote the direction of the preference and a number to show the consistency of the preference (for example I 29 and T 14) (Myers & McCaulley, 1992).

7.2.1.5 Interpretation of the MBTI, Form M

Preference scores reflect the relative preferences for one pole over the other. The letter indicates which direction the individual prefers or the direction in which the individual is likely to develop in preference to the opposite one. For example, a preference score or the letter T suggests that a person prefers to link his or her ideas by logical connection. In contrast, the letter F suggests that a person would rather weigh up his or her ideas against values and merits. Such a person is likely to be subjective rather than objective and have a high need for affiliation. The characteristics associated with a preference are often less apparent when the numerical portion of the preference score is low. A low score shows almost equal votes for each pole of the preference. While letters indicate the direction of the preference, the number indicates the strength of the preference (Myers et al., 2003).
7.2.1.6 Validity and reliability of the MBTI, Form M

The validity of the MBTI, Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998), is determined by its ability to demonstrate relationships and is predicted by theory. Most of the validation data presented focus on the construct validity of the instrument. The MBTI manual (Myers et al., 2003) provides extensive validity data and the large number of correlations with other personality instruments show numerous significant results. However, these correlations do have a limitation in terms of evidence for construct validity, as they are based on the four scales (EI, SN, TF, and JP) and thus only report four preferences at a time and not the relationship of the sixteen types (for example, ISTF, ESTJ). While there are different views on many aspects of the validity of the MBTI, there is general agreement on its high level of face validity (Costa & McCrae, 1998).

In presenting reliability data in the MBTI manual, Myers et al. (2003) examined internal consistencies based on Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients, none of which is below .70 for the four scales. In addition, split-half reliabilities were examined along with the test-retest reliabilities. The results showed a level of consistency which indicates that the MBTI, Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998), is a reliable instrument.

7.2.1.7 Reasons for choosing to use the MBTI, Form M

The MBTI, Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998), was chosen for its value as a self-insight or development tool. The results obtained from analysing the dominant and non-preferred functions and attitudes can benefit individuals by identifying their predominant personality preferences and working on the development of their non-preferred function preferences to deliver more balanced behaviour. Research by Myers et al (2003) has shown that the MBTI, Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998), has proven reliability and validity for all race and gender groups in the South African context.

7.2.2 Culture-free Self-esteem Inventories for Adults (CFSEI 2-AD)

The following section will focus on the development and rationale of the instrument, the description of the scales used within the instrument, administration and interpretation as well as the validity and reliability of the CFSEI 2-AD. Finally, the researcher will explain why the CFSEI 2-AD was used for this study.
7.2.2.1 Development of the Culture-free Self-esteem Inventories for Adults (CFSEI 2-AD)

The CFSEI 2-AD (Battle, 1992) is a self-report inventory developed during several years’ work with students and adult clients. The inventories, which are intended to measure an individual’s perception of feelings of self-worth and achievement in comparison with others, have been proven to be of value in offering greater insights into clients’ subjective feelings and psychological state of well-being. The CFSEI 2-AD consists of three different components, namely the general, social and personal components.

General self-esteem is the aspect of self-esteem that refers to individuals’ overall perceptions (cognitive self-evaluations) and feelings of worth and competence. Social self-esteem is the aspect of self-esteem that refers to individuals’ perception (cognitive self-evaluations) of the quality of their relationships with their peers. Lastly, personal self-esteem is the aspect of self-esteem that refers to individuals’ most intimate feelings of self-worth (Battle, 1992).

7.2.2.2 Rationale of the CFSEI 2-AD

The CFSEI 2-AD (1992) is designed to assess the construct of self-esteem in adults in a valid and reliable manner. The CFSEI 2-AD (1992) has been successfully used by psychologists, psychiatrists, counsellors and teachers as a screening device to identify individuals who may be in need of psychological assistance. The CFSEI 2-AD (1992) is viewed as a valuable clinical tool although it has also been used extensively for research purposes (Battle, 1992).

The results from the CFSEI 2-AD (1992) may, for example, indicate that a person possesses a high self-esteem in all areas except the social area. This result could help the therapist to focus on developing the person’s self-esteem in the social area. This instrument as such serves as a tool in designing personal development interventions and measuring growth progress (Battle, 1992).

7.2.2.3 Description of the scales of the CFSEI 2-AD

The CFSEI 2-AD (1992), which is the second edition of the instrument, contains 40 items and includes the following subtests:
General self-esteem (16 items)
Social/peer-related self-esteem (8 items)
Personal self-esteem (8 items)
Lie subtest items that indicate defensiveness (8 items)
Total self-esteem score

The items in the instrument are divided into two groups, namely those that indicate high self-esteem and those that indicate low self-esteem. Although responses are of the forced choice variety, for the purposes of this research, a six-point Likert-type scale was used. The respondents completed the 40 items by checking each item as 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = somewhat disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = slightly agree, 5 = somewhat agree and 6 = strongly agree.

7.2.2.4 Administration of the CFSEI 2-AD

The inventory can be administered to individuals and groups. This test usually requires approximately 15 to 20 minutes to administer. The instructions are indicated on the questionnaire and the response sheet. Although the test can be scored either manually or by means of a software programme, the researcher scored the form by electronic means.

The scores for the CFSEI 2-AD (1992) are derived by totalling the number of items checked that indicate high self-esteem, excluding the lie scale item. A separate score may be computed by totalling the number of items checked correctly in the lie scale. The total possible score for Form AD is 32, and the highest lie score is 8. All the negatively keyed items on the test are reverse-scored before the results are interpreted.

7.2.2.5 Interpretation of the CFSEI 2-AD

Each subscale (general, personal, social and total) is measured separately and reflects the perceptions (self-evaluations) and feelings of the respondent in these dimensions. As a result, an analysis can be carried out to determine which dimensions are true for the respondent and which are not. This serves as a useful diagnostic technique to ascertain the level of the respondent’s self-esteem. The higher the score, the more positive the level of self-esteem.
7.2.2.6 Validity and reliability of the CFSEI 2-AD

Battle (1992) found evidence of the validity of the CFSEI 2-AD. Content validity was built into the instrument by developing a construct definition of self-esteem and by writing items intended to cover all areas of the construct. Battle (1992) found acceptable internal consistency for the factor analysis conducted on the CFSEI 2-AD (1992).

Battle (1992) conducted means, standard deviations and correlations and found that the data were significant (.81 for all the subjects). Coetzee (2004) also conducted reliability tests using factor analysis tests and confirmed the reliability of the instrument in the South African context.

7.2.2.7 Reasons for using the CFSEI 2-AD

The CFSEI 2-AD (1992) was chosen for its appropriateness. It is an easy and quickly administered instrument and has proved to be valid and reliable. It has furthermore been shown to be free of cultural bias. At face value, it does not appear to be susceptible to practice, memory or other transfer effects that could influence the internal consistency and reliability or the internal and external validity of the research. The instrument can furthermore be used both for development interventions and to measure growth. Battle (1992) also noted that it has been proven that the instrument can offer important insights into a person’s subjective feelings about themselves and their psychological state of well-being.

7.2.3 Assessing Emotions Scale (AES)

The following section will focus on the development and rationale of the instrument, the description of the scales used within the instrument, administration and interpretation as well as the validity and reliability of the AES. Finally, the researcher will justify the use of the AES for this study.

7.2.3.1 Development of the AES

The AES (Schutte et al., 2007) is also referred to as the Emotional Intelligence Test, or the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale. The AES is based on Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) original model of emotional intelligence. Salovey and Mayer (1990) describe emotional intelligence as a
mix of abilities and traits. The AES measures traits, or characteristics, of emotional intelligence, assessing four dimensions (including perception of emotions, managing own emotions, managing other's emotions and utilising emotions). A trait approach to assessing emotional intelligence focuses on self or other reports to obtain information regarding the display of emotionally intelligent behaviour in daily life (Schutte et al., 1998).

7.2.3.2 Rationale of the AES

According to Schutte et al. (2007), the AES scale can be used for research purposes and to assist individuals who are interested in self-reflection with regard to aspects of their own emotional functioning in the context of career goals or problems related to their emotional functioning. The purpose of the AES is to assess characteristics, traits or emotional intelligence (Schutte et al., 2007).

7.2.3.3 Description of the AES

The AES (Schutte et al., 2007) is a self-report questionnaire which consists of 33 items. Examples of items included in the scale are “I know when to speak about my personal problems to others”, “I expect that I will do well in most things I try” and “I know what other people are feeling just by looking at them”. The respondents are asked to rate their responses on a 5-point scale. They circle “1” if they strongly disagree with the statement, “2” if they disagree somewhat, “3” if they neither agree nor disagree, “4” if they agree somewhat and “5” if they strongly agree.

The test consists of the following subscales:

- Perception of emotions (10 items)
- Managing own emotions (9 items)
- Managing others’ emotions (8 items)
- Utilising emotions (6 items)

7.2.3.4 Administration of the AES

The AES (Schutte et al., 2007) is a self-exploratory instrument that can be administered to individuals and groups and requires 5 minutes to complete on average. Instructions are given
on the questionnaire. The participants complete the items by circling their choice on the 5-point Likert scale. Respondents are required to respond to statements about their emotions or reactions associated with emotions.

7.2.3.5 Interpretation of the AES

Each respondent’s test form was scored electronically. Total scale scores were calculated by reverse-coding items 5, 28 and 33, and then summing all items. The scores can range from 33 to 165. The higher the score, the more emotionally intelligent characteristics the individual displays.

7.2.3.6 Validity and reliability of the AES

Schutte et al. (2007) suggested that a Cronbach’s Alpha of .70 or more is significant. A Cronbach’s Alpha of .90 was obtained for the AES. This is an indication of acceptable reliability.

Several studies have been done on the validity of the assessing emotions scale and other measures of emotional functioning such as the EQ-I and the MSCEIT (Schutte, Mallouf, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper and Golden, 1998). The results of these studies appear to confirm the validity of the AES.

7.2.3.7 Reasons for using the AES

The AES (Schutte et al., 2007) has been widely used in research and various studies suggest that the scale is reliable and valid. The constructs measured by the AES are applicable and relevant to this research.

7.2.4 Employability Attributes Scale (EAS)

The following section will focus on the development and rationale of the instrument, the description of the scales used within the instrument, administration and interpretation as well as the validity and reliability of the EAS (Bezuidenhout & Coetzee, 2010). Finally, the researcher will give reasons for using the EAS (Bezuidenhout & Coetzee, 2010) for this study.
7.2.4.1 Development of the EAS

The EAS (Bezuidenhout & Coetzee, 2010) has been developed for the South African context. The EAS (Bezuidenhout & Coetzee, 2010) is used as an instrument to measure individuals' level of confidence in their self-perceived employability attributes.

7.2.4.2 Rationale of the EAS

The purpose of the EAS (Bezuidenhout & Coetzee, 2010) is to assess the generic transferable attributes that a person needs in order to be employable in the context of the new world of work.

Individuals are measured on eight employability attributes, including:

- Career self-management (11 items)
- Cultural competence (5 items)
- Career resilience (6 items)
- Proactivity (7 items)
- Entrepreneurial orientation (7 items)
- Sociability (7 items)
- Self-efficacy (6 items)
- Emotional literacy (7 items)

7.2.4.3 Description of the EAS

The EAS is a self-rated, multi-factorial measure, consisting of 56 items which comprise the following eight subscales: career self-management (10 items), cultural competence (5 items), self-efficacy (6 items), career resilience (6 items), sociability (7 items), entrepreneurial orientation (7 items), proactivity (7 items) and emotional literacy (7 items). Individuals’ responses are measured on a 6-point Likert-type scale.

Examples of items included in the scale are “I regularly reflect on what my career options are”, “I actively seek feedback from others to make progress in my career” and “I know what skills I need to be successful in my career”. The respondents should rate their response on a 6-point scale. They circle the “1” if the statement is never true for them, the “2” if the statement is
occasionally true for them, the “3” if the statement is more than occasionally true for them, the “4” if the statement is often true for them, the “5” if the statement is more often true for them, and the “6” if the statement is always true for them.

7.2.4.4 Administration of the EAS

The EAS (Bezuidenhout & Coetzee, 2010) can be administered to individuals and groups, and requires an average of 15 minutes to complete. The instructions are given on the questionnaire. Supervision is not necessary as the questionnaire is self-explanatory.

7.2.4.5 Interpretation of the EAS

Each respondent’s test form is scored electronically. Total scale scores are calculated by summing all items for each subscale. The scores can range from 30 to 60. The higher the score, the higher the self-perceived ability of individuals to demonstrate the employability attributes.

7.2.4.6 Validity and reliability of the EAS

An exploratory factor analysis (Coetzee, 2010) and inter-item correlational analyses provided evidence that the EAS items meet the psychometric criteria of construct validity. In terms of reliability (internal-consistency), Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients for each subscale range between .78 and .90 (high) (Coetzee, 2010).

7.2.4.7 Reasons for using the EAS

This is the only known instrument for adults developed and tested in the South African context. This instrument focus on the psycho-social attributes that enable sustained employability. The EAS is therefore relevant to this research.

7.2.5 Limitations of the psychometric battery

The CFSEI 2-AD (1992), AES (Schutte et al., 2007) and EAS (Bezuidenhout & Coetzee, 2010) instruments chosen for this study are self-report assessment instruments. The MBTI, Form M (Myers & Myers 1998) is based on forced-choice inventories. The advantage of a forced-choice
response measurement is the limitation on how responses can be made. In addition, the keying or scoring of the responses is also fixed. The way in which the choice affects the score is also standardised. The meaning of this single response is not open to interpretation by the examiner as in a projective test. It therefore ensures objectivity. The questions are presented in such a manner that computer scoring is allowed, which eliminates the possibility of human error in scoring the results. (Miller, McIntyre & Lovler, 2011)

Self-reporting instruments also have a number of disadvantages. Self-reports focus on individuals’ verbalisations of their feelings towards themselves or others. Individuals may be unwilling or even unable to reveal aspects or feelings about themselves. The self-perceptions will only be accurate to the extent that the individual is willing to express him- or herself honestly (Bartram, 1996). Another disadvantage of self-reports is the possibility of faking and a spurious response set (the tendency to rate oneself in a favourable light, the set to respond “true”, no matter what the content of the inventory item may be, and the set to respond deviantly) (Merrel, 2003). When using self-reporting instruments, the results may be biased because of the tendency of test-takers to be dishonest and their inability to respond to certain constructs. In addition, the ipsative nature of the instruments may potentially limit the nature of the methods used to determine their validity and compare them with other instruments (Baron, 1996; Bartram, 1996).

In conclusion, the four instruments (MBTI, Form M, CFSEI 2-AD, AES and EAS, were selected after an extensive review of several instruments designed to measure personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes. A decisive factor in the selection of these instruments was the ability to use statistical correlation analysis to determine the degree of relationship between multiple variables used in this study. However, the limitations of the four instruments should be considered during the interpretation of the results stemming from the research findings.

7.2.6 Ethical considerations

According to De Vos (2011) and Louw and Delport (2006), ethics is defined as a set of moral principles which refer to the quality of research procedures with regard to the adherence to professional, legal and social obligations to the research participants. The procedures that will
be followed in the proposed research will adhere to all the ethical requirements that are necessary to ensure ethical responsibility.

Permission to conduct the research was obtained through the Department of Industrial and Organisational Psychology at the University of South Africa. To ensure that the researcher meets the ethical requirements, the following ethical principles were adhered to:

- Research was conducted within recognised parameters.
- Approval was obtained from the host institution.
- Both classical and recent resources were used to analyse and describe the concepts.
- Experts in the field of research were consulted to ensure a scientific research process.
- All the sources used were quoted.
- Informed agreement was obtained from participants.
- Participants were informed about the results of the research.

According to the Employment Equity Act 55 of 1998 all psychological tests should be valid, reliable, fair as well as unbiased against any employee or any specific group of employees. In order to comply with the Act, all instruments were evaluated on the basis of their validity and reliability.

### 7.3 ADMINISTRATION OF THE PSYCHOMETRIC BATTERY

This step within the research design is related to the collection of data. In gathering the data, the following process was used: Information about the purpose of the study, the confidentiality of the individual responses and instructions for completing the questionnaire was given to the respondents during the study school. The questionnaires were administered during the study school and collected as soon as they had been completed. Each test pack included a covering letter inviting the subjects to participate in the study voluntarily, assuring them that their individual responses would remain confidential. The covering letter stated that completing the questionnaires and returning them constituted agreement that the result might be used for research purposes only.
Each participant received a test pack containing five questionnaires and a covering letter, as outlined below:

- Consent form (explaining the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature and confidentiality)
- Biographical questionnaire
- MBTI, Form M
- CFSEI 2-AD
- AES
- EAS

Each questionnaire was coded to identify the participant and this was used to construct a match between the responses measured by the various measuring instruments.

7.4 SCORING OF THE PSYCHOMETRIC BATTERY

The responses of subjects (N = 304) on the various measuring instruments were captured onto an Excel spreadsheet by a professional data capturer and were thereafter verified by the researcher. The data were then sent to the institution’s Statistical Support Department, which imported the Excel spreadsheet into a database for scoring. Reports were produced for the total sample, and then per race, gender, age, marital status, job level and current employment status. All data were then converted into SPSS, version 20.0 (Field, 2011) and SAS, version 9.2 (2008) databases.

7.5 FORMULATION OF RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The term “hypotheses” refers to statements about the relationship between variables. A null hypothesis is a type of hypothesis used in statistics to suggest that no statistical significance is present in a specific set of observations. Therefore, the null hypothesis proposes that no variation exists between variables or that a single variable is no different from a zero. An alternative hypothesis is accepted if statistical significance is found between a set of variables or if a single variable is different from a zero (Kumar, 2005). Neuman (2000) noted that hypothesis statements should carry clear implications for the empirical testing of the stated relationships.
7.6 STATISTICAL PROCESSING OF THE DATA

The statistical process comprised three major stages, each consisting of various steps of statistical analysis. Figure 7.7 is a visual representation of the various stages and the steps followed.

**Figure 7.7.** Statistical processing of data

In order to address the empirical research questions formulated in chapter 1, a number of research hypotheses were formulated. These are summarised in Table 7.8 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Aim</th>
<th>Research hypothesis</th>
<th>Statistical procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Research aim 1:**  
To empirically determine the nature of the statistical interrelationships between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables as manifested in a sample of respondents in a typical South African organisational setting. | H01: There are no statistically significant positive interrelationships between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables  
Ha1: There are statistically significant positive interrelationships between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables. | Correlation analysis                             |
| **Research aim 2:**  
To empirically assess the nature of the overall statistical relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) as a composite set of independent latent variables and the employability attributes construct variables as a composite set of dependent latent variables | H02: The personality attributes construct variate (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) as a set of composite independent latent variables is not significantly and positively related to the employability attributes construct variate as a composite set of dependent latent variables.  
Ha2: The personality attributes construct variate (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) as a set of composite independent latent variables is significantly and | Canonical correlation analysis                     |
variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research aim 3:</th>
<th>Research aim 4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To determine whether the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Based on the overall statistical relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables, to assess whether a good fit exists between the elements of the empirically manifested structural model and the theoretically hypothesised model.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hypothesis | H03: The personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) do not positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables. | H04: The theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency model does not have a good fit with the empirically manifested structural model. |
| Hypothesis | Ha3: The personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables. | Ha4: The theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency model has a good fit with the empirically manifested structural model. |

| Methodology | Multiple regression analysis | Structural equation modelling |
**Research aim 5**  
To determine whether the biographical variables (age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status) significantly moderate the relationship between the personality attributes construct and employability attributes construct variables.

**H05**: The biographical variables (gender, race, age, marital status, job level and employment status) do not significantly and positively moderate the relationship between the independent (personality attributes construct variables) and the dependent (employability attributes construct variables) latent construct variates.

**Ha5**: The biographical variables (gender, race, age, marital status, job level and employment status) significantly and positively moderate the relationship between the independent (personality attributes construct variables) and the dependent (employability attributes construct variables) latent construct variates.

**Hierarchial moderated regression analysis**

---

**Research aim 6**  
To determine whether significant differences exist between the subgroups of biographical variables that acted as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and the employability attributes construct variables as manifested in the sample of respondents.

**H06**: There are no significant mean differences between the subgroups of the biographical variables that act as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and the employability attributes construct variables.

**Ha6**: There are significant mean differences between the subgroups of the biographical variables that act as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and the employability attributes construct variables.

**Test for significant mean differences**

---

Note: H0 (null hypothesis); Ha (alternative hypothesis)
7.6.1 Stage I: Descriptive statistical analyses

Descriptive statistics describe the sample characteristics in numerical data in terms of the chosen constructs as well as biographical variables.

This stage consisted of four steps, namely:
1. Determining the internal consistency reliability of the measuring instruments by means of Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient.
2. Evaluating the unidimensionality of the CFSEI-AD, AES and EAS by using Rasch analysis.
3. Determining the means and standard deviations, kurtosis and skewness of the categorical and frequency data.
4. Testing assumptions (correlational analysis, canonical correlation analysis, multiple regression analysis and tests for significant mean differences).

7.6.1.1 Internal consistency reliability analysis (MBTI, CFSEI-AD, AES, EAS)

The reliability of an instrument can be defined in terms of the internal consistency, where each item on a scale correlates with another item, ensuring that a test measuring the same thing more than once has the same outcome results (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2002).

The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was used in this study to determine the internal consistency reliability of the instruments. The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient ranges from 0, which means there is no internal consistency, to 1, which is the maximum internal consistency score (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2002). Therefore, the higher the Alpha coefficient, the more reliable the item or test. A Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of .75 is considered a desirable reliability coefficient (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2002). However, in the case of individual testing, reliabilities as low as .30 are acceptable when instruments are used to gather group data (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2002).

The internal consistency reliability estimates refer to how strongly items of a scale relate to one another (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2002). The Cronbach’s Alpha is one of the most widely used methods of calculating the internal reliability consistency (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2002).
7.6.1.2 Rasch analysis: Assessing unidimensionality

Rasch analysis assumes that the relationship between person ability and item difficulty can be modelled as a probabilistic function (which implies that if the ability level of an individual increases on a certain latent trait, the likelihood of scoring higher on each item also increases) (Fox & Jones, 1998). The Rasch analysis (Fox & Jones, 1998) therefore determines the relationship between person ability and item difficulty or endorsement for each unidimensional dimension separately. This implies that the whole continuum of the latent trait is evaluated through the items and invariantly for all groups or individuals (Hagquist, 2007).

7.6.1.3 Means, standard deviations, skewness, kurtosis and frequencies

The descriptive statistics used to analyse data in this study were frequencies, means and standard deviations (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2002). Frequency tables were used to indicate the distribution of biographical variable data and enabled the researcher to describe the sample population.

In addition, skewness and kurtosis were also used. Skewness refers to a measure of symmetry (or lack of symmetry). A set of data (or distribution of data) is categorised as symmetric if the data looks the same on each side of a central point. Kurtosis measures whether data are either peaked or flat in relation to the normal distribution. Skewness and kurtosis values ranging between the -1 and +1 normality range are recommended for conducting parametric tests.

7.6.1.4 Tests for assumptions

In most circumstances, the objective of research is to draw valid inferences from a sample of data from a population. However, random samples from a larger population will not provide exact values that are applicable to the whole population. For this purpose, statistical methods are used to make it possible to determine the confidence with which such inferences can be drawn. Cohen, Cohen, West and Aiken (2003) suggest the use of either confidence intervals or null hypothesis testing as a method of drawing statistical inferences.

The following assumptions underlying multivariate procedures and tests for significant mean differences as addressed in this study have been made; these will be discussed in more detail:
The accuracy of data entered into the data file and missing values

In order to assure accuracy of the data, screening for possible miscoding were conducted. Frequency statistics for each of the items were requested (by means of the SPSS, version 20 frequency procedure) and scrutinised in terms of minimum and maximum values as well as means and standard deviations. All the items shown fell within the possible range of values, and the data were therefore deemed acceptable for further scrutiny. As only completed questionnaires were accepted for this study, no missing data were detected.

Ratio of cases to independent variables

According to MacCallum, Browne and Sugawara (1996), determination of sample size is an important aspect to consider in order to achieve adequate statistical power. A rule of thumb used when determining an adequate sample size for the testing of a multiple correlation coefficient is \( N \geq 50 + 8m \) (where \( m \) is the number of independent variables). In this equation, the standard conventional Alpha level and medium-sized relationships between the independent and dependent variables were assumed (\( \rho = .05 \) and \( \beta = .20 \)). Based on the equation above, the required sample was \( N = 74 \). The obtained sample of \( N = 304 \) in this study was therefore considered highly satisfactory for achieving adequate statistical power to detect effects by performing correlation and regression analyses.

Outliers

Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) describe an outlier as a case with such an extreme value on one variable (univariate) or such an extraordinary combination of scores on two or more variables (multivariate) that it unjustifiably influences the statistics obtained from the analyses.

Outliers in this study were detected by visually examining boxplots of standardised normal scores for each variable.
(d) **Normality, linearity and homoscedasticity**

Multivariate normality refers to the assumption that all variables (and all linear combinations of the variables) are normally distributed. When the residuals of analysis are normally distributed and independent, the assumption of multivariate normality is met (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), statistical inferences become weaker as distributions depart from normality. These authors note that even when statistics are used purely descriptively, normality, linearity and homoscedasticity of variables enhance the analysis, and consequently the improvement of the normality of variables is recommended.

Normality of variables can be assessed by various methods. The present study made use of skewness and kurtosis as well as the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

When testing for linearity, the assumption is tested that there is a straight-line relationship between two variables when a line is fitted to the X- and Y-values on a bivariate scatterplot (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The present study tested this assumption by visually inspecting bivariate scatterplots. According to Kinnear and Gray (2000), the data points created should take the outline of an ellipse, where the longer axis slopes upwards from left to right. A thinner ellipse indicates a stronger degree of a linear relationship.

The assumption of homoscedasticity for ungrouped data assumes that the variability of scores for one continuous variable is more or less the same at all values of another continuous variable. This assumption is closely related to the assumption of normality as when the assumption of multivariate normality is met, the relationships between the variables are homoscedastic (Tabacknick & Fidell, 2001). Bivariate scatterplots for all possible variable pairs were again utilised in order to test for linearity and homoscedasticity. No problems were detected from the scatterplots.

(e) **Multicollinearity and singularity**

When variables are too highly correlated, multicollinearity and singularity occur. Multicollinearity occurs when variables are very highly correlated (.90), and singularity occurs when variables are perfectly correlating. When such high correlations are present, this indicates that they do not hold any additional information needed in the analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The present study made use of tolerance, VIF, eigen-values
and condition indices in order to test for the assumptions of multicollinearity and singularity. No concerns of multi-collinearity were detected in the tests.

7.6.2 Stage II: Correlational analysis

Correlational statistics refer to the relationship between various variables (Steyn, 2002). Correlational analysis was used in this study to test the relationship between personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes. Tests for normality revealed that the data were not normally distributed. A non-parametric procedure (Spearman product moment correlation) was therefore used.

This stage consisted of one step, namely performing Spearman product moment correlations to determine the direction and strength of the relationship between the variables of concern to this study.

The correlation coefficient is a point on the scale between 1.00 and +1.00 and the closer the coefficient is to either of these points, the stronger the relationship is between the two variables (Howell, 1995). A correlation of +1.00 indicates a perfect positive relationship, a correlation of .00 indicates no relationship, and a correlation of -1.00 represents a perfect negative relationship. In this study, the Spearman coefficient was used to test the H01 and Ha1 hypotheses regarding positive or negative relationships that were found between the scores on the MBTI, CFSEI-AD, AES and EAS.

7.6.3 Stage III: Inferential (multivariate) statistical analysis

Inferential (multivariate) statistics were performed to enable the researcher to draw inferences about the data.

This stage consisted of five steps, namely:

1. Conducting canonical correlation analysis (to empirically investigate the overall statistical relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) as the set of independent latent variables and the employability attributes construct variables as the set of dependent latent variables) in order to test hypotheses H02 and Ha2.

2. Conducting standard multiple regression analysis (to empirically investigate whether the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem
and emotional intelligence) positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables) in order to test hypotheses H03 and Ha3.

3. Conducting Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) (to determine the elements of the empirically manifested career meta-competency model and to assess the fit between the empirically manifested model and the theoretically hypothesised model) in order to test hypotheses H04 and Ha4.

4. Performing hierarchical moderated regression analysis (to empirically investigate whether the biographical variables (age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status) moderate the relationship between the personality attributes construct and employability attributes construct variables) in order to test hypotheses H05 and Ha5.

5. Conducting tests for significant mean differences (to empirically investigate whether significant differences exist between the groups of the biographical variables that act as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and employability attributes construct variables as manifested in the sample of respondents) in order to test hypotheses H06 and Ha6.

7.6.3.1 Canonical correlation analysis

Canonical correlation analysis is a multivariate statistical model that facilitates the study of linear interrelationships between two sets of variables (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). One set of variables is referred to as independent variables and the others are considered dependent variables. A canonical variate is formed for each set. Canonical correlation is therefore a technique that is used to measure the strength of the overall relationship between the linear composites (canonical variates) of the independent and the dependent variables and is expressed as a canonical correlation coefficient ($R_c$). In effect, it represents the bivariate correlation between the two canonical variates. However, canonical also contains a variate created from several dependent variables whereas multiple regression can accommodate only one dependent variable.

Canonical correlation places the fewest restrictions on the types of data on which it operates and can be used for both metric and non-metric data. Because the other techniques impose more rigid restrictions, it is generally believed that the information obtained from them is statistically stronger and may be presented in a more interpretable manner. However, in situations with multiple dependent and independent variables, canonical correlation is the most appropriate and powerful multivariate technique. Canonical correlation analysis is
therefore more general than multiple regression and discriminant analysis because it can
deal with multiple variables that may be metric or non-metric (Hair et al., 2010).

Canonical correlation analysis has several advantages for researchers. Firstly, it limits the
probability of committing Type I errors. The risk of a Type I error is related to the likelihood of
finding a statistically significant result when it does not exist. Increased risk of Type I error
occurs when the same variables in a data set are used for too many statistical tests. Secondly,
canonical correlation analysis reflects the reality of research studies better. The
complexity of research studies involving human and/or organisational behaviour may
suggest multiple variables that represent a concept and thus create problems when the
variables are examined separately. In addition, it can identify two or more unique
relationships, if they exist. Canonical correlation analysis is both technically able to analyse
the data involving multiple sets of variables and theoretically consistent with the purpose
(Hair et al., 2010).

The canonical correlation analysis process includes: (1) specifying the objectives of
canonical correlation, (2) developing the analysis plan, (3) assessing the assumptions
underlying canonical correlation, (4) estimating the canonical model and assessing overall
model fit, (5) interpreting the canonical variates and (6) validating the model.

The redundancy index of a canonical variate is the percentage of variance explained by its
own set of variables multiplied by the squared canonical correlation for the pair of variates.
Thus, for example, the redundancy indices for the independent variables explaining the
dependent variables are:

\[ RI_1: x = SV_{x1} \times R_{c1}^2 \]
\[ RI_2: y = SV_{x2} \times R_{c2}^2 \]

7.6.3.2 Standard multiple regression analysis

Multiple regression analysis is one of the most common multivariate methods used to study
the separate and collective contributions of several independent variables to the variance of
a dependent variable (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2002). The analysis procedure is used to
build models for explaining scores of the dependent variable from scores on a number of
other independent variables (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2002).
According to Cohen et al. (2003), multiple regression results highlight two things. Firstly, the \( R^2 \) values tell us how well a set of variables explains a dependent variable and secondly the regression results measure the direction and size (magnitude) of the effect of each variable on a dependent variable.

### 7.6.3.3 Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is a multivariate procedure, combining multiple regression and factor analysis, used to examine the research hypotheses of causality within a system. SEM is divided into two different parts, including a measurement model and a structural model. The measurement model deals with the relationships between the measured and latent variables whereas the structural model only deals with the relationships between the latent variables (Garson, 2008; Hoyle, 1995; Hair et al., 2010).

The ability of the SEM procedure to distinguish between direct and indirect relationships between variables and to analyse relationships between latent variables without random error differentiates SEM from other simpler, rational modelling processes such as multiple regression (Garson, 2008; Hoyle, 1995).

As a confirmatory approach, a model is postulated based on theory and empirical evidence from previous research. The SEM process focuses on the validation of the measurement model by obtaining estimates of the parameters of the model and by assessing whether the model itself provides a good fit to the data (Garson, 2008). The model adequacy is evaluated by means of goodness-of-fit measures which determine whether the model being tested should be accepted or rejected (Garson, 2008). In the context of the present study, the SEM analysis was performed to test the relationship between the composite canonical variates (the personality attributes construct and the employability attributes construct variables) with a \( R_c \) loading > .30 obtained from the canonical correlation analysis models.

### 7.6.3.4 Hierarchical moderated regression analysis

Saunders (1956) was the first author to describe the stepwise or hierarchical moderated regression analysis as a method of empirically detecting how a variable influences or "moderates" the nature of a relationship between variables. One variable (for example \( z \)) moderates the relationship between two other variables (for example \( x \) and \( y \)) if the degree of association between \( x \) and \( y \) varies as a function of the value held by \( z \) (Hair et al., 2010).
The predictor-criterion relationship analysis provides information about the strength of the relationship, expressed in terms of coefficients of correlation, by slopes of regression lines or by percentages of misclassifications (Hair et al., 2010; Stone & Hollenbeck, 1984).

In the context of the present study, hierarchical moderated regression analysis will be performed to determine whether the biographical variables (age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status) significantly moderate the relationship between the personality attributes construct and employability attributes construct variables.

7.6.3.5 Tests of differences between mean scores

For the purposes of this study, the t-test (for non-parametric data) was used to determine whether there are any significant mean differences between the groups of the biographical variables that act as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and employability attributes construct variables.

7.6.4 Level of significance

The level of significance expresses statistical significance in terms of giving the specific probability. Various levels of significance are identified. The most widely used statistical differences are based on \( p \leq .05 \) as a rule of thumb, therefore providing 95 percent confidence in the results being accepted as the standard when applied in other research contexts (Neuman, 2000). Table 7.9 indicates the different levels of statistical significance.

Table 7.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Less significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>0.01 to 0.05</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>0.001 to 0.01</td>
<td>Very significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Extremely significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When a test of significance reveals a \( p \)-value lower than the chosen significance level, the null hypothesis is rejected and the results are referred to as statistically significant. However, the researcher can make two types of errors (Type I and Type II errors). A Type I error occurs when the researcher falsely rejects a null hypothesis, by stating that a relationship
exists when in fact no relationship exists. A Type II error occurs when the researcher falsely accepts a null hypothesis by stating that a relationship exists, when in fact no relationship exists between variables.

In terms of standard multiple regression analysis and hierarchical moderated regression analysis each variable in the equation is tested for statistical significance, by testing whether the value of each regression coefficient is greater than 0. The levels of statistical significance of multiple regressions used in this study were:

\[ F(p) < .001; \]
\[ F(p) < .01; \] and
\[ F(p) < .05 \] as the cut-off for rejecting the null hypotheses.

Practical effect sizes can be used to determine whether the relationship between two variables is practically significant or important (Steyn, 2002). Where statistically significant relationships were found through correlation coefficients, r-values (equal to correlation magnitude) will be interpreted according to the following guidelines (Cohen, 1988):

- \( r \leq .30 \) (small practical effect)
- \( r \geq .30 \leq 0.49 \) (medium practical effect)
- \( r \geq .50 \) (large practical effect)

The level of significance of a canonical correlation generally considered to be the minimum acceptable for interpretation is the .05 level, which (along with the .01 level) has become the generally accepted level for considering a correlation coefficient to be statistically significant. In addition to separate tests of each canonical function, a multivariate test of all canonical roots can also be done to evaluate the significance of discriminant functions (which include the Wilks' lambda, Hotelling's trace, Pillai's trace and Roy's gc). The practical significance of the canonical functions, represented by the size of the canonical correlations, should also be considered when deciding which functions to interpret. The rule of thumb regarding the suitable size for correlations is set at a Rc loading of \( \geq .30 \). In the context of this study, the significance level of \( p \leq .05 \) and \( Rc \geq .30 \) was chosen as the cut-off point for rejecting the null hypotheses.

Specific emphasis is placed on the relationship of the strength of a moderator to statistical significance and the magnitude of the increment in \( R^2 \) associated with the moderator.
Hartmann & Moers, 1999). Cohen and Cohen (1983) propose that the F-statistic for the increase in $R^2$ equals the square of the t-statistic for interaction term. For example, a significant t-value of the coefficient of the interaction term implies a significant moderating effect of X1 on the relationship between X2 and Y.

The effect size estimate for the interaction term ($f^2$) was considered during the interpretation of moderated regression. The $f^2$ can provide the proportion of systematic variance accounted for by the interaction relative to the unexplained variance in the criterion.

Cohen and Cohen (1983) proposed the following guidelines:

- $f^2 = .02$ (small effect)
- $f^2 = .15$ (medium effect)
- $f^2 = .26$ (large effect)

### 7.6.5 Goodness of fit statistics: SEM

Chi-square was used as it is the most common goodness-of-fit test when comparing models (Strasheim, 2008). Using the chi-square, the difference between the observed data and the hypothesised model was tested (Garson, 2008). A significant chi-square indicates a lack of satisfactory model fit (poor model fit), whereas a non-significant chi-square indicates a good model fit. However, the sample size influences the chi-square values and is therefore regarded as a limitation. Garson (2008) suggests that if the sample is large (as in the case of this study), even small differences between the model and the data will result in a statistically significant result. With large samples, therefore, the chi-square will almost certainly be significant (Hox & Bechger, 1998).

As a result of the chi-square limitation, a variety of alternatives fit indices have been proposed by researchers (Garson, 2008; Hu & Bentler, 1999). These alternatives indices consider the fit of the model as well as its simplicity. Even though the goodness-of-fit indices still depend on sample size and distribution, the dependency is much smaller than that of the routine chi-square test (Hox & Bechger, 1998).

The Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) indicates the relative amount of the variances or covariances in the sample predicted by the estimates of the population. In addition, the Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index (AGFI) is a measure of the relative amount of variance accounted for by the model, corrected for the degrees of freedom in the model relative to the
number of variables. GFI and AGFI range between 0 and 1 and when models fit well, these indices will be closer to 1.00. The Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), as it is termed in the statistical package AMOS 17.0 which was utilised in the present study, is a relative measure of covariation explained by the model (Garson, 2008). With regard to the TLI, it is generally accepted that a value of less than .90 indicates that the fit of the model can be improved (Hoyle, 1995), although a revised cut-off value close to .95 has been advised by Hu and Bentler (1999).

To overcome the problem of sample size, Brown and Cudeck (1993) suggest using the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and the 90% confidence interval of the RMSEA. The primary principle of the RMSEA is that it evaluates the extent to which the model fails to fit the data. The RMSEA estimates the overall amount of error. The RMSEA point estimates should be 0.05 or less and the upper limit of the confidence interval should not exceed .08 (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2000). Hu and Bentler (1999) suggested a value of .06 as being indicative of good fit between the hypothesised model and the observed data. Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCullum and Strahan (1999) elaborated on these cut-off points and noted that RMSEA values ranging from .08 to .10 indicate marginal fit and those greater than .10 indicate a poor fit.

In order to confirm the model fit, root mean residuals (RMR), and specifically standardised root mean residuals (SRMR), are used. RMR refers to the mean absolute value of the covariance residuals. The closer the RMR is to 0, the better the model fit. SRMR refers to the average difference between the predicted and observed variances and covariances in the model based on standardised residuals. Once again, the closer the SRMR is to 0, the better the model fit. The rule of thumb indicates that a value ≤ .05 indicates a good fit and a value ≤ .08 indicates a mediocre fit (Arbuckle, 2006).

### 7.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter discussed the first six steps of the empirical investigation, which included the determination and description of the sample, choice of psychometric battery, the administration and scoring of the psychometric battery, the formulation of research hypotheses, and finally the statistical processing of the data.

Chapter 8 will address empirical research aims 1–6 as outlined in Table 7.8.
CHAPTER 8: RESEARCH RESULTS

This chapter discusses the statistical results of the study and integrates the empirical research findings with the literature review. The statistical results are reported in terms of descriptive, correlational, and inferential (multivariate) statistics.

8.1 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

This section discusses the steps relevant to descriptive statistics, namely assessing the scale reliability (internal consistency reliability and unidimensionality of measuring instruments) and determining means and standard deviations, kurtosis and skewness of the categorical data and frequency data. Step four (assumption testing) was discussed in chapter 7.

8.1.1 Reporting of scale reliability: Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient and Rasch analysis

This section provides the scale reliabilities of the following measurement instruments and subscales: Culture-free Self-esteem Inventory (CFSEI-AD), Assessing Emotions Scale (AES) and Employability Attributes Scale (EAS).

8.1.1.1 Reporting of scale reliability: Culture-free Self-esteem Inventories (CFSEI-AD)

Table 8.1 provides the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient and Rasch values for each of the four subscales of the CFSEI-AD (Battle, 1992). The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient scores varied from .80 (high) to .57 (medium) for the total sample (N = 304). The total CFSEI-AD scale obtained a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of .78 (high), which can be considered adequate for the purposes of the current study.
Table 8.1
Person and Item Summary Statistics (CFSEI-AD) (N = 304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>InItem (SD)</th>
<th>OutItem (SD)</th>
<th>Separation</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.10 (.10)</td>
<td>1.08 (.10)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.05 (.20)</td>
<td>1.08 (.80)</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social / peer self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.03 (.10)</td>
<td>1.04 (.10)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>0.98 (-.40)</td>
<td>1.05 (.50)</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.05 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.04 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.01 (.01)</td>
<td>1.04 (.40)</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.02 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.03 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.02 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.03 (.10)</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.03 (-.2)</td>
<td>1.04 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.03 (.00)</td>
<td>1.04 (.20)</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1 indicates that most of the subscales have high reliabilities. The social/peer self-esteem variable obtained a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of .57 (medium) and the lie items scale obtained a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of .58 (medium). These results may indicate that the social/peer self-esteem and lie items show less internal consistency than the other self-esteem subscales. According to Terre Blanch and Durrheim (2002), for broad group measures (as in the case of the current study), it is acceptable to have Alpha coefficients as low as .30.

Table 8.1 shows acceptable item separation for all of the dimensions (> 2.00) (Bond & Fox, 2007). The person separation index for most of the dimensions was somewhat lower than the guideline (> 2.00), except for the general self-esteem dimension, which indicates that useful and logical information was obtained from the participants and that participants in other settings would most probably provide the same answers. According to the infit and outfit statistics, individuals responded to the items in a consistent manner.
### 8.1.1.2 Reporting of scale reliability: Assessing Emotions Scale (AES)

Table 8.2 provides the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient and Rasch values for each of the 4 subscales of the AES (Schutte et al., 2007). The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient values varied from .87 (high) to .59 (medium) for the total sample (N = 304). The total AES scale obtained a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of .87 (high), which can be considered adequate for the purposes of the current study.

**Table 8.2**

**Person and Item Summary Statistics (AES) (N = 304)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>InItem (SD)</th>
<th>OutItem (SD)</th>
<th>Separation</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.07 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.03 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.00 (-.30)</td>
<td>1.03 (-.30)</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.00 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.00 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.03 (.00)</td>
<td>1.00 (-.30)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing other’s emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.02 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.01 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.02 (.00)</td>
<td>1.01 (.00)</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation of emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.04 (-.1)</td>
<td>1.01 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.01 (.10)</td>
<td>1.01 (.10)</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.09 (.00)</td>
<td>1.05 (-.10)</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.02 (.00)</td>
<td>1.05 (.20)</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2 indicates that most of the subscales have adequately high reliabilities. The perception of emotion and utilisation of emotions variables obtained medium Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients of .59.
Table 8.2 shows acceptable item separation for all of the dimensions (> 2.00) (Bond & Fox, 2007). The person separation index for most of the dimensions is somewhat lower than the guideline (> 2.00).

8.1.1.3 Reporting of scale reliability: Employability Attributes Scale (EAS)

Table 8.3 provides the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients and Rasch values for each of the eight subscales of the EAS (Bezuidenhout & Coetzee, 2011). The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient values vary from .96 (high) to .73 (high) for the total sample (N = 304). The total EAS scale obtained a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of .96 (high), which can be considered adequate for the purposes of the current study.

Table 8.3
Person and Item Summary Statistics (EAS) (N = 304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>InItem (SD)</th>
<th>OutItem (SD)</th>
<th>Separation</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career self-management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.05 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.04 (-.10)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>0.99 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.04 (.40)</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>0.98 (-.40)</td>
<td>0.99 (-.40)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.00 (-.20)</td>
<td>1.00 (-.30)</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.03 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.04 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.00 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.04 (.30)</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.04 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.01 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.00 (-.20)</td>
<td>1.01 (-.10)</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.03 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.02 (-.10)</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.02 (.00)</td>
<td>1.02 (.00)</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1.02 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.03 (-.10)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1.00 (-.20)</td>
<td>1.03 (.20)</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.3 indicates that all the subscales have high reliabilities. The career resilience variable obtained the lowest Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of .70 (high).

Table 8.3 demonstrates acceptable item separation for all the dimensions (> 2.00) (Bond & Fox, 2007). The person separation index for some of the dimensions is somewhat lower than the guideline (> 2.00).

In summary, the reliability coefficients for all variables and subscales are relatively high and can be considered sufficient for the current study. In addition, the mean item fit and person fit are acceptable for all the dimensions. The results can therefore be interpreted with confidence.

8.1.2 Reporting of means and standard deviations

The means and standard deviations for each of the four measuring instruments, Myers-Briggs Type Indictor (MBTI), Culture-free Self-esteem Inventory (CFSEI-AD), Assessing Emotions Scale (AES) and Employability Attributes Scale (EAS), were calculated and reported in the section that follows.

8.1.2.1 Reporting of frequency distributions: MBTI, Form M

The MBTI is scored by obtaining a frequency score across all the items within each subscale. Personality preferences are expressed as a percentage for the sample group in table format. The data are only used to categorise the sample according to the personality preferences, and
therefore only frequencies and percentages are shown. Table 8.4 presents the descriptive information for the eight MBTI subscales.

Table 8.4  
*Frequency Distribution of MBTI (N=304) (N = 304)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBTI</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceiving</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants scored the highest on the Extraversion (E) and Perceiving (P) attitudes and they scored the highest on the Intuition (N) and Feeling (F) mental functions. The participants therefore displayed the dominant personality preference of ENFP.

8.1.2.2 *Reporting of means and standard deviations: CFSEI-AD*

Individual subscale scores for the CFSEI-AD are computed by obtaining a mean score across all the items within each sub-scale. A mean score is obtained by summing all the individual scores for each subscale and then dividing the total score for each subscale by 6. Each individual subscale can range from 1 to 6. A 1 would be the minimum score that would result if a person scored each of the items applicable to the subscale as a 1, and likewise a score of 6 is possible if all items applicable to the subscale were scored as a 6.

Table 8.5 presents the descriptive information of the 4 CFSEI-AD subscales. The descriptive information consists of the minimum score, maximum score, means and standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis obtained for the CFSEI-AD.
Table 8.5  
*Means and Standard Deviations of CFSEI-AD (N=304)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social /peer esteem</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-esteem</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie items</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total self-esteem</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean scores of all the CFSEI-AD subscales ranged between 5.52 and 3.20. The sample of participants obtained the highest score on the general self-esteem (\(M = 4.52; SD = 11.11\)) subscale and the lowest score on the lie items (\(M = 3.20; SD = 5.95\)).

Skewness values ranged between .08 and -.53, thereby falling within the -1 and +1 normality range recommended for these coefficients (Howell, 2008). Similarly, the kurtosis values ranged between .00 and -.38, thereby falling within the -1 and +1 normality range recommended for these coefficients (Howell, 2008).

8.1.2.3 Reporting of means and standard deviations : AES

Individual subscale scores for the AES are computed by obtaining a mean score across all the items within each subscale. A mean score is obtained by summing all the individual scores for each subscale and then dividing the total score for each subscale by 5. Each individual subscale can range from 1 to 5. A 1 would be the minimum score that would result if a person scored each of the items applicable to the subscale as a 1, and likewise a score of 6 is possible if all items applicable to the subscale were scored as a 5.

Table 8.6 presents the descriptive information of the four AES subscales. The descriptive information consists of the minimum score, maximum score, means and standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis obtained for the AES.
Table 8.6

Means and Standard Deviations of AES (N=304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional intelligence</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of emotion</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing others’ emotions</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation of emotions</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total emotional intelligence</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean scores of all the AES subscales ranged between 4.16 and 3.77. The sample of participants obtained the highest score on the managing own emotions (\(M = 4.16; SD = 4.61\)) subscale and the lowest score on the perception of emotions (\(M = 3.77; SD = 4.29\)). The standard deviations of the subscales are fairly similar, all ranging from 3.12 to 4.61.

Skewness values ranged between -.28 and -.63, thereby falling within the -1 and +1 normality range recommended for these coefficients (Howell, 2008). Similarly, the kurtosis values ranged between .07 and .72, thereby falling within the -1 and +1 normality range recommended for these coefficients (Howell, 2008).

8.1.2.4 Reporting of means and standard deviations: EAS

Individual subscale scores for the AES are computed by obtaining a mean score across all the items within each subscale. A mean score is obtained by summing all the individual scores for each subscale and then dividing the total score for each subscale by 6. Each individual subscale can range from 1 to 6. A 1 would be the minimum score that would result if a person scored each of the items applicable to the subscale as a 1, and likewise a score of 6 is possible if all items applicable to the subscale were scored as a 6.

Table 8.7 presents the descriptive information of the eight EAS subscales. The descriptive information consists of the minimum score, maximum score, means and standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis obtained for the EAS.
Table 8.7

Means and Standard Deviations of EAS (N=304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employability attributes</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career self-management</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career resilience</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial orientation</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional literacy</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employability attributes</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>34.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean scores of all the EAS subscales ranged between 4.75 and 4.14. The sample of participants obtained the highest score on the career self-management ($M = 4.75; SD = 8.14$) and self-efficacy ($M = 4.75; SD = 4.07$) subscales and the lowest score on the sociability subscale ($M = 4.14; SD = 5.90$).

Skewness values ranged between -.03 and -.54, thereby falling within the -1 and +1 normality range recommended for these coefficients (Howell, 2008). Similarly, the kurtosis values ranged between .21 and -.62, thereby falling within the -1 and +1 normality range recommended for these coefficients (Howell, 2008).

All variables are shown to have a left-skewed distribution, with most values concentrated on the right of the mean and extreme values to the left (skewness < 0). All variables showed a platykurtic distribution, where the values are spread more widely around the mean.
8.1.3 Interpretation of means and standard deviations

This section interprets the results reported in Tables 8.4 to 8.7.

8.1.3.1 Interpretation of frequencies : MBTI, Form M

In terms of the attitude functions, the majority of the sample clusters in the Extraversion (53%) and Perceiving (86%) types. The participants show a preference towards the Intuition (85%) and Feeling (69%) mental functions, which means that the sample tends towards the ENFP personality type.

According to Myers and Briggs (1987), ENFP personality types are enthusiastic, idealistic and creative. They are able to do almost anything that interests them and have great people skills. They display a need to live their lives in accordance with their inner values, are excited by new ideas and bored with details. They are open-minded and flexible individuals with a broad range of interests and abilities. The participants are therefore most likely to display these characteristics.

8.1.3.2 Interpretation of means and standard deviations : CFSEI-AD

The high score obtained for general self-esteem suggests that individuals display high levels of psychological well-being and function self-efficaciously in terms of cultural criteria of success and happiness. In addition, such individuals are able to express themselves without difficulty and have a high self-acceptance. The participants therefore seem to have a high overall perception of and feelings about their worth (Battle, 1992). High internal consistency reliabilities were obtained for the general self-esteem dimension and the findings can therefore be interpreted with confidence.

The low mean scores obtained for the lie items variable suggest that the participants did not respond defensively to the self-esteem items and the scores on the various scales can be interpreted with confidence.
8.1.3.3 Interpretation of means and standard deviations: AES

The high score obtained for the managing own emotions variable suggests that participants are able to use their emotions in an adaptive way. Participants who manage their own emotions are aware of their individual goals and display high levels of self-knowledge and social awareness (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

High reliability coefficients were obtained for the managing own emotions dimension and the findings can therefore be interpreted with confidence.

8.1.3.4 Interpretation of means and standard deviations: EAS

The high scores obtained for the career self-management variable suggest that participants might be able to sustain their employability through continuous learning, and career planning and management efforts (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011). The participants are likely to be able to reflect on their career aspirations and develop clarity on what they want to accomplish in their careers. They would probably be able to recognise the skills they need to be successful in their careers and the actions they need to take to accomplish their career goals. The participants seem to have the confidence and persistence to achieve their career goals.

Similarly, the high score obtained for the self-efficacy variable suggests that the participants believe in their ability to cope, perform and thrive in their career- or performance-related tasks (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011). These participants can probably function independently of others and make their own decisions; they are confident about accomplishing their goals by their own efforts.

8.2 CORRELATIONAL STATISTICS

In order to investigate the relationship between the variables in this study, the descriptive statistics had to be transformed into explanatory (correlational) statistics to test research hypothesis H01 and Ha1. This section consist of one step, namely, Spearman product moment correlations.
8.2.1 Reporting of Spearman’s correlation coefficients (MBTI vs CFSEI-AD)

Since the data are non-parametric, the interrelationships between the variables were computed using Spearman’s correlations. Spearman’s correlations allowed the researcher to identify the direction and strength of the relationships between each of the variables. A cut-off of $p \leq .05$ ($r \leq .30$, medium practical effect size) was used to interpret the significance of the findings. As shown in Table 8.8, a number of significantly positive relationships were observed between the MBTI and CFSEI-AD variables.

Table 8.8
Spearman’s correlations (MBTI & CFSEI-AD) (N=304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBTI</th>
<th>General self-esteem</th>
<th>Social/peer self-esteem</th>
<th>Personal self-esteem</th>
<th>Lie items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>$r = .16^{**}$</td>
<td>$r = .28^{**}$</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>$-.13^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>$r = -.014$</td>
<td>$r = -.16^{**}$</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>$r = -.025$</td>
<td>$r = -.099$</td>
<td>$r = -.047$</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>$r = .045$</td>
<td>$r = .073$</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>$-.090$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>$r = .082$</td>
<td>$r = -.051$</td>
<td>$r = .15^*$</td>
<td>$-.020$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>$r = -.049$</td>
<td>$r = .067$</td>
<td>$r = -.11^*$</td>
<td>$-.114$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>$r = .063$</td>
<td>$r = -.048$</td>
<td>$r = -.001$</td>
<td>$-.004$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>$r = -.043$</td>
<td>$r = .074$</td>
<td>$r = -.016$</td>
<td>$-.041$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p \leq .001$ ** $p \leq .01$ * $p \leq .05$ (two-tailed)

+$r \leq .30$ (small practical effect size) ++ $r \geq .30 \leq .49$ (medium practical effect size)

++++ $r \geq .50$ (large practical effect size)

Several significant relationships were found between the MBTI and the CFSEI-AD. A significant relationship was observed between extraversion and general self-esteem ($r = .16$; small
practical effect size, \( p \leq .006 \) and social self-esteem (\( r = .28 \); small practical effect size, \( p \leq .000 \)).

A negative significant relationship was observed between extraversion and the lie items (\( r = -.13 \); small practical effect size, \( p \leq .019 \)). Introversion showed a significant negative relationship with social/peer self-esteem (\( r = -.16 \); small practical effect size, \( p \leq .004 \)), indicating that introverted individuals have a lower social/peer self-esteem.

A significant positive relationship was observed between the thinking dimension and personal self-esteem (\( r = .011 \); small practical effect size, \( p \leq .011 \)) and a significant negative relationship was found between the feeling dimension and personal self-esteem (\( r = .046 \); small practical effect size, \( p \leq .046 \)).

8.2.2 Interpretation of Spearman’s correlation coefficients (MBTI vs CFSEI2-AD)

The positive relationship observed between extraversion and general self-esteem suggests that those participants who are directed towards the outer world and focus their energy on people and objects as a result are likely to have a higher overall perception of themselves and a positive feeling about themselves (Battle, 1992).

In addition, participants with a preference for extraversion might also feel more positive about the quality of their relationships with other individuals, whereas the findings suggest that participants with a leaning towards introversion might be less satisfied with the quality of their relationships with others. Furthermore, the results suggest that the more extraverted a participant is, the less likely the participant is to lie (or be defensive) when reporting their self-esteem on the inventory.

According to the results, participants who use logical intellectual activities (Thinking-type) to produce their ideas have a higher personal self-esteem and seem to have a higher perception and feeling of self-worth. The results furthermore suggest that participants who evaluate every conscious activity will probably have a more negative perception and feeling of self-worth (Feist & Feist, 2009).
These findings seem to corroborate the findings of a study by Baumeister (1997), who also found that personality correlates positively with self-esteem. It is important, however, to consider that personal qualities (such as people’s beliefs about what they can do, their plans and strategies for enacting behaviours, their expectations for success, their self-concept, their positive and negative feelings about themselves, their needs based on their personality preferences, and their self-regulating strategies) will override their behaviour in certain circumstances (Coetzee, 2005).

The results provide sufficient evidence for a positively significant relationship between the four MBTI scales and the three self-esteem subscales (general, social and personal self-esteem) as measured by the CFSEI-AD).

8.2.3 Reporting of significant Spearman’s correlation coefficients (MBTI vs AES)

As shown in Table 8.9, a number of significant and positive relationships were observed between the MBTI and AES variables.

Significant positive relationships were observed between extraversion and managing own emotions ($r = .13$, small practical effect size, $p \leq .019$), managing others’ emotions ($r = .20$, small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$) and utilising emotions ($r = .13$, small practical effect size, $p \leq .028$).

A significant negative relationship was observed between judging and managing own emotions ($r = -.12$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .038$). Similarly, a significant negative relationship was observed between perception and managing own emotions ($r = -.12$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .033$).
### Table 8.9
*Spearman’s Correlations (MBTI & AES) (N=304)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception of emotions</th>
<th>Managing own emotions</th>
<th>Managing others’ emotions</th>
<th>Utilising emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MBTI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**p ≤ .001  **p ≤ .01  *p ≤ .05 (two-tailed)

+ $r ≤ .30$ (small practical effect size) ++ $r ≥ .30 ≤ .49$ (medium practical effect size)

+++ $r ≥ .50$ (large practical effect size)

#### 8.2.4 Interpretation of Spearman’s correlation coefficients (MBTI vs AES)

According to Mischel (1999) and Worline *et al.* (2002), people differ with regard to their demonstration of emotionally intelligent behaviour. The results suggest that participants with a preference for extraversion may be able to appraise and express their own emotions and read the emotions of others more effectively than participants with a preference for introversion. In addition, such participants are able to manage their emotions cognitively and use their emotions in an adaptive way (George, 2000; Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Participants who are directed towards the outer world and as a result focus their energy on people and objects will most likely be able to use emotions to facilitate their thoughts, understand their own emotions and those of other participants and manage their emotions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).
The results suggest that participants with a preference for extraversion will be able to use their emotions to aid their thinking and analyse emotions, value their probable trends over time and understand the outcomes of emotions. They will also be able to manage their emotion in the context of their individual goals, self-knowledge and social awareness. The results furthermore suggest that participants who rely on either their judging or their perception attitude will be less likely to manage their own emotions well.

Higgs (2001) found a positive relationship between the personality types and emotional intelligence. Ciarrochi et al. (2000) also found a number of relationships between emotional intelligence and personality. However, the results of this study only found significant relationships between the attitude functions (extraverted and introverted) of the personality types and emotional intelligence. No significant relationships were observed between the mental functions (SNTF) of the MBTI and emotional intelligence, suggesting that the mental functions of an individual do not significantly relate to their emotional intelligence.

The results provide support for the relationship between the four MBTI scales and the three emotional intelligence subscales (perception of emotion, managing own emotions and managing others’ emotions) as measured by the AES.

8.2.5 Reporting of significant Spearman’s correlation coefficients (MBTI vs EAS)

As shown in Table 8.10, a number of significantly positive relationships were observed between the MBTI and EAS variables.
Table 8.10
Spearman’s Correlations (MBTI & EAS) (N=304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employability attributes</th>
<th>CSM</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EO</th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>EL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBTI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.96</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p \leq .001$ ** $p \leq .01$ * $p \leq .05$ (two-tailed)
+ $r \leq .30$ (small practical effect size) ++ $r \geq .30 \leq .49$ (medium practical effect size)
+++ $r \geq .50$ (large practical effect size)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSM</th>
<th>Career self-management</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Introversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Career resilience</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial orientation</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Judging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Emotional literacy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Perceiving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.10 indicates several significant relationships between personality preferences and employability attributes. Extraversion (E) significantly relates to cultural competence ($r = .20$; small practical effect, $p \leq .000$), career resilience ($r = .16$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .005$), sociability ($r = .33$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$), proactivity ($r = .11$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .05$) and emotional literacy ($r = .18$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .002$).

A significant negative relationship was observed between introversion (I) and sociability ($r = -.17$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$). Similarly, a significant negative relationship was found between sensing and entrepreneurial orientation ($r = -.11$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .050$) and proactivity ($r = -.12$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .042$).

In contrast, a significant positive relationship was found between intuition (N) and entrepreneurial orientation ($r = .12$, small practical effect size, $p \leq .036$) and proactivity ($r = .12$, small practical effect size, $p \leq .042$).

Thinking (T) significantly correlates with career self-management ($r = .14$; small practical effect, $p \leq .015$), self-efficacy ($r = .14$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .015$), entrepreneurial orientation ($r = .18$, small practical effect size, $p \leq .002$) and proactivity ($r = .16$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .006$).

The results suggest that feeling preference bears a significant negative relationship to career self-management ($r = -.15$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .009$), self-efficacy ($r = -.14$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .014$), entrepreneurial orientation ($r = -.17$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .003$) and proactivity ($r = -.16$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .005$).

A significant negative relationship was observed between judging (J) and cultural competence ($r = -.12$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .033$). In addition, a significant negative relationship was observed between perceiving and career self-management ($r = -.11$; small practical effect, $p \leq .05$).
8.2.6 Interpretation of Spearman’s correlation coefficients (MBTI vs EAS)

The significant relationship observed between extraversion (E) and cultural competence suggests that extraverted individuals seem to have a high ability to understand, act and interface effectively in diverse cultural environments. Such individuals would probably be aware of the customs of other cultures and understand their values and beliefs. Participants with a preference for extraversion not only value the quality of their relationships with others but are confident about communicating interculturally and find it easy to initiate and maintain relationships with people from diverse cultural backgrounds (Bezuidenhout, 2010).

Similarly, participants with a preference for extraversion may have a high career resilience, which suggests that they will be able to adapt to changing circumstances by welcoming job and organisational changes and will look forward to working with new and different people. In addition, such participants will display self-confidence and be willing to take risks (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011). Participants with a preference for extraversion are adaptable, flexible, self-confident and competent, regardless of adverse career circumstances (Bezuidenhout, 2010).

Participants with a preference for extraversion appear to be more sociable, which implies that they will be open to establishing and maintaining social contacts and utilising formal and informal networks to the advantage of their career goals (Bezuidenhout, 2010). The results suggest that the more introverted an individual is, the less sociable such a person will be.

Participants with a preference for extraversion are likely to be engaging in active role orientations which could lead to future-oriented and self-initiated action to change and improve themselves or their situation (Bezuidenhout, 2010). In addition, such individuals have a high ability to use emotions and are able to read, understand and manage their own emotions as well as the emotions of others (Bezuidenhout & Coetzee, 2010). It is therefore evident from the results that extraverted participants tend to display higher employability attributes as opposed to introverted participants and will therefore be more employable than introverts.

The results furthermore suggest that participants who use their Sensing (S) mental function will have a less pronounced preference to use innovation and creativity. Such participants will probably not choose to take risks, do not have a high need for achievement and do not show a preference for autonomy in exploiting opportunities that exist in the career environment and
creating something of value. However, participants who use their Intuition mental function will have a higher entrepreneurial orientation.

Similarly, participants with an Intuition (N) preference appear to engage in active role orientation which leads to future-oriented and self-initiated action to change and improve on themselves or their situation. Participants with a predominant preference for using their Sensing (S) preference will be less proactive. Participants who use their Intuition (N) preference therefore demonstrate higher employability attributes as opposed to participants who use Sensing (S) preferences.

Participants who use Thinking (T) as a judgment function display high career self-management and may be able to sustain their employability through continuous learning, and career planning and management efforts (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011). Participants who use their Feeling (F) judgment function display a lesser ability to manage their careers themselves and are therefore less likely to sustain their employability and engage in continuous learning and career planning and management efforts.

In addition, participants who choose to use the Thinking (T) preference might display higher levels of self-efficacy whereas participants who use the Feeling (F) preference will have a lower perception of the degree of difficulty of career- or performance-related tasks. Such participants do not believe in their own ability to execute the courses of action required to deal with tasks (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011).

Similarly, the participants who prefer the Thinking (T) mental function are more oriented towards entrepreneurship, take more risks and are more proactive, whereas the results suggest that individuals who use their Feeling Judging function are less entrepreneurially oriented and less proactive.

It is therefore appears that participants who use Thinking (T) preferences have a higher ability to demonstrate employability attributes than individuals who prefer Feeling (F).

According to the results, people who choose judgment as a preference are less culturally competent and may be less inclined to fully understand, act and interface with diverse cultural environments. Although such individuals will probably succeed in communicating interculturally,
they will not enjoy initiating and maintaining relationships with people from a diverse culture (Bezuidenhout, 2010).

Participants whose preference is Perception (P) appear to be less inclined to manage their career themselves. Such individuals will probably not sustain their employability and will not engage in continuous learning, career planning and career management efforts (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011). The results suggest that extraverted participants who prefer Intuition and Thinking have significantly higher levels of employability attributes than introverted participants. This study seems to be in line with the findings of Cole et al. (2009), who also found that personality preference is significantly related to employability.

The results provide support for the relationship between the four MBTI scales and the employability attribute subscales (career self-management, cultural competence, self-efficacy, career resilience, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy) as measured by the EAS.

8.2.7 Reporting of significant Spearman’s correlation coefficients (CFSEI-AD vs AES)

As shown in Table 8.11, a number of significantly positive relationships were observed between the CFSEI-AD and AES variables.
Table 8.11
Spearman’s Correlations (CFSEI-AD & AES) (N=304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional intelligence</th>
<th>Perception of emotion</th>
<th>Managing own emotions</th>
<th>Managing others’ emotions</th>
<th>Utilising emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>(r = .22^{**})</td>
<td>(r = .42^{**})</td>
<td>(r = .33^{**})</td>
<td>(r = .14^{*})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/peer self-esteem</td>
<td>(r = .21^{**})</td>
<td>(r = .36^{**})</td>
<td>(r = .39^{**})</td>
<td>(r = .19^{**})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-esteem</td>
<td>(r = .12^{*})</td>
<td>(r = .36^{**})</td>
<td>(r = .21^{**})</td>
<td>(r = 0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie items</td>
<td>(r = -.19^{**})</td>
<td>(r = -.23^{**})</td>
<td>(r = -.18^{**})</td>
<td>(r = -.049)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** \(p \leq .001\) ** \(p \leq .01\) \(^* p \leq .05\) (two-tailed) 
+r ≤ .30 (small practical effect size) ++ \(r \geq .30 \leq .49\) (medium practical effect size) 
+++ \(r \geq .50\) (large practical effect size) 

Table 8.11 reports the Spearman’s correlations obtained for the CFSEI-AD and AES. In terms of general self-esteem, significant positive relationships were observed between all the AES variables. A significant positive relationship was observed between general self-esteem and perception of emotion \((r = .22; \text{small practical effect size}, \ p \leq .000)\), managing own emotions \((r = .42; \text{medium practical effect size}, \ p \leq .000)\), managing others’ emotions \((r = .33, \text{medium practical effect size}, \ p \leq .000)\) and utilising emotions \((r = .14; \text{small practical effect size}, \ p \leq .014)\).

Similarly, in terms of social/peer self-esteem, significant positive relationships were found between all the AES variables. Social/peer self-esteem significantly correlates with perception of emotions \((r = .21; \text{small practical effect size}, \ p \leq .000)\), managing own emotions \((r = .36; \text{medium practical effect size}, \ p \leq .000)\), managing others’ emotions \((r = .39; \text{medium practical effect size}, \ p \leq .000)\) and utilising emotions \((r = .19; \text{small practical effect size}, \ p \leq .001)\). Personal self-esteem yielded a significant positive relationship with perception of emotion \((r = .12; \text{small practical effect size}, \ p \leq .034)\), managing own emotions \((r = .36; \text{medium practical effect size}, \ p \leq .000)\) and managing others’ emotions \((r = .21; \text{small practical effect size}, \ p \leq .014)\).
.000). Significant positive relationships were therefore found between all the AES subscales except with utilising of emotions variable, where no significant relationship was found.

Significant negative relationships were observed between the lie items and all the AES variables except with the utilising of emotions variable, where no significant relationship was found. The lie items significantly correlate with perception of emotion \( (r = -0.19, \text{small practical effect size, } p \leq .001) \), managing own emotions \( (r = -0.23, \text{small practical effect size, } p \leq .000) \) and managing others’ emotions \( (r = -0.18, \text{small practical effect size, } p \leq .001) \).

### 8.2.8 Interpretation of Spearman’s correlation coefficients (CFSEI-AD vs AES)

Based on the data displayed in Table 8.11, participants with a high self-esteem appear to display high emotional intelligence as well. The higher an individual’s general self-esteem (sense of psychological well-being, self-efficacious functioning and self-acceptance), social self-esteem (sense of belongingness, evaluation, comparison and efficacy) and personal self-esteem (emotional self-awareness, mood and self-regard), the more such individuals seem to be able to perceive their own emotions, manage their own emotions and those of others and utilise their emotions.

However, it is interesting to note that no significant relationship was found between personal self-esteem (which relates to a person’s most innate perceptions and feelings of self-worth) and utilising emotions.

These findings are in line with those of Brown et al. (2003), who found that people with a higher self-esteem display higher emotional intelligence. Ciarrochi et al. (2000) and Schutte et al. (2002) also reported a positive correlation between self-esteem and emotional intelligence.

The results provide support for the relationship between the CFSEI-AD scales and the emotional intelligence subscales (perception of emotion, managing own emotions, managing others’ emotions and utilising of emotions) as measured by the AES.
8.2.9 Reporting of significant Spearman’s correlation coefficients (CFSEI-AD vs EAS)

As shown in Table 8.12, a number of significantly positive relationships were observed between the CFSEI-AD and EAS variables.

Table 8.12
Spearman’s Correlations (CFSEI-AD & EAS) (N=304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employability attributes</th>
<th>CSM</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EO</th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>EL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/peer self-esteem</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-esteem</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie items</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p ≤ .001 ** p ≤ .01 * p ≤ .05 (two-tailed)
+ r ≤ .30 (small practical effect size) ++ r ≥ .30 ≤ .49 (medium practical effect size)
+++ r ≥ .50 (large practical effect size)
Several significant relationships were found between the CFSEI-AD and EAS. General self-esteem shows a significant positive relationship with all the EAS variables.

- General self-esteem significantly correlates with the following: career self-management ($r = .32$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- cultural competence ($r = .16$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .05$)
- self-efficacy ($r = .22$; small practical effect, $p \leq .000$)
- career resilience ($r = .41$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- sociability ($r = .31$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- entrepreneurial orientation ($r = .28$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- proactivity ($r = .36$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- emotional literacy ($r = .32$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)

Similarly, a significant positive relationship was observed between social/peer self-esteem and all the EAS variables.

Social/peer self-esteem significantly correlates with the following:

- career self-management ($r = .23$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- cultural competence ($r = .18$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .001$)
- self-efficacy ($r = .12$; small practical effect, $p \leq .044$)
- career resilience ($r = .32$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- sociability ($r = .27$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- entrepreneurial orientation ($r = .17$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .003$)
- proactivity ($r = .28$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- emotional literacy ($r = .24$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)

Significant positive relationships were found between all the personal self-esteem variables and EAS, except for self-efficacy, where no significant relationship was found.
Personal self-esteem significantly correlates with the following:

- career self-management ($r = .21$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- cultural competence ($r = .15$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .009$)
- career resilience ($r = .33$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- sociability ($r = .24$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- entrepreneurial orientation ($r = .24$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- proactivity ($r = .28$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- emotional literacy ($r = .29$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)

A negative significant relationship was observed between the lie items and all the EAS variables. The lie items therefore have a negative significant relationship with:

- career self-management ($r = -.15$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .011$)
- cultural competence ($r = -.16$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .009$)
- self-efficacy ($r = -.16$, small practical effect size, $p \leq .005$)
- career resilience ($r = -.28$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- sociability ($r = -.27$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- entrepreneurial orientation ($r = -.21$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- proactivity ($r = -.23$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- emotional literacy ($r = -.24$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)

### 8.2.10 Interpretation of Spearman’s correlation coefficients (CFSEI-AD vs EAS)

According to the results (as shown in Table 8.12), participants with a high self-esteem display a high level of confidence regarding their employability attributes. Participants with a higher general, social/peer and personal self-esteem have a higher level of confidence in managing their career themselves, are culturally competent, display high levels of self-efficacy, are career resilient and sociable, are oriented towards entrepreneurship, are proactive and emotionally literate. However, it is interesting to note that no significant relationships were found between personal self-esteem and self-efficacy.
The lie items revealed a significant negative relationship with all the employability attributes variables, suggesting that the more confidence a participant has in his/her ability to demonstrate employability attributes, the less likely such an individual would be to respond defensively when reporting on his/her self-esteem.

These findings are in line with the findings of Briscoe and Hall (1999), Hall and Chandler (2005) and Herr et al. (2004), who also found that individuals with a higher self-esteem are more able to demonstrate employability attributes than individuals with a low self-esteem.

Brockner and Gauré (1983) and Kerka (1998) also found that a person with a low self-esteem is more likely to perform poorly and achieve less than a person with a high self-esteem. Baumeister (1997) furthermore found that people with a low self-esteem do not seem to have a clear sense of who and what they are and are not confident that they may succeed in anything they try. It therefore seems as if people with a low self-esteem would be less likely to have well-developed employability attributes than people with a high self-esteem.

The results provide support for the relationship between the CFSEI-AD scales and the employability attributes subscales (career self-management, cultural competence, self-efficacy, career resilience, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy) as measured by the EAS.

8.2.11 Reporting of significant Spearman’s correlation coefficients (AES vs EAS)

As shown in Table 8.13, a number of significantly positive relationships were observed between the AES and EAS variables.
Table 8.13
Spearman’s Correlations (AES & EAS) (N=304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional intelligence</th>
<th>Employability attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of emotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing others’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilising emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *** p ≤ .001 ** p ≤ .01 * * p ≤ .05 (two-tailed)
+ r ≤ .30 (small practical effect size) ++ r ≥ .30 ≤ .49 (medium practical effect size)
+++ r ≥ .50 (large practical effect size)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSM</th>
<th>Career self-management</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>Sociability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Career resilience</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Emotional literacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant relationships were observed between all the AES and EAS variables. All subscales (perception of emotion, managing own emotions, managing others’ emotions and utilisation of emotions) show a significant positive relationship with all the EAS (career self-management, cultural competence, self-efficacy, career resillience, sociability, entreprenurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy) variables.
Perception of emotions revealed a significant positive relationship with:

- career self-management ($r = .35$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- cultural competence ($r = .19$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .001$)
- self-efficacy ($r = .38$; medium practical effect, $p \leq .000$)
- career resilience ($r = .35$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- sociability ($r = .41$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- entrepreneurial orientation ($r = .40$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- proactivity ($r = .41$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- emotional literacy ($r = .56$; large practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)

Similarly, managing own emotions revealed a significant positive relationship with:

- career self-management ($r = .51$; large practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- cultural competence ($r = .26$; small practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- self-efficacy ($r = .44$; medium practical effect, $p \leq .000$)
- career resilience ($r = .58$; large practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- sociability ($r = .48$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- entrepreneurial orientation ($r = .45$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- proactivity ($r = .55$; large practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- emotional literacy ($r = .51$; large practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)

In addition, managing others’ emotions has a significant positive relationship with:

- career self-management ($r = .41$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- cultural competence ($r = .31$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- self-efficacy ($r = .35$; medium practical effect, $p \leq .000$)
- career resilience ($r = .48$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- sociability ($r = .45$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- entrepreneurial orientation ($r = .36$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- proactivity ($r = .44$; medium practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
- emotional literacy ($r = .53$; large practical effect size, $p \leq .000$)
Lastly, utilisation of emotions showed a significant positive relationship with:

- career self-management \((r = .40; \text{medium practical effect size, } p \leq .000)\)
- cultural competence \((r = .24; \text{small practical effect size, } p \leq .000)\)
- self-efficacy \((r = .43; \text{medium practical effect, } p \leq .000)\)
- career resilience \((r = .35; \text{medium practical effect size, } p \leq .000)\)
- sociability \((r = .32; \text{medium practical effect size, } p \leq .000)\)
- entrepreneurial orientation \((r = .36; \text{medium practical effect size, } p \leq .000)\)
- proactivity \((r = .39; \text{medium practical effect size, } p \leq .000)\)
- motional literacy \((r = .31; \text{small practical effect size, } p \leq .000)\)

**8.2.12 Interpretation of Spearman’s correlation coefficients (AES vs EAS)**

Table 8.13 suggests that participants who are able to perceive their emotions, manage their own emotions and those of others and able to utilise their emotions display higher confidence regarding their employability attributes. Therefore, participants who have a high emotional intelligence may be better able to sustain their employability through continuous learning, be able to communicate and interact interculturaly, believe in their own ability to execute tasks, adapt to changing circumstances, establish and maintain social contacts, be innovative and creative, be willing to take risks, accept responsibility for their decisions and read, understand, manage and use their emotions appropriately (Bezuidenhout, 2010). Participants with high emotional intelligence appear to be more confident about their employability attributes than participants with a lower emotional intelligence.

These findings confirm the studies of Ashkanasy and Daus (2005), Brown, Hesketh and Williams (2003), Dulewicz and Higgs (1999), Locke (2005), Pool and Sewell (2007) and Yorke and Knight (2004) who also found a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and employability.

The results provide support for the relationship between the AES scales and the employability attributes subscales (career self-management, cultural competence, self-efficacy, career resilience, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy) as measured by the EAS.
In summary, the results from the correlational analysis provide adequate support for hypothesis Ha1 (There is a statistically significant positive relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables.

### 8.3 INFERENTIAL AND MULTIVARIATE STATISTICS

Inferential and multivariate statistics are concerned with using samples to infer something about populations. This section consists of five steps, namely: conducting (1) canonical correlational analysis, (2) standard multiple regression analysis, (3) structural equation modelling, (4) hierachical moderated regression analysis, and (5) the test for significant mean differences.

#### 8.3.1 Canonical correlations

Three criteria are used when determining the canonical correlation of the independent and dependent variables; they include (1) the level of statistical significance of the function, the cut-off set for this study being $p \leq .05$, (2) the magnitude of the canonical correlation, and (3) the redundancy measure for the percentage of variance accounted for from the two data sets.

As shown in Table 8.14, the model has eight canonical dimensions (functions), where only the first four canonical correlations from the canonical correlation analysis are statistically significant: (1) $R_c = .726$ ($R_c^2 = .53$; very large practical effect; $F(p) = 3.74 (.0001)$; (2) $R_c = .490$ ($R_c^2 = .24$; large practical effect; $F(p) = 2.22 (.0001)$; (3) $R_c = .394$ ($R_c^2 = .16$; moderate practical effect; $F(p) = 1.77 (.0001)$; (4) $R_c = .350$ ($R_c^2 = .12$; small practical effect; $F(p) = 1.51 (.01)$).

Only the first canonical function will be reported on for the purposes of this study. The canonical function explains the relationship between the two canonical variates (the set of composite dependent variables and the variate for the set of composite independent variables) that relate to the relevant canonical function. Table 8.14 shows that the four multivariate criteria and the $Fp$ approximations for the model are also statistically significant.
Table 8.14

Canonical Correlation Analysis relating Self-esteem, Emotional Intelligence and Personality Type Preferences (Independent Variables) to Employability Attributes (Dependent Variables) (N = 304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical function</th>
<th>Overall canonical correlation (Rc)</th>
<th>Overall squared canonical correlation (Rc²)</th>
<th>F statistics</th>
<th>Probability (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>&lt; .0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>&lt; .0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>&lt; .0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate tests of significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate F statistic</th>
<th>Probability(ρ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>&lt; .0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>&lt; .0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling-Lawley Trace</td>
<td>1.962</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>&lt; .0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Greatest Root</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>&lt; .0001***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001   **p ≤ .01   *p ≤ .05

Because of the instability and variability of canonical weights and multicollinearity concerns (Hair et al., 2010), only the individual canonical structure correlations (loadings of Rc ≥ .30) and their individual squared canonical structure loadings (Rc²) are considered in interpreting the relative importance and magnitude of importance (practical significance) in deriving the two canonical variate constructs for the first canonical function that will be examined in the present study. The canonical structure correlations (loadings) measure the strength of the canonical relationship between a canonical variate and its individual original variables in the set of variables (within-set variable-to-variate correlation) (Hair et al., 2010). Those variables that
correlate highly ($R_c \geq .30$) with their canonical function variate can be regarded as having more in common with it.

Based on the canonical results shown in Table 8.15, the two canonical variates will be labelled as personality attributes (independent canonical variate construct) and general employability attributes (dependent canonical variate construct). The overall squared canonical correlation ($R_c^2 = .53$) shows a strong association between the two canonical variates. The personality attributes construct accounted for 53% ($R_c^2 = .53$; very large practical effect) of the variance in the general employability attributes canonical variate construct.

In terms of the independent canonical variate, Table 8.15 shows that the personality attributes canonical variate construct was most strongly influenced by the AES emotional intelligence variables (managing own emotions, perceiving emotions and managing others’ emotions) and the CFSEI-AD general self-esteem variable ($R_c^2 \geq .67 \leq .36$; large practical effect). The contribution of the AES utilisation of emotions and CFSEI-AD variables of personal self-esteem, social/peer self-esteem and the lie items in deriving the personality attributes canonical variate construct was moderate in terms of practical significance ($R_c^2 \geq .16 \leq .25$). The contribution of the MBTI extraverted preference was small in terms of practical significance ($R_c^2 = .11$). Overall, the MBTI personality preferences did not make a significant contribution to deriving the personality attributes canonical variate construct.

In terms of the dependent canonical variate, Table 8.15 shows that the general employability attributes canonical variate construct was most strongly influenced by the EAS emotional literacy ($R_c^2 = .79$; very large practical effect) and career resilience ($R_c^2 = .71$; very large practical effect) variables, followed by the pro-activity, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation, career self-management and self-efficacy variables ($R_c^2 \geq .66 \leq .35$; large practical effect). The contribution of the EAS cultural competence variable was moderate in terms of practical significance ($R_c^2 = .18$).
Table 8.15
*Standardised canonical correlation analyses results for the first canonical function variates (N = 304)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variate/variables</th>
<th>Canonical coefficients (weights)</th>
<th>Canonical loading (Rc) (structure correlations)</th>
<th>Canonical cross-loadings</th>
<th>Shared variance</th>
<th>Redundancy Index (percentage of overall variance of variables explained by the opposite canonical variate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average canonical loading squared (percentage of overall variance of variables explained by their own canonical variate)</td>
<td>Overall Rc² (canonical root) (percentage of overall variance in the dependent variate accounted for by the independent variate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set of independent variables: CFSEI-AD, AES, MBTI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CFSEI-AD</strong> (self-esteem)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.60 (.36)</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social / peer self-esteem</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.46 (.21)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-esteem</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.50 (.25)</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie items</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.40 (.16)</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AES</strong> (emotional intelligence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of emotion</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.77 (.59)</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.82 (.67)</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
emotions
Managing others’ emotions .22 .77 (.59) .56
Utilisation of emotions -.05 .47 (.22) .34

**MBTI (personality preferences)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.16 (.03)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.33 (.11)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.13 (.02)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11 (.01)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.05 (.003)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.03 (.001)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.01 (.0001)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.09 (.008)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent canonical variate: personality attributes** .20++ .53+++ .11+

**Set of dependent variables: Employability attributes (EAS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Career self-management</th>
<th>Cultural competence</th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Career resilience</th>
<th>Sociability</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.67 (.45)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.43 (.18)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                      | -.18                   | .59 (.35)           | .43           | .31              | .84 (.71)   | .69 (.48)                   | .50

263
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Proactivity</th>
<th>Emotional literacy</th>
<th>Dependent canonical variate: general employability attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.81 (.66)</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional literacy</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.89 (.79)</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent canonical variate: general employability attributes</td>
<td>.52+++</td>
<td>.53+++</td>
<td>.28+++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ $R^2 \leq .12$ (small practical effect size)  
++ $R^2 \geq .13 \leq .25$ (moderate practical effect size)  
+++ $R^2 \geq .26$ (large practical effect size)
In terms of practical significance, the magnitude of the relationship between the two canonical variate constructs is measured by the redundancy index. Ideally, the higher the redundancy the higher the percentage of variance accounted for by the independent variate in the dependent set of original variables and vice versa. Table 8.15 shows that the personality attributes canonical variate construct was able to predict 28% (large practical effect) of the variance in the individual original EAS (employability attributes) variables. The general employability attributes canonical variate construct was able to predict only 11% (small practical effect) of the variance in the individual original CFSEI-AD, AES and MBTI variables. These results indicate that the personality attributes canonical variate construct is a strong predictor of the general employability attributes construct.

Each canonical variate construct was also a strong predictor of its own construct variables. The personality attributes canonical variate construct explained 20% (moderate practical effect) of the variance in the individual original CFSEI-AD, AES and MBTI variables while the general employability attributes canonical variate construct explained 52% (very large practical effect) of the variance in the individual original EAS variables.

The large percentage of shared variance between the two canonical variate constructs ($R_c^2 = .53$) points to the importance of the variables measured by each variate construct in constructing a career meta-competency model. More specifically, the cross-loadings showed that the AES emotional intelligence variables (perceiving emotions, managing own emotions, and managing others’ emotions) contributed the most in explaining the variance in the general employability attributes canonical variate construct ($R_c^2 ≥ .30 – .35$; large practical effect). The contribution of the CFSEI-AD self-esteem variables (general self-esteem, social/peer self-esteem and personal self-esteem) and AES utilisation of emotions variable was moderate to small in terms of practical significance ($R_c^2 ≥ .11 ≤ .17$) in explaining the variance in the general employability attributes canonical variate construct. The contribution of the MBTI Extraverted preference was very small ($R_c^2 = .06$) in explaining the variance in the general employability attributes canonical variate construct. MBTI preferences were therefore removed from the independent latent canonical variate construct (personality attributes).

The EAS emotional literacy, career resilience, proactivity and sociability variables exhibited the highest correlations with the personality attributes canonical variate construct. In terms of practical significance, the contribution of these variables in explaining the variance in the personality attributes canonical variate construct was large ($R_c^2 ≥ .30 ≤ .42$). The contribution of the EAS variables of entrepreneurial orientation, career self-management and self-efficacy
was moderate in terms of practical significance in explaining the variance in the personality attributes canonical variate construct ($R^2 \geq .25 \leq .18$). The contribution of the EAS variable cultural competence was of little practical significance ($R^2 = .10$).

Figure 8.1 is a visual display of the canonical relationships as discussed in the previous section.

![Helio Plot](image)

**Figure 8.1.** Canonical correlation helio plot illustrating the relationship between the personality attributes construct variate and the employability attributes construct variate

The results of the canonical correlation analysis provide support for the Ha2 hypothesis (the personality attributes construct variate (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) as a set of composite independent latent variables is significantly and positively related to the employability attributes construct variate as a composite set of dependent latent variables).
8.3.2 Multiple regression

Standard multiple regression analysis was performed to assess the personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence variables that provide the best explanation of the proportion of the total variance in the scores of the employability attributes variable.

8.3.2.1 Reporting of multiple regression (MBTI vs CFSEI2-AD)

Table 8.16 indicates that the regression models explained a small ($R^2 \leq .12$) practical percentage of variance (Cohen, 1992). The regression of the personality preferences variables upon the general self-esteem variable produced a statistically significant model ($Fp(255.09; 119.93) = 2.13; p \leq .03$), accounting for 3% (small practical effect) of the variance. Extraversion ($\beta = .30; p \leq .001$) contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in general self-esteem ($R^2 = 3\%$, small practical effect).

The regression of the personality preferences variables upon the social/peer self-esteem variable also produced a statistically significant model ($Fp(123.74; 28.54) = 4.34; p \leq .000$), accounting for 8% (small practical effect) of the variance. Extraversion ($\beta = 3.14; p \leq .002$) contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in social/peer self-esteem ($R^2 = 8\%$, small practical effect).

In terms of the collinearity statistics, the variance inflation factor (VIF) values were lower than the cut-off of > 1.0 for multicollinearity concerns. These values imply that multicollinearity could be ruled out in interpreting the results.
### Table 8.16

**Multiple Regression (MBTI vs CFSEI-AD) (N = 304)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficient</th>
<th>Standardised coefficient</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Collinearity stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General self-esteem</strong> (constant)</td>
<td>56.99</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.03+</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social self-esteem</strong> (constant)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.08+</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**

- **p ≤ .001**
- **p ≤ .01**
- *p ≤ .05

+ $R^2 \leq .12$ (small practical effect size)
++ $R^2 \geq .13 \leq .25$ (medium practical effect size)
+++ $R^2 \geq .26$ (large practical effect size)

---

### 8.3.2.2 Interpretation of multiple regression (MBTI vs CFSEI-AD)

The results indicate that extraversion is significant in terms of predicting or explaining general and social/peer self-esteem. Extraverted individuals (who direct their energy towards the outer world) appear to have a higher sense of psychological well-being, higher level of self-acceptance and sense of belongingness. These findings support the findings of Baumeister (1997), Cole et al. (2009) and Higgs (2001), who found that personality preferences influence and predict behaviour and therefore the expression of self-esteem.

The results provided a small measure of evidence with regards to personality preferences (as measured by the MBTI) significantly predicting self-esteem (as measured by the CFSEI-AD).
8.3.2.3 Reporting of multiple regression (MBTI vs AES)

Table 8.17 indicates that the regression models explained a small ($R^2 \leq .12$) practical percentage of variance (Cohen, 1992). The regression of the personality preferences variables upon the managing own emotions variable produces a statistically significant model ($F_p(45.09; 21.10) = 2.14; p \leq .03$), accounting for 3% (small practical effect) of the variance. Extraversion ($\beta = .25; p \leq .005$) contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in managing own emotions ($R^2 = 3\%$, small practical effect). Thinking ($\beta = .35; p \leq .027$) also contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in managing own emotions. Lastly, feeling ($\beta = .30; p \leq .05$) contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in managing own emotions ($R^2 = 3\%$, small practical effect). The beta-weights indicate that Thinking ($\beta = .33$) makes the biggest contribution to explaining the variance in the variable managing own emotions.

The following variables contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in managing other’s emotions (5%, small practical effect): Extraversion ($\beta = .30; p \leq .001$) and Feeling ($\beta = .38; p \leq .014$). The beta-weights indicate that Feeling ($\beta = .38$) makes the biggest contribution to explaining the variance in the variable self-efficacy.

In terms of the collinearity statistics, the variance inflation factor (VIF) values were lower than the cut-off of $> 1.0$ for multicollinearity concerns. These values imply that multicollinearity could be ruled out in interpreting the results.
Table 8.17
Multiple Regression (MBTI vs AES) (N = 304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardised coefficient</th>
<th>Standardised coefficient</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Collinearity stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.03+</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing others’ emotions</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.05+</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001  **p ≤ .01  *p ≤ .05
+R² ≤ .12 (small practical effect size) ++ R² ≥ .13 ≤ .25 (medium practical effect size)
+++)R² ≥ .26 (large practical effect size)
8.3.2.4 Interpretation of multiple regression (MBTI vs AES)

The results indicate that Extraversion, Thinking and Feeling are significant in terms of predicting how an individual will manage his/her own emotions. It therefore seems as if participants who direct their energy outwards and use logic and feeling when making decisions are able to manage and control their emotions effectively and appropriately. In addition, extraversion and feeling seem to significantly predict the management of others’ emotions. Extraverted people who use their Feeling preference when making decisions will be able to manage others’ emotions appropriately and adequately. Various authors (Cole et al., 2009; Higgs, 2001; Kerka, 1998) found that personality preferences will influence the way in which individuals manage their own emotions and the emotions of others.

The results provided a small measure of supportive evidence with regards to personality preferences (as measured by the MBTI) significantly predicting emotional intelligence (as measured by the AES).

8.3.2.5 Reporting of multiple regression (MBTI vs EAS)

Table 8.18 indicates that the regression models explained a small ($R^2 \leq .12$) practical percentage of variance (Cohen, 1992). The regression of the personality preferences variables upon the cultural competence variable produced a statistically significant model ($F_{p}(67.67; 2.88) = 3.24; p \leq .001$), accounting for 6% (small practical effect) of the variance. Extraversion ($\beta = .27; p \leq .003$) contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in cultural competence ($R^2 = 6\%$, small practical effect). Judgement ($\beta = -.30; p \leq .020$) also contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in cultural competence. The beta-weights indicate that judgment made the biggest contribution to explaining the variance in the variable cultural competence.

The regression of the personality preferences variables upon the sociability variable produced a statistically significant model ($F_{p}(174.87; 3.96) = 5.56; p \leq .000$), accounting for 11% (small practical effect) of the variance. The following variables contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in sociability (11%, small practical effect): Extraversion ($\beta = .35; p \leq .000$) and Perception ($\beta = -.27; p \leq .032$). The beta-weights indicate that Extraversion made the biggest contribution to explaining the variance in the variable sociability.
The regression of personality preferences variables upon the proactivity variable produced a statistically significant model ($F_{p}(65.56; 24.76) = 2.65; p \leq .008$), accounting for 4% (small practical effect) of the variance. Extraversion ($\beta = .19; p \leq .033$) contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in proactivity ($R^2 = 4\%$, small practical effect).

In terms of the collinearity statistics, the variance inflation factor (VIF) values were lower than the cut-off of > 1.0 for multicollinearity concerns. These values imply that multicollinearity could be ruled out in interpreting the results.

8.3.2.6 Interpretation of multiple regression (MBTI vs EAS)

According to the results, extraversion significantly predicts cultural competence, sociability and proactivity. Individuals who direct their energy towards the outer world would therefore probably be able to understand, act and interface effectively with individuals from a diverse culture. In addition, such individuals might have the capacity to form social networks with others and be more proactive in their decision making and in taking responsibility for actions. Judging significantly predicts cultural competence, indicating that individuals who prefer a more structured and decided lifestyle will be able to communicate inter-culturally with confidence.

Perception seems to significantly predict sociability, suggesting that individuals who follow a more adaptive and flexible lifestyle will be able to build networks of friendship with people who are able to advance their careers and use the networks to find employment opportunities. These findings support the findings of Bezuidenhout (2010), Coetzee (2010), Cole *et al.* (2009), Higgs (2001) and Kerka (1998).

The results provided a small measure of supportive evidence with regards to personality preferences (as measured by the MBTI) significantly predicting employability attributes (as measured by the EAS).
Table 8.18

Multiple Regression (MBTI vs EAS) (N = 304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardised coefficient</th>
<th>Standardised coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Collinearity stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.06+</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>-3.70</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.10+</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>-4.46</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation</td>
<td>31.85</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001 **p ≤ .01 *p ≤ .05

+R² ≤ .12 (small practical effect size) ++ R² ≥ .13 ≤ .25 (medium practical effect size) +++R² ≥ .26 (large practical effect size)
Table 8.19 indicates that the regression models explained a small ($R^2 \leq .12$) and medium ($R^2 \geq .13 \leq .25$) practical percentage of variance (Cohen, 1992). The regression of the self-esteem variables upon the perception of emotion variable produces a statistically significant model ($F_p(96.64; 15.81) = 6.11; p \leq .000$), accounting for 6% (small practical effect) of the variance. Social self-esteem ($\beta = .13; p \leq .05$) contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in perception of emotion ($R^2 = 6\%$, small practical effect). The lie items ($\beta = -.14; p \leq .028$) also contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in perception of emotion. The beta-weights indicated that social self-esteem made the biggest contribution to explaining the variance in the variable perception of emotion.

The regression of the self-esteem variables upon the managing own emotions variable produced a statistically significant model ($F_p(347.55; 17.38) = 2.00; p \leq .000$), accounting for 20% (medium practical effect) of the variance. The following variables contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in managing own emotions (20%, medium practical effect): general self-esteem ($\beta = .20; p \leq .021$) and social/peer self-esteem ($\beta = .20; p \leq .001$). The beta-weights indicated that both general and social/peer self-esteem contribute equally to explaining the variance in the variable managing own emotions. The regression of self-esteem variables upon the managing others’ emotions variable produced a statistically significant model ($F_p(231.96; 14.77) = 15.71; p \leq .000$), accounting for 16% (medium practical effect) of the variance. General self-esteem ($\beta = .18; p \leq .037$) and social/peer self-esteem ($\beta = .29; p \leq .000$) contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in managing others’ emotions ($R^2 = 16\%$, medium practical effect).

The regression of self-esteem variables upon the utilising of emotions variable produced a statistically significant model ($F(4.6; 9.34) = 4.35; p \leq .002$), accounting for 4% (small practical effect) of the variance. The following variables contributed significantly towards explaining the variance in utilisation of emotions ($R^2 = 4\%$, small practical effect): General self-esteem ($\beta = 1.20; p \leq .037$), social/peer self-esteem ($\beta = .15; p \leq .029$) and personal self-esteem ($\beta = -.02; p \leq .024$). The beta-weights indicated that general self-esteem contributes most to explaining the variance in the variable utilising emotions.

In terms of the collinearity statistics, the variance inflation factor (VIF) values were lower than the cut-off of $> 1.0$ for multicollinearity concerns. These values imply that multicollinearity could be ruled out in interpreting the results.
Table 8.19
*Multiple Regression (CFSEI2-AD vs AES) (N = 304)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardised coefficient</th>
<th>Standardised coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Collinearity stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social self-esteem</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06+</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie items</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social self-esteem</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing others’ emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social self-esteem</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.86</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.04+</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social self-esteem</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-esteem</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001  **p ≤ .01  *p ≤ .05

$R^2 \leq .12$ (small practical effect size)  $R^2 \geq .13 \leq .25$ (medium practical effect size)  $R^2 \geq .26$ (large practical effect size)
8.3.2.8 Interpretation of multiple regression (CFSEI-AD vs AES)

According to Table 8.19, social self-esteem and the lie items significantly predict perception of emotions. The participants with a high social self-esteem appear to have an accurate perception of their emotions. Participants with a high general and social/peer self-esteem seem able to manage their own emotions effectively and appropriately. Similarly, general and social/peer self-esteem significantly predict the management of others’ emotions, suggesting that individuals with a high general and social/peer self-esteem will have the ability to manage others’ emotions and respond appropriately to other’s emotions.

Lastly, general, social/peer and personal self-esteem seem to explain and predict the utilisation of emotions. Participants with an overall high self-esteem seem able to utilise their emotions optimally and appropriately. These findings support the findings of Ashkanasy and Daus (2002), Bandura (1997) Brown, George-Curran and Smith (2003) Coetzee (2008), Pool and Sewell (2007) and Yorke and Knight (2004), who also found that self-esteem relates significantly to emotional intelligence.

The results provide sufficient evidence with regards to self-esteem (as measured by the CFSEI2-AD) acting as a significant predictor of emotional intelligence (as measured by the AES).

8.3.2.9 Reporting of multiple regression (CFSEI-AD vs EAS)

Table 8.20 indicates that the regression models explained a small ($R^2 \leq .12$) and medium ($13 \geq R^2 \leq .25$) practical percentage of variance (Cohen, 1992). The regression of the self-esteem variable upon the career self-management variable produces a statistically significant model ($F_p(545.98; 59.84) = 9.12; p \leq .001$), accounting for 10% (small practical effect) of the variance. General self-esteem ($\beta = .31; p \leq .01$) contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in career self-management ($R^2 = 10\%$, small practical effect). The regression of the self-esteem variable upon the cultural competence variable produces a statistically significant model ($F_p(83.09; 21.30) = 3.90; p \leq .001$), accounting for 4% of the variance. Social self-esteem ($\beta = .14; p \leq .05$) contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in cultural competence ($R^2 = 4\%$, small practical effect).

The regression of the self-esteem variable upon the self-efficacy variable produces a statistically significant model ($F_p(86.07; 15.66) = 5.50; p \leq .000$), accounting for 6% (small practical effect) of the variance. The following variables contributed significantly to explaining
the percentage of variance in self-efficacy (6%, small practical effect): general self-esteem ($\beta = .32; p \leq .001$) and personal self-esteem ($\beta = -.19; p \leq .05$). The beta-weights indicate that general self-esteem makes the biggest contribution to explaining the variance in the variable self-efficacy.

The regression of the self-esteem variable upon the career resilience variable produces a statistically significant model ($F_{p}(262.18; 15.04) = 17.44; p \leq .000$), accounting for 18% (medium practical effect) of the variance. General self-esteem ($\beta = .26; p \leq .01$) and social/peer self-esteem ($\beta = .15; p \leq .05$) are both variables that significantly contribute to explaining the percentage of variance of career resilience ($R^2 = 18\%$, medium practical effect). According to the beta-weights, general self-esteem is the variable that contributes the most towards explaining the career resilience construct. The regression of the self-esteem variable upon the sociability variable produces a statistically significant model ($F_{p}(347.31; 3.58) = 11.36; p \leq .000$), accounting for 12% (small practical effect) of the variance. Social/peer self-esteem ($\beta = .15; p \leq .05$) and lie items ($\beta = -.17; p \leq .01$) contribute significantly towards the explanation of the percentage of variance in sociability ($R^2 = 12\%$, small practical effect).

The regression of the self-esteem variable upon the entrepreneurial orientation variable produces a statistically significant model ($F_{p}(171.09; 23.28) = 7.32; p \leq .000$), accounting for 8% (small practical effect) of the variance. The percentage of variance for entrepreneurial orientation ($R^2 = 8\%$, small practical effect) is explained by general self-esteem ($\beta = .19; p \leq .05$). Lastly, the regression of the self-esteem variable upon the proactivity variable produces a statistically significant model ($F_{p}(28.77; 22.43) = 12.52; p \leq .000$), accounting for 13% (medium practical effect) of the variance. Both general self-esteem ($\beta = .23; p \leq .01$) and social/peer self-esteem ($\beta = .12; p \leq .05$) significantly contribute towards explaining the percentage of variance of proactivity ($R^2 = 13\%$, medium practical effect). The beta-weights indicate that general self-esteem is the biggest contributor towards explaining the variance in the variable proactivity.

In terms of the collinearity statistics, the variance inflation factor (VIF) values were lower than the cut-off of > 1.0 for multicollinearity concerns. These values imply that multicollinearity could be ruled out in interpreting the results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardised coefficient</th>
<th>Standardised coefficient</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>Collinearity stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$ $B$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career self-management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>33.98</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>.10+</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social self-esteem</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.06+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-esteem</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>.18++</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/peer self-esteem</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>.12+</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/peer self-esteem</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>02.29</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie items</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrepreneurial orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>27.01</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.08+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proactivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.13++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social self-esteem</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001   **p ≤ .01   *p ≤ .05

+R² ≤ .12 (small practical effect size)   ++R² ≥ .13 ≤ .25 (medium practical effect size)   +++R² ≥ .26 (large practical effect size)
8.3.2.10 Interpretation of multiple regression (CFSEI-AD vs EAS)

According to the results, general self-esteem significantly predicts career self-management, self-efficacy, career resilience, entrepreneurial orientation and proactivity. Participants with a high sense of psychological well-being, who are self-efficacious in terms of the cultural criteria of success and happiness and who have a high self-acceptance will most probably sustain employability through continuous learning and lifelong learning (Bezuidenhout, 2010). In addition, such individuals might typically have a high perception of their own ability to execute a task and perform well. Such individuals might furthermore easily adapt to changing working conditions and will more easily take risks and engage in innovative problem solving. Lastly, participants with a high general self-esteem may not only set high targets and goals for themselves, but will most probably also accept responsibility for their actions (Bandura, 1995; Coetzee, 2008; Pool & Sewell, 2007; Yorke & Knight, 2004).

On the other hand, social/peer self-esteem significantly predicts cultural competence, career resilience, sociability and proactivity. Participants who have a high self-acceptance and who are confident and comfortable in front of other people may most probably typically be able to understand, act and interface with a diverse culture. Such individuals will probably find it easier to have a meaningful and enjoyable conversation with people from a diverse culture. In addition, such individuals may probably have high levels of career resilience and might therefore look forward to working with and meeting new individuals. Participants with high social/peer self-esteem will probably be more sociable and proactive in their work environment (Bandura, 1995; Coetzee, 2008; Pool & Sewell, 2007; Yorke & Knight, 2004).

Lastly, personal self-esteem significantly explains self-efficacy. The participants with a high emotional awareness and self-regard will probably typically have an ability to function independently from others, make decision and have a high level of confidence in their ability to accomplish their personal goals (Pool & Sewell, 2007; Yorke & Knight, 2004).

The results provide sufficient evidence with regards to self-esteem (as measured by the CFSEI2-AD) as a significant predictor of employability attributes (as measured by the EAS).

8.3.2.11 Reporting of multiple regression (AES vs EAS)

Table 8.21 indicates that the regression models explained a small ($R^2 \leq .12$), medium ($.13 \geq R^2 \leq .25$) and large ($R^2 \geq .26$) practical percentages of variance (Cohen, 1992). The regression of the emotional intelligence variable upon the career self-management variable
produced a statistically significant model ($F_p(1308.44; 49.64) = 26.36; p \leq .000$), accounting for 25% (medium practical effect) of the variance. Managing own emotions ($\beta = .35; p \leq .000$) contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in career self-management ($R^2 = 25\%$, medium practical effect). In addition, utilising emotions ($\beta = .13; p \leq .032$) also contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in career self-management ($R^2 = 25\%$, medium practical effect). The beta-weights indicate that managing own emotions contributed most towards explaining the variance in career self-management.

The regression of emotional intelligence upon the cultural competence variable produced a statistically significant model ($F_p(161.31; 2.26) = 7.96; p \leq .000$), accounting for 8% (small practical effect) of the variance. The following variables contributed significantly towards explaining the variance in cultural competence ($R^2 = 8\%$, small practical effect): managing others' emotions ($\beta = .21; p \leq .012$), and utilising emotions ($\beta = .13; p \leq .048$). According to the beta-weights, managing others' emotions contributed most significantly towards explaining the variance in cultural competence ($R^2 = 4\%$, small practical effect).

The regression of emotional intelligence upon the self-efficacy variable produces a statistically significant model ($F_p(326.95; 12.44) = 26.29; p \leq .000$), accounting for 25% (medium practical effect) of the variance. The following variables contributed significantly to explaining the percentage of variance in self-efficacy (25%, small practical effect): perception of emotion ($\beta = .22; p \leq .001$), managing own emotions ($\beta = .22; p \leq .001$), and utilising emotions ($\beta = .24; p \leq .000$). The beta-weights indicate that utilising emotions makes the biggest contribution to explaining the variance in the variable self-efficacy.

The regression of emotional intelligence upon the career resilience variable produces a statistically significant model ($F_p(489.53; 12.00) = 4.81; p \leq .000$), accounting for 35% (large practical effect) of the variance. Managing own emotions ($\beta = .43; p \leq .000$) and managing others' emotions ($\beta = .18; p \leq .11$) are both variables that significantly contribute to explaining the percentage of variance of career resilience ($R^2 = 35\%$, large practical effect). According to the beta-weights, managing own emotions is the variable that contributes the most towards explaining the career resilience construct.

The regression of emotional intelligence upon the sociability variable produces a statistically significant model ($F_p(66.31; 26.34) = 25.02; p \leq .000$), accounting for 24% (medium practical effect) of the variance. Managing own emotions ($\beta = .27; p \leq .000$) and managing others’ emotions ($\beta = .17; p \leq .024$) contribute significantly towards the explanation of the percentage of variance in sociability ($R^2 = 24\%$, medium practical effect). The beta-weights
indicated that managing own emotions contributes the most towards explaining the sociability variable.

The regression of the emotional intelligence variable upon the entrepreneurial orientation variable produces a statistically significant model \((F_p(46.21; 19.52) = 23.58; p \leq .000)\), accounting for 23% (medium practical effect) of the variance. The percentage of variance for entrepreneurial orientation \((R^2 = 23\%\), medium practical effect) is explained by perception of emotion \((\beta = .19; p \leq .005)\) and managing own emotions \((\beta = .28; p \leq .000)\) where the beta-weights indicated that managing own emotions contributes the most towards explaining entrepreneurial orientation.

The regression of the emotional intelligence variable upon the proactivity variable produces a statistically significant model \((F_p(63.35; 17.75) = 35.51; p \leq .000)\), accounting for 31% (large practical effect) of the variance. The percentage of variance for proactivity \((R^2 = 31\%\), large practical effect) is explained by perception of emotion \((\beta = .13; p \leq .047)\) and managing own emotions \((\beta = .40; p \leq .000)\) where the beta-weights indicated that managing own emotions contributes the most towards explaining proactivity.

Lastly, the regression of the emotional intelligence variable upon the emotional literacy variable produces a statistically significant model \((F_p(808.61; 17.26) = 46.86; p \leq .000)\), accounting for 38% (large practical effect) of the variance. Perception of emotion \((\beta = .40; p \leq .000)\), managing own emotions \((\beta = .19; p \leq .004)\) and managing others’ emotions \((\beta = .16; p \leq .020)\) significantly contribute towards explaining the percentage of variance of emotional literacy \((R^2 = 38\%\), large practical effect\). The beta-weights indicated that perception of emotion is the biggest contributor towards explaining the variance in the variable emotional literacy.

In terms of the collinearity statistics, the variance inflation factor (VIF) values were lower than the cut-off of > 1.0 for multicollinearity concerns. These values imply that multicollinearity can be ruled out in interpreting the results.
Table 8.21
Multiple Regression (AES vs EAS) (N = 304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardised coefficient</th>
<th>Standardised coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Collinearity stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career self-management</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>.25++</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilising emotions</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.032*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing others’ emotions</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.012*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilising emotions</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.048*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25++</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of emotion</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilising emotions</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35+++</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing others’ emotions</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.011*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>.24++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneural orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>.23++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of emotion</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>.31+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of emotion</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.047*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional literacy</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>46.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of emotion</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing others’ emotions</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001    **p ≤ .01    *p ≤ .05

+R² ≤ .12 (small practical effect size)   ++ R² ≥ .13 ≤ .25 (medium practical effect size)   +++ R² ≥ .26 (large practical effect size)
8.3.2.12 Interpretation of multiple regression (AES vs EAS)

The results indicate that management of own emotions significantly predicts career self-management, self-efficacy, career resilience, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy. Participants who are able to manage their own emotions will therefore probably display higher employability attributes. In addition, the results suggest that managing others’ emotions significantly explains cultural competence, career resilience, sociability and emotional literacy. Participants who are able to manage others’ emotions appropriately and effectively will probably also display higher levels of confidence in their employability attributes.

Furthermore, perception of emotion significantly predicts self-efficacy, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy. Participants who perceive their own emotions effectively and positively will probably function independently from others, take risks, engage in proactive behaviour and use their emotions adaptively during certain situations.

Lastly, utilisation of emotion significantly predicts career self-management, cultural competence and self-efficacy. Participants who are able to utilise their emotions will probably be able to sustain their employability and engage in life-long and continuous learning. In addition, such individuals will probably be able to use their emotions during their interaction with people from a diverse culture. Lastly, participants who effectively utilise their emotions will probably persist with challenges and enjoy the discovery of new solutions. These findings confirm the findings of Coetzee and Beukes (2010), Jeager (2003) and Yorke and Knight (2002) that emotional intelligence significantly predicts employability attributes.

The results provided sufficient evidence with regards to emotional intelligence (as measured by the AES) significantly predicting employability attributes (as measured by the EAS).

In summary, the results of the correlational analysis provide adequate support for hypothesis Ha3 (the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables).
8.3.3 Structural Equation Modelling

On the grounds of the significant relationships indicated between the independent and dependent canonical variates, three structural equation models were investigated.

8.3.3.1 Reporting of structural equation models

Three models were tested. The initial baseline model (as shown in Table 8.22) had only a marginal fit to the data with a chi-square of 14057.15 (6091 df); CMIN/df = 2.31; p = .000; NFI = .40; RFI = .37; IFI = .54; TLI = .51; CFI = .53 and RMSEA = .07. Based on the low item reliability of both cultural competence and self-efficacy, these two constructs were removed from model 1 in order to investigate a model with a better fit.

The second model showed a 41% improvement in the data fit (NFI = .41) and the fit was still marginal: chi-square = 11448.05 (4938 df); CMIN/df = 2.32; p = .000; RFI = .38; IFI = .55; TLI = .52; CFI = .54, RMSEA = .07 and change CMIN of 2609. Based on the low item reliabilities of various constructs and low reliabilities on the constructs of cultural competence, self-efficacy and emotional literacy, these were removed from model 2 in order to test a better fit model.

As shown in Table 8.22, although the third model showed a 94% improvement in the model (NFI = .94), the fit was still marginal with a chi-square of 127.51 (41 df); CMIN/df = 3.11; p = .000; RFI = .92; IFI = .96; TLI = .94; CFI = .96, RMSEA = .08, change CMIN = 1132.54 and SRMR = .05. Apart from the fit statistics, the magnitude of the standardised path coefficient estimates between the independent and the dependent variables in the structural part of model 3 (provided in figure 8.2) were also considered. All standardised path coefficients were significant at the 5% level of significance (p ≤ .001).

Figure 8.2 specifies the standardised path coefficient estimates between the personality attributes construct and its variables, and the standardised path coefficients estimates between the employability attributes construct and its variables. The standardised path coefficient estimates between the personality attributes construct and the employability attributes construct are also specified.

The model fit (shown in figure 8.2) revealed that the model (model 3) explains 58% \(R^2 = .58\) of the variance in the employability attributes construct. In terms of relative importance, the variance in the employability attributes construct is mostly explained by proactivity (85%).
career self-management (72%), career resilience (72%), entrepreneurial orientation (71%) and sociability (49%). The variance in the personality attributes construct is mostly explained by emotional intelligence (80%) and only 28% by self-esteem. The variance in emotional intelligence is mostly explained by managing own emotions (69%), managing others’ emotions and perception of emotion (43%). The variance in self-esteem is mostly explained by general self-esteem (99%), personal self-esteem (54%) and social/peer self-esteem (29%).

Model 3 was accepted as best model fit (marginal). The results provided supportive evidence for hypothesis Ha4 (The theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency model has a good fit with the empirically manifested structural model).
Table 8.22

*Confirmatory Factor Analysis comparing the three hypothesised Structural Equation Models.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>CMIN</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>CMIN/df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>RFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>∆CMIN</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14057.15</td>
<td>6091</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11448.05</td>
<td>4938</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2609.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>127.51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1132.54</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* CMIN($\chi^2$) = chi-square; df = degrees of freedom; p = significance level; NFI = Bentler-Bonett normed fit index; RFI = relative fit index; TLI = non-normed fit index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation. SRMR = standardised root-mean-square residual.
Figure 8.2. Structural Equation Model 3 with standardised path coefficient estimates

Note: All standardised path coefficient estimates *** $p \leq .001$. Squared multiple correlations ($R^2$) shown in brackets.
8.3.3.2 Interpretation of Structural Equation Model 3

Model 3 indicates a marginal fit between the theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency model and the empirical structural model.

Overall, the results indicated that the personality attributes (general self-esteem, managing own emotions, managing others’ emotions, personal self-esteem, perception of emotion and social/peer self-esteem) contributed significantly in explaining the participants’ level of confidence in their employability attributes (proactivity, career self-management, career resilience, entrepreneurial orientation and sociability). Considering that these variables constitute the overall empirical career meta-competency model for the group of participants, they appear to be important to develop in terms of guiding the participants in sustaining their employability. Overall, emotional intelligence appears to be especially important in demonstrating the career meta-competency employability attributes.

The results therefore suggest that participants with a high sense of psychological well-being, high self-acceptance and a high sense of belongingness who are emotionally self-aware, have a high self-regard, who are able to perceive their emotions and manage their own emotions and the emotions of others will probably generally display their employability attributes with confidence. Such participants will probably be able to sustain their employability through continuous learning and career planning efforts. In addition, they will probably be able to adapt to changing work circumstances, be open to establish and maintain social networks and contacts within their working environment, will not be scared to take risks and actively engage in activities to improve themselves. These findings are in line with Al-Darmaki (2012); Coetzee and Schreuder (2011); Eby et al., (2003); Puffer (2011) and Weng and McElroy (2010), who also found that personality attributes (self-esteem and emotional intelligence) are significantly related to employability attributes.

8.3.4 Hierarchical moderated regression

On the grounds of the best fit structural equation model shown in Figure 8.2 and Table 8.22, hierarchical moderated regression analyses were performed to determine the interaction effects between the canonical variate construct (personality attributes) as independent or predictor latent variable and the canonical employability attributes variate construct (as dependent or criterion latent variable) and the following demographic variables: race, gender, age, marital status, job level and extraversion (as moderating variables). Mean-centred predictor data were used for this purpose. This procedure allowed the researcher to
determine which of these biographical variables moderated the relationship between the independent and the dependent canonical variate constructs. All main effect relationships revealed a significant effect on the canonical criterion or dependent variable. In terms of the demographical variables, only job level showed a significant interaction effect as a moderator of the relationship between the two canonical variate constructs. Therefore, only the job level statistical results are reported.

8.3.4.1 Reporting of moderated regression

According to Table 8.23, the interaction effect shows a significant negative relationship and therefore a decrease in the slope of the relationship between the variables of the personality attributes construct variate and variables of the employability attributes construct variate when job level is added to the equation. The main effect model explained a large ($R^2 = .286$) practical percentage of the variance (Cohen, 1992) and model 2 (the interaction effect) also showed a large ($R^2 = .295$) practical percentage of variance. Job level as a moderator of the relationship between the variables of the personality attributes construct variate and variables of the employability attributes construct variate produced a statistically significant model ($F_{p(18179.140; 433.709)}=4.014; p \leq .046; \beta = -.834$), with an effect size of $f = .0128$ (small effect), accounting for 30% of the variance in the employability attributes construct. Management as a job level negatively moderated the relationship between personality attributes (as the independent variable) and employability attributes (as the dependent variable).

To examine the nature of the significant interactions, a slope test was conducted. As shown in Figure 8.3, the relationship between personality attributes (independent variable) and employability attributes (dependent variable) is significantly weaker in terms of management and significantly stronger with staff.
Figure 8.3. Management job level as a moderator of the relationship between personality attributes and employability attributes. *Note:* Low moderator = management; high moderator = staff.
Table 8.23

*Hierarchical Moderated Regression*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardised coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>FΔ</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>RΔ</th>
<th>f²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>174.204</td>
<td>1.386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CCMC</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job level</td>
<td>2.869</td>
<td>2.775</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>6.263</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>174.166</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CMCC</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>1.464</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job level</td>
<td>2.597</td>
<td>2.765</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NJobLevel*</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>-2.004</td>
<td>.046*</td>
<td>4.014</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001  **p ≤ .01  *p ≤ .05
The relationship between the participants’ personality attributes and their employability attributes appears to be significantly weaker in terms of management and significantly stronger with staff. This implies that although the management level participants had stronger perceptions of their personality attributes, they seemed to be less confident than the staff level participants about their employability attributes. The results might be explained by the fact that individuals on a higher job level (management level and upwards) are most probably in the maintenance phase of their careers (having reached a managerial level), and may therefore be less interested or concerned about developing the set of employability attributes measured in the current study, hence the lower confidence in these attributes.

Participants not employed on a management level (staff level employees) seem more likely to display higher employability attributes when their personality attributes are developed and increased. The personality attributes of employees on a lower level should therefore be developed in order to increase their confidence in their ability to display employability attributes. The sample consisted of 47% males and 53% females on a management level and 22% males and 78% females on a staff level. The majority of the participants were therefore females on a staff level. This might explain the results as females on a staff level are given more opportunities in the world of work in terms of the Employment Equity Act and are therefore more likely to strive towards the enhancement of their employability (Jongens, 2006). In addition, the majority of the participants on a staff level were younger than 25 years and therefore still in their exploration phase. This might have contributed to the results as these participants are still trying to improve their personality and employability attributes in order to increase their confidence in displaying employability attributes.

Participants on lower levels (who are probably working towards either promotions or better career opportunities) could benefit from increased confidence in the displaying of employability attributes. Participants on a management level might already be more oriented towards entrepreneurship as opposed to individuals from lower job levels, suggesting that individuals on management levels will be more willing to take risks and show a higher preference for autonomy in exploiting opportunities that exist in the career environment (Chudzikowski, 2011). In addition, participants on management level might be more proactive as opposed to individuals on a lower job level. Individuals on a management level will therefore be more prone to accept responsibility for their decisions, set challenging targets for themselves and indentify opportunities before other people do (Chudzikowski, 2011; Creager, 2011).
The results provide a measure of supportive evidence for hypothesis Ha5 (The biographical variables (gender, race, age, marital status, job level and employment status) significantly and positively moderate the relationship between the independent (personality attributes construct variables) and the dependent (employability attributes construct variables) latent construct variates.

8.3.5 Test for significant mean differences

Inferential statistics are concerned with using a sample to infer something about a population. A t-test was used to determine whether the job level subgroups (management versus staff) significantly differ in terms of their personality attributes and employability attributes. Job level was found to be the only significant moderator of the relationship between the independent (personality attributes construct) and the dependent (employability attributes construct) variables.

8.3.5.1 Reporting of mean differences between the various job level subgroups.

As shown in Table 8.24, the results revealed no significant differences between the various job level subgroups, thus suggesting that differences in job level do not have to be considered during the interpretation of the results or during career counselling and development practices.

Table 8.24
Independent T-Test Results for Job Level (N=304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean scores for Job Levels</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Meta-Competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality attributes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>240.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability attributes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>176.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results provided sufficient support for hypothesis Ho6 (There are no significant mean differences between the groups of the biographical variables that act as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and employability attributes construct variables).

### 8.4 CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Table 8.25 summarises the conclusion with regards to the research hypotheses.

**Table 8.25**

*Conclusions regarding the Research Hypotheses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research aim</th>
<th>Research hypothesis</th>
<th>Supportive evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>H01</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ha1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a statistically significant positive relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>H02</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The personality attributes construct variate (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) as a set of composite independent latent variables is not significantly and positively related to the employability attributes construct variate as a composite set of dependent latent variables.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ha2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The personality attributes construct variate (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) as a set of composite independent latent variables is significantly and positively related to the employability attributes construct variate as a composite set of dependent latent variables.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>H03</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) do not positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ha3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>H04</td>
<td>The theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency model does not have a good fit with the empirically manifested structural model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ha4</td>
<td>The theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency model has a good fit with the empirically manifested structural model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>H05</td>
<td>The biographical variables (gender, race, age, marital status, job level and employment status) do not significantly and positively moderate the relationship between the independent (personality attributes construct variables) and the dependent (employability attributes construct variables) latent construct variates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ha5</td>
<td>The biographical variables (gender, race, age, marital status, job level and employment status) significantly and positively moderate the relationship between the independent (personality attributes construct variables) and the dependent (employability attributes construct variables) latent construct variates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>H06</td>
<td>There are no significant mean differences between the groups of the biographical variables that act as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and the employability attributes construct variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ha6</td>
<td>There are significant mean differences between the groups of the biographical variables that act as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and employability attributes construct the variables.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.5 INTEGRATION AND DISCUSSION

This section integrates the research results and discusses the results in terms of each of the stated empirical research aims.
8.5.1 Biographical profile of the sample and frequencies

The biographical profile obtained from the sample showed that the sample consisted predominantly of single black females between the ages of 26 and 40, in full-time employment at either staff, first-level supervisory or middle management level (career establishment phase). Considering that the participants are within the exploratory and establishment phases of their working lives, participants falling into this group might benefit from developing the attributes highlighted in the empirical career meta-competency model to sustain their employability in the contemporary workplace environment.

The sample furthermore consisted of predominantly ENFP personality types. Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) describe such types as being enthusiastic, idealistic and creative. They are able to do almost anything that interests them and have great people skills. They display a need to live their lives in accordance with their inner values, are excited by new ideas and bored with details. They are open-minded and flexible individuals with a broad range of interests and abilities. The participants may therefore be most likely to display these characteristics.

The participants scored very high on general self-esteem, suggesting that these individuals display high levels of psychological well-being and function self-efficaciously in terms of cultural criteria of success and happiness. In addition, these individuals might be able to express themselves without difficulty and have a high self-acceptance. The participants therefore seem to have a high overall perception of and feelings about their worth (Battle, 1992).

Similarly, the participants scored high on the managing own emotions variable, suggesting that the participants might be able to use their emotions in an adaptive way. Individuals who manage their own emotions are aware of their individual goals and display high levels of self-knowledge and social awareness (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

The high scores obtained for the career self-management variable suggest that participants might be able to sustain their employability through continuous learning, and career planning and management efforts (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011). The participants would probably be able to reflect on their career aspirations and develop clarity on what they want to accomplish in their careers. They would probably be able to recognise the skills they need to be successful in their careers and the actions they need to take to accomplish their career goals. The participants seem to have the confidence to achieve their career goals and
persist in doing so. The participants also scored high on the self-efficacy variable, suggesting a belief in their ability to cope, perform and thrive in their career- or performance-related tasks (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011). These participants would probably be able to function independently from others, make their own decisions and act confidently in accomplishing their goals by their own efforts.

8.5.2 Research aim 1

Research aim 1 was to conduct an empirical investigation into the statistical interrelationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables in a sample employed in a typical South African organisational context.

Overall, the results revealed that, apart from the Extraverted preference, personality preferences were not significantly associated with or related to the participants’ self-esteem, emotional intelligence or employability attributes.

A significant relationship was found between extraversion and self-esteem. This suggests that extraverted individuals may tend to display higher levels of self-esteem. They would probably display a high sense of psychological well-being, have high self-acceptance and have a sense of belongingness within groups. This finding might be explained by the fact that extraverted individuals are more outgoing and comfortable within groups, which is not only a reflection of the fact that not only do they display a high self-esteem but they also develop a high self-esteem during interaction with other people. These results corroborate findings by Baumeister (1997) and Bullock-Yowell, Andrews and Buzzetta (2011), who also found a significant relationship between extraversion as a personality preference and self-esteem.

Participants with an extraverted preference also seem to display higher levels of emotional intelligence. This suggests that they would probably be able to manage their own and others’ emotions more effectively and be able to utilise their emotions appropriately. Extraverted individuals tend to interact with people more frequently and may therefore be better able to deal with others’ emotions more appropriately as well as use their own emotions during an interaction with others. These findings are in line with the findings of Ciarrochi et al. (2000), George (2000) and Higgs (2001) who also found a number of significant positive relationships between personality and emotional intelligence.
It further appears that extraverted individuals are likely to display higher employability attributes than introverted types, which suggests that they might be able to understand and interact with diverse cultures, be able to adapt to changing circumstances, be open to maintaining and establishing social contacts and engage in active role orientations. Extraverted individuals tend to be more confident in interacting with people from other cultures; they prefer focusing their energy on the outer world and are therefore able to adapt to the changing outer world more effortlessly and might be more confident about engaging in active role orientations. Bullock-Yowell et al. (2011) and Cole et al. (2009) also found personality preferences to be significant related to employability.

It is interesting to note that extraversion was the only preference that revealed a significant relationship with self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes. As the sample consisted predominantly of participants with an extraverted type, this might have contributed to the significant relationships found between extraversion and self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes.

The results also revealed a significant relationship between self-esteem and emotional intelligence. This suggests that participants with a high sense of psychological well-being, who function self-efficaciously in terms of the cultural criteria of success and happiness, who have a high sense of belongingness and acceptance and a high self-regard will also have a high and accurate perception of their emotions, be able to manage their own emotions and those of others and effectively utilise their emotions appropriately. This relationship might exist because participants with a high self-esteem seemed more confident about expressing their emotions, interacting with others and managing their emotions as well as utilising their own emotions during interaction with others. These findings confirm the findings of Brown, George-Curran and Smith (2003), Di Fabio and Kenny (2011), Ciarrochi et al. (2000) and Schutte et al. (2002), who also reported significant positive relationships between self-esteem and emotional intelligence.

Self-esteem showed an overall high relationship with employability attributes. Therefore participants who have a high self-efficacy and emotional awareness might likely be more confident about displaying employability attributes. They might therefore be more confident and effective in the management of their careers, be culturally competent, have a high level of self-efficacy, display career resilience, be sociable, display an orientation towards entrepreneurship, be proactive and have a high emotional literacy. This relationship might be due to the fact that individuals with a high self-esteem appear to be more confident about socialising with others and interacting with people from a diverse culture as well as being
more confident about taking risks and engaging in entrepreneurial activities. Briscoe and Hall (1999), Coetzee and Roythorne-Jacobs (2012), Hall and Chandler (2005), Herr et al. (2004), Van der Velde and Van den Berg (2003), as well as Weng and McElroy (2010) also reported a significant relationship between self-esteem and employability.

The highest overall association was found between emotional intelligence and employability attributes. All emotional intelligence subscales (perception of emotion, management of own emotions, management of others’ emotions and utilisation of emotions) were significantly associated with employability attributes. This suggests that participants with a high emotional intelligence might be more effective in career planning efforts, understand and act effectively in diverse cultures, have an accurate approximation of their ability and capacity to complete tasks, adapt to changing circumstances, establish and maintain social relationships, take risks, engage in active role orientations and use their emotions adaptively. The observed relationship between the variables might be due to the fact that emotionally intelligent participants seem to be better able to manage and use their emotions to plan their careers, interact with other people appropriately, establish social networks that they can utilise in finding career opportunities and handle their emotions during changing circumstances and risk taking. Ashkanasy and Daus (2005), Brown, George-Curran and Smith (2003), Dulewicz and Higgs (1999), Locke (2005), Pool and Sewell (2007), Puffer (2011) as well as Yorke and Knight (2007) also reported significant relationships between emotional intelligence and employability. Salovey, Detweiler-Bedell, Detweiler-Bedell and Mayer (2008) also emphasised the importance of using conative, interpersonal, affective and cognitive abilities when displaying employability attributes.

In summary, the correlational analysis revealed that the personality preferences are significantly and positively associated with self-esteem, emotional intelligence or employability attributes. However, self-esteem and emotional intelligence (as a set of personality attributes) were significantly and positively associated with employability attributes.

8.5.3 Research aim 2

Research aim 2 was to conduct an empirical investigation into the overall statistical relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) as a composite set of independent latent variables and the employability attributes construct variables as a composite set of dependent latent variables.
The results showed that personality preferences did not contribute significantly to the personality attributes construct, thus confirming the findings of the correlational analysis.

The results revealed that the personality attributes construct was significantly and positively associated with the employability attributes construct, indicating that participants with a high self-esteem and high emotional intelligence are likely to be more confident about displaying the employability attributes. These findings are in line with the findings of Al-Darmaki (2012), Coetzee and Schreuder (2011), Di Fabio and Kenny (2011) Puffer (2011) and Weng and McElroy (2010). This is an important observation as it might indicate that if an individual’s self-esteem and emotional intelligence are enhanced, their employability attributes might also increase.

8.5.4 Research aim 3

Research aim 3 was to empirically investigate whether the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables.

The results revealed that only a preference towards extraversion significantly predicts self-esteem. Participants who direct their energy towards the outer world might have a higher sense of psychological well-being, higher level of self-acceptance and sense of belongingness. The findings are only partly in line with the findings of Cole et al. (2009) and Higgs (2001), who found that personality preferences predict the expression of self-esteem.

Extraversion as well as the thinking and feeling preference were found to significantly predict how an individual manages his or her own emotions. Participants who direct their energy towards the outer world and use their logic and feeling when making decisions seem to be able to manage and control their emotions effectively and appropriately. Extraverted individuals who use their feeling preference are likely to be able to manage others’ emotions appropriately and adequately as well. Various authors found that personality significantly predicts emotional intelligence (Higgs, 2001; Kerka, 1998). It appear, however, that this study is only partly in line with these findings as only some significant results were found.

The results revealed that participants with a preference for Extraversion seem able to understand, act and interface with people from a different culture, are able to form social networks effectively, are proactive in their decision making and take responsibility for their actions. Extraversion predicted cultural competence, sociability and proactivity. Judgment
was found to significantly predict cultural competence, suggesting that individuals who prefer a more structured lifestyle will be able to communicate interculturally with confidence. In addition, Perception was found to significantly predict sociability, indicating that individuals who follow a flexible lifestyle are able to build friendship networks with others that can advance their careers and they use these networks to find employment opportunities. Bezuidenhout (2010), Coetzee (2011), Higgs (2001) and Kerka (1998) also reported that personality preferences significantly predict employability attributes.

The results showed that social self-esteem significantly predicted perception of emotions, indicating that participants with a high self-esteem have an accurate perception of their emotions. The participants with a high general and social self-esteem seem to be able to manage their own emotions as well as the emotions of others appropriately and effectively. Self-esteem also significantly predicted the utilisation of emotions, suggesting that the participants with a high self-esteem might be able to utilise their emotions appropriately and effectively. Overall, self-esteem seems to significantly and positively predict emotional intelligence, which confirms the findings of Ashkanasy and Daus (2002), Bandura (1997), Brown, George-Curran and Smith (2003), Coetzee (2008), Pool and Sewell (2007) as well as Yorke and Knight (2004).

The results furthermore revealed that general self-esteem significantly predicted career self-management, self-efficacy, career resilience, entrepreneurial orientation and proactivity. Social self-esteem significantly predicted cultural competence, career resilience, sociability and proactivity. Similarly, personal self-esteem was found to significantly predict self-efficacy. This suggests that participants with an overall high self-esteem might display higher confidence in their employability attributes, which is in line with the findings of Whiston and Sexton (1998). It is very interesting, however, to note that self-esteem did not significantly predict emotional literacy.

Emotional intelligence (perception of emotion, management of own and others’ emotions as well as utilisation of emotions) significantly and positively predicted employability attributes (career self-management, cultural competence, self-efficacy, career resilience, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy). Overall, the results suggested that participants with a high emotional intelligence seem to display greater confidence in employability attributes. These results confirm the findings of Brown, George-Curran and Smith (2003), Coetzee and Beukes (2010), Emmerling and Cherniss (2003), Jeager (2003), Kidd (1998), Puffer (2011) and Yorke and Knight (2007).
In summary, the results revealed that self-esteem significantly predicted emotional intelligence and personality, and self-esteem and emotional intelligence significantly predicted employability attributes.

8.5.5 Research aim 4

Based on the statistical relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables, research aim 4 was to assess the fit between the empirically manifested structural equation model and the theoretically hypothesised model.

The structural equation model indicated that the theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency model has a marginal (and acceptable) fit with the empirically manifested structural model. The model fit revealed that self-esteem and emotional intelligence were contributing most significantly towards the personality attributes construct. Only career self-management, career resilience, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation and proactivity were included in the employability attributes construct. A significant positive relationship was found between personality attributes and employability attributes, which confirms the results found during the correlational canonical analysis. The structural equation model highlighted the importance of self-esteem and emotional intelligence as important attributes to enable individuals to develop the confidence to demonstrate the employability attributes needed for sustained employability. Schreuder and Coetzee (2011) also noted that individuals could sustain employability by the optimal use of both occupation-related attributes and career meta-competencies. The empirical career meta-competency model can therefore be utilised in a career counselling context in order to enhance an individual’s career meta-competencies in order to develop the attributes required to sustain employability.

It is interesting to note that cognitive, affective, conative and interpersonal psychological dimensions are found to be significant and important in a career meta-competency model. Cognitive, interpersonal and affective psychological dimensions contributed most to the personality attributes construct, suggesting that individuals should be developed on a cognitive, interpersonal and affective level in order to enhance their personality attributes. Employability attributes included in the model mostly relate to the conative psychological dimension, suggesting that individuals should be developed on a conative (motivational) level in order to increase their employability attributes. Hartung (2011) also noted that cognitive, affective, conative and interpersonal psychological dimensions are important in career development practices.
The following career meta-competencies (as shown in Table 8.26) are therefore included in the proposed career meta-competency model for sustained employability.

Table 8.26
 Career Meta-Competencies for Sustained Employability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological dimension</th>
<th>Career meta-competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Personal self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Social/peer-related self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.5.6 Research aim 5:

Research aim 5 was to empirically investigate whether the biographical variables (age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status) significantly moderate the relationship between the personality attributes construct and employability attributes construct variables.

Job level was indicated as the only significant moderator of the relationship between the personality attributes and employability attributes constructs and their related variables. The results indicated that the participants on a staff job level who had a high self-esteem and high level of emotional intelligence were more likely to display a higher degree of career self-management, career resilience, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation and proactivity. Puffer (2011) also found that individuals on staff level are likely to be able to display higher levels of employability attributes. This also suggests that the career meta-competency model may therefore be used most effectively with participants on a staff level.
8.5.7 Research aim 6:

Research aim 6 was to empirically investigate whether significant differences exist between groups of biographical variables that act as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and employability attributes construct variables as manifested in the sample of respondents.

No significant mean differences were found between the personality attributes and employability attributes constructs in terms of job level. This indicates that there are no significant mean differences between the participants employed on the various job levels in terms of the attributes of the proposed career meta-competency model. These findings are in contrast with the findings of Van der Heijden, De Lange, Demerouti and Van der Heijden (2009), who found that individuals in the second half of their careers and on a higher job level are able to display higher employability attributes.

Based on the results, the model (as displayed in Figure 8.4) can be adopted during career counselling and career development interventions. In order to increase individuals’ confidence in displaying the employability attributes (required for sustained employability), career counsellors, human resource practitioners and industrial psychologists should consider developing the following behavioural elements in their career counselling and development interventions as they relate to the attributes identified by the career meta-competency model.

On a cognitive level, interventions should assist individuals to enhance their general self-esteem. An awareness of emotions should be developed along with individuals’ ability to manage their own careers.

On an affective level, individuals should be assisted to enhance their personal self-esteem and to manage own emotions.

On a conative level, individuals should increase their career resilience, entrepreneurial orientation and ability to act proactively.

In an interpersonal level, individuals’ social self-esteem should be enhanced, as should their ability to manage others’ emotions and be more sociable within a working environment.
Figure 8.4. Empirical career meta-competency model for sustained employability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 8.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The descriptive, correlations and inferential (multivariate) statistics that were of relevance to this research were reported and interpreted to enable the researcher to integrate the findings of the literature review with the empirical research findings. The results provided supportive evidence for the stated research hypotheses.

The empirical research aims 1–6 have been achieved in this chapter. Chapter 9 will address the empirical research aim 7.
CHAPTER 9: CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter addresses the empirical research aim 7, namely to formulate conclusions based on the findings, and make recommendations for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices, specifically career counselling practices, and for possible future research based on the findings of this research project. This chapter outlines the core conclusions of the study, discusses the research limitations and makes recommendations for career counselling practices, including future research.

9.1 CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were drawn regarding the literature review and the empirical integration.

9.1.1 Conclusions regarding the literature review

The general aim of this research was to determine the relationship dynamics between individuals’ personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, and emotional intelligence) and their employability attributes, and to establish whether an overall career meta-competency profile can be constructed to inform career counselling practices in the multicultural South African organisation context. The study further aimed to determine whether individuals from different age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status groups differ significantly with regard to their personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and their employability attributes.

Conclusions were drawn about each of the specific literature research aims.

9.1.1.1 The first research aim: To conceptualise the contemporary employment context in the 21st century.

The first research aim, namely to conceptualise the contemporary employment context in the 21st century, was achieved in chapter 2. There is an increasing emphasis on the accountability of individuals as career agents in view of the changing contemporary employment context. As a result, employers no longer require technical skills alone from individuals; they also demand additional career meta-competencies such as an awareness of one’s own personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and confidence in
displaying employability attributes. Individuals should therefore be proactive agents and should strive to develop employability attributes and thereby seek career counselling interventions to assist them (Al-Darmaki, 2012; Haberman & Bluck, 2000). The literature concluded that a career meta-competency model can assist individuals in the career development and counselling context to increase their career meta-competencies and thereby enhance their ability to find and sustain employment.

9.1.1.2 The second research aim: To conceptualise the personality attributes constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence and the employability attributes construct.

The second research aim, namely to conceptualise the personality attributes constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence and the employability attributes construct was achieved in chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6.

(a) Conclusions about the construct of personality preferences

Personality preferences as defined by the psychological types (Jung, 1921, 1959, 1971, 1990) and theory of personality types (Myers, 1987) formed the foundation for a theoretical understanding of individual differences in behaviour and emotional response. From these theories it was concluded that individuals have a preferred manner in which they express themselves and react within their external environment. People differ with regard to the manner in which they gather information, reach conclusions, relate to the external world, use their psychological energy, and regulate and evaluate themselves (Myers et al., 2003).

Personality types are measured using four bipolar scales, each dealing with individual differences. The four bipolar scales consist of four opposite attitudes (Extraversion—Introversion and Judgment—Perception) and four mental functions (Sensing—Intuition and Thinking—Feeling). Sixteen different personality types can be derived from these combinations (Myers et al., 2003).

Individuals are born with a preference towards a pair of opposite attitudes and mental functions. When a person only uses their preferred (dominant) attitude or mental function, the nonpreferred (or inferior) attitude or function is ignored, which leads to one-sided development and inflexibility in response behaviour (Myers et al., 2003).
The psyche regulates itself and steers people into a sense of completion, individuation and wholeness by means of unconscious triggering of the inferior attitude or function. Certain role behaviour that demands the use of the nonpreferred or inferior function may result in emotional conflict and the unconscious explosion of the inferior function. Furthermore, a work environment that demands a specific role behaviour and discards nonconformity inhibits the personality development process. When forced into a nonpreferred or inferior function, people may experience a feeling of insecurity, inferiority and incompetence as well as a low self-esteem (Myers et al., 2003).

An understanding of personality development could assist individuals to consciously develop and use their nonpreferred attitudes and functions in conjunction with their preferred dominant functions, which would result in a deep authenticity and positively high self-esteem. Mastering the use of nonpreferred attitudes and functions could also help people to develop into flexible, creative and self-regulating individuals (Myers et al., 2003).

Each person’s development is influenced by multiple factors (Myers & Kirby, 1994). The most common and important environmental influences on development include:

- Cultural values and expectations (Feingold, 1994; Myers & Kirby, 1994, Myers et al., 2003)
- Family and friends (Jung, 1921; Myers & Kirby, 1994, Myers et al., 2003; Roberts, 2009)
- Environmental influences (Myers & Kirby, 1994, Myers et al., 2003; Roberts, 2009)
- Gender (Feingold, 1994; Myers & Kirby, 1994)
- Individual factors that require or encourage development of skills and behaviours (Myers & Kirby, 1994, Myers et al., 2003)
- Education (Myers & Kirby, 1994, Myers et al., 2003)
- Religion (Myers et al., 2003)
- Profession (Myers et al., 2003)

(b) Conclusions about the construct of self-esteem

Self-esteem is an important psychological construct as it is an essential component of any individual’s daily experiences. It refers to the way people feel about themselves, affecting their interaction with their environment and the people they come into contact with (Kernis, 2003).
Self-esteem is described by Battle (2002) as the perception that a person has about his or her own self-worth, which develops repeatedly and becomes more differentiated with adulthood and interaction with other people. Gray-Little and Hafdahl (2000) refer to self-esteem as a predictor of human behaviour and an indication of how one might react to certain events. They also regard self-esteem as an index to psychological well-being.

Many more definitions of self-esteem exist, but all the definitions appear to include the fact that self-esteem is the evaluative component of one’s self-concept and includes an evaluation of the cognitive, affective and social aspects of the self. For the purposes of this research, self-esteem was defined as a socially constructed emotion rooted in four ideas of acceptance, evaluation, comparison and efficacy (Hewitt, 2002; Battle, 1992).

A multidimensional approach to the study of the construct of self-esteem was proposed. The multidimensional approach proposes that a person’s self-esteem comprises a sum of separate self-evaluations in many specific areas of performance (Sullivan & Guglielmo, 1985).

Battle’s (1992) model of self-esteem was applicable in this research as the principles underlying the measurement of self-esteem allowed the study to conduct the measurement of self-esteem within the context of the workplace. Battle (1992) identified three dimensions of self-esteem, including general self-esteem, social/peer self-esteem and personal self-esteem.

People display different levels of self-esteem. People with a high self-esteem surround themselves with positive feelings and place the emphasis on success, whereas people with a low self-esteem focus on their weaknesses and failures (Baumeister, 1997; McFarlin & Blascovich, 1981, Kernis, 2003; Lane, et al., 2004; Mruk, 2006).

Schaefer (1994) noted that the variables that influence the expression of self-esteem are mostly related to the socialisation process (described in terms of the social identity approach). Kinicki and Kreitner (2003) described socialisation within the organisational context as the process during which an individual learns the values, norms and required behaviour from a group in order to allow him to be a member of the specific group.
The major socialisation variables that influence an individual’s experience of self-esteem include:

- **Age** (Orth *et al.*, 2010; Robins & Trzesniewski, 2005)
- **Gender** (Josephs *et al.*, 1992; Orth *et al.*, 2010; Robins *et al.*, 2002)
- **Race** (Orth *et al.*, 2010; Robins *et al.*, 2002; Twenge & Crocker, 2002)
- **Socioeconomic status** (Leary & Baumeister, 2000; Orth *et al.*, 2010)

*(c) Conclusions about the construct of emotional intelligence*

Various definitions of emotional intelligence are found in the literature, but all the definitions seemed to include the following: (i) emotional intelligence (the ability to apply intelligence to the domain of emotions) is distinct from (but positively related to) other intelligences; (ii) some people have a higher emotional intelligence than others; (iii) emotional intelligence develops over a person’s life span and can be enhanced with training; and lastly (iv) emotional intelligence includes the ability to identify and perceive emotions (in oneself and in others), as well as the ability to manage emotions successfully (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005; Locke, 2005).

For the purposes of this study, emotional intelligence was defined as the extent to which individuals are able to tap into their feelings and emotions as a source of energy to guide their thinking and actions (Mayer & Salovey, 1990). According to Mayer and Salovey (1997), emotions help people to create various future plans, improve decision making processes (due to better understanding of emotional reactions), and facilitate creative thinking and problem solving. Individuals who have the ability to perceive and understand their emotions should be better able to assess their job skills and interests, to set suitable career goals, generate realistic career plans and gain the developmental experiences needed in order to take advantage of appropriate career opportunities (Poon, 2004).

Individuals’ emotional responses differ as a result of variables that influence the way individuals react when confronted with a situation presented by external factors such as the environment.
The key variables of importance in this research include:

- Cross-cultural influences (Ekman, 1994; Triandis, 1994)
- Race/ethnicity (Hewitt, 2002; Van Rooy et al., 2005)
- Gender (Brown, George-Curran and Smith, 2003; Ford & Collins, 2010; Pugh, 2002; Singh, 2004; Tapia, 2001).
- Personal influences (Kanfer & Kantrowitz, 2002), and
- Life span development changes (Bar-On, 2000; Fariselli, Ghini, & Freeman, 2008; Mayer et al., 2000; Von Rooy et al., 2005).

Conclusions about the construct of employability attributes

Brown, Hesketh and Williams (2003) defined employability as an individual’s ability to (i) find a job; (ii) retain a job, and (iii) move between jobs and organisations if necessary. Employability is therefore the relative chance that an individual has to obtain and maintain different kinds of employment. This definition also relates to individual differences.

In the context of the present study, employability attributes were regarded as a psychosocial construct representing career-related characteristics which promote adaptive cognition, behaviour and affect as well as enhancing an individual’s suitability for appropriate and sustainable employment opportunities (Bezuidenhout, 2010; Coetzee, 2011; Fugate et al., 2004; Yorke & Knight, 2007). Similarly, personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes were viewed as career meta-competencies that were presumed to enhance individuals’ employability.

Bezuidenhout’s (2010) employability attributes model consists of eight career-related attributes and dispositions which promote adaptive cognition, affect and behaviour and enhance an individual’s suitability for appropriate and sustained employment opportunities. These eight attributes include career self-management, career resilience, sociability, self-efficacy, cultural competence, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy.

It seems as if most employability models recognised that career meta-competencies and attributes are essential for employability, but none of the above models clearly distinguished between the skills, competencies or attributes needed in order to enhance employability.
Individuals’ employability differs as a result of certain variables.

The key variables of importance in this research include:

- Age (De Armond et al., 2006; Van Rooy et al., 2005).
- Gender (Clarke, 2008; Lee, 2001; Scandura & Lankau, 1997)
- Race (Beukes, 2010; Lee, 2001; Mancinelli et al., 2010; Rothwell et al., 2009)
- Geographical position and economic situation (Brown, Hesketh and Williams, 2003; McQuaid et al., 2005)

9.1.1.3 The third research aim: To conceptualise the nature of the theoretical relationship between the personality attributes constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem, and emotional intelligence and the employability attributes construct, and explain the relationship in terms of an integrated theoretical model.

The third research aim, namely to conceptualise the nature of the theoretical relationship between the personality attributes constructs personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence and the employability attributes construct, and explain the relationship in terms of an integrated theoretical model was achieved in chapter 6.

It was evident from the literature that a theoretical relationship does exist between the personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and employability attributes.

Cole et al. (2009) and Kerka (1998) found a positive relationship between personality preferences and employability. Pool and Sewell (2007) found that employability attributes (such as self-esteem) relate significantly to personality attributes and employability. Bandura (1995) explained that individuals’ self-esteem influences the way in which they think, feel, motivate themselves and act. It is furthermore suggested that individuals who feel and think that they can achieve anything are more likely to succeed in whatever occupation they choose than are people who do not have a high self-esteem (Yorke & Knight, 2004). The development of a healthy, high self-esteem therefore relates positively to employability (Coetzee, 2008).

Brown, George-Curran and Smith (2003) found that students with a higher self-esteem display a higher emotional intelligence. They furthermore found that when a person
possesses a high emotional intelligence and self-esteem, he or she is more likely to perform well in career-related tasks (which could include higher employability skills). Bezuidenhout (2010) and Coetzee and Beukes (2010) found that career self-management and emotional literacy are important career-related attributes. Jeager (2003) found that emotional intelligence correlates positively with employability. It therefore appears that Ashkanasy and Daus (2002) recognise the relationship between emotional intelligence and employability attributes. Pool and Sewell (2007) and Yorke and Knight (2007) also recognise emotional intelligence as an important attribute of an individual's employability.

9.1.1.4 The fourth research aim: To construct a conceptual career meta-competency model based on the theoretical relationship dynamics between the personality attributes constructs (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct.

The fourth research aim, namely to construct a conceptual career meta-competency model based on the theoretical relationship dynamics between the personality attributes constructs (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct was achieved in chapter 6.

It was hypothesised that individuals’ personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) are significantly related to their employability attributes. Theoretically, the sustained employability of an individual is dependent on the development and demonstration of personal career-related attributes that constitute the personality and employability constructs (Cranmer, 2006; Tomlinson, 2007). The attributes required for sustained employability constitute specific behavioural elements:

On a cognitive level, individuals’ personality preferences (Cole et al., 2009; Higgs, 2001; Kerka, 1998), general self-esteem (Bandura, 1999; Coetzee, 2008; Pool & Sewell, 2007; Yorke & Knight, 2004), perceptions of their emotions (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Brown et al., 2003a; Bezuidenhout, 2010; Coetzee & Beukes, 2010; Jeager, 2003; Yorke & Knight, 2002), career self-management (Bezuidenhout, 2010; Coetzee & Beukes, 2010) and self-efficacy (Bezuidenhout, 2010) may influence their ability to create employment opportunities and sustain their employability.

On an affective level, individuals’ personal self-esteem (Bandura, 1995; Coetzee, 2008; Pool & Sewell, 2007; Yorke & Knight, 2004), management of their own emotions, utilisation of emotions and emotional literacy (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Brown, Hesketh and Williams,
2003; Bezuidenhout, 2010; Coetzee & Beukes, 2010; Jeager, 2003; Yorke & Knight, 2002) may influence their ability to adapt to changing situations and therefore sustain their employability.

On a conative level, individuals’ career resilience, entrepreneurial orientation and proactivity may influence their ability to adapt to and welcome organisational changes, their willingness to take risks and engage in creative problem solving in order to improve themselves, their situation or their employability (Bezuidenhout 2010, Coetzee 2011). These attributes may assist individuals to obtain employment and thereby enhance their employability.

On an interpersonal level, individuals’ social/peer-related self-esteem (Bandura, 1997; Coetzee, 2008; Pool & Sewell, 2007; Yorke & Knight, 2004), management of others’ emotions (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Brown et al., 2003a; Bezuidenhout, 2010; Coetzee & Beukes, 2010; Jeager, 2003; Yorke & Knight, 2002), cultural competence and sociability (Bezuidenhout, 2010; Coetzee, 2011) may influence their ability to interact and network with others. Effective interaction and networking may create employment opportunities for individuals and thereby enhance their employability.

Figure 6.7 in chapter 6 gave an overview of these behavioural elements.

9.1.1.5 The fifth research aim: To outline the implications of the theoretical career meta-competency model for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices and specifically career counselling practices in the contemporary employment context.

The fifth research aim, namely to outline the implications of the theoretical career meta-competency model for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices and specifically career counselling practices in the contemporary employment context, was achieved in chapter 6.

One of Myers and Briggs’s (1987) original motives for developing the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) as a measure of personality type was to use the instrument during career counselling in order to help people find meaningful and productive work (Friedman & Slatt, 1988; Pittenger, 1993; Saunders, 1991). The MBTI is probably the most widely used instrument in career counselling (Furnhan & Stringfield, 1993). According to Cole et al. (2009), personality plays a role during the selection of employees. Career development and counselling practices can help an individual to identify their dominant functions and enhance their weaker preferences in order to increase their employability.
Smoll et al. (1993) found a direct relationship between self-esteem and vocational behaviour, which merits attention by counsellors. Walsh and Osipow (1995) emphasised the importance of including self-esteem enhancement interventions in the personal counselling section during career counselling. A counsellor should assess the self-esteem of an individual in the course of career counselling, and also assess the emotional state of the client and then engage in appropriate interventions to help the individual internalise his or her accomplishments in order to enhance or increase the person’s self-esteem (Morgan & Brown, 1991).

Caruso and Wolfe (2001) and Kidd (1998) emphasised that emotion plays a vital role in career development, selection and the workplace. With this in mind, effective regulation of emotions (in oneself and others) and the utilisation of feelings to motivate, plan and achieve career goals are important issues to address during career planning and any attempt to enhance employability. Menhart (1999) found a significant relationship between emotional intelligence and career behaviours and emphasised that emotional intelligence is a vital aspect within career counselling and career assessment practices.

Sustainable employability refers not merely to obtaining a job, but to remaining employable over the long term. To achieve this, individuals need a broader collection of attributes in order to be successful in their career development and their work (Watts, 2006). For an individual to stand the best chance of obtaining a satisfying job at which he or she could be successful, education in career self-management and career development learning is important (Coetzee & Beukes, 2010; Pool & Sewell, 2007).

Individuals rely on perceived competencies and interests when deciding on an occupational choice or formulating career goals (Feldman, 2002). Bezuidenhout’s (2010) model of employability attributes appears to be of value in career counselling and guidance as it provides a framework that can be used in career counselling to help individuals to understand the attributes that are necessary to enhance their employability.

On a cognitive level, career development support practices and career counselling should focus on creating self-awareness to make it possible to recognise (and improve) on underdeveloped personality types. Individuals should also be assisted within these interventions to enhance their general self-esteem and engage in managing their own careers.
On an **affective** level, career development support practices and career counselling should help individuals to gain personal insight. This could enable individuals to improve on their personal self-esteem and not only to manage their own emotions but also to utilise their emotions appropriately within the work context. Having a high personal self-esteem and ability to manage and utilise emotions could prove valuable to individuals in obtaining and sustaining their employability.

On a **conative** level, career development support practices and career counselling could possibly help individuals to improve their confidence so that they become more willing to take risks and try creative solutions to problems when confronted with changing situations within the new world of work.

Lastly, on an **interpersonal** level, career development support practices and career counselling could assist individuals to read and understand the emotions of others (in order to respond appropriately to opportunities) as well as to communicate and connect with people from other cultures or backgrounds. It should be remembered that the new world of work incorporates very diverse cultures.

Table 9.1 summarises the conclusions based on the theoretical career meta-competency model for sustained employability.

**Table 9.1**

*Conclusions regarding Career Meta-competencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological behavioural dimension</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>- Create self-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enhance self-esteem and overall feeling of self-worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Efficiently manage own careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>- Gain personal insight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve personal self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Manage own emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conative</td>
<td>- Improve confidence about taking risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>- Read and understand others’ emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Communicate and engage with individuals from different cultures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.1.2 Conclusions regarding the empirical study

The study was designed to perform seven major tasks, namely:

1. To empirically determine the nature of the statistical interrelationships between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables as manifested in a sample of respondents in a typical South African organisational setting. This was achieved by empirically testing research hypotheses H01 and Ha1.

2. To empirically assess the nature of the overall statistical relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) as a composite set of independent latent variables and the employability attributes construct variables as a composite set of dependent latent variables. This was achieved by empirically testing research hypotheses H02 and Ha2.

3. To determine whether the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables. This was achieved by empirically testing research hypotheses H03 and Ha3.

4. Based on the overall statistical relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables, to assess whether a good fit exists between the elements of the empirically manifested structural model and the theoretically hypothesised model. This was achieved by empirically testing research hypotheses H04 and Ha4.

5. To determine whether the biographical variables (age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status) significantly moderate the relationship between the personality attributes construct and employability attributes construct variables. This was achieved by empirically testing research hypotheses H05 and Ha5.

6. To determine whether significant differences exist between the subgroups of biographical variables that acted as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and the employability attributes construct variables as manifested in the sample of respondents. This was achieved by empirically testing research hypotheses H06 and Ha6.

7. To formulate conclusions based on the findings, and make recommendations for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices, specifically career counselling.
practices, and for possible future research based on the findings of this research project. This task is addressed in this chapter.

9.1.2.1 The first research aim: To empirically determine the nature of the statistical interrelationships between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables in a sample of respondents as manifested in a typical South African organisational setting.

The empirical results provided supportive evidence for research hypothesis Ha1. The following 6 conclusions were reached in this regard:

a) Conclusion 1: Participants’ personality preferences were significantly and positively related to their self-esteem.

- The positive relationship observed between extraversion and general self-esteem suggests that individuals who are directed towards the outer world and as a result focus their energy on people and objects will probably have a higher overall perception of themselves and a positive feeling about themselves.
- Extraverted individuals feel more positive about the quality of their relationships with other individuals whereas introverted individuals are less satisfied with the quality of their relationships with others.
- Individuals who use logical intellectual activities (Thinking-type) to produce their ideas have a higher personal self-esteem and a higher perception and feeling of self-worth.

b) Conclusion 2: Participants’ personality preferences are significantly and positively related to their emotional intelligence.

- Extraverted individuals appraise and express their own emotions and read the emotions of others more effectively than introverted individuals.
- Extraverted individuals are able to manage their emotions cognitively and use their emotions in an adaptive way.
- Individuals who are directed towards the outer world and as a result focus their energy on people and objects will probably be able to use their emotions to facilitate
their thinking, understand their own emotions and those of other individuals and manage their emotions.

- Extraverted individuals use their emotions to assist their thinking and to analyse emotions, value their probable trends over time and understand the outcomes of emotions. They are also able to manage their emotion in the context of their individual goals, self-knowledge and social awareness.
- Individuals who use either their Judging or their Perception attitude might be less likely to manage their own emotions.

c) Conclusion 3: Participants’ personality preferences are significantly and positively related to their employability attributes.

- Extraverted individuals have high levels of confidence in their ability to understand, act and interface effectively in diverse cultural environments. Such individuals will be aware of the customs of other cultures and understand their values and beliefs.
- Not only do extraverted individuals value the quality of their relationships with others, they are confident about communicating interculturally and find it easy to initiate and maintain relationships with people from diverse cultural backgrounds.
- Extraverted individuals have a high career resilience, which suggests that they will be able to adapt to changing circumstances by welcoming job and organisational changes and will look forward to working with new and different people. In addition, such individuals will display self-confidence and be willing to take risks.
- Extraverted individuals are adaptable, flexible, self-confident and competent, regardless of adverse career circumstances.
- Extraverted individuals tend to be more sociable, which implies that they will be open to establishing and maintaining social contacts and utilising formal and informal networks to the advantage of their career goals. The more introverted an individual is, the less sociable such a person will be.
- Individuals with extraverted personality types will probably also engage in active role orientations, which could lead to future-oriented and self-initiated action to change and improve themselves or their situation.
- Extraverted individuals have a great ability to use their emotions and are able to read, understand and manage their own emotions as well as the emotions of others. Extraverted individuals will therefore tend to display higher employability attributes than introverted individuals and will therefore be more employable than introverts.
Individuals who use their Sensing (S) mental function will have a lower preference for using innovation and creativity. Such individuals are unlikely to want to take risks, do not have a high need for achievement and do not show a preference for autonomy in exploiting opportunities that exist in the career environment and creating something of value. However, individuals who use their Intuition mental function will have a higher entrepreneurial orientation.

Individuals with an Intuition (N) preference will engage in active role orientation that leads to future-oriented and self-initiated action to change and improve on themselves or their situation. Individuals with a predominant preference for Sensing (S) will be less proactive. Individuals who use the Intuition (N) preference therefore demonstrate higher employability attributes than individuals who use Sensing (S) preferences.

Individuals who uses Thinking (T) as a judgment function display high career self-management and may be able to sustain their employability through continuous learning and career planning and management efforts.

Individuals who use their Feeling (F) judgment function display a lower ability to manage their careers themselves and are therefore less likely to sustain their employability and engage in continuous learning, and career planning and management efforts.

Individuals who prefer to use the Thinking (T) preference will display higher levels of self-efficacy whereas participants who use the Feeling (F) preference will have a lower perception of the degree of difficulty of career- or performance-related tasks. Such participants do not believe in their own ability to execute the courses of action required to deal with tasks.

Individuals who prefer the Thinking (T) mental function are more oriented towards entrepreneurship, take more risks and are more proactive; the results suggest that individuals who use their feeling judgment function are less entrepreneurially oriented and less proactive. It was therefore evident that individuals who use Thinking (T) preferences have a greater ability to demonstrate employability attributes than individuals who prefer Feeling (F).

Individuals who use Judgment as a preference are less culturally competent and may be less inclined to fully understand and interact with diverse cultural environments. Although such individuals will probably succeed in communicating interculturally, they will not enjoy initiating and maintaining relationships with people from a diverse culture.
Individuals who prefer the Perception attitude will be less inclined to manage their career themselves. Such individuals will probably not sustain their employability and will not engage in continuous learning, career planning and career management efforts.

- Extraverted individuals, who prefer Intuition and Thinking have significantly higher levels of employability attributes than introverted individuals.

**d) Conclusion 4: Participants’ self-esteem is significantly and positively related to their emotional intelligence.**

- Participants with a high self-esteem will also display high emotional intelligence. The higher an individual’s general self-esteem (sense of psychological well-being, self-efficacious functioning and self-acceptance), social self-esteem (sense of belongingness, evaluation, comparison and efficacy) and personal self-esteem (emotional self-awareness, mood and self-regard) the more such an individual will be able to perceive their own emotion, manage their own emotions and those of others and utilise their emotions.

- Personal self-esteem (which relates to a person’s most innate perceptions and feelings of self-worth) does not relate to the utilisation of emotions.

**e) Conclusion 5: Participants’ self-esteem is significantly and positively related to their employability attributes.**

- Participants with a high self-esteem display a high level of confidence regarding their employability attributes.

- Participants with a higher general, social/peer and personal self-esteem have a higher level of confidence in managing their career themselves, are culturally competent, display high levels of self-efficacy, are career-resilient and sociable, are oriented towards entrepreneurship, and are proactive and emotionally literate.

- Personal self-esteem does not relate to self-efficacy.

- Participants with a low self-esteem would be less likely to have well-developed employability attributes than people with a high self-esteem.
Conclusion 6: Participants’ emotional intelligence is significantly and positively related to their employability attributes.

- Participants who are able to perceive their emotions, manage their own emotions and those of others and utilise their emotions display higher confidence regarding their employability attributes. Therefore, participants who have a high emotional intelligence may be better able to sustain their employability through continuous learning, be able to communicate and interact interculturaly, believe in their own ability to execute tasks, adapt to changing circumstances, establish and maintain social contacts, be innovative and creative, willing to take risks, accept responsibility for their decisions and read, understand, manage and use their emotions appropriately.
- Participants with high emotional intelligence are therefore more confident about their employability attributes than individuals with a lower emotional intelligence.

9.1.2.2 The second research aim: To empirically assess the nature of the overall statistical relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) as a composite set of independent latent variables and the employability attributes construct variables as a composite set of dependent latent variables.

The empirical results provided supportive evidence for research hypothesis Ha2. The following three conclusions were drawn:

- Personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence (as the personality attributes construct) predicted a large variance in the employability attributes construct. Personality attributes are therefore a strong predictor of general employability attributes.
- Emotional intelligence was found to be the strongest predictor (in terms of the personality attributes construct) of the general employability attributes construct.
- Personality preferences (as a personal attribute variable) were found to be the weakest predictor of general employability attributes.
9.1.2.3 The third research aim: To determine whether the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) positively and significantly predict the employability attributes construct variables.

The empirical results provided supportive evidence for research hypothesis Ha3. Six conclusions were drawn regarding the third research aim.

(a) Conclusion 1: Personality preferences significantly and positively predict self-esteem.

The results indicate that extraversion is significant in terms of predicting or explaining general and social/peer self-esteem. Extraverted individuals (who direct their energy towards the outer world) will therefore have a higher sense of psychological well-being, higher level of self-acceptance and sense of belongingness.

(b) Conclusion 2: Personality preferences significantly and positively predict emotional intelligence.

- Extraversion, thinking and feeling are significant in terms of predicting how an individual will manage his/her own emotions. It therefore seems as if people who direct their energy outwards and use logic and feeling when making decisions are able to manage and control their emotions effectively and appropriately.
- Extraversion and feeling seem to significantly predict the management of others’ emotions. Extraverted people who use their feeling when making decisions will be able to manage others’ emotions appropriately and adequately.

(c) Conclusion 3: Personality preferences significantly and positively predict employability attributes.

- Extraversion significantly predicts cultural competence, sociability and proactivity. Individuals who direct their energy towards the outer world will in consequence be able to understand, act and interface effectively with individuals from a diverse culture. In addition, such individuals will have the capacity to form social networks with others and be more proactive in their decision making and taking responsibility for actions.
Judgment significantly predicts cultural competence, indicating that individuals who prefer a more structured and decided lifestyle will be able to communicate interculturally with confidence.

Perception significantly predicts sociability, suggesting that individuals who follow a more adaptive and flexible lifestyle will be able to build friendship networks with people who could advance their careers and use the networks to find employment opportunities.

(d) **Conclusion 4: Self-esteem significantly and positively predicts emotional intelligence.**

- Social self-esteem significantly predicts perception of emotions. People with a high social self-esteem therefore have an accurate perception of their emotions. Individuals with a high general and social/peer self-esteem will be able to manage their own emotions effectively and appropriately.
- Similarly, general and social/peer self-esteem significantly predict the management of others’ emotions, suggesting that individuals with a high general and social/peer self-esteem will have the ability to manage others’ emotions and respond appropriately to others’ emotions.
- General, social/peer and personal self-esteem seem to explain and predict the utilisation of emotions. Individuals with an overall high self-esteem will be able to utilise their emotions optimally and appropriately.

(e) **Conclusion 5: Self-esteem significantly and positively predicts employability attributes.**

- General self-esteem significantly predicts career-self-management, self-efficacy, career resilience, entrepreneurial orientation and proactivity. Participants with a high sense of psychological well-being, who are self-efficacious in terms of the cultural criteria of success and happiness and who have a high level of self-acceptance will sustain employability through continuous learning and lifelong learning. In addition, such individuals typically have a high perception of their own ability to execute and perform tasks. Such individuals will furthermore easily adapt to changing working conditions and will be more ready to take risks and engage in innovative problem solving. Lastly, participants with a high general self-esteem will not only set high targets and goals for themselves, but will also accept responsibility for their actions.
• On the other hand, social/peer self-esteem significantly predicts cultural competence, career resilience, sociability and proactivity. Participants who have a high self-acceptance and who are confident and comfortable in front of other people will typically be able to understand, act and interface with a diverse culture. Such individuals will probably find it easier to have a meaningful and enjoyable conversation with people from a diverse culture. In addition, such individuals will have a higher career resilience, and will therefore look forward to working with and meeting new individuals. Participants with high social/peer self-esteem are more sociable and proactive in their work environment.

• Lastly, personal self-esteem significantly predicts self-efficacy. Individuals with a high emotional awareness and self-regard typically have an ability to function independently of others, make their own decisions and be highly confident about accomplishing their personal goals.

(f) Conclusion 6: Emotional intelligence significantly and positively predicts employability attributes.

• The management of own emotions significantly predicts career self-management, self-efficacy, career resilience, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy. Participants who are able to manage their own emotions will therefore display higher employability attributes. In addition, managing others’ emotions significantly explains cultural competence, career resilience, sociability and emotional literacy. Participants who are able to manage others’ emotions appropriately and effectively will also display higher employability attributes.

• Furthermore, perception of emotion significantly predicts self-efficacy, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy. Participants who perceive their own emotions effectively and positively can function independently of others, take risks, engage in proactive behaviour and use their emotions adaptively in certain situations.

• Lastly, utilisation of emotion significantly predicts career self-management, cultural competence and self-efficacy. Participants who are able to utilise their emotions will sustain their employability and engage in life-long and continuous learning. In addition, such individuals will be able to use their emotions during their interaction with people from a diverse culture. Participants who effectively utilise their emotions will persist with challenges and enjoy the discovery of new solutions.
9.1.2.4 The fourth research aim: Based on the overall statistical relationship between the personality attributes construct variables (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and the employability attributes construct variables, to assess whether a good fit exists between the elements of the empirically manifested structural model and the theoretically hypothesised model.

The empirical results provided supportive evidence for research hypothesis Ha4.

Model 3 indicated a moderate fit between the theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency model and the empirical structural model.

The following career meta-competencies should be developed in order to increase and develop confidence in the displaying of employability attributes.

- **On a cognitive level**, general self-esteem, perception of emotion and career self-management are important career meta-competencies which could positively influence employability attributes.
- **On an affective level**, managing own emotions and personal self-esteem were found to be important career meta-competencies which could (if enhanced) positively increase confidence in displaying employability attributes.
- **On a conative level**, employability attributes such as resilience, entrepreneurial orientation and ability to act proactively are positively related to personality attributes and should therefore (if developed) positively influence an individual’s confidence in displaying employability attributes.
- **On an interpersonal level**, individuals’ social self-esteem, management of others’ emotions and sociability significantly and positively influence employability attributes.

It seems as if only general self-esteem, personal self-esteem (and social self-esteem to a lesser extent) as well as perception of emotions and management of own and others’ emotions contribute towards employability attributes. In addition, the findings indicate that should these variables be developed and enhanced, this could positively influence and increase career self-management, career resilience, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation and proactivity among black females in the establishment phases of their careers.
9.1.2.5 The fifth research aim: To determine whether the biographical variables (age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status) significantly moderate the relationship between the personality attributes construct and employability attributes construct variables.

The empirical results provided supportive evidence for research hypothesis Ha5 only in terms of job level.

- Participants on a management job level significantly and negatively moderate the relationship between personality attributes and employability attributes. Participants employed on a staff level who scored higher on personality attributes are therefore likely to display greater confidence in their employability attributes.
- The personality attributes of employees on a staff level should therefore be developed in order to increase their confidence in their ability to display employability attributes.
- Other biographical variables (age, gender, race, marital status and employment status) do not moderate the relationship between personality attributes and employability attributes as manifested in the sample.

9.1.2.6 The sixth research aim: To determine whether significant differences exist between the subgroups of biographical variables (age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status) that acted as significant moderators between the personality attributes construct and the employability attributes construct variables as manifested in the sample of respondents.

The empirical results provided supportive evidence for research hypothesis H06. No significant mean differences were found between job level groups that act as significant moderators between personality attributes construct and employability construct variables. Significant differences therefore do not exist between people from different job levels.

9.1.3 Conclusions regarding the central hypothesis

In chapter 1, the central hypothesis of this research project stated that the overall relationship dynamics between an individual’s personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and employability attributes constitutes a career meta-competency profile that informs career counselling practices aimed at helping
individuals to sustain their employability. Individuals from different age, gender, cultural, marital status, job level and employment status groups will differ significantly with regard to their personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes.

The empirical study provided evidence to support the central hypothesis.

9.1.4 Conclusions about contributions to the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology and career counselling practices

General conclusions are drawn in terms of the literature review, empirical study and counselling practice.

9.1.4.1 Conclusions in terms of the literature review

The findings of the literature review contributed to the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, specifically to career development and counselling practice. The literature shed new light on how individuals' personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence (as a composite set of personality attributes) are related to employability attributes. In particular, the literature review provided insight into the different concepts and theoretical models that lead to the enhancement of personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes.

9.1.4.2 Conclusions in terms of the empirical study

The empirical findings contributed new knowledge on the relationship dynamics between individuals' personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and their employability attributes. The new insights derived from the findings may help to broaden our perspective on how individuals' personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) explain their confidence in displaying employability attributes. Furthermore, the findings may be used to help participants develop greater self-awareness, which may in turn help them to increase and sustain their employability. On the basis of the model constructed from the empirical findings, career counsellors, human resource practitioners and industrial psychologists could gain a deeper understanding of the personality attributes of an individual and how they relate to the individual's employability attributes. This should help counsellors to develop and enhance the attributes individuals require to sustain their employability.
9.1.4.3 Conclusions in terms of counselling practice

The conclusions of the research indicate that career counsellors, human resource practitioners and industrial psychologists should be aware of the different concepts and theoretical models that influence the variables of personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes when working in the field of career development and counselling, and should take cognisance of the strengths and weaknesses of the four measuring instruments used in the study.

Career counsellors, human resource practitioners and industrial psychologists should be mindful of the psychometric properties of the different measuring instruments (MBTI, Form M, CFSEI-AD, AES and EAS) before using them in career development and counselling initiatives. The instruments used should be supported by sufficient reliability and validity data to support their use in the South African context specifically. Integrity in selecting, administering and interpreting instruments and providing individual feedback is fundamental in ensuring that career development and counselling practices are valid.

The primary focus of a career counsellor, human resource practitioner and industrial psychologist functioning as a career developer or counsellor to assist individuals with career development should be to help individuals become aware of their dominant and weaker personality preferences, become aware of their self-esteem and their emotional intelligence. Career guidance and career counselling practices should incorporate strategies which facilitate the development of personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and employability attributes in order to help individuals to become more employable.

9.2 LIMITATIONS

The limitations in terms of the literature review and the empirical study are discussed below.

9.2.1 Limitations of the literature review

In terms of the literature review, the following limitations were encountered:

The literature review with respect to personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability within the South African context was limited because of the following:
Only four variables (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes) were used in the study and therefore the study cannot provide a holistic indication of factors or variables that may potentially impact on the sustained employability potential of individuals.

The study was limited to three paradigms, namely the analytical paradigm, the humanistic paradigm and the cognitive social learning paradigm, which focused on the discipline of Industrial and Organisational Psychology and its subfields, career psychology, personnel psychology and psychometrics.

The theory of personality preferences is a complex construct and is characterised by a diverse method of describing the concept and functioning of personality. Furthermore, using the MBTI limited the study to using personality preferences and not personality types.

The literature review provided several definitions of self-esteem and little agreement seemed to exist with regard to the dimensional aspects of self-esteem. Using the self-esteem model of Battle (1992) limited the study to general, social and personal self-esteem.

The literature also provided several definitions of emotional intelligence and a debate seemed to exist with regard to the dimensions and competencies included in the concept. Using the instrument designed by Schutte et al. (2007) limited the study to perception of emotion, management of own emotion, management of others’ emotions and utilisation of emotions.

Several models of employability attributes were found in the literature. Using the model of Bezuidenhout and Coetzee (2010) limited the study to the following attributes: career self-management, cultural competence, career resilience, self-efficacy, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation, proactivity and emotional literacy.

### 9.2.2 Limitations of the empirical study

In terms of the empirical study, the following limitations were encountered:

- The findings of the study cannot be generalised to the overall population owing to the relatively small sample utilised for this study. The sample characteristics might therefore have impacted on the power of the outcome of the study.
- An ethnic limitation might be present because the sample consisted predominantly of African females (so that whites and males were underrepresented).
• Data were collected only from a convenience sample of individuals who attended a study school, which did not allow for a random sample to be taken from the general population group.
• Data were furthermore only collected from the participants enrolled within a distance education institution, and therefore students from other higher education institutions were also underrepresented.
• Only four measuring instruments were utilised in the study. Different measuring instruments might have revealed different results.

9.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, conclusions and limitations of this study, recommendations for Industrial and Organisational Psychology, career development and career counselling practices as well as further research are outlined below:

9.3.1 Recommendations regarding Industrial and Organisational Psychology, career development and counselling practices

The main aim of this study was to identify the implications of the theoretical relationship between personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence (as a set of composite personality attributes) and employability attributes, and based on the findings, to construct a career meta-competency model for sustained employability.

The empirical study confirmed that individuals' personality preferences are partly related to employability attributes and that self-esteem and emotional intelligence are significantly related to an individuals' employability attributes.

Self-esteem and emotional intelligence could be included in a personality attributes construct. Human resource practitioners, industrial psychologists and career counsellors should therefore engage in interventions in order to increase individuals' personality attributes and employability attributes as these are important constructs in the boundaryless career framework (McCabe & Savery, 2007).

Human resource practitioners, industrial psychologists and career counsellors should assist individuals to enhance their general self-esteem and thereby increase their sense of psychological well-being and the ways in which they express themselves. Social self-esteem
should also be enhanced by helping individuals to accept themselves for who they are and to express themselves in the company of others. Human resource practitioners, industrial psychologists and career counsellors should assist individuals to increase their personal self-esteem by becoming aware of their own emotions and increasing their personal self-regard.

Puffer (2011) points out that recently the role of emotion is often neglected during career counselling and career development interventions. Human resource practitioners, industrial psychologists and career counsellors should help individuals to become aware of their own emotions, understand their own emotions and the emotions of others and to respond appropriately or react to their own emotions and those of others, thereby increasing individuals’ emotional intelligence.

When these personality attributes are developed and increased, individuals should be able to sustain their employability through continuous learning and career planning and management efforts, adapt to changing circumstances and even welcome change, be open to establishing and maintaining social contacts effectively, be innovative and willing to take risks and engage in active role orientation which might lead to future-oriented and self-initiated action to change and improve oneself or one’s own situation. Mastering these competencies should increase the potential of an individual to obtain and sustain appropriate employment opportunities.

The career meta-competency model developed could therefore help individuals and human resource practitioners, industrial psychologists and career counsellors to develop their personality attributes (self-esteem and emotional intelligence) in order to increase their employability attributes. Individuals (as career agents) who endeavour to make themselves more employable should attempt to undergo career counselling to help them to enhance their employability attributes. Human resource practitioners, industrial psychologists and career counsellors should make use of the career meta-competency model to assist them in their interventions to help individuals to enhance their employability attributes.

Organisations could attempt to include the career meta-competency model in their career development practices (for individuals on both a middle management and a staff level) in order to retain valuable employees within their organisation. A career meta-competency model focusing on personality attributes might therefore provide balanced assistance on a cognitive, affective, conative and interpersonal level to individuals seeking to enhance their confidence in displaying employability attributes.
Based on the research findings and the relationships identified, the following organisational interventions in terms of career development and career counselling can be recommended:

- Organisations that are endeavouring to enhance the employability attributes of valuable employees should attempt to provide career development plans which could assist individuals to increase their levels of personality attributes.

- In order to optimise individuals’ sustained employability, organisations should employ people with not only the correct qualifications and technical skills, but also the necessary career meta-competencies. Organisations should therefore promote career development and career counselling interventions on a cognitive, conative, affective and interpersonal level in order to enhance their career meta-competencies.

- Organisations could develop a career development counselling framework that could be used to aid employees in developing their personality attributes. This would help them to develop their employability attributes and career meta-competencies by identifying the relationship that exists between their self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes.

- The role of both the manager and the industrial psychologist is that of a career counsellor. To successfully fill this role as a career counsellor, one should gain a holistic image of an individual’s self-esteem and emotional intelligence. This enables the career counsellor to help individuals to increase their career meta-competencies. This could potentially assist individuals to obtain and sustain suitable career opportunities.

- Human resource practitioners, industrial psychologists and career counsellors could use the Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory (CFSEI-AD), Assessing Emotions Scale (AES) and Employability Attributes Scale (EAS) in career counselling to help the individuals to identify their career meta-competencies that could affect their employability attributes and therefore their potential to obtain and sustain suitable employment opportunities.

- Feedback on the level of self-esteem and emotional intelligence should be aligned with personal development goals. Interventions should be identified to improve areas where individuals achieved lower scores.

- Organisations should explore the extent to which provision is made for career development opportunities. Factors such as the provision of training opportunities and opportunities for internal promotion could be considered in creating a perception that the organisational values enhance career meta-competencies.
Organisations should ensure that the personal development plans of individuals are aligned with the need to develop weaker levels of self-esteem and emotional intelligence.

Career counsellors could use self-reflection models to facilitate the individual’s conceptualisation of the authentic self.

Employees’ career development interventions should be individualised, taking biographical factors (especially job level) into account.

Workshops on personality attributes and self-esteem as well as employability attributes should be offered.

The latest trend in the literature (Betz & Borgen, 2010, Gati & Asulin-Peretz, 2011, Herman, 2010) seems to suggest that online interventions can assist individuals to identify their weaker personality attributes and seek career counselling assistance on the basis of this feedback.

Based on the research findings and relationships found, the following individual interventions in terms of career development and career counselling strategies can be recommended:

- Individuals could engage in self-reflection upon receiving feedback with regard to their personality attributes.
- Individuals could engage in personal therapy in order to enhance low levels of self-esteem and low emotional intelligence.

Table 9.2 is a summary of the recommendations made on an individual and organisational level.
### Table 9.2

**Recommendations on an Individual and Organisational level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual level</th>
<th>Psychological dimension</th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Emotional Intelligence</th>
<th>Employability attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>General self-esteem:</td>
<td>Perception of emotion:</td>
<td>Career self-management:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Focus on things that make you happy.</td>
<td>- Concentrate and focus on understanding other people's non-verbal behaviour.</td>
<td>- Regularly reflect on career aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Believe in your own abilities.</td>
<td>- Concentrate on reading others' emotions by looking at them and listening to them.</td>
<td>- Research the skills needed to be successful in your chosen career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Accept yourself for who you are.</td>
<td>- Try to understand why other people experience the emotions they do.</td>
<td>- Seek information on what a specific career entails on a frequent basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Freely express your own views and feelings.</td>
<td>- Focus on becoming aware of your own emotions.</td>
<td>- Clearly formulate career goals and action plans to achieve them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Don't feel ashamed of yourself.</td>
<td>- Focus on your own non-verbal behaviour and body language.</td>
<td>- Seek advice on what must be done in order to succeed in your career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Don't compare yourself to others.</td>
<td>- Become aware of events that trigger own emotions.</td>
<td>- Display confidence that you can successfully carry out and achieve career goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Engage in social activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Show initiative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Social self-esteem:</td>
<td>Managing others’ emotions:</td>
<td>Sociability:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|              | • Work on the quality of relationships with friends and colleagues.  
|              | • Engage in social activities.  
|              | • Share your ideas with other people.  
|              | • Believe in your own abilities and ideas.  
|              | • Speak about your emotions only at appropriate times, in appropriate places and with appropriate people.  
|              | • Be open to others if they want to confide in you.  
|              | • Share your emotions with others on appropriate occasions.  
|              | • Try to arrange events that others will also enjoy.  
|              | • Seek advice from others on how to make progress in your career.  
|              | • Adapt to different social situations.  
|              | • Build a network of friends with people who can advance your career.  
|              | • Use your network of friends to find new job opportunities.  
|              | • Change your non-verbal | • Persist in difficult tasks and do not give up.  
|              | | • Seek out ways of doing things differently in your career.  
|              | | • Enhance your skills and knowledge to benefit your career.  
|              | | • Pay a lot of attention to developing yourself.  
<p>| | | |
|              | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Personal self-esteem:</th>
<th>Managing own emotions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Don’t let things depress you easily.</td>
<td>- Reflect on previous experiences when confronted with a similar situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work on your appearance and accept yourself for who you are.</td>
<td>- Believe in your own abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relax.</td>
<td>- Be optimistic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Don’t be overly sensitive.</td>
<td>- Make positive emotions last.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase your confidence level.</td>
<td>- Seek out activities that make you happy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Focus on how you present yourself to others.
- Compliment others when they have done something right or well.
- Actively engage in listening to others when they share an experience with you.
- When another person is down, try to uplift the person.

behaviour appropriately in different cultural circumstance.
| Conative | Imagining a good outcome to the task you are doing.  
|          | - When faced with challenges, persist in the task and believe in your success.  
|          | - Have a positive mood when facing obstacles.  
|          |  
|          | Career resilience:  
|          | - Regularly ask the opinion of others regarding your own strengths and weaknesses.  
|          | - Do not feel inferior towards others.  
|          | - Believe in your own qualities.  
|          | Entrepreneurial orientation:  
|          | - Take responsibility for your own success and failures in your career.  
|          | - Think about how things can be done differently.  
|          | - Be willing to take risks.  
<p>|          | - Continuously look into new |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business opportunities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Consider new ideas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proactivity:**

- Take responsibility for your decisions.
- Adapt to changing circumstances in your career.
- Persevere in the face of difficult career circumstances.
- Try to identify good opportunities before others do.

---

**Organisational level**

- Provide career development plans for employees.
- Provide career development interventions and career counselling.
- Assess individuals’ personality attributes and employability attributes.
- Provide feedback to individuals and identify improvement areas with regard to personality attributes and employability attributes.
- Align feedback given to employees’ personal development plans.
- Individualise and customise employees’ personal development interventions.
- Offer interventions to employees to increase personality attributes and employability attributes (such as workshops on self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes).
9.3.2 Recommendations for further research

These recommendations are intended for populations working with individuals in a career development or career counselling setting, such as human resource practitioners, industrial psychologists and career counsellors. Based on the conclusions and limitations, recommendations for future research are outlined below.

In order to enhance the external validity, future research efforts should attempt to obtain a larger and more representative sample. This study was limited in respect of the choice of sample. The sample could be extended to represent a broader presentation of demographic variables, indicating a balanced spread of representation of people with a different personality preference, level of self-esteem and emotional intelligence.

Further studies would be of value for career counselling purposes, as they might help human resource practitioners, industrial psychologists and career counsellors to provide guidance on interventions to enhance personality attributes, which could increase employability attributes.

This study provides only limited insight into personality as it focused on personality preferences and not types and therefore influenced the relationships found between personality and self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes. Future research should make use of another personality instrument (such as the OPQ and the 16PF) in order to test the relationship between different variables.

Different job levels had an effect on the relationship found between self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes. It is recommended that future longitudinal studies should be carried out to test the consistency of the relationship that exists between personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes. Consistent findings, over a period of time, could assist human resource practitioners, industrial psychologists and career counsellors to interpret information, create a practical and reliable framework and refine a career meta-competency model which would help individuals to enhance their employability attributes with a view to achieving sustained employability.
9.4 EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH

The study investigated the existence of a relationship between personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence (as a composite set of personality attributes) and employability attributes. The results suggest that a relationship exists between the variables of relevance to this study and that the aforementioned variables may provide insight into career counselling practices within the 21st century working environment.

The research contributed on three levels to the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, namely on a theoretical, an empirical and a practical level.

9.4.1 Contribution on a theoretical level

On a theoretical level, the readers of the study developed a better understanding of the constructs of personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and employability attributes and the way these relate to individuals’ sustained employability in the contemporary world of work. The positive outcomes of the research raised awareness of the fact that individuals in the workplace have different personalities and differ with regard to their self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes, and that these constructs are important in career counselling practices aimed at helping individuals to sustain their employability in an increasingly turbulent and uncertain employment context.

The literature review suggested that a relationship between personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes existed. The changing context of the world of work, focus on individuals to act as career agents, and emphasis placed on career meta-competencies has required career counselling practices to turn their focus toward a career meta-competency model to assist individuals to become proactive agents in managing their careers and to assist them to increase their career meta-competencies.

The relationships found between the variables may therefore be useful for future research on exploring the possibility of effectively creating a career counselling intervention to develop a person’s personality attributes and employability attributes in order to increase their
employability. Furthermore, the research results contributed to the body of knowledge concerned with psychological factors that might possibly increase a person’s employability.

9.4.2 Contribution on an empirical level

On an empirical level, the study provided useful insight into firstly, the interrelationships found between the set of personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence), secondly, the relationship found between the personality attributes constructs and the employability attributes construct, and thirdly, individuals’ biographical characteristics (age, gender, race, marital status, job level and employment status) as moderators of the relationship between the personality attributes and employability attributes constructs. The findings are useful in informing industrial psychologists, career counsellors and human resource practitioners which psychological and biographical aspects play a role in people’s employability. These results are valuable in constructing a career meta-competency model that can be used in career counselling and development practices in the contemporary employment context.

The empirical study provided statistically significant support for the central hypothesis. The findings therefore suggest that a relationship does exists between individuals’ personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes. Self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes could be included in a career meta-competency model in order to increase general employability. In addition, differences were found among participants in a management group with regard to their career meta-competencies. This study is original and it is the first study to make use of the newly South African developed employability attributes scale (EAS) in relation to the other constructs.

9.4.3 Contribution on a practical level

On a practical level, the study established that individuals from different job levels differ in terms of their personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) and employability attributes. Considering the current organisational context, which is characterised by cultural and generational diversity, the results may be valuable in the career development and career counselling context.
In terms of both the personality and the employability attributes constructs, a career-competency model pointed to an ideal personality and employability attributes profile on a cognitive, affective, conative and interpersonal behavioural level that may potentially enhance a person’s employability. Industrial psychologists, human resource practitioners and career guidance counsellors and other persons involved in career counselling and development can use this model in their counselling to point out areas for further development to increase employability. The argument in this study was to not only obtain a specific job, but also remaining employable over the longer term. In order to do this, individuals not only need a broader array of attributes in order to be successful in their work, but also need to possess the attributes necessary for career development management in a way that will sustain their employability throughout their lives.

In conclusion, it is trusted that the findings of the study provided insight into the relationship between personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence) and employability attributes, and that human resource practitioners, industrial and organisational psychologists and career counsellors will be able to effectively utilise the insights towards enhancing career meta-competencies in their career development and counselling practices. Sustainable employment has become a prominent focus of many organisations because of the competitive nature of today’s working environment. In addition, the multicultural South African context illuminates the need to consider differences between biographical groups regarding the variables of relevance to this study. Recommendations have been made for future research, and this study should be seen as a step towards making a positive contribution to the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology in the South African context.

9.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter discussed the conclusions with regard to the study, in terms of both theoretical and empirical objectives. Possible limitations of the study were discussed with reference to both the theoretical and the empirical study of the research. Recommendations for future research to explore the relationship between personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes were discussed. Finally, an integration of the research was presented, emphasising the extent to which the results of the study provided support for
the career meta-competency model which constituted the relationship between the variables of personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and employability attributes.

In this chapter the last research aim (7) was achieved, namely to formulate conclusions based on the findings, and make recommendations for Industrial and Organisational Psychology practices, specifically career counselling practices and for possible future research based on the findings of this research project.

This concludes the research project. The next section presents the research article.
Exploring Employees’ Personality Attributes in Relation to their Employability Attributes in the Business Management Field

Abstract
This study explored a convenience sample (N = 304) of early career employees’ personality preferences (measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator), self-esteem (measured by the Culture-free Self-esteem Inventory for Adults) and emotional intelligence (measured by the Assessing Emotions Scale), as a composite set of their personality attributes, in relation to their employability attributes (measured by the Employability Attributes Scale). The participants comprised 81% blacks and 64% females employed in the business management field in managerial/supervisory (53%) and staff (28%) level positions. Their ages ranged between 25 and 40 years (79%). A canonical analysis indicated that the participants’ personality attributes were significantly and positively related to their employability attributes. Structural equation modelling indicated a moderate fit between the personality and employability canonical variate constructs. The findings may be used to inform career counselling practices aimed at helping employees to become proactive career agents in their career development.

Keywords: career meta-competencies, personality preferences, self-esteem, emotional intelligence, employability, business management, early career, career development
The new relationship between the worker and the world of work has created the need to develop career interventions that help individuals to take ownership of their careers and be proactive agents in managing their careers (Baruch, 2004; Coetzee, 2008; Fugate, Kinicki & Ashforth, 2004). Various authors emphasise that individuals need a certain set of skills, competencies and personality attributes to make them more employable in the new world of work (ACCI, 2002; Clarke, 2008; Morley, 2001). Eby, Butts and Lockwood (2003) posit that possessing a number of specific career meta-competencies should promote career success. Such competencies refer to the ability of individuals to adjust to constantly changing situations by adapting their behaviour accordingly (Eby et al., 2003). The ability to adapt to changing circumstances reflects a high level of emotional intelligence. Eby et al. (2003) found that having a proactive personality is important for success in a boundaryless career context. According to Coetzee (2010), people in the 21st century are competency traders whose employability is determined by knowledge, transferable skills and unique attributes and accomplishments. People need to continuously fulfill, acquire or create work through the use of career meta-competencies.

**Career meta-competencies, career development and employability**

Career meta-competencies refer to a set of psychological career resources regarded as critical in career development (Coetzee, 2008). These psychological career resources include attributes and abilities such as behavioural adaptability, self-knowledge, career orientation awareness, sense of purpose, self-esteem and emotional literacy, which help individuals to be self-sufficient continuous learners and down-to-business agents in the management of their own careers (Briscoe & Hall, 1999; Coetzee, 2008; Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012; Hall & Chandler, 2005; Herr, Cramer, & Niles, 2004). Various authors found that individuals who have a broad range of psychological career resources are easily able to adapt to changing career circumstances and demonstrate higher levels of employability (Fugate et al., 2004; Griffen & Hesketh, 2005).

Several researchers focusing on career development suggest that individuals should become more conscious of their own work-related capability as well as their career meta-competencies as these competencies influence general employability (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Brockner & Gaure, 1983; Brown, George-Curran, & Smith, 2003; Pool & Sewell, 2007; Yorke & Knight, 2004). De Vos and Soens (2008) and Eby et al. (2003) found that personal identity and self-insight are the two most prominent career meta-competencies that people need in their careers.
as additional resources in order to be prepared for the new challenges of the world of work. Pool and Sewell (2007) identified self-esteem and emotional intelligence as vital career meta-competencies for career success and therefore for increased employability. Kerka (1998) also noted that career development is influenced by various factors, such as personality and self-esteem.

The concept of personality preferences seems to be partly responsible for people’s career behaviour. Cole, Field, Giles and Harris (2009) found a significant relationship between individuals’ personality preferences and their employability. Higgs (2001) suggests that an individual could develop his or her weaker personality attributes and thereby deliver more rounded behaviour, which could possibly enhance the person’s employability.

**Personality attributes in relation to employability attributes**

In the context of the present study, the constructs of personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence are regarded as a composite set of personality attributes that influence people’s ability to demonstrate employability attributes.

Jung (1971) contends that variations in people’s behaviour can be explained by innate differences in the ways they prefer to take in information, make decisions and generally deal with the world. These differences are expressed in people’s personality type preferences. Personality type is defined as the dominant and conscious predisposition to either act or react in a characteristic manner when observing one’s outer world and assigning meaning to each experience (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk & Hammer, 2003). Jung (1921) posited that type is predispositioned within human beings and is thus a universal attribute. The Jungian psychological type theory was extended by Katherine Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers to form the well-known Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) typology for helping people understand their own and others’ use of natural preferences in mental or cognitive functioning (Myers & Myers, 1995), and to help them integrate such understanding in their everyday life (Myers *et al.*, 2003). Table 1 provides an overview of the 16 personality preference types as identified by the MBTI typology.
Table 1
_Sixteen Personality Preference Types (Myers et al., 2003)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraverts with dominant Sensing and auxiliary Thinking</th>
<th>ESTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Sensing and auxiliary Feeling</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Sensing and auxiliary Thinking</td>
<td>ISTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Sensing and auxiliary Feeling</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Intuition and auxiliary Thinking</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Intuition and auxiliary Feeling</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Intuition and auxiliary Thinking</td>
<td>INTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Intuition and auxiliary Feeling</td>
<td>INFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Thinking and auxiliary Sensing</td>
<td>ESTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Thinking and auxiliary Intuition</td>
<td>ENTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Thinking and auxiliary Sensing</td>
<td>ISTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Thinking and auxiliary Intuition</td>
<td>INTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Feeling and auxiliary Sensing</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts with dominant Feeling and auxiliary Intuition</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Feeling and auxiliary Sensing</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts with dominant Feeling and auxiliary Intuition</td>
<td>INFP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-esteem is the process by which people maintain a sense of self-integrity, that is, a perception of themselves as globally moral, adequate, and efficacious when they confront threats to a valued self-image (Sherman et al., 2009). Battle (1992) divided self-esteem into general self-esteem, social/peer self-esteem and personal self-esteem.

Emotional intelligence is the extent to which individuals are able to tap into their feelings and emotions as a source of energy to guide their thinking and actions (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Salovey and Mayer divided emotional intelligence into perception of emotion, managing own emotions, managing others' emotions and utilisation of emotions.

Employability attributes refer to career-related attributes and dispositions that promote adaptive cognition, behaviour and affect, as well as enhance an individual’s suitability for appropriate and sustained employment opportunities (Coetzee, 2011).
These include attributes such as:

- **Career self-management**: The ability to sustain employability by means of constant learning career planning and management efforts (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011).
- **Cultural competence**: The metacognitive ability to understand, act and interface successfully within a culturally diverse environment (Bezuidenhout, 2010).
- **Career resilience**: The ability to adapt to changing situations by accepting job and organisational changes, willingness to take risks as well as possession of self-confidence (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011).
- **Self-efficacy**: An individual's perception of the extent of difficulty of career-related or performance-related tasks which they believe they are going to attempt as well as their perception of how well they will be able to execute the required actions in order to deal with those tasks (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011).
- **Sociability**: The ability to be open to, establish and maintain social contacts, as well as utilise formal and informal networks for the benefit of one’s career (Bezuidenhout, 2010).
- **Entrepreneurial orientation**: An individual’s preference for innovation and creativity, a tendency to take risks, a need for achievement, a tolerance of uncertainty as well as a preference for autonomy in the exploitation of opportunities within the career environment and the creation of something valuable (Bezuidenhout, 2010).
- **Proactivity**: The tendency to engage in active role orientations that lead to future-oriented and self-initiated action in order to change oneself and one’s situation (Bezuidenhout, 2010).
- **Emotional literacy**: The ability to use emotions adaptively as well as an individual's ability to read, understand and control their own emotions and those of others (Bezuidenhout, 2010, Coetzee, 2010).

The personality type theory of Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) provides a possible explanation as to why people differ in the demonstration of self-esteem and emotionally intelligent behaviour. Ciarrochi, Chan and Caputi (2000) and Schutte, Malouff, Simunek, Hollander and McKenley (2002) found a significant positive correlation between self-esteem and emotional intelligence. Higgs (2001) found a positive relationship between the personality types outlined in the personality type theory of Myers and Briggs (Myers, 1987) and emotional intelligence. Ciarrochi et al. (2000) also found a number of significant relationships between emotional
intelligence and personality. However, they question whether there is a relationship between self-esteem and both these variables.

The humanistic personality theories of Rogers (1959, 1963) and Maslow (1970) emphasise the need to belong as a strong motivational need, which affects people’s emotional responses to their social life. Baumeister and Leary (1995) note that both the positive and the negative emotions that people experience are linked to the need to belong. Both Brockner and Guare (1983) and Kerka (1998) found that people with a low self-esteem would probably perform poorly and achieve less than would people with a high self-esteem. Baumeister (1997) suggests that people with a low self-esteem do not seem to have a clear sense of self-identity and are not confident of succeeding at anything they try. It therefore seems as if people with a high self-esteem would be more likely to have well-developed employability skills than people with a low self-esteem. Brown et al. (2003) noted that individuals with a higher self-esteem display a higher level of emotional intelligence. They also found that when people possess high emotional intelligence and self-esteem, they are more likely to perform well in career-related tasks (which could include higher employability skills).

Ashkanasy and Daus (2002) found that emotional intelligence has an influence on the selection of employees and the management of their performance, and they therefore recognise the relationship between emotional intelligence and employability attributes. Coetzee and Beukes (2010) found a significant relationship between individuals’ employability skills, their emotional intelligence and their satisfaction with career-related tasks. Pool and Sewell (2007) and Yorke and Knight (2004) also indicated emotional intelligence as an important attribute of an individual’s employability.

Given the argument that personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence can be taught and learnt (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Myers et al., 2003; Pool & Sewell, 2007; Salovey & Meyer, 1990), and the fact that there is a growing need to develop and enhance individuals’ employability skills (Coetzee & Beukes, 2010; Pool & Sewell, 2007), a model indicating the relationship between these four variables would be a valuable resource in career counselling practice where the concern is enhancing individuals’ ability to proactively manage their career development.
Goal of the study
The objective of the study was to explore whether individuals’ personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) related significantly and positively to their employability attributes. The following specific research question was formulated:

_Do individuals’ personality attributes (personality preferences, self-esteem and emotional intelligence) significantly and positively relate to their employability attributes?_

The outcomes of this article could potentially serve as a guideline to assist industrial psychologists, human resource professionals and career guidance practitioners involved in career counselling in the development of individuals’ ability to demonstrate their employability attributes with confidence and thus manage their career development more proactively.

Method
Participants
The participants were a convenience sample of (N = 304) early career adults employed in the business management field. The sample was predominantly represented by blacks (81%) and females (64%) in the exploration and establishment phases of their careers (79% = 25–40 years). The participants predominantly occupied managerial/supervisory (53%) and staff-level positions (28%) in the South African service industry.

Measuring instruments
The participants completed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Form M (MBTI), the Culture-free Self-esteem Inventory (CFSEI2-AD), the Assessing Emotions Scale (AES), and the Employability Attributes Scale (EAS).

The well-established MBTI, Form M (Myers & Myers, 1998) was used to measure the participants’ personality types. The MBTI, Form M, is a self-reporting instrument consisting of 93 items arranged in a forced-choice format. For each item, subjects have two responses to choose from. The objective of the MBTI is to classify an individual into one of the 16 personality types (Myers, et al., 2003). There is general agreement on the MBTI’s high levels of face validity (Myers, et al., 2003, p.160). Myers, et al. (2003) report internal consistency reliabilities of .80 for the MBTI Form M scales. Test-retest reliabilities are shown to be high and also show consistency over time.
The CFSEI 2-AD (Battle, 1992) is a self-report inventory intended to measure an individual's perception of feelings of self-worth and achievement in comparison to others. The CFSEI2-AD consists of four subscales: general self-esteem (16 items), social/peer self-esteem (8 items), personal self-esteem (8 items) and lie/defensiveness items (8 items). The lie subtest measures defensiveness. Individuals who respond defensively to self-esteem items refuse to ascribe to themselves characteristics of a generally valid but socially unacceptable nature. For the purposes of this study participants’ responses were measured on a six point Likert-type scale. Factor analysis by Battle (1992) confirms the construct validity of the CFSEI2-AD. In terms of reliability, Battle (1992) reports test-retest correlations of .79 up to .82. Internal consistency reliability coefficients ranged between .79 and .92 for all the subscales (Battle, 1992).

The AES (Schutte, Malouff & Bhullar, 2009) is a 33-item self-report inventory which uses a five-point Likert scale to measure individuals’ emotional intelligence traits and consists of four subscales: perception of emotion (10 items), managing own emotions (9 items), managing others’ emotions (8 items) and utilisation of emotions (6 items). Validity studies on the AES justify the various underlying constructs of the four subscales (Chapman & Hayslip, 2006; Ciarrochi et al., 2000; Saklofske, Austin & Minksi, 2003).

In terms of reliability (internal consistency), Ciarrochi et al. (2000) report Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients of .55 (moderate) to .78 (high). Test-retest reliability tests (Schutte et al., 1998) indicate a coefficient score of .78 for total scale scores. Validity studies (Bracket & Mayer, 2003; John & Srivastava, 1999; McCrae & Costa, 1999; Schutte et al., 1998) confirm both the convergent and the divergent validity of the AES.

The EAS (Bezuidenhout 2010, 2011 & Coetzee, 2010) has been developed for the South African context and is used as an instrument to measure individuals' self-perceived employability attributes. The EAS (Bezuidenhout, 2010; Coetzee, 2010) is a self-rated, multi-factorial measure which contains 56 items and eight subscales: career self-management (11 items), cultural competence (5 items), self-efficacy (6 items), career resilience (6 items), sociability (7 items), entrepreneurial orientation (7 items), proactivity (7 items), and emotional literacy (7 items). Respondents are required to rate each item on a six-point Likert-type scale. An exploratory factor analysis (Coetzee, 2010) provided evidence that the EAS items meet the psychometric criteria of construct validity. Cronbach’s Alpha (internal consistency) reliability coefficients for each subscale range between .78 and .90 (Coetzee, 2010).
Research procedure
The participants attended a three-day study school at a distance learning higher education institution. A total of 500 respondents attended the study school and 304 usable questionnaires were returned, yielding a response rate of 61%. The aim of the study, the confidentiality of the responses and instructions for completing the questionnaire were discussed with the respondents on the first day of the study school. Each questionnaire included a covering letter inviting subjects to participate voluntarily in the study and assuring them that their individual responses would remain confidential. The covering letter also stated that completing the questionnaires and returning them constituted agreement to use the results for research purposes only. In terms of ethics, permission for the research was obtained from the institution’s research ethics committee.

Statistical analysis
Canonical correlational analyses were performed to assess the overall statistical relationship between the CFSEI2-AD, AES, and MBTI variables (as a composite set of multiple independent personality attributes variables) and the EAS variables (as a composite set of multiple dependent employability attributes variables). Canonical correlation analysis was considered appropriate and useful because the statistical analyses involved examining relationships between two composite sets of multiple variables. Canonical correlation analysis limits the probability of committing Type I errors (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2010).

The Wilks Lambda’s chi-square test was performed to test for the significance of the overall canonical correlation between the independent and dependent variates of a canonical function. In order to counter the probability of a type I error, it was decided to set the significance value for interpreting the results at a 95% confidence interval level ($F_p \leq .05$). Effect sizes were used to decide on the practical significance of the findings. In line with guidelines by Hair et al. (2010), the cut-off criteria for factorial loadings ($\geq .30$) were used to interpret the relative importance of the canonical structure correlations or loadings in deriving the canonical variate constructs. The redundancy index was also considered for assessing the magnitude of the overall correlational relationships between the two variates of a canonical function and the practical significance of the predictive ability of the canonical relationship (Hair et al., 2010). Squared canonical correlation ($Rc^2$) values of $\leq .12$ (small practical effect), $\geq .13 \leq .25$ (medium practical effect), and $\geq .26$ (large practical effect) ($F_p \leq .05$) (Cohen, 1992) were also considered in the interpretation of the magnitude or practical significance of the results.
Structural equation modelling (SEM) was also performed. SEM is a multivariate procedure, combining multiple regression and factor analysis when examining the research hypotheses of causality within a system. SEM is divided into two different parts and includes a measurement model and a structural model. The measurement model deals with the relationships between the measured and latent (set of independent) variables whereas the structural model only deals with the relationships between the latent (set of dependent) variables.

The SEM process focuses on the validation of the measurement model by obtaining estimates of the parameters of the model and assessing whether the model itself provides a good fit to the data (Garson, 2008). The model adequacy is evaluated by means of goodness-of-fit measures which determine whether the model being tested should be accepted or rejected (Garson, 2008). The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) at the 90% confidence interval was used as a measure to determine goodness-of-fit. The primary principle of the RMSEA is that it evaluates the extent to which the model fails to fit the data. The RMSEA point estimates should be 0.05 or less and the upper limit of the confidence interval should not exceed 0.08 (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2000). An RMSEA value of 0.06 (CFI ≥ .90) was regarded as a good fit, RMSEA values ranging from 0.08 to 0.10 (CFI ≤ .90) were regarded as a mediocre fit and those greater than 0.10 indicated a poor fit (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCullum & Strahan, 1999; Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Results

Descriptive statistics: Means, standard deviations and reliability analysis

Table 2 shows that the participants obtained the highest mean scores for the CFSEI-AD general self-esteem ($M = 4.52; SD = 11.11$), AES managing own emotions ($M = 4.16; SD = 4.61$), and the EAS career self-management ($M = 4.75; SD = 8.14$), self-efficacy ($M = 34.75; SD = 4.07$) and proactivity ($M = 4.72; SD = 5.08$) variables.
### Table 2

**Descriptive Statistics: Means, Standard Deviations and Reliability Summary Statistics**

*(CFSEI-AD, AES & EAS) (N=304)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-esteem (CFSEI-AD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social / peer self-esteem</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-esteem</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie items</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total self-esteem</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional intelligence (AES)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of emotion</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing others’ emotions</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation of emotions</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total emotional intelligence</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employability attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career self-management</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career resilience</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial orientation</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional literacy</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total emotional intelligence</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>34.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social/peer self-esteem and the lie items obtained internal consistency reliability coefficients below .70. All the other CFSEI-AD subscales obtained acceptable Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients which were higher than the guideline of .70 (Hair et al. 2010).
With the exception of the AES utilisation of emotions and perception of emotions (Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient = .59, moderate) variables, all of the subscales of the two scales obtained acceptable Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients (internal consistency) which were higher than the guideline of .70 (Hair et al. 2010).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBTI, Form M</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that the participants scored the highest on the MBTI (E) Extraversion (53%) and (P) Perception (86%) attitudes and the highest on the (N) Intuition (58%) and (F) Feeling (69%) mental functions. The dominant personality type preference for the sample of participants can therefore be labelled as ENFP.

Canonical correlation analyses

Table 4 shows that the canonical model has eight canonical functions (dimensions), of which the canonical correlations of only the first four functions are statistically significant: (1) Rc = .726 ($Rc^2 = .53$; very large practical effect; $F(p) = 3.74(.0001)$; (2) Rc = .490 ($Rc^2 = .24$; large practical effect; $F(p) = 2.22 (.0001)$; (3) Rc = .394 ($Rc^2 = .16$; moderate practical effect; $F(p) = 1.77 (.0001)$; and (4) Rc = .350 ($Rc^2 = .12$; small practical effect; $F(p) = 1.51(.01)$. For the purposes of this article, only the results of the first canonical function will be examined. The canonical function explains the relationship between the two canonical variates (the variate for the set of dependent variables and the variate for the set of independent variables) that relate to the relevant canonical function. Table 4 shows that the four multivariate criteria and the $F$ approximations for the model are also statistically significant.
### Table 4
Canonical Correlation Analysis relating the Set of Personality Attributes (Independent Variables) to Employability Attributes (Dependent Variables) (N = 304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical function</th>
<th>Overall canonical correlation (Rc)</th>
<th>Overall squared canonical correlation (Rc²)</th>
<th>F statistics</th>
<th>Probability (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>&lt;.0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>&lt;.0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>&lt;.0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multivariate tests of significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate F statistic</th>
<th>Probability (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>&lt;.0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai’s Trace</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>&lt;.0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling-Lawley Trace</td>
<td>1.962</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>&lt;.0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy’s Greatest Root</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>&lt;.0001***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001

Because of the instability and variability of canonical weights and multicollinearity concerns (Hair *et al.*, 2010), only the individual canonical structure correlations (loadings of Rc ≥ .30) and their individual squared canonical structure loadings (Rc²) are considered in interpreting the relative importance and magnitude of importance (practical significance) in deriving the two canonical variate constructs for the first canonical function that will be examined in the present study. The canonical structure correlations (loadings) measure the strength of the canonical relationship between a canonical variate and its individual original variables in the set of variables (within-set variable-to-variate correlation) (Hair *et al.*, 2010). Those variables that
correlate highly ($R_c \geq .30$) with the canonical function variate can be regarded as having more in common with it.

Based on the canonical results shown in Table 5, the two canonical variates will be labelled as personality attributes (independent canonical variate construct) and general employability attributes (dependent canonical variate construct). The overall squared canonical correlation ($R_c^2 = .53$) shows a strong association between the two canonical variates. The personality attributes construct accounted for 53% ($R_c^2 = .53$; very large practical effect) of the variance in the general employability attributes canonical variate construct.

In terms of the independent canonical variate (personality attributes), Table 5 shows that the personality attributes canonical variate construct was most strongly influenced by the AES emotional intelligence variables (managing own emotions, perceiving emotions and managing others’ emotions) and the CFSEI-AD general self-esteem variable ($R_c^2 \geq .67 \leq .36$; large practical effect). The contribution of the AES utilisation of emotions and CFSEI-AD variables personal self-esteem, social/peer self-esteem and the lie items in deriving the personality attribute canonical variate construct was moderate in terms of practical significance ($R_c^2 \geq .16 \leq .25$). The contribution of the MBTI extraverted (E) preference was small in terms of practical significance ($R_c^2 = .11$). Overall, the MBTI personality preferences did not contribute significantly to the derivation of the personality attribute canonical variate construct. This variable was therefore removed in the structural equation model in order to test the data fit.

In terms of the dependent canonical variate (employability attributes), Table 5 shows that the general employability attributes canonical variate construct was most strongly influenced by the EAS emotional literacy ($R_c^2 = .79$; very large practical effect) and career resilience ($R_c^2 = .71$; very large practical effect) variables, followed by the proactivity, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation, career self-management and self-efficacy variables ($R_c^2 \geq .66 \leq .35$; large practical effect). The contribution of the EAS cultural competence variable was moderate in terms of practical significance ($R_c^2 = .18$)
Table 5

*Standardised Canonical Correlation Analyses Results for the First Canonical Function Variates (N = 304)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variate/variables</th>
<th>Canonical coefficients (weights)</th>
<th>Canonical loading (Rc) (structure correlations)</th>
<th>Canonical cross-loadings</th>
<th>Shared variance</th>
<th>Redundancy Index (percentage of overall variance of variables explained by the opposite canonical variate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average canonical loading squared</td>
<td>Overall Rc² (canonical root)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(percentage of overall variance of variables explained by their own canonical variate)</td>
<td>(percentage of overall variance in the dependent variate accounted for by the independent variate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Set of independent variables: CFSEI-AD, AES, MBTI</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CFSEI-AD (self-esteem)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.60 (.36)</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social / peer self-esteem</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.46 (.21)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-esteem</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.50 (.25)</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie items</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.40 (.16)</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AES (emotional intelligence)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of emotion</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.77 (.59)</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own emotions</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.82 (.67)</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing others’ emotions</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.77 (.59)</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation of emotions</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.47 (.22)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTI (personality preferences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.16 (.03)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.33 (.11)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.13 (.02)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11 (.01)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.05 (.003)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.03 (.001)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.01 (.0001)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.09 (.008)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent canonical variate: Personality attributes .20++ .53+++ .11+

Set of dependent variables: Employability attributes (EAS)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career self-management</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.67 (.45)</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.43 (.18)</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.59 (.35)</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career resilience</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.84 (.71)</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.76 (.58)</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial orientation</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.69 (.48)</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.81 (.66)</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional literacy</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.89 (.79)</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent canonical variate: general employability attributes .52+++ .53+++ .28+++  
+ $R_c^2 \leq .12$ (small practical effect size)  ++ $R_c^2 \geq .13 \leq .25$ (moderate practical effect size)  + ++ $R_c^2 \geq .26$ (large practical effect size)
In terms of practical significance, the magnitude of the relationship between the two canonical variate constructs is measured by the redundancy index. Ideally, the higher the redundancy the higher the percentage of variance accounted for by the independent variate in the dependent set of original variables and vice versa. Table 5 shows that the personal attribute canonical variate construct was able to predict 28% (large practical effect) of the variance in the individual original EAS (employability attributes) variables. The general employability attributes canonical variate construct was able to predict only 11% (small practical effect) of the variance in the individual original CFSEI-AD, AES and MBTI variables. These results indicate the personal attribute canonical variate construct as a strong predictor of the general employability attributes construct.

Each canonical variate construct was also a strong predictor of its own construct variables. The personality attributes canonical variate construct explained 20% (moderate practical effect) of the variance in the individual original CFSEI-AD, AES and MBTI variables while the general employability attributes canonical variate construct explained 52% (very large practical effect) of the variance in the individual original EAS variables.

The large percentage of shared variance between the two canonical variate constructs ($R^2_c = .53$) points to the importance of the variables measured by each variate construct in assessing the practical significance of the overall relationship. More specifically, the cross-loadings showed that the AES emotional intelligence variables (perceiving emotions, managing own emotions, and managing others’ emotions) contributed the most in explaining the variance in the general employability attributes canonical variate construct ($R^2_c \geq .30 - .35$; large practical effect). The contribution of the CFSEI-AD self-esteem variables (general self-esteem, social/peer self-esteem and personal self-esteem) and AES utilisation of emotions variable was moderate to small in terms of practical significance ($R^2_c \geq .11 \leq .17$) in explaining the variance in the general employability attributes canonical variate construct. The contribution of the MBTI extraverted (E) preference was very small ($R^2_c = .06$) in explaining the variance in the general employability attributes canonical variate construct.

The EAS emotional literacy, career resilience, proactivity and sociability variables exhibited the highest correlations with the personality attribute canonical variate construct. In terms of practical significance, the contribution of these variables in explaining the variance in the personality attributes canonical variate construct was large ($R^2_c \geq .30 \leq .42$). The contribution of
the EAS variables entrepreneurial orientation, career self-management and self-efficacy was moderate in terms of practical significance in explaining the variance in the personality attributes canonical variate construct ($R^2 \geq .25 \leq .18$). The contribution of the EAS variable cultural competence was of little practical significance ($R^2 = .10$).

**Structural equation modelling (SEM) analysis**

On the grounds of the canonical analysis, three structural equation models were investigated.

The initial baseline model (as shown in Table 6) had only a marginal fit to the data with a chi-square of 14057.15 (6091 df); $CMIN/df = 2.31$; $p = .000$; NFI = .40; RFI = .37; IFI = .54; TLI = .51; CFI = .53 and RMSEA = .07. Apart from the literature fit measures, the significance of the estimated regression coefficients between the independent (personality attributes) variables and the dependent (employability attributes) variables in the structural part of model 1 were also considered. With the exception of the social self-esteem variable ($p = .404$) and all social self-esteem items, all the coefficients between the variables are significant at the 5% level of significance. Although the highly significant chi-square measure for the model indicates a poor fit, given the large sample size, it would be incorrect to conclude a poor fit based on the significance of the chi-square index only (Garson, 2008). The alternative indices all indicate a mediocre fit. Based on the low item reliability of both cultural competence and self-efficacy, these two variables were removed from model 1 in order to investigate a better fit model.

The second model showed a 41% improvement in the data fit (NFI = .41) and the fit was still marginal: chi-square = 11448.05 (4938 df); $CMIN/df = 2.32$; $p = .000$; RFI = .38; IFI = .55; TLI = .52; CFI = .54, RMSEA = .07 and change CMIN of 2609. The results some improvement in the model fit. With the exception of the social self-esteem variable ($p = .433$) and all social self-esteem items, all the coefficients between the variables are significant at the 5% level of significance. The alternative indices all indicate a moderate fit. Based on the low item reliabilities of the various constructs and low reliabilities of the constructs of cultural competence, self-efficacy and emotional literacy, these variables were removed from model 2 in order to test a model with a better fit.

As shown in 6, although the third model showed a 94% improvement in the model (NFI = .94), the fit was still marginal with a chi-square of 127.51 (41 df); $CMIN/df = 3.11$; $p = .000$; RFI = .92; IFI = .96; TLI = .94; CFI = .96, RMSEA = .08, change CMIN = 1132.54 and SRMR = .05. Apart from the fit statistics, the magnitude of the standardised path coefficient estimates
between the independent and the dependent variables in the structural part of model 3 (provided in figure 8.2) were also considered. All standardised path coefficients were significant at the 5% level of significance ($p \leq .001$).

Figure 1 specifies the standardised path coefficient estimates between the personality attributes construct and its variables, and the standardised path coefficients estimates between the employability attributes construct and its variables. The standardised path coefficient estimates between the personality attributes construct and the employability attributes construct are also specified.

The model fit (shown in figure 1) revealed that the model (model 3) explains 58% ($R^2 = .58$) of the variance in the employability attributes construct. In terms of relative importance, the variance in the employability attributes construct is mostly explained by proactivity (85%), career self-management (72%), career resilience (72%), entrepreneurial orientation (71%) and sociability (49%). The variance in the personality attributes construct is mostly explained by emotional intelligence (80%) and only 28% by self-esteem. The variance in emotional intelligence is mostly explained by managing own emotions (69%), managing others’ emotions and perception of emotion (43%). The variance in self-esteem is mostly explained by general self-esteem (99%), personal self-esteem (54%) and social/peer self-esteem (29%).

Model 3 was accepted as best model fit (marginal). The results provided supportive evidence for hypothesis Ha4 (The theoretically hypothesised career meta-competency model has a good fit with the empirically manifested structural model).
Table 6

Confirmatory Factor Analysis comparing the three hypothesised Structural Equation Models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>CMIN</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>CMIN/df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>RFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>∆CMIN</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14057.15</td>
<td>6091</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11448.05</td>
<td>4938</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2609.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>127.51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1132.54</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CMIN(χ²) = chi-square; df = degrees of freedom; p = significance level; NFI = Bentler-Bonett normed fit index; RFI = relative fit index; TLI = non-normed fit index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation. SRMR = standardised root-mean-square residual.
Figure 8.2. Structural Equation Model 3 with standardised path coefficient estimates

Note: All standardised path coefficient estimates *** $p \leq .001$. Squared multiple correlations ($R^2$) shown in brackets.
Discussion

Overall the results suggest that personality attributes (self-esteem and emotional intelligence) are significantly and positively related to general employability attributes. These results corroborate research findings by Ashkanansy and Daus (2002), Ciarrochi et al. (2000), Cole et al. (2009), Higgs (2001), Orth et al. (2010), Pool and Sewell (2007); Schutte et al. (2002) and Yorke and Knight (2004). Emotional intelligence and general self-esteem seem to explain the biggest correlation between the personality attributes and general employability attributes constructs. This suggest that those participants who are able to perceive their own emotions, manage their own and others’ emotions and utilise their emotions seem to display higher confidence in demonstrating their employability attributes. In addition, the participants with a high level of general self-esteem, that is, those who have a high perception of their own self-worth, seem to have higher levels of confidence in demonstrating employability attributes.

It seems as if personality preferences do not play a significant role in the participants’ ability to demonstrate their employability attributes. This is line with the findings of Cole et al. (2009), who also found that personality is only partly responsible for explaining career behaviour and therefore employability attributes. Only extraversion seemed to influence the participants’ ability to demonstrate employability attributes. This is in line with the findings of Barick and Mount (1991) and Rothmann and Coetzer (2003), who also found that extraverted individuals (as opposed to introverted individuals) tend to demonstrate higher levels of job performance and career management, therefore also the ability to demonstrate high levels of employability attributes.

In addition, the results showed that emotional literacy, career resilience, proactivity, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation, career self-management and self-efficacy (as a set of employability attributes) contributed the most towards the general employability attributes construct.

Based on the canonical and structural equation modelling, it seems as if general self-esteem, social self-esteem, personal self-esteem, perception of emotions, managing own emotions and managing others’ emotions should be developed in order to increase the participants’ employability attributes. Furthermore, career self-management, career resilience, sociability, entrepreneurial orientation and proactivity seem to be the most important attributes to consider in career counselling and career development. These constructs therefore need to be developed to help the sample of participants to proactively
manage their career development and sustain their employability in the contemporary world of work.

It can be concluded that the empirical models derived from the canonical correlation analyses and structural equation model provide useful pointers in terms of the career meta-competencies that need to be considered in counselling employees in the early career development stage of their lives.

**Limitations and future research**

Since the present study was limited to predominantly early career black females employed in the business management field, the findings cannot be generalised to other occupational, gender and race contexts. Furthermore, given the exploratory nature of the research design, this study cannot yield any statements about causation. Relationships between the variables have therefore been interpreted rather than established. These findings therefore need to be replicated with broader samples across various sectors before more extensive conclusions can be drawn about the relationship between the constructs of concern in this study. Longitudinal studies are also recommended to investigate the relationship between individuals’ personality and employability attributes and the way these influence the career development and employability of individuals over time.
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