

THE ROLE OF PERSONALITY AND WORK MOTIVATION IN SHAPING LECTURER PERFORMANCE: A PATH ANALYSIS APPROACH

Endang Wiyanti^{1*}, Bibin Rubini², Suhendra³

Universitas Indraprasta PGRI¹, Universitas Pakuan^{2,3}

endangwiyanti76@gmail.com^{1*}, bibinrubini@gmail.com², suhendra@unpak.ac.id³

Keywords: Lecturer Performance; Personality; Work Motivation; Path Analysis; Academic Performance

Abstract: Lecturer performance is a key determinant of academic quality in private higher education institutions. This study aims to examine the role of personality and work motivation in shaping lecturer performance using a path analysis approach. The study employed a quantitative explanatory survey design involving 147 lecturers from private higher education institutions in South Jakarta, Indonesia. Data were collected using structured questionnaires measuring personality, work motivation, and lecturer performance. Personality was measured through indicators of comfort in social interaction, adaptability, emotional stability, carefulness in acting, and openness to novelty. Work motivation was measured through achievement, recognition, responsibility, interest, salary, bonus, status, and working conditions, while lecturer performance was measured through teaching, research, community service, publication, and academic supporting activities. The results showed that personality had a positive and significant direct effect on lecturer performance. Personality also had a positive and significant effect on work motivation, and work motivation had a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance. However, work motivation did not significantly mediate the relationship between personality and lecturer performance. These findings indicate that lecturer personality contributes more directly to academic performance than indirectly through motivation. The study contributes to educational management literature by emphasizing the role of individual psychological factors in explaining lecturer performance. Practically, private higher education institutions should strengthen lecturer development programs that consider personality-based strengths, self-regulation, adaptability, emotional stability, and work motivation to improve academic performance.

Submitted: 11-05-2026

Revised: 11-06-2026

Accepted: 31-07-2026

INTRODUCTION

Lecturer performance is a central issue in higher education because lecturers are responsible for carrying out academic duties related to teaching, research, community service, publication, and other supporting academic activities. In the context of private higher education, lecturer performance is not only an individual achievement but also an indicator of institutional quality, competitiveness, and sustainability. This study identifies lecturer performance as a key variable influenced by personality and work motivation, using path analysis to examine the direct and indirect relationships among these variables.



Unlike organizational approaches that emphasize external factors such as institutional support and leadership, this article focuses on individual psychological factors. Specifically, it examines how personality and work motivation shape lecturer performance. This focus is important because lecturers may work in similar institutional environments but still show different levels of academic performance. Such differences can be explained partly by individual traits, motivation, self-regulation, confidence, and achievement orientation.

The first theoretical foundation of this study is the Five-Factor Model of Personality. This model explains personality through five broad dimensions: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 2008). In the academic profession, these traits are highly relevant. Extraversion may support classroom communication and academic networking; agreeableness may support collegiality and student engagement; conscientiousness may strengthen discipline, responsibility, and persistence; emotional stability may help lecturers manage academic pressure; and openness to experience may encourage innovation in teaching, research, and publication.

The relationship between personality and lecturer performance can also be explained using Trait Activation Theory. This theory states that personality traits are expressed in behavior when relevant situational cues activate those traits (Tett & Burnett, 2003). Tett and Burnett's model specifically explains how job demands, constraints, releasers, and facilitators influence trait expression in work behavior. Academic work provides many such cues. Teaching may activate communication, patience, and social confidence. Research and publication may activate conscientiousness, curiosity, persistence, and openness to new ideas. Community service may activate empathy, cooperation, and adaptability. Therefore, personality may influence lecturer performance because different academic tasks allow different personality traits to be expressed.

This study also draws on the Personality Trait-Based Interactionist Model of Job Performance, which argues that personality does not affect performance in isolation but interacts with work situations (Tett & Burnett, 2003). In higher education, the academic role is complex and multidimensional. Lecturers are required to teach, conduct research, publish, provide community service, and contribute to institutional activities. These varied tasks provide opportunities for personality traits to influence performance. For example, lecturers with high conscientiousness may perform better in research and publication because these activities require planning, discipline, and persistence. Lecturers with high openness to experience may be more adaptive in using new teaching methods and developing research ideas.

The outcome variable in this study is supported by Individual Work Performance Theory. Koopmans et al. (2011) conceptualize individual work performance as work behavior that contributes to organizational goals. They identified task, contextual, counterproductive, and adaptive performance as major dimensions used in individual work performance frameworks. In the higher education context, task performance refers to formal academic duties, contextual performance refers to voluntary contributions to the academic environment, and adaptive performance refers to the ability to adjust to new academic demands.

Personality may influence lecturer performance, but personality alone may not be sufficient. Lecturers also need motivation to translate their traits into sustained academic effort. Therefore, this study uses Achievement Motivation Theory to explain why some lecturers are more



persistent in pursuing academic goals. McClelland (1961) argues that individuals with high achievement motivation tend to set challenging goals, take responsibility for outcomes, seek feedback, and pursue excellence. This theory is relevant because lecturer performance involves achievement-oriented tasks such as improving teaching quality, conducting research, publishing articles, and contributing to academic reputation.

The role of work motivation can also be explained using Self-Determination Theory. Deci and Ryan (2000) distinguish goal contents and regulatory processes, emphasizing autonomy, competence, and relatedness as central psychological needs. They state that motivation is strengthened when individuals experience these needs. Lecturers need autonomy to manage teaching and research, competence to complete academic tasks effectively, and relatedness to feel connected with students, colleagues, and the academic community. When these psychological needs are fulfilled, lecturers are more likely to show intrinsic motivation and sustained performance.

Another important perspective is Expectancy Theory. Vroom (1964) explains that motivation is influenced by individuals' belief that effort will lead to performance and that performance will lead to valued outcomes. In the academic context, lecturers are more likely to exert effort when they believe that their work will result in meaningful outcomes, such as publication, promotion, recognition, professional growth, or institutional contribution. Thus, expectancy theory helps explain how lecturers decide whether to invest effort in teaching, research, and publication activities.

This study also applies Goal-Setting Theory. Locke and Latham (2002), summarizing decades of empirical research on its mechanisms, moderators, and practical significance, argue that specific and challenging goals improve performance because they direct attention, increase effort, encourage persistence, and stimulate strategy development. For lecturers, clear academic goals such as publication targets, research outputs, teaching innovation, and community service outcomes can strengthen motivation and improve performance.

Self-Efficacy Theory is also relevant in explaining lecturer performance. Bandura (1977) defines self-efficacy as an individual's belief in their capability to organize and execute actions required to achieve desired outcomes, influencing the initiation of behavior, the amount of effort invested, and persistence in difficult situations. Lecturers with high self-efficacy are more likely to persist when facing academic challenges, such as writing journal articles, conducting research, developing teaching materials, or adapting to technological change.

A broader explanation is provided by Social Cognitive Theory. Bandura (1986) explains that human behavior is shaped by reciprocal interactions among personal factors, behavior, and environment. In this study, personality represents personal factors, work motivation represents psychological energy and behavioral direction, and lecturer performance represents academic work behavior. This theory supports the idea that lecturer performance is shaped by the interaction between individual characteristics and motivational processes.

Academic work often requires self-directed effort, long-term planning, and continuous evaluation. Therefore, this study also uses Self-Regulation Theory. Carver and Scheier (2001) explain that individuals regulate behavior through goal setting, monitoring, feedback, and adjustment. Lecturers must regulate their own academic activities, including preparing teaching



materials, completing research projects, writing articles, and meeting institutional expectations. Self-regulation helps explain how motivated lecturers maintain consistency and persistence in academic work.

The study also uses Proactive Personality Theory. Bateman and Crant (1993) define proactive personality as a stable tendency to take initiative and influence one's environment. In higher education, proactive lecturers are more likely to seek research opportunities, develop new teaching strategies, initiate collaboration, and contribute to institutional improvement. Proactive personality is important because academic performance often requires initiative beyond formal job requirements.

Another relevant theory is Core Self-Evaluations Theory. Judge et al. (1997) explain that core self-evaluations reflect individuals' fundamental appraisal of themselves and include self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability. Lecturers with positive core self-evaluations are more likely to feel confident, capable, and motivated to face academic challenges. This theory strengthens the argument that personal psychological resources influence motivation and performance.

This article also applies Person–Job Fit Theory. Person–job fit refers to the compatibility between individual characteristics and job demands. Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit and their individual consequences, finding that fit at work is related to important individual outcomes, including job attitudes and performance. In the lecturer profession, performance may improve when lecturers' personality characteristics fit academic demands such as teaching, research, publication, communication, and community engagement. A lecturer with strong openness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability may be better suited to academic roles that require innovation, discipline, and resilience.

The Job Demands–Resources Model also provides a useful explanation, showing how job resources are related to motivation and performance across different occupations. Bakker and Demerouti (2007) argue that job demands and job resources influence employee well-being, motivation, and performance. Lecturer work involves high demands, including teaching load, research expectations, publication pressure, administrative duties, and community service. At the same time, lecturers need personal resources such as motivation, emotional stability, self-efficacy, and adaptability.

This study is also informed by Conservation of Resources Theory, which is useful for explaining how lecturers manage demanding academic tasks while trying to preserve and build their personal resources. Hobfoll (1989) argues that individuals strive to obtain, retain, and protect valued resources. In academic work, lecturers need psychological resources such as motivation, confidence, emotional stability, time, energy, and professional competence. When lecturers possess and maintain these resources, they are more likely to sustain performance despite academic pressure.

Finally, lecturer performance can be enriched through Organizational Citizenship Behavior Theory. Organ (1988) explains that organizational citizenship behavior refers to voluntary behavior that supports organizational effectiveness but is not always formally rewarded. In higher education, lecturers often contribute beyond formal academic duties, such as mentoring



students, helping colleagues, participating in academic committees, managing journals, supporting accreditation, and strengthening the academic climate. These extra-role behaviors are important components of lecturer performance, especially in private higher education institutions where institutional development often depends on lecturers' voluntary contributions.

Based on these theoretical perspectives, this study argues that lecturer performance is shaped by the interaction between personality and work motivation. Personality provides relatively stable psychological tendencies that influence how lecturers respond to academic responsibilities. Work motivation provides the direction, energy, and persistence needed to transform these tendencies into academic performance. Thus, work motivation is positioned as a mediating variable that links personality to lecturer performance.

Accordingly, the hypotheses of this study are formulated as follows:

H1: Personality has a positive direct effect on lecturer performance.

H2: Personality has a positive direct effect on work motivation.

H3: Work motivation has a positive direct effect on lecturer performance.

H4: Work motivation mediates the effect of personality on lecturer performance.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative explanatory survey design to examine the direct and indirect effects of personality on lecturer performance through work motivation. A quantitative design was considered appropriate because the study aimed to test hypothesized relationships among variables using numerical data collected through structured questionnaires (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The explanatory approach was used to determine whether personality directly predicts lecturer performance and whether work motivation functions as a mediating mechanism in this relationship.

The study applied path analysis because the proposed model involved both direct and indirect effects among variables. Path analysis is appropriate for testing theoretically specified causal relationships among observed variables and for estimating the magnitude of direct and indirect effects (Kline, 2016). In this article, personality was treated as the independent variable, work motivation as the mediating variable, and lecturer performance as the dependent variable.

Research Setting and Participants

The study was conducted in private higher education institutions in South Jakarta, Indonesia. The target population consisted of 4,697 lecturers, while the accessible population consisted of 232 lecturers from selected private higher education institutions. The final sample consisted of 147 lecturers, determined using the Yamane formula with a 5% margin of error (Yamane, 1967).

The sample was selected using proportional random sampling. This technique was used to ensure that lecturers from each selected institution were represented proportionally based on the size of the accessible population.

Table 1 *Population and Sample Distribution*



No.	District	Institution	Accessible Population	Sample
1	Jagakarsa	Universitas Indraprasta PGRI	140	89
2	Pancoran	Universitas Trilogi	22	14
3	Pasar Minggu	Universitas Siber Asia	10	6
4	Mampang Prapatan	Universitas Paramadina	31	20
5	Tebet	Universitas Sahid	29	18
Total			232	147

Note. The sample distribution was adapted from the dissertation research design.

Variables and Operational Definitions

This study involved three main variables: personality, work motivation, and lecturer performance. Personality was positioned as the independent variable, work motivation as the mediating variable, and lecturer performance as the dependent variable.

Personality refers to the relatively stable characteristics of lecturers that shape how they think, behave, react, and interact with others. In this study, personality was measured through five indicators: comfort in social interaction, adaptability, emotional stability, carefulness in acting, and openness to novelty.

Work motivation refers to the internal and external drive that encourages lecturers to carry out academic responsibilities and achieve professional goals. Work motivation was measured through eight indicators: achievement, recognition, responsibility, interest, salary, bonus, status, and working conditions.

Lecturer performance refers to lecturers' behavior and accomplishments in carrying out academic responsibilities. Lecturer performance was measured through five indicators: teaching, research, community service, publication, and academic supporting activities.

Table 2 *Operational Variables and Indicators*

Variable	Role in Model	Operational Definition	Indicators
Personality	Independent variable	Stable individual characteristics that influence lecturers' reactions, interactions, and academic behavior	Comfort in social interaction, adaptability, emotional stability, carefulness in acting, openness to novelty
Work motivation	Mediating variable	Internal and external drive that encourages lecturers to perform academic duties and achieve goals	Achievement, recognition, responsibility, interest, salary, bonus, status, working conditions
Lecturer performance	Dependent variable	Lecturers' behavior and accomplishments in carrying out academic responsibilities	Teaching, research, community service, publication, academic supporting activities

Instrumentation

Data were collected using structured questionnaires. The personality questionnaire was developed based on the indicators of lecturer personality relevant to academic work, namely social interaction, adaptability, emotional stability, carefulness, and openness to novelty. The work motivation questionnaire measured intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors, including achievement, recognition, responsibility, interest, salary, bonus, status, and working conditions.



The lecturer performance questionnaire measured academic work behavior related to teaching, research, community service, publication, and supporting academic activities.

The instruments used a five-point Likert-type scale. For personality and work motivation, the response options ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. For lecturer performance, the response options ranged from never to always. Higher scores indicated stronger personality characteristics, higher work motivation, and better lecturer performance.

Table 3 *Measurement Structure*

Variable	Number of Indicators	Scale Type	Response Range
Personality	5	Likert scale	Strongly disagree to strongly agree
Work motivation	8	Likert scale	Strongly disagree to strongly agree
Lecturer performance	5	Rating scale	Never to always

Validity and Reliability Testing

Before the main data collection, the instruments were tested on 30 lecturers who were not included in the final research sample. Instrument validity was examined using item-total correlation with Pearson's product-moment correlation. Items were considered valid when the calculated correlation coefficient exceeded the critical value at the .05 significance level.

Reliability was examined using Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha is commonly used to assess the internal consistency of multi-item instruments (Cronbach, 1951). A coefficient of .70 or higher was considered acceptable for research purposes. Items that did not meet validity and reliability criteria were excluded from the final analysis.

Data Collection Procedure

The data were collected through questionnaires distributed to lecturers in selected private higher education institutions in South Jakarta. Respondents were informed that their responses would be used for academic research purposes. After the questionnaires were returned, the data were coded, screened, and prepared for statistical analysis.

The data screening process included checking missing values, identifying inconsistent responses, and ensuring that the data met the requirements for further analysis. Only complete and valid responses were included in the final dataset.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was conducted in several stages. First, descriptive statistics were used to describe the empirical characteristics of each variable, including mean, standard deviation, minimum score, maximum score, and score distribution.

Second, assumption tests were conducted before path analysis. The normality test was used to examine whether the residuals were normally distributed. The multicollinearity test was used to ensure that the predictor variables were not highly correlated. The heteroscedasticity test was used to examine whether the residual variance was constant across levels of prediction.

Third, path analysis was used to test the direct and indirect effects among personality, work motivation, and lecturer performance. The direct effect of personality on lecturer performance was tested to determine whether lecturer personality directly predicts performance. The direct



effect of personality on work motivation was tested to determine whether personality predicts motivational strength. The direct effect of work motivation on lecturer performance was tested to determine whether motivated lecturers demonstrate better performance.

Fourth, mediation analysis was conducted to examine whether work motivation mediates the relationship between personality and lecturer performance. Mediation analysis was used because this study assumes that personality affects lecturer performance not only directly but also indirectly through motivational processes. The mediation logic follows the principle that an independent variable may influence a dependent variable through an intervening variable (Hayes, 2022).

Table 4 *Data Analysis Procedures*

Stage	Analysis	Purpose
1	Descriptive statistics	To describe the empirical distribution of each variable
2	Normality test	To examine whether residuals were normally distributed
3	Multicollinearity test	To ensure that predictor variables were not highly correlated
4	Heteroscedasticity test	To examine whether residual variance was constant
5	Path analysis	To test direct effects among variables
6	Mediation analysis	To test the indirect effect of personality on lecturer performance through work motivation

Research Model

The research model consisted of two substructures. The first substructure examined the effect of personality on work motivation. The second substructure examined the effects of personality and work motivation on lecturer performance.

The structural equations were formulated as follows:

Substructure 1

$$M = \beta_1 P + \varepsilon_1$$

Substructure 2

$$Y = \beta_2 P + \beta_3 M + \varepsilon_2 Y$$

Where:

Symbol	Description
P	Personality
M	Work motivation
Y	Lecturer performance
β	Path coefficient
ε	Error term

The conceptual model is presented in Table 5.

Table 5 *Hypothesized Path Model*

Path	Relationship Tested	Expected Direction
H1	Personality → Lecturer performance	Positive
H2	Personality → Work motivation	Positive



Path	Relationship Tested	Expected Direction
H3	Work motivation → Lecturer performance	Positive
H4	Personality → Work motivation → Lecturer performance	Positive indirect effect

Theoretical Basis of the Method

The methodological model was developed based on several theoretical assumptions. First, the Five-Factor Model of Personality explains that stable personality traits influence individual behavior in work settings (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 2008). Second, Trait Activation Theory explains that personality traits become visible when work situations provide cues for their expression (Tett & Burnett, 2003). Third, Achievement Motivation Theory explains that motivation drives individuals to pursue standards of excellence and achievement (McClelland, 1961). Fourth, Individual Work Performance Theory explains performance as work behavior that contributes to organizational goals (Koopmans et al., 2011).

Thus, the model assumes that lecturer personality influences work motivation and lecturer performance. Work motivation is positioned as a mediating variable because motivation provides the direction, energy, and persistence needed to translate personality traits into academic performance.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Descriptive Statistics

The data were obtained from 147 lecturers from private higher education institutions in South Jakarta. The variables analyzed in this article were personality, work motivation, and lecturer performance. The descriptive statistics show that work motivation had a mean score of 140.03 ($SD = 14.85$), lecturer performance had a mean score of 137.67 ($SD = 13.16$), and personality had a mean score of 118.91 ($SD = 23.23$). These values indicate that the respondents generally demonstrated moderate to high levels of work motivation and lecturer performance, while personality scores showed greater variation among respondents. The original research report states that the study collected data from 147 respondents and calculated descriptive statistics for performance, personality, and motivation.

Table 1 *Descriptive Statistics of Personality, Work Motivation, and Lecturer Performance*

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Personality	147	118.91	23.23	70	160
Work motivation	147	140.03	14.85	112	170
Lecturer performance	147	137.67	13.16	106	163

Note. SD = standard deviation.

Assumption Testing

Before conducting path analysis, assumption tests were performed to ensure that the data met the requirements for regression-based path analysis. The normality test showed that the residuals were normally distributed. The residual for the lecturer performance model had a significance value of .200, and the residual for the work motivation model also had a



significance value of .200. Both values were greater than .05, indicating that the normality assumption was fulfilled.

Multicollinearity was examined using tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF). In the lecturer performance model, personality had a tolerance value of .838 and VIF of 1.193, while work motivation had a tolerance value of .418 and VIF of 2.392. In the work motivation model, personality had a tolerance value of .863 and VIF of 1.158. These values indicate that multicollinearity was not detected because the tolerance values were greater than .10 and the VIF values were below 10. Furthermore, heteroscedasticity was not detected, as the significance values for the personality and motivation paths were well above the .05 threshold.

Table 2 *Summary of Assumption Testing*

Test	Model / Path	Result	Decision
Normality	Lecturer performance model	$p = .200$	Normal
Normality	Work motivation model	$p = .200$	Normal
Multicollinearity	Personality → Lecturer performance	Tolerance = .838; VIF = 1.193	Not detected
Multicollinearity	Work motivation → Lecturer performance	Tolerance = .418; VIF = 2.392	Not detected
Multicollinearity	Personality → Work motivation	Tolerance = .863; VIF = 1.158	Not detected
Heteroscedasticity	Personality → Lecturer performance	$p = .567$	Not detected
Heteroscedasticity	Work motivation → Lecturer performance	$p = .547$	Not detected
Heteroscedasticity	Personality → Work motivation	$p = .925$	Not detected

Path Analysis

Path analysis was conducted to examine the direct and indirect effects among personality, work motivation, and lecturer performance. The model tested three direct paths: personality to lecturer performance, personality to work motivation, and work motivation to lecturer performance. In addition, the indirect effect of personality on lecturer performance through work motivation was examined.

The results show that personality had a positive and significant direct effect on lecturer performance ($\beta = .207$, $p < .001$). This means that lecturers with stronger personality characteristics, such as adaptability, emotional stability, carefulness, comfort in social interaction, and openness to novelty, tended to demonstrate better academic performance. In the broader dissertation model, personality contributed directly to lecturer performance by 20.7%.

Work motivation also had a positive and significant direct effect on lecturer performance ($\beta = .297$, $p < .001$). This result indicates that lecturers with higher motivation tended to perform better in teaching, research, community service, publication, and academic supporting activities. Among the variables relevant to this article, work motivation showed the strongest direct effect on lecturer performance. The dissertation report states that motivation had a direct effect on lecturer performance of 29.7%.



Personality had a positive and significant direct effect on work motivation ($\beta = .122, p = .034$). This means that lecturer personality contributed to the formation of work motivation, although the effect was relatively small compared with its direct effect on lecturer performance. The broader model reported that personality contributed directly to motivation by 12.2%.

Table 3 *Direct Effects Among Personality, Work Motivation, and Lecturer Performance*

Hypothesis	Path	β	p	Result
H1	Personality $\rightarrow$ Lecturer performance	.207	< .001	Supported
H2	Personality $\rightarrow$ Work motivation	.122	.034	Supported
H3	Work motivation $\rightarrow$ Lecturer performance	.297	< .001	Supported

Note. β = standardized path coefficient.

Indirect Effect Through Work Motivation

The mediation analysis showed that the indirect effect of personality on lecturer performance through work motivation was positive but not significant ($\beta = .036, p = .064$). This result indicates that work motivation did not effectively mediate the relationship between personality and lecturer performance. In other words, personality had a stronger direct effect on lecturer performance than an indirect effect through work motivation. The dissertation report explicitly states that motivation did not function effectively as an intervening variable in the effect of personality on performance.

Table 4 *Indirect Effect of Personality on Lecturer Performance Through Work Motivation*

Hypothesis	Indirect Path	β	p	Result
H4	Personality $\rightarrow$ Work motivation $\rightarrow$ Lecturer performance	.036	.064	Not supported

Total Effect

The total effect of personality on lecturer performance was .243, consisting of a direct effect of .207 and an indirect effect of .036 through work motivation. This indicates that most of the contribution of personality to lecturer performance occurred directly rather than through motivation. The original research report presents the direct, indirect, and total effects, showing that personality had a direct effect of .207, an indirect effect of .036, and a total effect of .243 on lecturer performance.

Table 5 *Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects on Lecturer Performance*

Predictor	Direct Effect	Indirect Effect Through Work Motivation	Total Effect
Personality	.207	.036	.243
Work motivation	.297	—	.297

Note. The indirect effect of personality through work motivation was not statistically significant.

Summary of Hypothesis Testing

The results supported three of the four hypotheses. Personality had a significant positive direct effect on lecturer performance, personality had a significant positive direct effect on work



motivation, and work motivation had a significant positive direct effect on lecturer performance. However, the mediating role of work motivation in the relationship between personality and lecturer performance was not supported because the indirect effect was not statistically significant.

Table 6 *Summary of Hypothesis Testing*

Hypothesis	Statement	Result
H1	Personality has a positive direct effect on lecturer performance.	Supported
H2	Personality has a positive direct effect on work motivation.	Supported
H3	Work motivation has a positive direct effect on lecturer performance.	Supported
H4	Work motivation mediates the effect of personality on lecturer performance.	Not supported

Interpretation of Findings

The findings indicate that personality is an important individual factor in shaping lecturer performance. Lecturers with stronger personality characteristics tend to show better academic performance. This supports the view that lecturer performance is influenced not only by external institutional factors but also by internal psychological characteristics.

The results also show that work motivation plays a significant role in lecturer performance. Motivated lecturers are more likely to demonstrate higher levels of teaching quality, research engagement, publication productivity, community service, and academic supporting activities. This finding confirms that motivation remains a central psychological factor in explaining academic performance.

However, work motivation did not significantly mediate the relationship between personality and lecturer performance. This means that personality contributes to lecturer performance more directly than indirectly through motivation. In practical terms, lecturer personality may influence academic performance through behavioral tendencies such as discipline, adaptability, emotional stability, carefulness, and openness to novelty, without necessarily depending on motivational processes. Therefore, lecturer development programs should not only strengthen motivation but also consider personality-based strengths that support academic performance.

Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that personality and work motivation play important roles in shaping lecturer performance. Three main findings were supported. First, personality had a positive and significant direct effect on lecturer performance. Second, personality had a positive and significant direct effect on work motivation. Third, work motivation had a positive and significant direct effect on lecturer performance. However, the mediating role of work motivation in the relationship between personality and lecturer performance was not supported. These findings provide an important explanation that lecturer performance is shaped by both stable individual characteristics and motivational factors, although motivation does not fully explain how personality influences performance.



The first finding shows that personality has a positive and significant direct effect on lecturer performance. This result supports the Five-Factor Model of Personality, which explains that personality traits influence how individuals think, behave, interact, and respond to work demands (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 2008). In the context of higher education, lecturers with stronger personality characteristics tend to demonstrate better performance because academic work requires social interaction, adaptability, emotional stability, carefulness, and openness to new ideas. These characteristics are closely related to lecturers' ability to teach effectively, conduct research, publish scholarly work, participate in community service, and support institutional activities.

This finding is also consistent with Trait Activation Theory. According to Tett and Burnett (2003), personality traits are expressed in behavior when work situations provide relevant cues. Academic work provides many situations that activate personality traits. Teaching activities activate communication skills, patience, social confidence, and emotional stability. Research and publication activate conscientiousness, persistence, curiosity, and openness to novelty. Community service activates adaptability, empathy, and cooperation. Therefore, lecturer performance can be understood as a form of personality expression in academic tasks.

The finding also supports previous studies showing that personality is related to work performance. Barrick and Mount (1991) found that conscientiousness is a consistent predictor of job performance across occupational groups. Judge and Ilies (2002) also reported that personality traits are related to performance motivation. In the lecturer context, personality may become especially important because lecturers perform tasks that require autonomy, self-direction, creativity, responsibility, and continuous academic development. Thus, personality is not merely a personal attribute but a psychological resource that supports academic performance.

The second finding shows that personality has a positive and significant effect on work motivation. This means that lecturers' personality characteristics influence their motivational strength in carrying out academic responsibilities. Lecturers who are careful, emotionally stable, adaptable, socially comfortable, and open to novelty may be more likely to develop motivation to achieve academic goals. This finding supports the argument that personality traits influence motivational processes (Judge & Ilies, 2002). For example, conscientious lecturers may be motivated to complete academic tasks because they value responsibility and achievement. Lecturers who are open to experience may be motivated to explore new research topics, teaching methods, and academic innovations.

This finding can also be explained through Achievement Motivation Theory. McClelland (1961) argues that individuals with strong achievement motivation tend to pursue excellence, accept responsibility, and seek feedback. Certain personality characteristics, especially conscientiousness and openness to experience, may strengthen achievement-oriented behavior. In the academic profession, this may appear in lecturers' willingness to improve teaching quality, conduct research, write journal articles, and participate in professional development.

The third finding confirms that work motivation has a positive and significant direct effect on lecturer performance. This result supports motivation theories which argue that motivation determines the direction, intensity, and persistence of work behavior. According to Self-Determination Theory, motivated individuals perform better when they experience autonomy,



competence, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000). In the lecturer profession, motivation encourages individuals to prepare teaching materials, complete research projects, publish scholarly work, engage in community service, and contribute to institutional goals.

The result is also consistent with Goal-Setting Theory. Locke and Latham (2002) explain that specific and challenging goals can improve performance by directing attention, increasing effort, and encouraging persistence. Lecturers with strong motivation are more likely to pursue academic goals such as research completion, publication, teaching innovation, and community service outcomes. Therefore, work motivation becomes a central psychological factor that strengthens lecturer performance.

This finding is in line with studies showing that motivation contributes to performance. Forson et al. (2021) found that motivation influences job performance among teachers. Similarly, Pujilestari et al. (2023) reported that achievement motivation contributes to teacher performance improvement. In higher education, motivated lecturers are more likely to show persistence and responsibility in performing academic duties. This is particularly important because lecturer performance often depends on self-directed effort rather than constant supervision.

However, the fourth finding shows that work motivation did not significantly mediate the relationship between personality and lecturer performance. This means that although personality affects work motivation and work motivation affects lecturer performance, the indirect effect of personality on performance through motivation was not strong enough to be statistically significant. In other words, personality influences lecturer performance more directly than indirectly through work motivation.

This result is theoretically meaningful. It suggests that personality may shape lecturer performance through behavioral tendencies rather than only through motivational processes. For example, careful lecturers may naturally work in an organized and responsible manner. Emotionally stable lecturers may manage academic pressure effectively. Lecturers who are open to novelty may adopt innovative teaching or research practices. These behaviors can directly improve performance without necessarily depending on motivation as an intervening variable. This interpretation is consistent with the Personality Trait-Based Interactionist Model of Job Performance, which explains that traits can directly influence performance when work situations allow those traits to be expressed (Tett & Burnett, 2003).

The non-significant mediation result also suggests that motivation and personality may function as parallel predictors of lecturer performance rather than as a strong sequential mechanism. Personality provides stable behavioral tendencies, while motivation provides energy and persistence. Both are important, but motivation does not necessarily become the main pathway through which personality affects performance. This finding is useful because it shows that improving lecturer performance requires more than motivational interventions. Institutions also need to understand personality-based strengths that support academic work.

This finding differs from some studies suggesting that motivation can mediate the relationship between individual characteristics and performance. However, it aligns with the idea that personality traits often have direct effects on work behavior, especially in occupations requiring autonomy, discipline, adaptability, and professional responsibility. Lecturer work is highly self-



managed, and many academic tasks depend on personal discipline and trait-based consistency. Therefore, personality may directly influence performance through habitual work behavior, emotional regulation, and openness to academic development.

The findings can also be interpreted using Social Cognitive Theory. Bandura (1986) explains that behavior results from reciprocal interaction among personal factors, behavior, and environment. In this study, personality represents personal factors, motivation represents psychological drive, and lecturer performance represents academic behavior. The significant direct effects suggest that both personal characteristics and motivation contribute to academic behavior. However, the non-significant mediation indicates that the pathway from personality to performance is not fully transmitted through motivation. Other mechanisms, such as self-efficacy, self-regulation, person–job fit, or proactive behavior, may explain this relationship more strongly.

Self-Efficacy Theory may provide an alternative explanation. Bandura (1977) argues that individuals' belief in their capability influences effort, persistence, and performance. Lecturers with strong personality characteristics may perform better because they also possess stronger confidence in managing academic tasks. Similarly, Self-Regulation Theory suggests that individuals who can monitor and adjust their behavior are more likely to achieve goals (Carver & Scheier, 2001). Thus, self-efficacy and self-regulation may be more powerful mediators than general work motivation in explaining how personality affects lecturer performance.

Person–Job Fit Theory also helps explain the findings. Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) argue that compatibility between individual characteristics and job demands is related to performance. Lecturers whose personality fits academic work may perform better because the job naturally matches their traits. For instance, openness to experience fits research and innovation demands, conscientiousness fits publication and teaching preparation demands, and agreeableness fits student interaction and collegial collaboration. In this case, the direct effect of personality on performance may be strong because academic work itself activates and rewards certain personality traits.

The Job Demands–Resources Model also supports the interpretation. Bakker and Demerouti (2007) argue that personal resources help individuals manage job demands and maintain performance. Lecturer work involves high demands, including teaching load, research expectations, publication pressure, and administrative responsibilities. Personality characteristics such as emotional stability, adaptability, and carefulness may function as personal resources that help lecturers handle these demands. Work motivation remains important, but personality may directly support performance by enabling lecturers to cope with academic challenges.

The practical implication of these findings is that higher education institutions should not rely only on motivational programs to improve lecturer performance. Motivation is important, but personality-based development is also needed. Institutions should design lecturer development programs that strengthen self-regulation, resilience, academic discipline, adaptability, and openness to innovation. Recruitment, training, mentoring, and professional development programs should consider how personality characteristics support academic performance.



In addition, institutions should create academic environments that allow positive personality traits to be expressed. For example, lecturers who are open to novelty should be given opportunities to develop innovative teaching methods and research collaborations. Lecturers with strong conscientiousness should be supported through structured academic targets and publication mentoring. Lecturers with strong social interaction skills may be encouraged to engage in student mentoring, community service, and collaborative academic programs. Such strategies can help transform personality-based strengths into measurable academic performance.

Overall, this study contributes to educational management literature by showing that lecturer performance is shaped by both personality and work motivation. Personality has a direct role in determining lecturer performance, while work motivation independently strengthens performance. However, motivation does not significantly mediate the relationship between personality and performance. This suggests that personality-based behavioral tendencies may influence lecturer performance directly, and future studies should examine other mediating variables such as self-efficacy, self-regulation, work engagement, resilience, or person–job fit.

Table 7 *Relationship Between Current Findings and Supporting Theories*

Finding	Supporting Theory	Interpretation
Personality positively affects lecturer performance	Five-Factor Model; Trait Activation Theory	Lecturer traits are expressed in academic behavior such as teaching, research, publication, and service.
Personality positively affects work motivation	Achievement Theory; Core Self-Evaluations Theory	Positive personality characteristics may strengthen achievement orientation and motivational drive.
Work motivation positively affects lecturer performance	Self-Determination Theory; Goal-Setting Theory; Expectancy Theory	Motivation increases effort, persistence, and goal-directed academic behavior.
Work motivation does not mediate personality and performance	Personality and Interactionist Model; Fit Theory	Trait-Based Personality may directly influence performance through trait expression and fit with academic work demands.

Table 8 *Comparison With Previous Studies*

Current Finding	Relevant Previous Studies	Similarity or Difference
Personality significantly affects lecturer performance	Barrick and Mount (1991); Tett and Burnett (2003); Judge and Ilies (2002)	Similar: personality traits are related to work behavior and performance.
Personality significantly affects work motivation	Judge and Ilies (2002); McClelland (1961)	Similar: personality is associated with motivational tendencies and achievement orientation.
Work motivation significantly affects lecturer performance	Forson et al. (2021); Pujilestari et al. (2023); Locke and Latham (2002)	Similar: motivation supports effort, persistence, and performance.
Work motivation does not mediate the personality–performance relationship	Tett and Burnett (2003); Kristof-Brown et al. (2005)	Different from mediation-based assumptions; supports direct trait expression and person–job fit explanation.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that personality and work motivation are important psychological factors in shaping lecturer performance in private higher education. Personality was found to have a



positive and significant direct effect on lecturer performance, indicating that lecturers with stronger personality characteristics, such as adaptability, emotional stability, carefulness, comfort in social interaction, and openness to novelty, tend to demonstrate better academic performance. These characteristics support lecturers in carrying out teaching, research, community service, publication, and academic supporting activities.

The study also found that personality has a positive and significant effect on work motivation. This means that lecturers' personal characteristics contribute to their enthusiasm, responsibility, persistence, and willingness to achieve academic goals. Lecturers with positive personality traits are more likely to develop stronger motivation in performing their academic duties.

Work motivation was also proven to have a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance. This finding confirms that motivated lecturers are more likely to show better performance because motivation provides the direction, energy, and persistence needed to complete academic responsibilities effectively. Therefore, strengthening work motivation remains an important strategy for improving lecturer performance.

However, work motivation did not significantly mediate the relationship between personality and lecturer performance. This indicates that personality influences lecturer performance more directly than indirectly through motivation. In other words, lecturer personality may shape academic performance through stable behavioral tendencies, such as discipline, adaptability, emotional control, responsibility, and openness to innovation, rather than only through motivational processes.

Theoretically, this study contributes to educational management literature by explaining lecturer performance from an individual psychological perspective. The findings support the relevance of personality theory, trait activation theory, achievement motivation theory, and individual work performance theory in understanding academic performance. Practically, private higher education institutions should not focus only on motivational programs but also consider personality-based lecturer development. Training, mentoring, academic coaching, and professional development programs should strengthen lecturers' self-regulation, resilience, adaptability, academic discipline, and openness to innovation.

Overall, lecturer performance can be improved by recognizing the role of personality and strengthening work motivation. Since personality has a stronger direct contribution to performance, higher education institutions should develop strategies that allow lecturers' positive personality traits to be expressed in academic work. At the same time, motivation should be continuously strengthened to support lecturers' persistence and commitment in achieving academic excellence.



REFERENCES

- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x>
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(2), 103–118. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030140202>
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2001). *On the self-regulation of behavior*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139174794>
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO personality inventory and NEO five-factor inventory professional manual*. Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Forson, J. A., Ofosu-Dwamena, E., Opoku, R. A., & Adjavon, S. E. (2021). Employee motivation and job performance: A study of basic school teachers in Ghana. *Future Business Journal*, 7, Article 30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-021-00077-6>
- Hayes, A. F. (2022). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (3rd ed.). The Guilford Press.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>
- Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 797–807. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.797>
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19, 151–188.
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). The Guilford Press.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., de Vet, H. C. W., & van der Beek, A. J. (2011). Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 53(8), 856–866. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e318226a763>
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals’ fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x>



- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57(9), 705–717. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705>
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Van Nostrand.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2008). The five-factor theory of personality. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 159–181). The Guilford Press.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books.
- Pujilestari, Y., Rubini, B., & Sunaryo, W. (2023). Improving teacher performance through strengthening learning organization, transformational leadership and achievement motivation. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 49(1), 142–153.
- Tett, R. P., & Burnett, D. D. (2003). A personality trait-based interactionist model of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3), 500–517. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.500>
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row.

