ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS

ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM

The Effect of Learning Agility on Job Performance and Job Satisfaction and Moderating Role of Personal Traits

Mine Öztürk

118630015

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gergely Czukor

ISTANBUL

2021

The Effect of Learning Agility on Job Performance and Job Satisfaction and Moderating Role of Personal Traits

Öğrenme Çevikliğinin İş Performansı ve İş Tatmini Üstündeki Etkisi ve Kişilik Özelliklerinin Moderatör Etkisi

Mine Öztürk

118630015

Tez Danışmanı:	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gergely Czukor İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi	(İmza): ……
Jüri Üyesi:	Doç. Dr. İdil Işık İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi	(İmza): ……
	Prof. Dr. Güler İslamoğlu Marmara Üniversitesi	(İmza): ……

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih : 24.10.2021
Toplam Sayfa Sayısı : 76

Anahtar Kelimeler:

1) Öğrenme Çevikliği
2) İş Tatmini
3) İş Performansı
4) Beş Kişilik Özelliği
5) Yetenek Yönetimi

Keywords:

1) Learning Agility
2) Job Satisfaction
3) Job Performance
4) Big Five Personal Traits
5) Talent Management

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

At first place, I would like to thank to my thesis advisor Dr. Gergely Czukor for his guidance and for sharing his knowledge and experience with me with great patience during my thesis. And also, I would like to thank my professor Assoc.Prof. İdil Işık, who has supported me in many fields since I started this master's degree and has shed light with her knowledge and experience.

I am incredibly grateful to Dr. Ecmel Ayral, who give me courage for everything I do. He was the one who makes me start this program.

I also want to thanks to my dear friend Ahmed Sulaiman for his endless support to complete this thesis and everything he did in my life.

I must add my family here starting with my mother and father, Gülizar and Cuma Ali Öztürk, and also my brother Murat Öztürk and his wife Bahar Öztürk. They have believed in me and also give great patience and care.

I want to say the most significant and most special thanks to my daughter Eylül Naz Altun for her patience during this master program. I couldn't be able to do anything without her support.

TEŞEKKÜRLER

Öncelikle tez danışmanım Dr. Gergely Czukor'a tezim boyunca yol gösterdiği, bilgi ve deneyimlerini büyük bir sabırla benimle paylaştığı için teşekkür ederim. Ayrıca hocam Doç.Dr. İdil Işık'a bu yüksek lisansa başladığımdan beri birçok alanda bana destek olduğu, bilgi ve tecrübesiyle bana ışık tuttuğu için teşekkür ederim.

Yaptığım her şey için bana cesaret veren Dr. Ecmel Ayral'a da çok teşekkür ederim. Beni bu programı başlatan kişi oydu.

Bu tezi tamamlamamdaki sonsuz desteği ve hayatımda yaptığı her şey için sevgili dostum Ahmed Süleyman'a çok minnettarım.

Son olarak bana inanan, büyük sabır ve özen gösteren aileme, annem Gülizar Öztürk'e, babam Cuma Ali Öztürk'e ve ayrıca kardeşim Murat Öztürk ve eşi Bahar Öztürk'e teşekkür ederim.

Bu yüksek lisans programında gösterdiği sabır için kızım Eylül Naz Altun'a en büyük ve en özel teşekkürlerimi sunmak istiyorum. Onun desteği olmadan hiçbir şey yapamazdım.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments iii
Teşekkürler iv
Table of Contents v
List of Abbreviations viii
List of Figures ix
List of Tables x
Abstract xi
Özet xii

INTRODUCTION..... 1

1.1 Learning Agility..... 4
1.2 Job Satisfaction 6
1.3 Job Performance..... 7
1.4 Big Five Personality Traits 9
1.4.1 Openness To Experience 11
1.4.2 Conscientiousness.....12
1.4.3 Extraversion 13
1.4.4 Agreeableness 14
1.4.5 Neuroticism (Emotional Stability) 15

SECTION 1 - METHODS 16

2.1 Participants 17
2.2 Procedure 18
2.3 Measures 19
2.3.1 Learning Agility 19
2.3.2 Job Satisfaction 20
2.3.3 Job Performance 20
2.3.4 Big Five Personality Traits 21
2.3.5 Demographic Form 21

SECTION 2 – RESULTS 22

3.1 Reliability Statistics 24
3.2 Job Performance Factor Analysis 24
3.3 Group Differences by Level 28
3.4 Correlation Analysis 29
3.5 MANOVA 31
3.6 Moderation Analysis 32

SECTION 3 - DISCUSSION 35

4.1 The Limitation of the Study 38
4.2 Practical Implications 38
4.3 Future Research 39
4.4 Conclusion 39

REFERENCES 41

APPENDIX 53

Appendix A: Learning Agility Scale (Turkish) 53
Appendix B: Learning Agility Scale (English) 54
Appendix C: Job Satisfaction Scale (Turkish) 55
Appendix D: Job Satisfaction Scale (English) 56
Appendix E: Job Performance Scale (Turkish)..... 57
Appendix F: Job Performance Scale (English)……..... 58
Appendix G: Big Five Personal Traits Scale (Turkish)..... 59
Appendix H: Big Five Personal Traits Scale (English) 60
Appendix I: Demographic Form (Turkish) 61
Appendix J: Demographic Form (English) 62
Appendix K: Informed Consent Form (Turkish) 63
Appendix L: Informed Consent Form (English) 64
Appendix M: Result of Evaluation by Ethics Committee..... 65

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BFPT	Big Five Personality Traits
CP	Contextual Performance
IWP	Individual Work Performance Questionnaire
KMO	Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin
MJSS	Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale
OCB	Organizational Citizenship Behaviors
TP	Task Performance

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Hypothesis model …..…….....…..……..… 16

Figure 3.6.1. Moderation effect of emotional stability …….…...… 33

Figure 3.6.2. Moderation effect of extraversion ……...……..…..… 34

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Demographic Characteristics 18

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics 23

Table 3.1. Reliability Statistics of Scales 24

Table 3.2.1. KMO and Bartlett's Test of Job Performance Scale 25

Table 3.2.2. Total Variance Explained of Job Performance Scale 26

Table 3.2.3. Component Matrix of Job Performance Scale 27

Table 3.3.1. Normality Tests 28

Table 3.3.2. Kruskal-Wallis Tests for Education Level, Experience and Age 29

Table 3.4. Correlational Relationships Between Variables 30

Table 3.4. Significant and Marginally Significant Tests..... 32

Table 3.6. Moderation Analysis 32

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to investigate the effects of learning agility on job satisfaction and job performance, in light of the moderating roles of personality traits on these relationships. Following this purpose, quantitative research was carried out among 116 participants working in different sectors. In the study, the Learning Agility Scale, the Job Satisfaction Scale and the Job Performance Scale was used. Also, personality data were collected for each participant. Personality traits were measured by the Big Five Personality Traits inventory.

Learning Agility scores were calculated and correlated with participants' job performance and job satisfaction. Then personality traits' moderation role in those relationship was examined. The study revealed that learning agility highly correlated with job satisfaction and job performance. However, MANOVA analyses indicated that Learning Agility was significantly predictive only for job satisfaction. Further analyses identify that only emotional stability and extraversion have a moderation effect.

The study showed that, learning agility will play a helpful role in companies' processes of finding, hiring, and retaining talent. In the following processes, companies' hiring individuals with high learning agility will also ensure high job satisfaction and job performance of these individuals.

Keywords: Learning Agility, Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, Big Five Personal Traits, Talent

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı, öğrenme çevikliğinin, iş tatmini ve iş performansı üzerindeki etkisini ve kişilik özelliklerinin bu ilişkiler üstündeki moderatör etkisini analiz etmekti. Bu amaç doğrultusunda farklı sektörlerde çalışan 116 katılımcı ile nicel araştırma yapılmıştır. Araştırmada Öğrenme Çevikliği Ölçeği, İş Doyumu Ölçeği ve İş Performansı Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Ayrıca her bir katılımcı için kişilik verileri toplanmıştır. Kişilik özellikleri, Beş Büyük Kişilik Özelliği envanteri ile ölçülmüştür.

Çalışmada öncelikle, Öğrenme Çevikliği puanları hesaplanmış ve katılımcıların iş performansı ve iş tatmini ile ilişkisine bakılmıştır. Daha sonra kişilik özelliklerinin bu ilişkilerdeki düzenleyici rolü incelenmiştir. Çalışma, öğrenme çevikliğinin iş tatmini ve iş performansı ile yüksek oranda ilişkili olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bununla birlikte, çoklu regresyon analizleri, Öğrenme Çevikliğinin yalnızca iş tatminini önemli ölçüde öngördüğünü göstermiştir. Daha ileri analizler, yalnızca duygusal istikrarın ve dışa dönüklüğün bu ilişkiler üstünde bir etkiye sahip olduğunu göstermiştir.

Çalışma, öğrenme çevikliğinin şirketlerin yetenekleri bulma, işe alma ve elde tutma süreçlerinde yardımcı bir rol oynayacağını göstermiştir. İlerleyen süreçlerde şirketlerin öğrenme çevikliği yüksek kişileri işe almaları da bu kişilerin iş doyumunun ve iş performansının yüksek olmasını sağlayacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğrenme Çevikliği, İş Tatmini, İş Performansı, Beş Büyük Kişisel Özelliği, Yetenek

INTRODUCTION

Agility has become popular concept of research in recent years, (Beck et al., 2001; Bennett et.al., 2014; Hosking, 2018; Millar et al., 2018; Rigby et al., 2015). It has emerged for more risk-free execution of project management methodologies of the software world. However, it turned out that agility has an essential place in risk prevention and fast, flexible, and creative action (Sutherland et al., 2106). Agility is applied in various areas, and one of them is learning agility, recently considered by human resources professionals and managers in recruitment and selection (Mathis et al., 2010). High quality recruitment and selection procedures help organizations find employees based on the skills and qualifications the company needs to fill available vacancies. This process is the first step for organizations to move forward with talented employees. In short, the correct design of the selection process supports the company in hiring the right people (Nur et al., 2019).

Retaining talent has become increasingly important in businesses, in addition to finding the right candidates. The primary reasons for this are the growing work force, unemployment, and challenges in training skilled employees in the market. Also, rapid technical advancements enhanced the quality of graduate education and its methods. These changes have given rise to a young generation with increased capacity in creative thinking, practical innovative skills, and cooperative spirit (Whysall et al., 2019; Ott et al. 2018). Both the technological developments, and rapidly increasing number of young people graduated from university increased access to talent, and on the other hand, made it difficult for companies to find young people suitable for the positions they really seek (Li & Gao, 2009). The two main reasons for this are the rapid change in competencies and the increase in the number of universities and the decrease in the quality of education received by graduates. It appears for companies it is challenging find the right talent and keep them for an extended period. At the same time, talents are

in constant need to develop themselves and learn new competencies. Otherwise, the prospect of losing will emerge for both parties. Losing a talent leads to costs for organizations, including the hiring a new talent for that role training, orienting, and further it led to indirect costs, such as losing the organizational knowledge and employee network (Ott et al. 2018). For employees, the stress of job seeking, and the psychological pressure of quitting or firing can create psychological trauma. The literature shows that when the recruitment and retaining processes are designed correctly, companies and employees can establish much longer-lasting relationships (Halifah et.al., 2019). In such cases the company does not want to lose the employee and the employee does not want to leave the company. This creates a win-win situation.

Job satisfaction refers to employees' attitudes toward their work and job performance refers to the extent to which an employee excels in his/her work. While job satisfaction indicates duration, desire, and motivation of the talent in the organization, job performance is one of the important criteria that determines how long the talent will be retained. Hiring candidates with the potential of high job satisfaction and job performance will increase the success of the current company and decrease turnover rate (Karan & Rahman; 2014). In the literature, it has been shown that salary, career advancement, environment, colleagues, job and psychological security, company image, leadership, collaboration, development opportunities, communication, motivation, training, and empowerment are the factors that improve job satisfaction. (Chien J., 2015; Tran et. al., 2015; Uddin et.al., 2016) For improving job performance, self-efficacy, job satisfaction, engagement, citizenship behaviors seem to be the most important factors (Maslach et. al., 2008; Rai et. al., 2018).

In the present study, I focus on learning agility as a predictor of job performance and satisfaction, thus I attempt to draw attention to learning agility as factor to consider both in terms of attracting and retaining talents. Learning agility is the ability to be resilient, adapt with ease and learn from experience in order to be successful (Lombardo et. al., 2000). Employees with high learning agility are flexible, calm, and relaxed in the face of challenging situations. They also make decisions faster than those

who have low levels of learning agility. These individuals view challenging work experiences as opportunities for development (Mitchinson & Morris, 2012).

In addition, according to Lombardo and Eichinger (2000), individuals with high learning agility have high self-awareness and make an effort to get feedback from others to support their own self- development. All these mentioned qualities are seen as important factors for individuals with learning agility to progress in their careers, to show high job performance and to have high job satisfaction. (Anseel, 2017; Mitchinson & Morris, 2012). Research shows there is a positive correlation between workplace learning and job satisfaction (Ryu, et al.,2019). This relationship is argued to resemble to the relation between intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction. In their study, workplace learning affected job satisfaction by providing a source of intrinsic motivation. Based on the literature, it seems that if companies succeed to hire individuals with high learning agility, these new members of the organization will also have high job satisfaction and performance. Thus, they will support the development of the company, make the right recruitment, and reduce the percentage of turnover.

While learning agility is an important characteristic, personality traits may have further implications, as the literature indicates that personality traits can be related with learning agility, job satisfaction and job performance. Barric et al. (2005) found that extraversion and agreeableness have positive relationship with job performance; while conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience have not statistically significant relationship. On the other hand, Judge et.al (1999) suggest that conscientiousness may be the only personal traits affect career success and job performance. Hong TM Bui (2017) made a research 7662 people in United Kingdom with all age groups to investigate if job satisfaction is related to personality traits. His study revealed that extraversion has no significant effect on job satisfaction, on the other hand other factors in big five personal traits like agreeableness, conscientiousness has positive, neuroticism and openness to experience has negative effect on job satisfaction., The purpose of the present research is to contribute to this literature by investigating the relationship between learning agility, job performance and job

satisfaction, and to test the moderating role of the big five personality traits. From a practical point of view, the study aims to provide a tool for companies that they can use in the recruitment process. If companies use the learning agility inventory as a recruitment tool, they can predict that the job satisfaction and job performance of the people they hire will also be high. Thus, while recruiting, they reach employees with both high job performance and high job satisfaction.

1.1 Learning Agility

In past research on learning agility, the study of Lombardo and Eichinger (2000) to identify people with high performance in companies stands out. According to this study, Lombardo and Eichinger stated that the roles of people in managerial positions have changed in an increasingly complex and globalized world, so that individuals in such roles need to be resilient, adapt easily in all situations and learn from experience in order to be successful. The researchers also emphasized that high performance in their previous roles was not fundamentally a factor, and it was very important to understand and learn what new roles demand from their current situation. Based on this, Lombardo and Eichinger defined learning agility as "the willingness and ability to learn new competencies in order to perform under first-time, tough, or different conditions" (Lombardo et. al., 2000). They created a 4-factor structure. Based on this conceptual model, the first factor is *people agility,* it tells us how quickly individuals learn from their experience, how much they know themselves, how positive and constructive are their relationships with themselves and with others, and how calm and flexible they are when dealing with situations that require change. The second factor is *change agility,* it is related with individuals' curiosity for new ideas and their enthusiasm for creating new things and to develop new skills. The third factor is *results agility,* which refers to result orientation even under difficult conditions, and with how such results focused behaviors set an example for other people and build trust in them. Finally, *mental agility* indicates the extent to which employees can apply new perspectives to resolve exiting problems and if they are capable to see below the surface

when encountering organizational problems. Mental agility also relates with individuals' sense of comfort explaining their ideas and act in volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguity situations.

Research indicates that individuals with high learning agility are more comfortable in the face of difficulties (Mitchinson & Morris, 2012), try to learn from their experience for their own development rather than escaping from challenging situations, and implement their learning into practice (De Meuse et al., 2012), and can make connections between their experiences (DeReu, Ashford, & Myers, 2012). Gravett and Caldwell (2016) argued that organizations should provide and sustain a culture of learning agility, besides educating the employees to manage stress, so a great portion of negative influences on job performance could be eliminated. Again, according to Lombardo and Eichinger (2000), people with high learning agility will carry the companies to the future.

According to McCauley (2001), employees with high learning agility are in constant need of learning. They describe both their life and work as "learning experiences" that they take responsibility for and use for their personal development. In addition, these individuals take a proactive approach to all the problems they see. They analyze the problem, focus on the solution, take the initiative, and take action. Finally, these individuals prefer to share with other people what they have learned from their experiences and to maintain critical thinking even in stressful circumstances. They examine their own solution methods and criticize the places where they see problems. Individuals with high learning agility are open to the ideas, feedback, and perspectives of others. McCauley (2001) explains the importance of selecting employees according to learning agility as follows; since employees do not have the competencies they will need in the future while they are at the beginning of their careers, learning agility will guide them to learn these and improve themselves. That is, employees are more likely to develop executive competencies if their learning agility is high.

1.2 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction refers to how individuals working at the workplace feel about their own jobs. According to Dugguh & Denies (2014) and Locke (1976), job satisfaction is a pleasured feeling when someone achieve their job successfully. Spector (1997) defines job satisfaction as the feeling an individual shows towards his/her job. In other words, it shows how much people like or dislike their job. Also, job satisfaction directly increases the motivation of the employees, the quality and efficiency of the work done (Aaron et al., 2015; Seema & Maryam, 2013). This creates a cycle, as employees work better and more productively, their job satisfaction increases, which again produces higher quality jobs. At the same time, this cycle also increases the motivation of the employee. In addition to all these, productivity increases, and turnover rates reduce (Linda and Michael, 2014). Iskandar, Ahmad, and Martua (2014) showed that job satisfaction is a major success factor, and as long as employees enjoy their work and their success is appreciated, they become committed to their companies. Dugguh and Denies (2014) state that companies should attach great importance to the satisfaction and well-being of employees to meet productive and efficient high-performance expectations. Also, organizations can use job satisfaction to retain more experienced, educated, and competent employees, who support the growth and development of the company. (Chih-Cheng et al., 2015; Ahmad et al., 2012; Elizeberth & Zakkariya, 2015; Sarlaksha & Mangadu, 2014; Abu, 2013).

Singh & Jain (2013) explains job satisfaction as emotional responses that people were showing for their current job and for aspects of their jobs. They explain the factors that affect job satisfaction as; policies of compensation and benefit (salary, incentives, etc.), job security (reasonable targets, facility of transfer, etc.), working conditions (working methods, tools, and equipment etc.), relationship with superior authority, promotion and career development (training programs, opportunity use their skills, etc.), leadership styles, work group (group dynamics, need for affiliation, etc.), personal variables, and other factors such as encouragement, feedback, feel like a part of family and use of internet and other technology. When we look at the factors that create job satisfaction, we see that Bontis and Serenko (2007) examined job satisfaction

in four main factors. These; training and development, pay satisfaction, manager satisfaction, and job apprehension. Similar to this research, another study examining job satisfaction under four factors is Garcia-Bernal et al. (2005)'s work. Accordingly, the four factors that emerged: professional development, interpersonal relationships, economic expectations and working conditions.

Many studies revealed that job satisfaction is getting higher when workers see that their skills, knowledge, competencies, abilities develop by learning programs (Ilgen et al., 1979). As learning opportunity in the workplace increases, job satisfaction also increases (Rowden and Conine, 2005; Ryu and Moon; 2019), which has further positive consequences, such as enhanced employees' trust and devotion to the company (Kasim & Ghaffar, 2012). studies reviewed here show that there is a positive link between learning and job satisfaction. Bases on these findings, I predict that learning agility will enhance job satisfaction.

H1: There is a positive relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction.

1.3 Job Performance

Job performance is an important outcome which is among the success factors of organizations, and it also links with other HR functions, such as training, and development. According to Njanja (2013), job performance refers to how employees fulfill their job descriptions/tasks determined by the company. Peng (2014), on the other hand, states that job performance depends not only on the amount of work completed but also on the quality of the work done. Like Peng, Albeiti (2015) states that job performance is related to how long, how intensely and how well the work is done. Javed et all. (2014) described performance as a set of organizational behaviors of an individual that affect the company's goals. Accordingly, the organizational behavior of the employee directly affects the development and growth of the organization. This behavior also affects other employees, resulting in a collective organizational performance.

There are three subdimensions of job performance, including task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive behaviors. Task performance includes the duties of the employee that are specified in their job descriptions and that directly affect the products or services of the company they work for. TP can be either direct or indirect. For example, when employees work on production line to produce the companies' finished goods is direct TP, when their supervisor manage those staff to do their job its indirect TP. In our study we won't separate TP to direct or indirect. Contextual performance, on the other hand, is the task that is not included in the job description of the employees and does not affect the products / services of the company, unlike the task performance. CP is all behaviors and activities performed by employees that feed the social and psychological environment of the company. For example, by changing the work processes in the company, making it better not only for himself but also for all his colleagues. Counterproductive behaviors are harmful behaviors that adversely affect the organization and decrease job performance. These behaviors naturally affect the individual, their colleagues, and the organization. Such behaviors can include non- compliance with business hours, not finishing work on time, gossiping, stealing within the company, and mobbing

Training programs to enhance performance form the basis of companies' HR practices as they nurture and develop the talents and enhance the knowledge and skills of employees (Guest, 1997). As the employee develops through training programs, their job performance is expected to increase. Learning improves competencies and skills of employees and increases their job performance, commitment, and motivation. (Enos, Kehrhahn, & Bell, 2003; Maurer, Lippstreu, & Judge, 2008; Park, 2009; Tsai & Tai, 2003;). Enos, Kehrhahn, and Bell's study (2003) indicates that informal learning via challenging activities, action, and reflection increase job performance. When participants of the training interact with their peers during informal learning, it provides observing, assisting, and copying positive behaviors. As a result, participants start to increase the commitment and social interactions in the organization. According to Bedford's research (2011), learning agility is highly correlated with job performance and advancement potential. De Meuse (2017), and Gravett and Caldwell (2016) argue

that learning agility is the most important factor that helps an individual to predict his/her potential and thus his performance.

H2: There is a positive relationship between learning agility and job performance.

1.4 Big Five Personality Traits as Moderators

The studies conducted on big five personality traits originate from the works of Allport et.al. (1930). The essence of their work was to list all the adjectives denoting personality, put them into a factor analysis, and specify certain personality traits with the results. This study was finalized with the studies of Goldberg (1992) and McCrea et al (2003). As the name suggests, the big five model embraces personality traits in 5 main factors, including openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability (or neuroticism). Ellis (2008) and Dörnyei (2005) describes those factors as, individuals who are *open to experience* are not traditional, creative, imaginative, and curious and resilient. *Conscientiousness* refers to being systematic, organized, and work efficiently people that also hard working and self-disciplined. These individuals are not careless or negligent. *Extraversion refers to* being social with skills of being passionate and active in social settings. *Extroverted* individuals are talkative and not restrained around others. People who have high scores on *Agreeableness* are friendly, kind, generous and forgiving. They are trusted by others as they tend not be critical nor suspicious and have a tendency to cooperate. Finally, individuals who have *emotional stability* tend not to worry or show anxiety and insecurity. They are calm and relaxed, also sometimes can be unemotional.

The five personality traits are widely used in the organizational psychology literature. It is relationship with other approaches has been included in the different studies. Such as studies showing that big five personality traits affect both job satisfaction and job performance. Although there are studies showing the effects of personality traits on job satisfaction, job performance and learning agility.

Many studies investigated the moderator effect of BFPT on various relationships in organizational psychology. Liao (2010) showed that each personality traits had moderation effect on the relationship between job stress and job burnout. In the study of Golparvar et.al., (2012) demonstrated that organizations can use co-worker-based interactional justice and procedural justice for promoting organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) among employees with different level of conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness to experience. In another study, the moderating role of big five personality factors in the relationship between employee morale and work commitment was examined. According to this study, it is evident that the moderator variable plays a major role in strengthening the relationship between the variables. The results showed that high level of extroversion and conscientiousness make the relationship between interactional justice and OCB stronger. On the other hand, low level of extroversion and conscientiousness has no effect on the relationship between interactional justice and OCB. Also, low level of conscientiousness and extroversion makes the relationship between procedural justice and OCB stronger and high level of conscientiousness and extroversion has no effect. On top of that, low level of openness to experience make the relationship between interactional justice and OCB stronger but high level of openness to experience has no effect.

In addition to these, Suri et. al (2019) looked at the moderator role of five personality traits in the relationship between self-efficacy and career choice. According to the study, neuroticism, conscientiousness, and openness to experience significantly moderated the relationship. On the other hand, extraversion and agreeableness were found to be non-significant moderators. In addition to all these, different studies have been conducted on the moderator effect of the five personality traits, not only in the field of psychology, but also in different fields. (Alexandrov et.al., 2010; Apriwandi et.al., 2019; Correa et.al., 2019; Yu et.al., 2020; Majali et.al., 2016; Nyenze, 2017; Spalj et.al., 2016) In this section, I will propose the mechanism of potential moderator effects of personality traits in the light of the available literature and construct specific hypotheses.

1.4.1 Openness To Experience

As mentioned above, openness to experience generally includes characteristics such as not traditional, creative, imaginative, curious, and resilient. These individuals accept changes quickly and focus on solutions rather than problems. In addition, they are inclined to help others. (Ellis, 2008; Dörnyei, 2005). These people tend to have a lot of different interests and they have a curiosity to understand the world around them. That brings a deep feeling for learn new things (Gans et. al., 2019). Topolinsky and Hertel (2109) stated that people with high levels of openness are naturally inclined to try new things, are independent, imaginative, also have high level of job satisfaction. Additionallyi, Judge & Zapata (2015) found a positive relationship between openness to experience and job performance. Importantly, Connolly (2001) found significant correlation between openness to experience and learning agility.

It appears that high levels of openness to experience can create a psychological state in which individuals are motivated to seek out new experiences, such as finding non-routine-based solutions at work. Such a tendency for openness should enable them to have a wider impact of their learning agility. Thus, for individuals with high openness, learning agility will room to influence how people do their work. In contrast, less open individuals are less curious and are closed to change, and their preference for the familiar and routine-based working could interfere with their learning agility capacity to find an application area, and therefore their job satisfaction and job performance will decrease. Accordingly, I predict that openness to experience will positively affect the relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction and also job performance.

H3.1.a: The relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction will be stronger among people who have high level of openness to experience as compared to those who has low level of openness to experience.

H3.1.b: The relationship between learning agility and job performance will be stronger among people who have high level of openness to experience as compared to those who has low level of openness to experience.

1.4.2 Conscientiousness

Individuals with high levels of conscientiousness are systematic, organized, and work efficiently. They have high level of self-discipline and are hard working. At the same time, these individuals are not careless or negligent. (Ellis, 2008; Dörnyei, 2005). Lounsbury et al. (2012) defined that people with high levels of conscientiousness obey company rules, norms, and values. Conscientiousness has direct and indirect effects on performance (Judge et.al., 1999) Their analyses suggest that conscientiousness may be the only personal trait that affect career success and job performance. Further, Hong TM Bui (2017) revealed that conscientiousness has positive effect on job satisfaction. Notably, De Meuse (2017) hypothesized that there is a negative relationship between conscientiousness and learning agility. The researcher argued that individuals with high scores on conscientiousness are more planful, organized and focus on details so they tend to be more tactical. But on the other hand, individuals with high learning agility have a broader perspective and are nonlinear thinkers so they tend to be more strategic. However, De Meuse (2017) found no relationship between conscientiousness and learning agility.

The literature indicates that individuals with high conscientiousness work in a planned and systematic manner and have high self-discipline. As argued in the case of other traits, high levels likely create channels by which their learning agility can have a strong impact on work outcomes For individuals who have low level of conscientiousness, even if they have an agility to learn new things, their tendency of being unplanned and non-systematic would interfere with learning agility to have an impact on job performance and job satisfaction. Accordingly, I predict that

conscientiousness will increase the magnitude of the relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction and also job performance.

H3.2.a: The relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction will be stronger among people who have high level of conscientiousness as compared to those who has low level of conscientiousness.

H3.2.b: The relationship between learning agility and job performance will be stronger among people who have high level of conscientiousness as compared to those who has low level of conscientiousness.

1.4.3 Extraversion

Ellis, (2008) and Dörnyei (2005) describe individuals with high extraversion as social individuals with passion. These individuals are talkative, energetic, and not restrained. With their high level of energy in social settings they can complete more tasks in time, and they are less likely to get exhausted in teamwork as compared to others (Rusting & Larsen, 1998). Completing more jobs, having more energy and high social skills, they have also high job satisfaction and job performance. Judge and Zapata (2015) found a positive correlation between extraversion and job performance. Also, Judge et. al.'s (2002) meta-analysis study, they found a strong correlation between extraversion and job satisfaction, too. Miller's (2018) found a strong relationship between extraversion and learning agility.

People who have high level of extraversion are considered being social with passion, energy, and enthusiasm. Their ability to interact with other people brings them other abilities such as understanding others well and being cooperative. Extroverts can have good relations with both their subordinates and superiors (Raja et. al., 2020). Having strong relations in the workplace implies that extroverts are socially resourceful, which can strengthen the impact of their learning agility on job performance and job satisfaction as compared to the individuals who are more

introverts and are less active socially. Accordingly, I predict that extraversion will make stronger the relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction and job performance.

H3.3.a: The relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction will be stronger among people who have high level of extraversion as compared to those who has low level of extraversion.

H3.3.b: The relationship between learning agility and job performance will be stronger among people who have high level of extraversion as compared to those who has low level of extraversion.

1.4.4 Agreeableness

People who have high scores in agreeableness are friendly, kind, trustable, generous, and forgiving. They are not critical nor suspicious and can cooperate (Ellis, 2008; Dörnyei, 2005). The kindness, generosity, and trustworthiness of people with high agreeableness make their relationships with other people strong. This personality trait enables them to show high empathy towards others. Bui (2017) found a high level of relationship between job satisfaction and agreeableness for each gender category, young and middle age, but non-significant in elder age. According to Tett et al., (1991), agreeableness is one of the important predictors of business performance. When we look at the relationship between learning agility, no statistically significant relationship was found in by De Meuse's (2017) and Miller (2018).

These people, who are easy to work with, friendly, and have a high sense of empathy, seem to be values that companies should hold in their hands. Their competencies make them a commodity that establishes and strengthens relations within the company. These competencies enable them to establish, maintain and strengthen better relationships. Since having high or low agreeableness is a factor that only affects individuals' relationships, it will not open a new field for learning agility and will not change the

areas where learning agility is applied, so it will not change the effect of learning agility on job satisfaction and job performance. Bases on the findings, I couldn't be able to develop a hypothesis, but I want to explore its effect to see if any further research can be done on this.

1.4.5 Neuroticism (Emotional Stability)

Individuals who have high level of emotional stability are calm and relaxed people (Ellis, 2008; Dörnyei, 2005). Low level of emotional stability called neuroticism in literature. With high level of neuroticism people are coping with negative emotions, they have high level of anxiety, depression, vulnerability and even hostility (Costa & McCrea, 1992). With those feelings they don't have the ability to use their time effectively. So, it is hard for them to finish their tasks and duties and it also bring less job performance and job satisfaction. Judge et al (1999) revealed that there is a negative relationship between neuroticism and job performance. Bui H.T. (2017) confirmed this and also found that neuroticism has negative effect on job performance in all gender and age groups. In Judge et. al.'s (2002) study they found a strong negative relation between neuroticism and job satisfaction. Also, they found negative correlations between leadership emergence and effectiveness.

Individuals who have high neuroticism try to cope with anxiety, stress and depression that can diminish their ability in decision-making. Thus, the consequences of neuroticism, such as increased stress and worry, potentially prevents individuals from realizing, their own learning agility, which can reduce the impact of learning agility on job satisfaction and job performance. In contrast, people with high emotional stability can deal with the stressful situations and can make better decisions, which provides more room for learning agility to have a higher impact on job satisfaction and job performance. I predict that neuroticism will negatively affect the relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction and also job performance.

H3.4.a: The relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction will be weaker among people who have high level of neuroticism as compared to those who has low level of neuroticism.

H3.4.b: The relationship between learning agility and job performance will be weaker among people who have high level of neuroticism as compared to those who has low level of neuroticism.

Figure 1. Hypothesis Model

SECTION 1

METHODS

2.1 Participants and Design

The number of participants who completed the survey was 118, including 85 female (73.3%) and 31 male (26.7%. During data cleaning, only 2 participants' data were deleted. Finally, 116 participants were used for data analysis. Participants were recruited by non-probability (convenience) sampling in this research. In this study, the age range was 19 to 65, the mean of age was 33.16 (*SD*=8.33). The study included participants. Only one participant was high school graduated (0.9%). The bachelor's degree participants were 62.1% (*n*=72) master's degree was 35.3% (*n*=41) and PhD was 1.7% (*n*=2) of total data. Participants were recruited from different sectors as automotive, education, FMCG, logistics, information technologies, manufacture, telecommunication, health, insurance, finance, public and consulting. The majority was from education (*n*=18), and information technologies (*n*=10). Participants' work experience was between 1 to 44 years (*M*=10.474, *SD*=8.72).

The study relied on a survey design. The focal predictor was learning agility, the big five personality traits were used as moderators. The outcome variables included task performance, contextual performance, counterproductive behavior and job satisfaction.

Table 2.1. Demographic Characteristics

	n	%
Gender		
Women	85	73.3
Men	31	26.7
Age		
19-29	48	41.4
30-40	45	38.8
41-51	20	17.2
52-Up	3	2.6
Educational Status		
High School	1	.9
Bachelor	72	62.1
Master	41	35.3
PhD	2	1.7
Experience (Total)		
1-5 Years	44	37.9
6-10 Years	29	25.0
11-15 Years	10	8.6
15 Years and Up	33	28.4

2.2 Procedure

Online questionnaire was used as a data collection tool. After having the ethics committee approval, the survey form was shared with the participants via social media (Linkedin and Instagram). The data were collected through Google Forms. The questionnaire was shared with the HR departments of the companies in the researcher's network via email. Applying the snowball method of recruitment, Participants were asked to share the survey with their own networks.

The questionnaire started with a consent form and continued with four main scales and ended with a demographic form. The four measures consist of learning agility, job satisfaction, job performance and five personality traits. Turkish versions of all scales were used. For each measure, a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) was used. All the survey's measures were originally written in English. In previous studies, all scales were translated and validated in Turkish. Appendices A to J contains Turkish and English versions of the surveys.

2.3 Measures

2.3.1 Learning Agility

The learning agility scale used in this study was developed by Yazıcı and Özgenel (2020) referred to as the Marmara Learning Agility Scale. It has 5 factors with 30 items. In their study, the Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) level of this scale is greater than .90 and Bartlett's test value ($p<.05$) indicates the data are normally distributed (George & Mallery, 2016). They also applied exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to the scale. As a result of EFA, a structure with 5 factors and 30 items has been emerged. Based on the related literature they mention in their study, the first factor was named "Agility in Human Relations", the second factor was named "Agility in Creating Results", the third factor was "Mental Agility", the fourth factor was "Agility in Change", and the fifth factor was "Self-Awareness".

The main purpose of this study was to measure the relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction and job performance. Learning agility was used a composite measure in line with Yazıcı et.al., (2020) measured learning agility both with its sub-factors and as composite measure, and the analyzes showed that both uses gave statistically significant results. Learning agility as composite measure helped to keep the study design simple... The Cronbach's alpha score of composite measure test was (α=.94) in Yazıcı & Özgenel (2020) study. In this recent study Cronbach's alpha score was (α=.95).

2.3.2 Job Satisfaction

In this study, Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale (MJSS) was used. This scale has been adapted to many different languages, and validity and reliability studies were conducted (Diaz et al. 1992; Özcan et al. 2007; Ghiselli et al. 2001; Özdevecioğlu, 2003; Hançer et al. 2003; Örücü et al. 2005; Youself, 1998). The scale has two different forms; one is with 100 questions (long form) and the other one is with 20 questions (short form). Each dimension in the long form has five factors but in the short form, there is only one factor remaining (Weiss et al. 1967).

The short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was used in this study, which was developed by Weiss et al. (1967). It is a 20-item measure combining the items related to satisfaction states consisting of internal and external factors from the long form (100 items) of the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale. The measure was validated in Turkish, including an inter-item reliability of .77 (Deniz and Güliz Gökçora, 1985). In this current study Cronbach's alpha was.93.

2.3.3 Job Performance

In this study, Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWPQ 0.3) was used. It's a self-evaluation scale that asks participant about their past 3-month experiences in their daily work life (Koopmans et al, 2013). Koopmans conducted a systematic review of the 58 studies to establish a clear definition and conceptualization of IWP. Koopmans identified potential indicators of IWP after developing a clear conceptual framework. The selected indicators were used to build the first version of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWPQ). Following that, the generic short scales were created (IWPQ 0.2). Koopmans then increased the IWPQ 0.2 to 0.3 by adding items in each dimension, resulting in a 27-item IWPQ. I.

The 18-item IWPQ which is used in this study was established as a result of this procedure (Koopmans, 2014). It consists of 3 factors and 18 items. The factors are task performance (7 items), contextual performance (12 items) and counterproductive work behavior (8 items). Cronbach Alpha values of factors in Koopmans et.al. (2014) study are task performance is (α=.79), contextual performance is (α=.83), and counterproductive work behavior is (α=.89). In present study, inter-item reliability was high for each dimension; including task performance (α=.85), contextual performance (α=.92), and counterproductive work behavior (α=.87).

2.3.4 Big Five Personality Traits

The scale used in this study was developed by Verlmuts and Geris (2005). They used the original scale from Goldberg's (1992) study and improved it. The questionnaire consists of 5 factors: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience. The scale has 30 items. In this present study Cronbach's alpha score were acceptable for each dimension including extraversion (α =.79), agreeableness (α =.88), conscientiousness (α =.85), emotional stability (α =.84) and openness to experience (α =.88).

2.3.5 Demographic Form

Participants were asked to fill a form about their sex, age, educational status, sector, job title and working year. Demographic questions both Turkish and English placed in Appendix.

SECTION 2

RESULTS

The aim of this analysis was to test the relations of learning agility with job satisfaction and job performance; and to investigate the moderating role of personality traits in these relationships. There were three questions that sought to be answered. Is there a relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction? Is there a relationship between learning agility and performance (i.e., task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive behaviors)? Do personality traits have a moderating effect on these relationships? In this chapter, the results of the analysis will be presented which were conducted to answer those questions.

For learning agility, the dimensions of job performance, job satisfaction and big five personality traits' means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis are reported in Table 3.1. To see whether learning agility scores systematically differed by gender, age, working experience and educational status, ANOVA were conducted. Correlation analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between the study variables. To test hypotheses, MANOVA (Multivariate analysis) was conducted assuming that the four dependent variables (job satisfaction, task performance, contextual performance, counterproductive behaviors) covaried. The MANOVA tested whether the composite measure of the four dependent variables were affected by learning agility and its interactions with the personality traits. Additionally, between subject analysis was preformed to test the relative effect of the predictors on the four outcomes. Finally, significant hypothesized interaction effects in the between subject analysis were further analyzed using the process macro (Hayes et.al, 2014).

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Error	Std. Deviation	Skewness Statistic	Skewness Std. Error	Kurtosis Statistic	Kurtosis Std. Error
Learning Agility	116	1,63	5,00	4,0284	0,04719	0,50822	-1,219	0,225	4,020	0,446
Job Satisfaction	116	1,60	5,00	3,7379	0,06460	0,69581	-0,839	0,225	0,922	0,446
Task Performance	116	2,00	5,00	3,8005	0,06431	0,69269	-0,332	0,225	-0,454	0,446
Contextual Performance	116	2,00	5,00	3,9583	0,06452	0,69492	-0,531	0,225	-0,070	0,446
Counterproductive Behaviors	116	1.00	5.00	2,0571	0,07412	0,79833	0,869	0,225	0,756	0,446
Agreeableness	116	1,83	5,00	4,3463	0,05423	0,58407	-1,391	0,225	3,557	0,446
Extraversion	116	1,67	5,00	3,5345	0,07331	0,78958	-0,321	0,225	-0,526	0,446
Conscientiousness	116	1,67	5,00	3,9971	0,07087	0,76328	-0,714	0,225	0,159	0,446
Emotional Stability	116	1,00	5,00	3,6451	0,08015	0,86324	-0,503	0,225	0,128	0,446
Openness to Experience	116	1,83	5,00	4,0287	0,06849	0,73763	-0,558	0,225	-0,059	0,446
Valid N (listwise)	116									

3.1 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach Alpha test was applied to all scales in the research to test the reliability of them. The detailed information shown in the Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1 Reliability Statistics of Scales

	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	M	SD	N of Items
Learning Agility	.949	.950	4.02	.50	30
Job Satisfaction	.932	.933	3.73	.69	20
Task Performance	.854	.858	3.80	.69	7
Contextual Performance	.917	.919	3.95	.69	12
Counterproductive Behaviors	.866	.867	2.05	.79	8
Extraversion	.793	.790	3.53	.78	6
Agreeableness	.881	.889	4.34	.58	6
Conscientiousness	.849	.858	3.99	.76	6
Emotional stability	.836	.837	3.64	.86	6
Openness to experience	.875	.884	4.02	.73	6

3.2 Job Performance Factor Analysis

Jon performance scale which used in the research was tested by KMO Sampling Adequacy Test and Bartlett Test for Sphericity. KMO tests the conformity of correlation between variables of the factor analysis. Since for all scales the KMO score is above 0.50, the sampling efficiency of the scales is acceptable (Durmuş, Yurtkoru and Çinko, 2011). Also, Bartlett Test for Sphericity tests whether the variables of the scales are adequately related with each other. If the p value is under 0.05, there is adequate relation between the variables for applying the factor analysis (Durmuş, Yurtkoru and Çinko, 2011). The results of both tests are given at the below sections of each related scale. The KMO test result of the scale of job performance is .813, and

Bartlett test is also significant (X^2= 2286.916, *df* = 351, *p* = .000). As a result, three factors were defined explaining the 55.975 % of the total variance.

In original scale item there was 7 item in Task Performance and 18 item was in Contextual Performance. The present factor analysis showed that these two items are displaced. But during this research original factors of the scale used. Detailed tables about factor analysis are below.

Table 3.2.1 KMO and Bartlett's Test of Job Performance Scale

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0,813
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2286,916
	df	351
	Sig.	0,000

Table 3.2.2 Total Variance Explained of Job Performance

	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	8,850	32,779	32,779	8,850	32,779	32,779	6,053	22,418	22,418
2	4,202	15,563	48,341	4,202	15,563	48,341	4,728	17,510	39,927
3	2,061	7,633	55,975	2,061	7,633	55,975	4,333	16,047	55,975

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 3.2.3 Component Matrix

	Component		
	1	2	3
I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time.	0,479		
My planning was optimal.	0,656		
I kept in mind the results that I had to achieve in my work.	0,693		
I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work.	0,688		
I knew how to set the right priorities.	0,752		
I was able to perform my work well with minimal time and effort.	0,578		
Collaboration with others was very productive.	0,604		
I took on extra responsibilities.		0,508	
I started new tasks myself when my old ones were finished.		0,740	
I took on challenging work tasks, when available.		0,503	
I worked at keeping my job knowledge up to date.		0,787	
I worked at keeping my job skills up to date.		0,679	
I came up with creative solutions to new problems.		0,736	
I kept looking for new challenges in my job.		0,738	
I did more than was expected of me.		0,788	
I actively participated in work meetings.		0,720	
I actively looked for ways to improve my performance at work.		0,453	
I grasped opportunities when they presented themselves.		0,507	
I knew how to solve difficult situations and setbacks quickly.		0,441	
I complained about unimportant matters at work.			0,737
I made problems greater than they were at work.			0,834
I focused on the negative aspects of a work situation, instead of on the positive aspects.			0,826
I spoke with colleagues about the negative aspects of my work.			0,763
I spoke with people from outside the organization about the negative aspects of my work.			0,795
I did less than was expected of me. I managed to get off from a work task easily.			0,648
I sometimes did nothing, while I should have been working.			0,601
My planning was optimal.			0,481

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

3.3 Group Differences by Level

To examine if the data could be investigated as a whole or whether group differences necessitated the sample being divided for further investigation. First of all, Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test conducted. The results revealed that both gender, age and education levels were not normally distribution. For this reason, non-parametric tests, Kruskal Wallis and Mann Whitney were used. Detailed information about normality tests are below in Table 3.3

Table.3.3.1 Normality Tests

		Kolmogorov-Smirnovb			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Learning Agility Education Level	Bachelor	.136	72	.002	.907	72	.000
	Master	.176	41	.003	.954	41	.095
	PhD	.260	2	.			
Learning Agility Age	19-29	.146	48	.012	.877	48	.000
	30-40	.193	45	.000	.941	45	.023
	41-51	.202	20	.032	.924	20	.119
	51-Up	.349	3	.	.832	3	.194
Learning Agility Gender	Women	.140	85	.000	.921	85	.000
	Man	.138	31	.140	.945	31	.116
Learning Agility Experience	1-5 Years	.122	44	.099	.962	44	.150
	6-10 Years	.182	29	.015	.930	29	.055
	11-15 Years	.179	10	.200	.954	10	.721
	15 Years and Up	.170	33	.017	.828	33	.000

Mann Whitney test was used to analyze whether learning agility differs according to gender. According to this test, learning agility scores did not differ depending on gender. (U = 1306.5 p=.945, z=-.069, r=-.006). For education level, work experience and age

Kruskal Wallis test was used. Learning agility score did not differ depending on any of them. Detailed information about Kruskal Wallis test can be seen in below, in Table 3.3.2

Table 3.3.2 Kruskal-Wallis Tests for Education Level, Experience and Age

	Education Level	Experience	Age
Kruskal-Wallis H	4.007	.903	.486
df	2	3	3
Asymp. Sig.	.135	.825	.922

In sum, learning agility did not change depending on age, gender, education level and work experience. In the following steps of the analysis, there was no need to control for the effects of these variables.

3.4 Correlation Analysis

As predicted in Hypothesis 1 and 2, learning agility hah a statistically significant positive correlation with job satisfaction, task performance and contextual performance. However, learning agility did not have significant correlation with counterproductive behaviors. Also, learning agility had statistically significant correlations with two personality dimensions. It had a positive significant correlation with agreeableness and openness to experience. The correlation between learning agility and extraversion was significant at the level of .05. There is no correlation between learning agility and conscientiousness and also emotional stability.

There was a statistically significant correlation between job satisfaction and job performance factors. There is a positive correlation between job satisfaction and task performance and contextual performance. As expected, there is a negative correlation between job satisfaction and counterproductive behaviors. Counterproductive behavior has a statistically significant negative correlation only with emotional stability. Detailed information about correlations is shown in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4. Correlational Relationships Between Variables (N= 116)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Learning Agility	.									
2. Job Satisfaction	.391**	.								
3. Task Performance	.356**	.305**	.							
4. Contextual Performance	.466**	.433**	.670**	.						
5. Counterproductive Behaviors	-0,118	-.220*	-0,080	-0,160	.					
6. Agreeableness	.309**	.334**	.249**	.361**	-0,077	.				
7. Extraversion	.185*	0,068	0,022	0,027	-0,068	-0,022	.			
8. Conscientiousness	0,129	0,149	.420**	.350**	-0,114	.338**	-0,085	.		
9. Emotional stability	0,042	0,016	0,098	-0,017	-.357**	0,034	0,030	-0,007	.	
10. Openness to experience	.364**	.283**	0,174	.399**	-0,013	.484**	-0,021	.400**	-.211*	.

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

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

3.5 MANOVA

MANOVA was conducted with the aim to test whether the hypothesized main and interaction effects were confirmed on the composite measure of the four outcome variables. The analysis tested the main effect and two-way interaction effects between learning agility and each personality trait. In the main effects, there were no statistically significant results. For two-way interactions, analysis showed that the interaction between emotional stability and learning agility had a significant effect on the composite measure F (4,101) = 2.518, p =.046; *Wilk's* Λ = 0.909, *partial* $\eta 2$ = .091. Beta values of this interaction effect were negative for each outcome: task performance (β=-.091), contextual performance (β= -.192), counterproductive behaviors (β=-.323) and job satisfaction (β=-.91). The rest of the interactions did not have any significant effect on the outcome variables.

Tests of between subjects' effects revealed that the main effect of learning agility was significantly predictive only of job satisfaction (p = .044) but not the performance outcomes. This result did not confirm the binary correlation analysis and indicates that when testing the relative effect of learning agility on the four outcomes, only job satisfaction is affected significantly. The test of the between subjects' effects further showed that extraversion significantly related with task performance (β=-1.420, p = .022) and contextual performance (β=-1.153, p = .054) and emotional stability was a significant predictor of job satisfaction (β=1.317, p = .014). Between subject analysis further indicated that emotional stability has moderation effect on the relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction (β =-.323, p = .014). Further, extraversion had a marginally significant moderation effect on the relationship between learning agility and contextual performance (β=.117, p =. 053).

3.5. Significant and Marginally Significant Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Learning Agility (LA)	Job Satisfaction	1,61	1	1,61	4,17	0,044	0,039
Extraversion (E)	Task Performance	1,91	1	1,91	5,40	0,022	0,049
Extraversion (E)	Contextual Performance	1,26	1	1,26	3,81	0,054	0,035
Emotional Stability (ES)	Job Satisfaction	2,40	1	2,40	6,22	0,014	0,056
ES * LA	Job Satisfaction	2,41	1	2,41	6,23	0,014	0,056
E * LA	Task Performance	1,91	1	1,90	5,40	0,022	0,049
E * LA	Contextual Performance	1,27	1	1,27	3,85	0,053	0,036

3.6 Moderation Analysis

To further investigate the significant interactions, moderated regression analysis was conducted using the process macro (Hayes, 2013). Moderation analysis indicated that emotional stability had statistically significant effect on the relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction, F= 8.20, p=.0001, R^2= .18. Further, extraversion had a statistically significant effect on the relationship between learning agility and contextual performance. Table 3.5. displays the results of these moderation analyses completed in the process macro.

Table 3.6 Moderation Analysis

	Model	Coeff.	SE	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
Job Satisfaction	Learning Agility (LA)	.5594	.1179	4.7454	.0000	.3258	.7930
	Emotional Stability (ES)	-.0007	.0690	-.0106	.9916	-.1375	.1360
	LA*ES	-.2272	.1181	-1.9235	.0520	-.4612	.0068
Contextual Performance	Learning Agility (LA)	.7318	.1184	61.794	.0000	.4972	.9665
	Extraversion (E)	-0.565	.0730	-.7747	.4402	-.2011	.0881
	LA*E	.3136	.1356	2.3122	.0226	.0449	.5824

For job satisfaction, simple slope analysis at different levels of emotional stability showed a significant effect for high level of emotional stability (*t*=2.35, *p*=.02, *ß*=.355), and low levels of emotional stability (*t*=4.66, *p*=.00, *ß* =.747). This result was inconsistent with the hypothesis as it was put forward that high emotional stability would strengthen the relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction. However, contrary to the prediction, low emotional stability was associated with a larger Beta value as compared to high emotional stability, hence, low emotional stability strengthened the relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction. The visualized information about the moderation effect of emotional stability presented on the figure in Figure 3.6.1. Also, tests of highest order unconditional interaction analysis show that, the interaction accounts for 2.71 percent of the variance. (r2 = .027, F= 3.70 p=0.057) Even this is not a significant result, but an effect size indicator, this explains 2,71 percentage of the variables.

Figure 3.6.1. Moderation effect of emotional stability

The second analysis focused on the moderating role of extraversion. Its revealed that extraversion moderates the relationship between learning agility and contextual performance (t= 2.31, p= .02) and also the moderation model is statistically significant (F= 12.86 , p=.000, R^2= .25). Simple slope analysis at different levels of extraversion indicates that each level (i.e., 1 SD below and above the mean for extroversion) was associated with a significant relation between learning agility and contextual performance. However, confirming the hypothesis, the Beta value was larger for extroverts as compared to introverts, high level of extraversion (t= 5.39, p=.00, β =.982), and low levels of extraversion (t=3.26, p=.001, β =.456). The visualized information about the moderation effect of extraversion presented in Figure 3.6.2. Also, tests of highest order unconditional interaction analysis show that, the interaction accounts for 3.56 percent of the variance. (r2 = .036, F= 5.35 p=0.023) This was a significant result and as an effect size indicator, this explains 3,56 percentage of the variables.

Figure 3.6.2. Moderation effect of extraversion

SECTION 3

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between learning agility, job satisfaction and job performance considering the moderating role of personality traits from the big five model. It was predicted that learning agility will have a positive relationship with both job satisfaction and job performance. Additionally, it was predicted that big five personality traits excluding agreeableness will increase the strength of those relationships. Learning agility as a research topic is relatively unexplored in the literature. Existing studies have focused more on understanding and measuring this concept and measuring its impact on other variables. In particular, the effect of learning agility on leadership is frequently mentioned in the literature. Although there are studies on job performance and its effect, its effect on job satisfaction has not been considered until now. In addition, the relationship between learning agility and five personality traits has been evaluated differently in different studies. This study contributed to the literature both by revealing the effect of learning agility on job satisfaction and job performance, and by looking at the moderator role of five personality traits. It put forward an approach to give a different direction to future studies and to conduct deeper research on some issues.

The first hypothesis sought to be answered in this study was "*There is a positive relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction.*" This prediction was confirmed in both correlation analysis and MANOVA. Based on correlation analysis there was a positive correlation between learning agility and job satisfaction. In MANOVA, job satisfaction was the only dependent variable effected by learning agility. These results are compatible with the literature. There were many studies that revealed that when learning agility or experiential learning opportunities increases, job satisfaction

also increases (Ilgen et al., 1979; Kasim et.al., 2012; Rowden et.al., 2005; Ryu et. Al., 2019).

The second hypothesis was "*There is a positive relationship between learning agility and job performance.*" Correlation analysis revealed that learning agility has positive correlation both with task performance and contextual performance. On the other hand, there were no correlation between learning agility and counterproductive behavior. In MANOVA analysis, there were no significant relationship between learning agility and task performance factors. This difference between the two results can be explained by the correlation analysis' focus one-to-one relation between the variables, while the MANOVA provides a between subject analysis concurrently testing the relative effects of the predictors on the outcome. These results are not fully compatible with the literature. In many studies, including De Meuse (2017) and Gravett & Caldwell (2016) studies, it is argued that learning agility is the most important factor that helps an individual to enhance performance. However, in the present thesis study, when controlling for the effects of learning agility on the rest of the outcome variables, there was no relationship between learning agility and task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive behavior.

The moderation hypotheses addressed the moderating role of big five personality traits in the relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction, task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive behaviors. It was hypothesized that openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, and emotional stability would strengthen the relationships. On the other hand, there were no specific hypothesis set with regards to agreeableness and the analysis indeed confirmed that having high or low level of agreeableness has no effect on the relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction and job performance.

The results with regards to the effect of learning agility on job satisfaction indicated that the relationship, opposite to the hypothesis, was getting weaker in response to high

levels of emotional stability. It was predicted that employees with high levels of emotional stability can deal with the stressful situations and can make better decisions, and that will provide more room for learning agility to have a higher impact on job satisfaction. However, the result showed the opposite. The link between learning agility and job satisfaction for employees with high emotional stability weakened. One reason for this result may be that people with high emotional stability are away from anxiety and stress, which affect human life when it is experienced at a high rate, but which has a motivating effect when it is experienced at a low rate. The deficiency in these cases may have created a lack of motivation, leaving no room for learning agility and thus weakening the relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction. The positive side of this finding is that individuals with high levels of neuroticism can mitigate the negative consequences of this personality trait if they also possess high levels of learning agility.

Another confirmed hypothesis concerning moderation included the role of extraversion. The present research revealed that learning agility and contextual performance relation is getting stronger with high levels of extraversion. It was predicted that having strong relations in the workplace implies that extroverts are socially resourceful, which can strengthen the impact of their learning agility on job performance. The other two hypotheses put forward in the study were that openness to experience and conscientiousness would increase the relationship between learning agility and both job satisfaction and job performance. However, the analyzes showed that these two variables did not have any moderator role.

Past research has focused on the main effects of the five personality traits with other variables. By focusing on moderator roles, this study showed that some personality traits can interact with learning agility. Contrary to expectations, the fact that emotional stability has a negative effect is a subject that needs to be investigated in depth. In addition, extraversion, and conscientiousness, which are expected to change this relationship should also be investigated.

4.1 Limitations of the Study

Considering the data obtained, the first limitation stems from the gender distribution of the participants. Participants were predominantly women. In future studies, attention should be paid to the balance of the gender distribution of the participants. Also, a self-report scale was used for job performance. In addition to evaluating individual job performance, a 360-degree performance measurement may provide give more valid results with a study including his/her peers and superiors. In this context, it is recommended to use a 360-degree scale for future studies. A further matter was about sample size. The current study was shared on social media such as Linkedin, although participants from different age groups, education levels, experience levels, different sectors and business lines participated in the study, the number of participants can be increased with different studies. Finally, the educational level of participants was not homogeneously distributed, too. Participants with bachelor's degree was predominant (N=72, %62.1). In future studies, balance of the educational level distribution of the participants should get more attention.

4.2 Practical Implications

Starting point of this research was the importance of material and moral burdens of the recruitment processes for both companies and individuals. Along with these burdens, hiring and placing the right employee in the recruitment processes increases long-term job performance and job satisfaction of the employee. Naturally, this can lead to employees extending their tenure working in the company. The research confirmed that learning agility has a statistically significant effect on job satisfaction and job performance. Based on this result, if the companies use a learning agility inventory in their recruitment processes, it can guide them in their decision-making processes. Hiring

employees with high learning agility will also mean recruiting employees with high job performance and job satisfaction.

4.3 Future Research

In this study, extraversion had an effect on the relationship with learning agility and job performance, which should be tested in future studies to better understand. Also, emotional stability had an effect on the relationship with learning agility and job satisfaction and that can be tested in future studies to better understand, too. Learning agility scores used as a whole not with the factors it had. So in the future, learning agility factors can be added to study and that can be analyzed deeply to understand all factors' effect on job satisfaction and job performance. In addition, the effect of five personality traits on learning agility factors can be examined one by one. Thus, it can be investigated which learning agility factors are affected by personality traits that show a moderator effect. Another issue encountered during the study, and which will guide future studies is the possible mediator role of job satisfaction. This has been observed in the study and analysis, so a separate study on it would be necessary and good to shed light on this issue. Finally, while measuring the learning agility of individuals, it is also possible to look at how much they are willing to learn. Today, in-company trainings are generally compulsory trainings. Therefore, whether the individual chooses the trainings voluntarily or not has a moderator effect on these relations may be the subject of a separate study.

4.4 Conclusion

The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of learning agility on job performance and job satisfaction and to determine the moderator effect of five personality traits in this relationship. The study showed that learning agility was positively related to job satisfaction. Considering the moderator role of personality traits, it was found that emotional stability had a moderator effect on the relationship between learning agility and job satisfaction. Extraversion, on the other hand, affects the relationship between learning agility and job performance as a moderator. However, this positive effect of learning agility is moderated by personality traits and companies should be aware of this, the study showed that, learning agility will actually play a helpful role in companies' processes of finding, hiring and retaining talent. In the following processes, if companies hire individuals with high learning agility, it will also ensure high job satisfaction and job performance of these individuals.

REFERENCES

Aaron D, Arndt Anusorn, Singhapakdi & Vivian Tam (2015),"Consumers as employees: the impact of social responsibility on quality of work life among Australian engineers", Social Responsibility Journal, 11, 98 – 108.

Abu Md. Taher, (2013),"Variations of quality of work life of academic professionals in Bangladesh", European Journal of Training and Development, 37(6), 580 – 595.

Ahmad H. Abu Raddaha Jafar Alasad Zainab F. Albikawi Khulood S. Batarseh Eman A. Realat Asia A.Saleh Erika S. Froelicher, (2012),"Jordanian nurses' job satisfaction and intention to quit", Leadership in Health Services, 25 (3) , 216 – 231.

Albeiti, M. (2015). The Role of Motivation on Employees' Performance: The Case of Victoria Commercial Bank of Kenya. Unpublished MBA, Thesis. United States International University – Africa

Alexandrov, A., Myers, S., & Sen, S. (2010). The moderating effect of personality traits on attitudes toward advertisements: A contingency framework. Management & Marketing Challenges for Knowledge Society, 5(3).

Allport, G.W., and Odbert, H.S. (1936). Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study. Psychological Monographs, 47, (No. 211).

Anseel, F. (2017). Agile learning strategies for sustainable careers: a review and integrated model of feedback-seeking behavior and reflection.Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 28, 51-57.

Apriwandi, Supriyono, & Choirunnisa, A. (2020). The moderation effect of power distance orientation and leadership personality on budget participation and relationship of university performance in Indonesia. Proceedings of the 3rd Asia Pacific International Conference of Management and Business Science (AICMBS 2019).

Barrick, M., Mount, M., & Strauss, J. (1993). Conscientiousness and performance of sales representatives: Test of the mediating effects of goal setting. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 715-722.

Beck, Kent, Mike Beedle, Arie Van Bennekum, Alistair Cockburn, Ward Cunningham, Martin Fowler, James Grenning, Jim Highsmith, Andrew Hunt, and Ron Jeffries. 2001. Manifesto for Agile Software Development. Available online: https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Manifesto-for-Agile-Software Development-Beck-Beedle/3edabb96a07765704f9c6a1a5542e39ac2df640c

Bedford, C. L. (2011). The role of learning agility in workplace performance and career advancement. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy.

Bennett, Nathan, and James Lemoine. 2014. What a difference a word makes: Understanding threats to performance in a VUCA world. Business Horizons 57: 311–17.

Bontis, N., & Serenko, A. (2007). The moderating role of Human Capital Management Practices on employee capabilities. Journal of Knowledge Management, 11(3), 31–51.

Bui HT. Big Five personality traits and job satisfaction: Evidence from a national sample. Journal of General Management. 2017;42(3):21-30.

Chien, J. (2015). The Impact of Change Management on Employee Satisfaction and Engagement, 9(5), 1680–1685.

Chih-Cheng Volvic Chen, Chih-Jou Chen & Ming-Ji James Lin, (2015),"The impact of customer participation: the employee's perspective", Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 30(5), 486 – 497.

Correa, P., Grandón, E. E., Alfaro-Pérez, J., & Painén-Aravena, G. (2019). Personality types as moderators of the acceptance of information technologies in organizations: A Multi-Group Analysis in PLS-SEM. Sustainability, 11(14), 3987.

Costa PT Jr and McCrea JJ (1992) Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) Professional Manual. Odessa: PAR.

Connolly, J. J. (2001). Assessing the construct validity of a measure of learning agility. Doctoral Dissertation. Florida International University, Florida.

De Meuse, K. P., Dai, G. & Swisher, V. V. (2012). Leadership development: Exploring, clarifyıng and expanding our understanding of learning agility. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 5, 280-315.

De Meuse, K. P. (2017). Learning agility-beyond the hype: What science has to say. Minneapolis: Wisconsin Management Group.

DeRue, D. S., Ashford, S. J. & Myers, C. G. (2012). Learning agility: In Search of conceptual clarity and theoretical grounding. Industrial and Organizational Psychology,5(3), 258-279.

Diaz, P. E., Park, J. (1992). The impact of isolation on hospitality employees' job satisfaction and job performance. Journal of Hospitality&Tourism Research, 15 (3), 41- 49.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005) The Psychology of the Language Learner, Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Dugguh, S., & Dennis, A. (2014). Job satisfaction theories: Traceability to employee performance in organizations, IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM) e-ISSN: 2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. 16(5), 11-18.

Durmuş, E Serra-Çinko - Sosyal Bilimlerde SPSS'le Veri Analizi. İstanbul: Beta Yayınları, 2011

Elizerbeth G., Zakkariya K.A, (2015),"Job related stress and job satisfaction: comparative research among bank employees", Journal of Management Development, 34(3), 316 – 329.

Ellis, R. (2008) The Study of Second Language Acquisition. (2nd ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Enos, M. D., Kehrhahn, M. T., & Bell, A. (2003). Informal learning and the transfer of learning: How managers develop proficiency. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 14(4), 369-387.

Gans, S., & Cherry, K. (2019). The Big Five Personality Traits, 5 Major Factors of Personality. Retrieved from https://www.verywellmind.com/the- big-five-personality-dimensions-2795422

García-Bernal, J., Gargallo-Castel, A., Marzo-Navarro, M., & Rivera-Torres, P. (2005). Job satisfaction: Empirical evidence of gender differences. Women in Management Review, 20(4), 279–288.

Ghiselli, R. F., Lalopa, J. M., Bai, B. (2001). Job satisfaction, life satisfaction and turnover intent: Among food service managers. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 42 (2), 28-37.

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. Psychological Assessment, 4, 26-42.

Golparvar, M., & Javadian, Z. (2012). Moderating effects of the big five personality factors on the relationship between perceived organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). European Journal of Scientific Research, 74(4), 527–543.

Gravett, L. S., Caldwell, S. A. (2016). Learning Agility: The Impact on Recruitment and Retention. Palgrave Macmillan: New York.

Guest, D. (1997), "Human resource management and performance: a review and research agenda", International Journal of Human Resource Management, 8(3), 263-76.

Hançer, M., George, R. T. (2003). Job satisfaction of restaurant employees: An empirical investigation using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Journal of Hospitality&Tourism Research, 27 (1), 85-100. ss.

Hayes, A. F. (2013). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach. New York: The Guilford Press.

Hayes, A. F., & Agler, R. A. (2014). On the standard error of the difference between independent regression coefficients in moderation analysis. Multiple Linear Regression Viewpoints, 40 (2), 16-27.

Hosking, A. (2018). Agile leaders balance speed and stability. HR Future 2018: 10–11.

Ilgen, C.D. Fisher, M.S. Taylor (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 349-371.

Iskandar, M., Ahmad, R., & Martua, H., (2014). Factors Influencing Employees' Performance: A Study on the Islamic Banks in Indonesia: International Journal of Business and Social Science 5(2)

Javed, M., Balach & Hassan, F., (2014). Determinants of Job Satisfaction and its impact on employee Performance and Turnover Intentions. International Journal of Learning & Development ISSN 2164-4063, 4(2).

Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J., & Barrick, M. R. (1999). The Big Five Personality Traits, General Mental Ability, And Career Success Across The Life Span. Personnel Psychology, 52(3), 621–652.

Judge TA, Heller D and Mount MK (2002) Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology 87(3): 530–541.

Judge, T. A., & Zapata, C. P. (2015). The person-situation debate revisited: Effect of situation strength and trait activation on the validity of the big five personality traits in predicting job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 58*(4), 1149–1170.

Karan R, Rahman MS (2014). Role of job involvement in job satisfaction, job performance and turnover intention-an empirical study. The Chittagong University Journal of Business Administration, 29: 233-250.

Kasim R. & Abdul Ghaffar C., (2012),"Leadership – style, satisfaction and commitment", Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, 19, 61 – 85.

Koopmans, L., Bernaards , C.M, Hildebrandt, V.H., Buuren, S.van, Beek. A. J. van der, Vet, H. C.W. de, Development of an individual work performance questionnaire

(2013) International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 62(1), 6-28

Li, R., & Gao, S. (2009). Roles of Modern Information Technology in Graduate Training. International Education Studies, 2(2).

Linda D., Michael H., (2014),"Dealing with the “Grumpy Boomers”: re-engaging the disengaged and retaining talent", Journal of Organizational Change Management, 27(4), 660 – 676.

Liao, Y. L (2019). Big-Five Personality Traits as Moderating Effects Exploring the Relationship between Job stress and Job Burnout. International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 8(5).

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger, R. W. (2000). High potentials as high learners. Human Resource Management, 39: 321-330.

Lounsbury, J. W., Foster, N., Carmody, P. C., Young Kim, J., Gibson, L. W., & Drost, A. W. (2012). Key personality traits and career satisfaction of Customer Service Workers. Managing Service Quality: An International Journal, 22(5), 517–536.

Majali, T. A., & Bohari, A. M. (2016). International Review of Management and Marketing, 6(S7), 265–269.

Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2010). Human Resource Management, 13th Edition. In Human Resource Management, 13th ed., 214–216. South-Western Cengage Learning.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early predictors of Job Burnout and engagement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 93(3), 498–512.

Maurer, T. J., Lippstreu, M., & Judge, T. A. (2008). Structural model of employee involvement in skill development activity: The role of individual differences. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72(3), 336-350.

McCauley, C. D. 2001. "Leadership Training and Development." In The Nature of Organizational Leadership. Eds. S. J. Zaccaro and R. J. Klimoski. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. 347-383.

McCrae, R.R. and Costa, P.T. Jr. (2003) Personality in Adulthood: A Five-Factor Theory Perspective (2nd edition). New York: Guilford.

Millar, Carla CJM, Olaf Groth, and John F. Mahon. 2018. Management Innovation in a VUCA World: Challenges and Recommendations. California Management Review 61: 5–14.

Miller S. (2018) Exploring the Concept of Learning Agility (Master's Thesis). https://mro.massey.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10179/15173/02_whole.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y

Mitchinson, A. & Morris, R. (2012). Learning abaut learning agility. Greensboro, N.C: Center for Creative Leadership

Njanja, L. W., Maina, R. N., Kibet, L. K., & Njagi, K. (2013). Effect of Reward on Employee performance: A case of Kenya Power and Lighting Company Ltd., Nakuru, Kenya. International Journal of Business and Management, 8(21), 41.

Nyenze, C. M. (2017). Moderating Effect Of Personality Traits On The Relationship Between Institution Responsiveness And Competitiveness Of Public Universities In Kenya (thesis).

Halifah, R., Uldini, M., & Usman, O. (2019). Effect of Recruitment, Selection, Training, and Placement on Performance of Employee (in ERA Industri 4.0). SSRN Electronic Journal.

Ott, D.L., Tolentino, J.L., and Michailova, S. 2018. "Effective Talent Retention Approaches." Human Resource Management International Digest 26(3):16–19.

Örücü, E., Halaçoğlu, İ. M. 2005. Örgütsel bağlılık, iş tatmini ve güçlendirme (yetkilendirme) arasındaki ilişkiler: Eti maden işletmeleri. Bandırma bor ve asit fabrikaları örneği. Balıkesir Sempozyumu Bildirileri 17-20 Kasım 2005, içinde Balıkesir, 107-113.

Özcan, E. D., Taşkıran, E. (2007). İş tatmini, örgüte bağlılık ve işe bağlılık arasındaki ilişkiler: Bir Turizm İşletmesi Üzerinde Araştırma. Çeşme Ulusal Turizm Sempozyumu Bildirileri 21-23 Kasım 2007, içinde İzmir, 514-523.

Özdevecioğlu, M. (2003). İş tatmini ve yaşam tatmini arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, İ.İ.B.F. 11. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi Bildirileri 22-24 Mayıs 2003, içinde Afyon, 693-711.

Park, Y. (2009). The relationships among investment in workplace learning, organizational perspective on human resource development, organizational outcomes of workplace learning, and organizational performance using the Korea 2005 and 2007 Human Capital Corporate Panel surveys. The Ohio State University.

Peng, Y.P. (2014). Job satisfaction and job performance of university librarians: A disaggregated examination. Library and information research, 36(1):74-82.

Rai, A., Ghosh, P., Chauhan, R., & Singh, R. (2018). Improving in-role and extra-role performances with rewards and recognition. Management Research Review, 41(8), 902–919.

Raja, F. U., Akhtar, N., & Hussain, S. Q. (2020). Exploring perception of professionals regarding introversion and extroversion in relation to success at workplace. Journal of Educational Sciences & Research, 7(2), 184–195.

Rigby, Darrell K., Steve Berez, Greg Caimi, and Andrew Noble. 2015. Agile Innovation. San Francisco: Bain & Company.

Rowden, R. W., & Conine Jr, C. T. (2005). The impact of workplace learning on job satisfaction in small US commercial banks. Journal of Workplace Learning, 17(4), 215-230.

Rusting, C., & Larsen, R. (1998). Personality and cognitive processing of affective information . Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin , 24, 200–213 .

Ryu, G., & Moon, S.-G. (2019). The effect of actual workplace learning on job satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. Journal of Workplace Learning, 31(8), 481–497.

Sarlaksha Ganesh & Mangadu Paramasivam Ganesh, (2014),"Effects of masculinity-femininity on quality of work life", Gender in Management: An International Journal, 29(4), 229 – 253.

Seema Arif & Maryam Ilyas, (2013),"Quality of work-life model for teachers of private universities in Pakistan", Quality Assurance in Education, 21(3) , 282 – 298.

Singh J., & Jain, M. (2013). A Study of Employees' Job Satisfaction and Its Impact on their Performance, Journal of the Indian Research, (IS N: 2321 4155). Vol. N.04, October-December 2013, 105-111.

Spalj, S., Novsak, A., Bilobrk, P., Katic, V., Zrinski, M. T., & Pavlic, A. (2016). Mediation and moderation effect of the big five personality traits on the relationship between self-perceived malocclusion and psychosocial impact of Dental Esthetics. The Angle Orthodontist, 86(3), 413–420.

Spector, P. (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Suri, S., & Sharma, S. (2019). Moderating Effects of Big Five Personality between Self Efficacy and Career Choice among College Students. International Journal of Innovative Studies in Sociology and Humanities, 4(5).

Sutherland, J., Rigby, K., Takeuchi, H (2016). Embracing Agile. Embracing Agile. Retrieved April, 2021, from https://hbr.org/2016/05/embracing-agile

Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (2006). Personality Measures As Predictors Of Job Performance: A Meta-Analytic Review. Personnel Psychology, 44(4), 703–742.

Tran, L., & Thao, T. (2015). Factors Affecting Employee Performance – Evidence From Petrovietnam Engineering Consultancy J.S.C.

Topolinski, S., & Hertel, G. (2007). The Role of Personality in Psychotherapists' Careers: Relationships between Personality Traits, Therapeutic Schools and Job Satisfaction. Psychoterapy Research, 378–390.

Tsai, W. C., & Tai, W. T. (2003). Perceived importance as a mediator of the relationship between training assignment and training motivation. Personnel Review, 32(2), 151-163.

Uddin, M. J., Chowdhury, M., & Yasmin, M. (2016). Job Satisfaction of the Employees of the General Insurance Companies in Bangladesh, 5(1), 7–18.

Vermulst AA, Gerris JRM. QBF: Quick Big Five Personality Test Manual. Leeuwarden, The Netherlands: LDC Publications, 2005.

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center.

Whysall, Z., Owtram, M. and Brittain, S. (2019), "The new talent management challenges of Industry 4.0", Journal of Management Development, Vol. 38 No. 2, pp. 118-129.

Yazıcı, Ş. & Özgenel, M. (2020). Marmara öğrenme çevikliği ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi, geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. Journal of History School, 44, 365-393.

Youself, D. A. (1998). Satisfaction with job security as a predictor of organizational commitment and job performance in a multicultural environment. International Journal of Manpower, 19 (3), 184-194.

Yu, T.-K., Lee, N.-H., & Chao, C.-M. (2020). The moderating effects of young adults' personality traits on social media immersion. Frontiers in Psychology, 11.

Appendix A - Turkish Version of Learning Agility Scale

Sayın katılımcı, aşağıdaki maddelerin doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Bu nedenle size en uygun olan seçeneği işaretleyiniz.

1. Hiçbir zaman
2. Nadiren
3. Bazen
4. Çoğunlukla
5. Her zaman

	1	2	3	4	5
Farklı rollerdeki görevleri yerine getirebilirim.					
Zorlandıkları görevlerde insanlara yardım ederim.					
Önemli projelerde yer almakta istekli olurum.					
Kişiler arası ilişki kurmakta başarılıyım.					
Değişim karşısında rahatım.					
Değişimde aktif rol alırım.					
Yeni şeyler denemeyi severim.					
Eskimiş fikirlere yeni bakış açısı katarım					
Değişim esnasında esnek olurum					
Hızlı öğrenirim					
Karmaşık şeyler ilgimi çeker					
Karmaşık problemleri rahatça çözerim					
Yeni bir şeyler öğrenmeye meraklıyımdır					
Farklı kavramlar arasında yeni bağlantılar kurabilirim					
Problemlerin kaynağını bulurum					
Olayların zıt ve paralel yönlerini bulurum					
Olaylara geniş bir bakış açısıyla bakarım					
Meslektaşlarımla yaptığımız ortak işlerde farkımı gösteririm					
Verilen görevleri meslektaşlarımdan daha kısa sürede yerine getiririm					
Problemler karşısında kendimi ve meslektaşlarımı motive ederim					
Doğru kararları hızlı verebilirim					
Nasıl bir performans sergileyeceğimi bilirim					
Başarısız olduğum durumlarda harekete geçerim					
Kendimi tanırım					
Becerilerimi, güçlü ve zayıf yönlerimi bilirim					
Deneyim edinmek için gayret gösteririm					
Zorluklarla baş başa kaldığımda duygularımı yönetebilirim					
Duygularımı değerlendirebilirim					

Appendix B - English Version of Learning Agility Scale

Dear participant, the following items do not have right or wrong answers. Therefore, please mark the option that best suits you.

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Sometimes
4. Mostly
5. Always

	1	2	3	4	5
I can fulfill tasks in different roles.					
I can help people with difficult tasks.					
I would be willing to take part in important projects.					
I am successful in establishing interpersonal relationships.					
I am comfortable with change.					
I take an active role in change.					
I like to try new things.					
I bring a new perspective to old ideas.					
I am flexible during change					
I learn fast					
Complex things intrigue me					
I solve complex problems comfortably					
I am curious to learn something new					
I can make new connections between different concepts					
I can find the source of the problems					
I can find the opposite and parallel sides of things					
I look at events from a broad perspective					
I show my difference in the joint work we do with my colleagues					
I can complete the assigned tasks in a shorter time than my colleagues					
I motivate myself and my colleagues in the face of problems					
I can make the right decisions quickly					
I know how to perform					
I take action when I fail					
I know myself					
I know my skills, strengths and weaknesses					
I strive to gain experience					
I can manage my emotions when I am alone with difficulties					
I can evaluate my feelings					

Appendix C – Turkish version of Job Satisfaction Scale

Aşağıda mesleğinizin çeşitli yönleriyle ilgili cümleler bulunmaktadır. Her cümleyi dikkatle okuyunuz. Mesleğinizden, o cümlede belirtilen şekilde ne derece memnun olduğunuzu karşılarına (X) işareti ile belirtiniz.

Her cümleye cevap verirken, "Bu yönden işimden ne derece memnunum?" diye kendinize sorunuz.

1. Hiç memnun değilim
2. Memnun değilim
3. Kararsızım
4. Memnunum
5. Çok memnunum

	1	2	3	4	5
Beni her zaman meşgul etmesi bakımından					
Bağımsız çalışma imkânının olması bakımından					
Ara sıra değişik şeyler yapabilme imkânı bakımından					
Toplumda "saygın bir kişi" olma şansını bana vermesi bakımından					
Yöneticinin emrindeki kişileri iyi yönetmesi bakımından					
Yöneticinin karar verme yeteneği bakımından					
Vicdani bir sorumluluk taşıma şansını bana vermesi yönünden					
Bana garantili bir gelecek sağlaması yönünden					
Başkaları için bir şeyler yapabildiğimi hissetmem yönünden					
Kişileri yönlendirmek için fırsat vermesi yönünden					
Kendi yeteneklerimle bir şeyler yapabilme şansı vermesi yönünden					
İşimle ilgili alınan kararların uygulamaya konması yönünden					
Yaptığım iş karşılığında aldığım ücret yönünden					
Terfi imkânının olması yönünden					
Kendi fikir-kanaatlerimi rahatça kullanma imkânı vermesi yönünden					
Çalışma şartları yönünden					
Çalışma arkadaşlarının birbirleriyle anlaşmaları yönünden					
Yaptığım iş karşılığında takdir edilmem yönünden					
Yaptığım iş karşılığında duyduğum başarı hissi yönünden					
Mesleğimi yaparken kendi yöntemlerimi kullanabilme imkânı vermesi açısından					

Appendix D – English version of Job Satisfaction Scale

Below are sentences related to various aspects of your profession. Read each sentence carefully. Indicate how satisfied you are with your profession as stated in that sentence with an (X) sign.

While answering every sentence, Ask yourself, "How satisfied am I with my job in this respect?".

1. I am not satisfied at all
2. I am not satisfied
3. I am indecisive
4. I am satisfied
5. I am very satisfied

	1	2	3	4	5
Being able to keep busy all the time					
The chance to work alone on the job					
The chance to do different things from time to time					
The chance to be "somebody" in the community					
The way my boss handles his/her workers					
The competence of my supervisor in making decisions					
Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience					
The way my job provides for steady employment					
The chance to do things for other people					
The chance to tell people what to do					
The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities					
The way company policies are put into practice					
My pay and the amount of work I do					
The chances for advancement on this job					
The freedom to use my own judgment					
The working conditions					
The way my co-workers get along with each other					
The praise I get for doing a good job					
The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job					
The chance to try my own methods of doing the job					

Appendix E – Turkish version of Job Performance Scale

Aşağıdaki sorular, son 3 ayda işteki davranışınızla ilgilidir. İşteki davranışınızın gerçek bir resmini elde etmek için, olabildiğince dikkatli ve dürüst yanıt vermeniz önemlidir. Belirli bir soruyu nasıl yanıtlayacağınızdan emin değilseniz, lütfen mümkün olan en iyi yanıtı verin.

1 - Nadiren 2 - Bazen 3 - Düzenli 4 - Sıklıkla 5 - Her zaman

	1	2	3	4	5
İşimi zamanında tamamlanacak şekilde planlamayı başardım.					
Planlamam optimal düzeydeydi.					
İşimde elde etmem gereken sonuçları aklımda tuttum.					
İşteki ana sorunları, yan sorunlardan ayırabildim.					
Doğru öncelikleri nasıl belirleyeceğimi biliyordum.					
İşimi minimum zaman ve çaba ile iyi bir şekilde gerçekleştirebildim.					
Başkalarıyla işbirliği çok verimli geçti.					
Ekstra sorumluluklar üstlendim.					
Eskileri bitirdiğimde yeni görevlere kendim başladım.					
Mümkün olduğunda zorlu iş görevlerini üstlendim.					
İş bilgilerimi güncel tutmak için çaba gösterdim.					
İş becerilerimi güncel tutmak için çaba gösterdim.					
Yeni sorunlara yaratıcı çözümler buldum.					
İşimde beni zorlayarak geliştirecek şeyler aramaya devam ettim.					
Benden beklenenden fazlasını yaptım.					
İş toplantılarına aktif olarak katıldım.					
İşteki performansımı artırmanın yollarını aktif olarak aradım.					
Ortaya çıkan fırsatları gördüm ve anladım.					
Zor durumları ve aksaklıkları nasıl hızla çözeceğimi biliyordum.					
İşteki önemsiz konulardan şikayet ettim.					
Sorunları işte olduğundan daha büyük hale getirdim.					
Olumlu yönleri yerine iş durumunun olumsuz yönlerine odaklandım.					
Meslektaşlarımla işimin olumsuz yönleri hakkında konuştum.					
İşimin olumsuz yönleri hakkında şirket dışından insanlarla konuştum.					
Benden beklenenden daha azını yaptım.					
Bir görevden kolayca uzaklaşmayı başardım.					
Çalışmam gerekirken bazen hiçbir şey yapmadım.					

Appendix F – English version of Job Perofrmance Scale

The following questions relate to your behavior at work in the last 3 months. To get a true picture of your conduct at work, it is important that you respond as carefully and honestly as possible. If you are not sure how to answer a particular question, please give the best possible answer.

1 - Rarely 2 - Sometimes 3 - Regularly 4 - Often 5 - Always

	1	2	3	4	5
I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time.					
My planning was optimal.					
I kept in mind the results that I had to achieve in my work.					
I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work.					
I knew how to set the right priorities.					
I was able to perform my work well with minimal time and effort.					
Collaboration with others was very productive.					
I took on extra responsibilities.					
I started new tasks myself, when my old ones were finished.					
I took on challenging work tasks, when available.					
I worked at keeping my job knowledge up-to-date.					
I worked at keeping my job skills up-to-date.					
I came up with creative solutions to new problems.					
I kept looking for new challenges in my job.					
I did more than was expected of me.					
I actively participated in work meetings.					
I actively looked for ways to improve my performance at work.					
I grasped opportunities when they presented themselves.					
I knew how to solve difficult situations and setbacks quickly.					
I complained about unimportant matters at work.					
I made problems greater than they were at work.					
I focused on the negative aspects of a work situation, instead of on the positive aspects.					
I spoke with colleagues about the negative aspects of my work.					
I spoke with people from outside the organization about the negative aspects of my work.					
I did less than was expected of me. I managed to get off from a work task easily.					
I sometimes did nothing, while I should have been working.					

Appendix G – Turkish version of BFPT Scale

Aşağıda size verilen ifadelerden sizin için uygun olanları lütfen işaretleyin. Örneğin, başkalarıyla vakit geçirmeyi seven biri olduğunuza katılıyor musunuz? Bu ifadeye ne ölçüde katıldığınızı veya katılmadığınızı belirtmek için uygun ifadeyi lütfen işaretleyin

1. Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
2. Biraz Katılmıyorum
3. Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum
4. Biraz Katılıyorum
5. Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

Kendimi ..... biri olarak görüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
Cana yakın					
Yardımsever					
Nazik					
Birlikte çalışmayı seven					
Uyumlu					
Anlayışlı					
Mesafeli					
Sessiz					
İçe dönük					
Konuşkan					
Utangaç					
Çekingen					
Dağınık					
Dikkatli					
Tertipli					
Dakik					
Düzenli					
Sistemli					
Hırçın					
Gergin					
Alıngan					
Kaygılı					
Ürkek					
Endişeli					
Hayal gücü geniş					
Meraklı					
Bilgili					
Yenilikçi					
Sanatçı ruhlu					
Yaratıcı					

Appendix H – English version of BFPT Scale

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

1. Disagree Strongly
2. Disagree a Little
3. Nighter Agree Nor Disagree
4. Agree a Little
5. Agree Strongly

I see Myself as Someone Who…	1	2	3	4	5
Friendly					
Helpful					
Kind					
Likes to work together					
Easy going					
Understanding					
Distant					
Quiet					
Introvert					
Talkative					
Shy					
Timid					
Messy					
Careful					
Tidy					
Punctual					
Organized					
Systematic					
Combative					
Nervous					
Squeamish					
Anxious					
Fearful					
Worried					
Imagination wide					
Curious					
Knowledgeable					
Innovator					
Artistic					
Creative					

Appendix I – Turkish Demographic Form

1. **Biyolojik Cinsiyetiniz : _____**

2. Yaşınız (1) 18-23 (2) 24-38 (3) 39-53 (4) 54 ve üzeri

3. Eğitim Durumunuz (1) Lise (2) Lisans (3) Yüksek Lisans (4) Doktora

4. Çalıştığınız Sektör (1) Telekomünikasyon (2) IT (3) Sağlık (4) Eğitim (5) Perakende

5. Mesleğiniz

6. Çalışma Süreniz (1) 1 Ay – 12 Ay (2) 1 yıl– 5 Yıl (3) 5 yıl – 10 Yıl (4) 10 yıl üstü

Appendix J – Turkish Demographic Form

1. **What is your biological sex? _____**

2. Age (1) 18-23 (2) 24-38 (3) 39-53 (4) 54 and up

3. Education Status (1) High School (2) Graduate (3) Master (4) Phd

4. In Which Sector (1) Telecommunication (2) IT (3) Health Care (4) Education (5) Retail

5. Your Job

6. How long are you working (1) 1 Month – 12 Month (2) 1 Year– 5 Years (3) 5 Years – 10 Years (4) 10 years and up

Appendix K – Informed Turkish Consent Form

Değerli katılımcı,

Bu anket formları İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Endüstriyel/Örgütsel Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Programı'nda danışman hoca Dr. Gergely Czukor ve öğrencisi Mine Öztürk tarafından yürütülmekte olan tez çalışmasına veri toplamak amacıyla hazırlanmıştır. Vereceğiniz tüm bilgiler gizli tutulacak, hiçbir kimse ve/veya kuruluşa verilmeyecektir. Soruları dikkatli okuyarak objektif, samimi, gerçek duygu ve düşüncelerinizi yansıtmanız araştırmanın amacına ulaşması için önemlidir.

Araştırmada yer alan soruların katılımcılar açısından olumsuz etkileri olması beklenmemektedir. Araştırmaya katılımınız tamamen isteğe bağlıdır. Araştırmayı yanıtlamanız yaklaşık 30 dakikalık sürenizi alacaktır. Araştırmaya katılmanız halinde aşağıda yer alan 'Yukarıdaki çalışmanın amacını ve içeriğini belirten bildiriyi okudum, anladım ve araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum.' kısmı açılacaktır. O kısma 'Evet' diyerek çalışmaya başlayabilirsiniz. Çalışmaya başladıktan sonra da istediğiniz zaman mazeret bildirmeden vaz geçebilirsiniz veya cevap vermek istemediğiniz soruyu mazeret bildirmeden cevapsız bırakabilirsiniz. Yarım bırakılmış anketler imha edilecek ve veritabanına dahil edilmeyecektir.

Anketten elde edilen veriler gizli tutulacak ve bilimsel araştırma için kullanılacaktır. Çalışma 20.05.2021tarihine kadar erişilebilir olacaktır.

Anketlere ayıracağınız zaman ve göstereceğiniz özenden dolayı şimdiden teşekkür ederim.

Gergely Czukor – gergely.czukor@bilgi.edu.tr
Mine Öztürk - mine.ozturk@gmail.com

Appendix L – English Informed Consent Form

Dear participant,

These questionnaires are conducted by the Industrial / Organizational Psychology Graduate Program of the Institute of Social Sciences of Istanbul Bilgi University. These questionnaires are prepared to collect data for the application part of the thesis led by Mine Öztürk with her thesis advisor Dr.Gergely Czukor. All information you provide will be kept confidential and will not be given to anyone and / or organization. Reading the questions carefully, reflecting your objective, sincere, true feelings and thoughts are important for the purpose of the research.
The questions in the study are not expected to have negative effects for the participants. Your participation in the research is entirely voluntary. Answering the research questions will take approximately 30 min. If you participate in the research, the section in which below 'I have read, understood and agree to participate in the research' will open. You can start by saying 'Yes'. After you start answering, you can always give up without giving an excuse or leave the question you do not want to answer unanswered without any excuse. Surveys left incomplete will be destroyed and will not be included in the database.

The data obtained from the questionnaire will be kept confidential and used for scientific research. The study will be available until 20.05.2021.

Thank you in advance for your time and attention.

Gergely Czukor – gergely.czukor@bilgi.edu.tr
Mine Öztürk - mine.ozturk@gmail.com

Appendix M – Results of Evaluation by Ethics Committee

ETHICS BOARD APPROVAL

Ethics Board Approval is available in the printed version of this dissertation.