



## PERSONAL EMPOWERMENT AS DETERMINANTS OF ORGANISATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Aisyah Abu Bakar<sup>1</sup>, Mariana Mohamed Osman<sup>2</sup> & Muhammad Faris Abdullah<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>*Kulliyyah of Architecture and Environmental Design*  
INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA

### Abstract

Architects can influence workplace behaviours and manoeuvre workers' emotions through aligning design strategies with human moods. Design sustains organisational well-being through strengthening space occupants' empowerment, leading to better work performances. *Issue:* Existing research has limited empirical evidence on the impact of personal empowerment (PE) on organisational opportunity (OO). *Purpose:* This paper aims to verify the statistical predictability of OO based on PE. *Approach:* Multiple Correlation and Multiple Linear Regression were carried out to assess linear associations and parameters of linear equations to predict OO components based on PE items. *Findings:* OO components were predictable by the majority of the PE items and 'monitoring behaviours to suit with situation' was the strongest predictor of OO.

**Keywords:** organisational opportunity, personal empowerment

## INTRODUCTION

Human interdependence with other humans (HIH) plays a big part in architectural psychology as designers now gain a new set of criteria in improving emotional aspects of spatial designs. HIH is one of the potent causes of subjective sustainable well-being (SSWB). Personal empowerment (PE) and organisational opportunity (OO) are dimensions of HIH. Space qualities have a tremendous impact on occupants' way of thinking, patterns of actions and, thus promote PE, leading to improved concentration, willingness to act, and ultimately, OO. Over time, extensive literature have discussed the positive effect of PE on OO. This paper assesses the statistical predictability of OO based on PE.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Case studies based on articles from selected Asian Journals from the year 2011 onwards highlight conditional factors and potential determinants of OO. Table 1 summarises these findings.

**Table 1** Conditional factors and potential determinants for organisational opportunity

Conditional Factors (Keywords)	Potential Determinants	References
Job security (stability and continuance of one's job), organisational commitment (sense of oneness with organisation), social comfort (feeling of trust with social environment) and quality of work (quality of experience of employees-organisation relationship).	Co-workers involvement and belongingness (willing to contribute, participate, share, volunteer), and sense of responsibility	Sarina & Mohamad Adli (2012)
Financial well-being (ability to meet current and ongoing financial obligation, and moderation in spending (restraining self from excessive expenditure)	Productivity (effectiveness), and self-control (ability to control oneself or desires)	Mokhtar, Husniyah, Sabri, & Abu Talib. (2015)
Time-based constraint (the time demands of one role are incompatible with those of another), strain-based constraint (strain experienced in one role interferes with participation in another role), and behaviour-based constraint (behaviour pattern appropriate to one domain are inappropriate in another).	Emotional intelligence (ability to recognize and react to owns and others' emotions), self-control (ability to control oneself) and social support (perception that one is cared for)	Panatik, Zainal Badri, Rajab, Abdul Rahman, & Mad Shaha (2011)
Work-family conflict (incompatible demands between career and family roles), and personal adjustment (balancing conflicting needs or certain requirements against the surrounding obstacles)	Self-esteem through adaptation (confidence in self-worthiness resulting from one's interaction with others)	(Rashid, Nordin, Omar, & Ismail (2012)
Work ethics (principles that hard work is virtuous and believing in moral benefits of work), and passiveness in taking charge (reluctant to do more than what were minimally required to do).	Organisational commitment (accountability, integrity, teamwork and participation, effort and proactivity)	Salin (2013)
Goal orientation (the ability to take charge and focus on demanding tasks), bravery (courageous character), achievement motivation (the need to success or attaining excellence), and job performance	Dominance (influence over others), openness (frankness), cheerful (optimistic), confidence, and imaginative (inventiveness)	Halim, Zainal, Omar, Hafidz, & Othman (2013)
Job insecurity (behavioural withdrawal, perceived powerlessness to maintain a desired continuity experienced, and concern the possibility of being retrenched in the future)	Optimism (hopefulness and confidence for the future), and confidence in hierarchy and ranks of the organisation	Ho, Sambasivan, & Liew (2013)
Safety culture (an outcome of values, attitudes and behaviours concerning safety in the workplace), safety training, resource allocation and management.	Commitment (dedication), and leadership (guiding and inspiring others)	Ismail, Ahmad, Ismail, &

		Janipha (2012)
Sense of empowerment given to employees in relation to freedom to perform, and positive emotions translated in job satisfaction.	Competence (capability and efficiency) and task meaningfulness	Aziz & Ennew (2013)
Social-oriented achievement (an inclination to achieve a standard of excellence set by significant others (e.g. teachers, parents) that is pursued and evaluated according to the ways and the standards determined by others)	Security (the state of feeling safe) and conformity (behaving in accordance to accepted conventions or standards set by society)	Liem, Martin, Porter, & Colmar (2012)

The findings from the case studies generate three significant components of OO: (i) Fluency and Versatility (OOa), (ii) Encouraging Interaction (OOb) and (iii) Collaborative Engagement (OOc).

**Table 2** Components and determinants of organisational opportunity

Definition of OO	Components	Indicators	Code
Optimism and openness expressed in exchange ideas and encouraging interactions that insinuate hope and positive prospect for the future in the working environment	Fluency and Versatility	sense of clarity and understand of tasks and roles at work	OOa
		flexible in handling different work roles and diverse tasks	
	Encouraging Interaction	sharing the same stance with my co-workers	
motivating and assisting co-workers at their work			
Collaborative Engagement	Collaborative Engagement	cherishing co-workers' accomplishments	OOc
		valuing ideas and suggestions from co-workers	
		being engaged in decision-making process	
		delivering ideas and suggestion constructively	
		sharing skills and knowledge eagerly with co-workers	
		optimistic with the hierarchy at the organisation	

Personal Empowerment (PE) manifests in the opportunity to exercise control, voice and choice with regards to social surroundings. Qualities adhere to PE include (i) self-motivation with regards to goal orientation, autonomy and self-regulation (Fatimah, Lukman, Khairudin, Wan Shahrazad, & Halim, 2011; Chin, Khoo, & Low, 2012; Kok, 2016), (ii) social acceptance and coherence with others (Fatimah et al., 2011; Nesbit, Jepsen, Demirian, & Ho, 2012; Kadir, Omar, Desa, & Yusoff, 2013; Zamani, Khairudin, Sulaiman, Halim, & Nasir, 2013), and (iii) composure, stability and resilience (Sulaiman, Kadir, Halim, Omar, Latiff, & Sulaiman, 2013; Sipon, Nasrah, Nazli, Abdullah, & Othman, 2014).

**Table 3** Determinants of personal empowerment

Definition of PE	Indicators	Code
Self-esteem in taking control over life along with sense of composure to progress in the social environment	setting goals and striving to meet goals	PE1
	striving and working hard even for easy goals	PE2
	monitoring behaviours to suit with situations	PE3
	knowing when somebody is offended	PE4
	ensuring others are comfortable when making deals	PE5
	able to be friendly with distasteful persons when necessary	PE6
	able to work out solutions during stress and difficulties	PE7
	tackling problems efficiently in unexpected conditions	PE8
	feeling energetic for daily routines and activities	PE9
	having hardly distracted and focus mind	PE10

Based on theoretical underpinnings, the research hypothesize that OO components are predictable by PE. The following sections provide empirical evidence the predictability of OOa, OOb and OOc based on PE items.

**METHOD**

A sample of 4,315 was gathered after the data screening process. The Malaysian respondents were given an 11-point Likert scale to respond to questionnaire items which include the components of OO and the ten PE items. Pearson correlation analyses were conducted to observe if there were linear associations between the OO components and PE items. Ensuing correlation analyses, multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to estimate parameters of the linear equations used to predict values of OOa, OOb and OOc from PE items.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

At 95% confidence level, there were statistically significant positive correlations between (i) OOa and each of PE items, (ii) OOb and each of PE items, and (iii) OOc and each of PE items. The null hypotheses claiming there are no statistically significant correlations between (i) OOa and respective PE items, (ii) OOb and respective PE items, and (iii) OOc and respective PE items were all rejected.

**Table 4** Multiple Correlations between PE items and OOa, OOb and OOc

H <sub>0</sub> There is no statistically significant correlation between OOa and respective PE items											
H <sub>0</sub> There is no statistically significant correlation between OOb and respective PE items											
H <sub>0</sub> There is no statistically significant correlation between OOc and respective PE items											
Correlation Strength Threshold (Dancey & Reidy, 2004)											
	0	.1	.2	.3	.4	.5	.6	.7	.8	.9	1
	zero	weak			moderate			strong		perfect	
DV	Stats	PE1	PE2	PE3	PE4	PE5	PE6	PE7	PE8	PE9	PE10
OOa	r	.522**	.511**	.505**	.430**	.463**	.370**	.446**	.422**	.465**	.419**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315
OOb	r	.469**	.503**	.497**	.465**	.493**	.437**	.463**	.454**	.468**	.419**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315
OOc	r	.513**	.533**	.524**	.491**	.535**	.463**	.486**	.479**	.494**	.449**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315	4315
Statistical Interpretation of Multiple Correlation Analyses											
OOa	At 95% confidence level, there were statistically significant and moderate correlations between OOa and (i) PE1 (r =.522, p = .000); (ii) PE2 (r =.511, p = .000); (iii) PE3 (r =.505, p = .000); (iv) PE4 (r =.430, p = .000); (v) PE5 (r =.463, p = .000); (vi) PE6 (r =.370, p = .000); (vii) PE7 (r =.446, p = .000); (viii) PE8 (r =.422, p = .000); (ix) PE9 (r =.465, p = .000); (x) PE10 (r =.419, p = .000).										
OOb	At 95% confidence level, there were statistically significant and moderate correlations between OOb and (i) PE1 (r =.469, p = .000); (ii) PE2 (r =.503, p = .000); (iii) PE3 (r =.497, p = .000); (iv) PE4 (r =.465, p = .000); (v) PE5 (r =.493, p = .000); (vi) PE6 (r =.437, p = .000); (vii) PE7 (r =.463, p = .000); (viii) PE8 (r =.454, p = .000); (ix) PE9 (r =.468, p = .000); (x) PE10 (r =.419, p = .000).										

OOc At 95% confidence level, there were statistically significant and moderate correlations between OOc and (i) PE1 ( $r = .513, p = .000$ ); (ii) PE2 ( $r = .533, p = .000$ ); (iii) PE3 ( $r = .524, p = .000$ ); (iv) PE4 ( $r = .491, p = .000$ ); (v) PE5 ( $r = .535, p = .000$ ); (vi) PE6 ( $r = .463, p = .000$ ); (vii) PE7 ( $r = .486, p = .000$ ); (viii) PE8 ( $r = .479, p = .000$ ); (ix) PE9 ( $r = .494, p = .000$ ); (x) PE10 ( $r = .449, p = .000$ ).

Three (3) multiple regression analyses were carried out to predict the values of each of dependent variables (i) OOa, (ii) OOb and (iii) OOc given the set of PE explanatory variables (PE1, PE2, PE3, PE4, PE5, PE6, PE7, PE8, PE9, and PE10).

**Table 5** Multiple Linear Regression – PE predicting OOa

H <sub>0</sub>							
There will be no significant prediction of OOa by PE1, PE2, PE3, PE4, PE5, PE6, PE7, PE8, PE9 and PE10							
Model Summary							
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson		
1	.590	.348	.346	1.33143	1.756		
ANOVA							
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		
Regression	4066.801	10	406.680	229.413	.000		
Residual	7629.699	4304	1.773				
Total	11696.500	4314					
Coefficients							
Model	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std Error	$\beta$			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	2.842	.127		22.381	.000	2.593	3.091
PE1	.192	.020	.206	9.487	.000	.152	.231
PE2	.074	.023	.075	3.201	.001	.029	.119
PE3	.133	.020	.136	6.557	.000	.094	.173
PE4	.022	.021	.021	1.011	.312	-.020	.064
PE5	.108	.021	.109	5.127	.000	.067	.149
PE6	-.024	.020	-.023	-1.210	.226	-.063	.015
PE7	.067	.023	.069	2.977	.003	.023	.111
PE8	-.071	.024	-.074	-2.957	.003	-.118	-.024
PE9	.110	.023	.116	4.740	.000	.065	.156
PE10	.060	.019	.068	3.227	.001	.023	.096

A multiple regression was generated to predict OOa based on PE items. R value of .590 indicated an acceptable level of prediction ( $R > 0.5$ ). The Durbin-Watson statistic was 1.756 which is between 1.5 and 2.5 and therefore the data was not autocorrelated. A significant regression equation was found,  $F(10, 4304) = 229.413, p = .000$ , with an  $R^2$  of .348; indicating that the proportion of variance in OOa that can be explained by PE items was 34.8%.

At 95% confidence level, PE1 ( $B = .192, t = 9.487, p = .000$ ), PE2 ( $B = .074, t = 3.201, p = .001$ ), PE3 ( $B = .133, t = 6.557, p = .000$ ), PE5 ( $B = .108, t =$

5.127,  $p = .000$ ), PE7 ( $B = .067$ ,  $t = 2.977$ ,  $p = .000$ ), PE8 ( $B = -.071$ ,  $t = -2.957$ ,  $p = .003$ ), PE9 ( $B = .110$ ,  $t = 4.740$ ,  $p = .000$ ) and PE10 ( $B = .060$ ,  $t = 3.227$ ,  $p = .001$ ) were significant predictors of OOa. On the contrary, it was found that PE4 ( $B = .022$ ,  $t = 1.011$ ,  $p = .312$ ) and PE6 ( $B = -.024$ ,  $t = -1.210$ ,  $p = .226$ ) were not significant predictors of OOa.

Personal Empowerment (PE) items account for 34.8% of Fluency and Versatility (OOa). Eight (8) of PE items were significant predictors of OOa.

**Table 6** Multiple Linear Regression – PE predicting OOb

H <sub>0</sub>							
There will be no significant prediction of OOb by PE1, PE2, PE3, PE4, PE5, PE6, PE7, PE8, PE9 and PE10							
Model Summary							
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson		
1	.586	.343	.342	1.18229	1.760		
ANOVA							
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		
Regression	3145.099	10	314.510	225.001	.000		
Residual	6016.203	4304	1.398				
Total	9161.302	4314					
Coefficients							
Model	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std Error	$\beta$			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	3.075	.113		27.277	.000	2.854	3.296
PE1	.040	.018	.049	2.253	.024	.005	.076
PE2	.115	.021	.133	5.622	.000	.075	.155
PE3	.104	.018	.119	5.742	.000	.068	.139
PE4	.039	.019	.042	2.033	.042	.001	.076
PE5	.109	.019	.125	5.832	.000	.072	.146
PE6	.066	.018	.072	3.783	.000	.032	.101
PE7	.033	.020	.039	1.669	.095	-.006	.073
PE8	.009	.021	.010	.411	.681	-.033	.051
PE9	.076	.021	.091	3.697	.000	.036	.117
PE10	.031	.016	.039	1.868	.062	-.002	.063

A multiple regression was generated to predict OOb based on PE items. R value of .586 indicated an acceptable level of prediction ( $R > 0.5$ ). The Durbin-Watson statistic was 1.760 which is between 1.5 and 2.5 and therefore the data was not autocorrelated. A significant regression equation was found,  $F(10, 4304) = 225.001$ ,  $p = .000$ , with an  $R^2$  of .343; indicating that the proportion of variance in OOb that can be explained by PE items was 34.3%.

At 95% confidence level, PE1 ( $B = .040$ ,  $t = 2.253$ ,  $p = .024$ ), PE2 ( $B = .115$ ,  $t = 5.622$ ,  $p = .000$ ), PE3 ( $B = .104$ ,  $t = 5.742$ ,  $p = .000$ ), PE4 ( $B = .039$ ,  $t = 2.033$ ,  $p = .042$ ), PE5 ( $B = .109$ ,  $t = 5.832$ ,  $p = .000$ ), PE6 ( $B = .066$ ,  $t = 3.783$ ,  $p = .000$ ), PE7 ( $B = .033$ ,  $t = 1.669$ ,  $p = .095$ ), PE8 ( $B = .009$ ,  $t = .411$ ,  $p = .681$ ), PE9 ( $B = .076$ ,  $t = 3.697$ ,  $p = .000$ ), PE10 ( $B = .031$ ,  $t = 1.868$ ,  $p = .062$ ).

=.000) and PE9 (B = .076, t = 3.697, p =.000) were significant predictors of OOb. On the contrary, it was found that PE7 (B = .033, t = 1.669, p = .095), PE8 (B = .009, t = .411, p = .681) and PE10 (B = .031, t = 1.868, p =.062) were not significant predictors of OOb.

Personal Empowerment (PE) items account for 34.3% of Encouraging Interaction (OOB). Seven (7) of PE items were significant predictors of OOa.

**Table 7** Multiple Linear Regression – PE predicting OOC

H <sub>0</sub>							
There will be no significant prediction of OOC by PE1, PE2, PE3, PE4, PE5, PE6, PE7, PE8, PE9 and PE10							
Model Summary							
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson		
1	.625	.390	.389	1.22692	1.714		
ANOVA							
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		
Regression	4150.512	10	415.051	275.719	.000		
Residual	6478.993	4304	1.505				
Total	10629.505	4314					
Coefficients							
Model	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std Error	β			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	2.242	.117		19.161	.000	2.012	2.471
PE1	.090	.019	.101	4.824	.000	.053	.126
PE2	.108	.021	.115	5.057	.000	.066	.149
PE3	.099	.019	.106	5.289	.000	.062	.136
PE4	.029	.020	.029	1.480	.139	-.010	.068
PE5	.162	.019	.172	8.331	.000	.124	.200
PE6	.065	.018	.066	3.583	.000	.030	.101
PE7	.022	.021	.024	1.066	.286	-.019	.063
PE8	.012	.022	.014	.563	.574	-.031	.056
PE9	.072	.021	.080	3.377	.001	.030	.114
PE10	.052	.017	.061	3.020	.003	.018	.085

A multiple regression was generated to predict OOa based on PE items. R value of .625 indicated an acceptable level of prediction (R > 0.5). The Durbin-Watson statistic was 1.714 which is between 1.5 and 2.5 and therefore the data was not autocorrelated. A significant regression equation was found, F (10, 4304) = 275.719, p = .000, with an R<sup>2</sup> of .390; indicating that the proportion of variance in OOC that can be explained by PE items was 39%.

At 95% confidence level, PE1 (B = .090, t = 4.824, p = .000), PE2 (B = .108, t = 5.057, p =.000), PE3 (B =.099, t = 5.289, p =.000), PE5 (B = .162, t = 8.331, p = .000), PE6 (B = .065, t = 3.583, p =.000), PE9 (B = .072, t = 3.377, p =.001) and PE10 (B = .052, t = 3.020, p =.003) were significant predictors of

OOc. On the contrary, it was found that PE4 ( $B = .029, t = 1.480, p = .139.$ ), PE7 ( $B = .022, t = 1.066, p = .286$ ) and PE8 ( $B = .012, t = .563, p = .574.$ ) were not significant predictors of OOc.

Personal Empowerment (PE) items account for 34.8% of Collaborative Engagement (OOc). Seven (7) of PE items were significant predictors of OOc.

**Table 8** Summary of findings

		IV (Predictor Variables) - $\beta$									
		PE1	PE2	PE3	PE4	PE5	PE6	PE7	PE8	PE9	PE10
DV (Outcome Variables)	OOa	.206 ✓	.075 ✓	.136 ✓	.021 ✗	.109 ✓	-.023 ✗	.069 ✓	-.074 ✓	.116 ✓	.068 ✓
	OOb	.049 ✓	.133 ✓	.119 ✓	.042 ✓	.125 ✓	.072 ✓	.039 ✗	.010 ✗	.091 ✓	.039 ✗
	OOc	.101 ✓	.115 ✓	.106 ✓	.029 ✗	.172 ✓	.066 ✓	.024 ✗	.014 ✗	.080 ✓	.061 ✓

✓ = statistically significant predictor; ✗ = not statistically significant predictor

DV	Indicators	IV	Top 3 Strongest Predictors	$\beta$
OOa Fluency and Versatility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sense of clarity and understand of tasks and roles at work</li> <li>flexible in handling different work roles and diverse tasks</li> </ul>	PE1	setting goals and striving to meet goals	.206
		PE3	<b>monitoring behaviours to suit with situations</b>	<b>.136</b>
		PE9	feeling energetic for daily routines and activities	.116
OOb Encouraging Interaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sharing the same stance with my co-workers</li> <li>motivating and assisting co-workers at their work</li> <li>cherishing co-workers' accomplishments</li> <li>valuing ideas and suggestions from co-workers</li> </ul>	PE2	striving and working hard even for easy goals	.133
		PE5	ensuring others are comfortable when making deals	.125
		PE3	<b>monitoring behaviours to suit with situations</b>	<b>.119</b>
OOc Collaborative Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>being engaged in decision-making process</li> <li>delivering ideas and suggestion constructively</li> <li>sharing skills and knowledge eagerly with co-workers</li> <li>optimistic with the hierarchy at the organisation</li> </ul>	PE5	ensuring others are comfortable when making deals	.172
		PE2	striving and working hard even for easy goals	.115
		PE3	<b>monitoring behaviours to suit with situations</b>	<b>.106</b>

Findings show that majority of PE items significantly account for OOa, OOb and OOc. PE3, designating ‘*monitoring behaviours to suit with situations*’ was in the top three strongest predictors across OO components. The quality of coexisting and coinciding with social surrounding leads to OO. Handling emotions and behaviours consciously and rationally requires regular interactions to learn and acclimatise with the social atmosphere. Architectural planning of workspaces can influence human interactions. For instance, open spaces encourage more spontaneous and coincidental meetings and less pre-planned traditional meetings. Organisations can build networking cultures and encourage collaboration among co-workers leading to better performance and sustained organisational well-being.



## CONCLUSION

HIH in SSWB propounds the idea that human expressions and behaviours need coexist harmoniously with concerns of others. This paper evidence that OO is predictable through PE. Statistical modelling on the constructs elaborated in this paper are the next steps in the future direction of the research.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research was supported by Post-Doctoral Fellow under Research Initiatives Grant Scheme (RIGS-PDF), International Islamic University Malaysia (project title: RPDF19-005-0015)

## REFERENCES

- Aziz, Y. A., & Ennew, C. (2013). Assessing the effects of empowerment and emotions on job satisfaction in hotel service environments. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 21(SPEC. ISSUE), 65-84.
- Chin, N.-S., Khoo, S., & Low, W.-Y. (2012). Self-determination and goal orientation in track and field. *Journal of Human Kinetics*, 33(1), 151-161.
- Dancey, C., & Reidy, J. (2004) *Statistics without maths for psychology: Using SPSS for Windows*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Fatimah, O., Lukman, Z. M., Khairudin, R., Wan Shahrazad, W. S., & Halim, F. W. (2011). Procrastination's relation with fear of failure, competence expectancy and intrinsic motivation. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 19(Special), 123-127.
- Halim, F. W., Zainal, A., Omar, F., Hafidz, S. W. M., & Othman, M. A. (2013). Exploring the mediating mechanisms in the personality-job performance relationship. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 21(December), 189-200.
- Ho, J. A., Sambasivan, M., & Liew, E. Y. (2013). The relationship between job insecurity, shock, and turnover intention, amongst survivors of organizational downsizing. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 21(Special), 101-114.
- Ismail, F., Ahmad, N., Ismail, R., & Janipha, N. A. I. (2012). The behavioural factors' characteristics of safety culture. *Journal of Asian Behavioural Studies*, 2, 67-75.
- Kadir, N. B. A., Omar, F., Desa, A., & Yusoff, F. (2013). Secure style, PWB-related gratitude and SWB-related engagement as predictors of affect balance among social science students in Malaysia: A pilot study. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 21, 85-98.
- Kok, J. K. (2016). The relationships between procrastination and motivational aspects of self-regulation. *Jurnal Psikologi Malaysia*, 30(1), 30-39.
- Liem, G. A. D., Martin, A. J., Porter, A. L., & Colmar, S. (2012). Sociocultural antecedents of academic motivation and achievement: Role of values and achievement motives in achievement goals and academic performance. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 15(1), 1-13.
- Mokhtar, N., Husnyah, A. R., Sabri, M. F., & Abu Talib, M. (2015). Financial well-being among public employees in Malaysia: A preliminary study. *Asian Social Science*, 11(18), 49-54.
- Nesbit, P. L., Jepsen, D., Demirian, S., & Ho, J. (2012). Extending self-leadership research to the East: Measurement equivalence of the Chinese and English versions of the MSLQ. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 15(2), 101-111.

- Panatik, S. A., Zainal Badri, S. K., Rajab, A., Abdul Rahman, H., & Mad Shaha, I. (2011). The impact of work family conflict on psychological well-being among school teachers in Malaysia. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29(2010), 1500-1507.
- Rashid, W. E. W., Nordin, M. S., Omar, A., & Ismail, I. (2012). Work/family conflict: The link between self-esteem and satisfaction outcomes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 65(ICIBSoS), 564-569.
- Salin, P. (2013). Islamic work ethics and organizational commitment: Evidence from employees of banking institutions in Malaysia. *Social Sciences & Humanities*, 21(4), 1471-1489.
- Sarina, M. N., & Mohamad Adli, A. (2012). Quality work life among factory workers in Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 35(December 2011), 739-745.
- Sipon, S., Nasrah, S. K., Nazli, N. N. N. N., Abdullah, S., & Othman, K. (2014). Stress and religious coping among flood victims. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 140, 605-608.
- Sulaiman, W. S. W., Kadir, N. B. A., Halim, F. W., Omar, F., Latiff, R. A., & Sulaiman, W. S. W. (2013). Structural relations between personality traits, coping strategy, social support and well-being among adolescents. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 21(December), 121-134.
- Zamani, Z. A., Khairudin, R., Sulaiman, W. S. W., Halim, F. W., & Nasir, R. (2013). Relationship between achievement motivation and personality among pre and post-independence Malaysian Malays. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 21(December), 135-142

Received: 12<sup>th</sup> January 2019. Accepted: 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2019