

Full Length Research Paper

The big five personality traits and their relationship with work engagement among public sector university teachers of Lahore

Nayyar Raza Zaidi^{1*}, Rana Abdul Wajid¹, Farheen Batul Zaidi², Ghazala Batul Zaidi³ and Mohammad Taqi Zaidi⁴

¹Lahore School of Economics, Pakistan.

²University of the Punjab, Pakistan.

³MCB Bank, Pakistan.

⁴Lancaster University, United Kingdom.

Accepted 2 April, 2012

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the big five personality traits and work engagement among public sector university teachers of Lahore. The subjects of the study were 399 teachers, 237 male and 161 female. They were selected randomly from all public sector universities of Lahore. In this study, Big Five Inventory (BFI) was used to measure various dimensions of personality (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience). The instrument used to measure engagement was the Utrecht Work engagement Scale (UWES), which includes three subscales: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience were found to be positively related to work engagement. Neuroticism was negatively related to work engagement. Multiple regression analysis showed that personality traits of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience have significant effects on work engagement. However, the strength of relationship between big five traits and work engagement was not very strong ($R\text{-squared} = 0.28$).

Key words: Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, openness to experience, big five inventory, work engagement, utrecht work engagement scale.

INTRODUCTION

People intuitively understand what psychologists have demonstrated through research—that an individual's behaviors and attitudes show durable disposition across seemingly unrelated domains (Gray and Watson, 2001; Gosling, 2008). Thus, personality refers to relatively enduring personal characteristics in the sense of generalized and basic conduct tendencies which reflect long term, pervasive individual differences in emotional style and general influence on emotional responses (Warr, 1999).

Understanding predispositional characteristics and their

relationship with work engagement is important because it contributes to theoretical basis of the construct. According to Bandura (1978: 345), behavior is a process of reciprocal determinism in which there is a continuous reciprocal interaction among behavior, personal characteristics, and environmental factors. Determinism means “the production of effects by events” rather than a predetermined manner independent of the individual. In interacting with the environment, individuals do not simply react to external stimuli; rather, external factors affect behavior through internal processes. These internal

*Corresponding author. E-mail: dmayyar@lahoreschool.edu.pk.

processes in part determine what will be observed, how it will be interpreted, and how it will be used in the future. Because individuals can think reflectively and plan behavior in advance, they can change their environment. Hence, behavior is not only influenced by the environment but the environment is partially shaped by the individual. For example, individuals' optimistic expectations impact how they behave, and the environmental consequences created by their behaviors then change their expectations.

It is widely agreed that engagement arises from both personal and environmental factors (Macey and Schneider, 2008). Since environmental influences, predispositional factors, and behavior all function in a reciprocal relationship with each other (Bandura, 1978), the study of work engagement should include all three elements. The job demands-resources model primarily explains work engagement as a function of environmental factors. However, environment is not solely responsible for controlling or shaping the extent to which individuals are engaged in their work. Personal factors also function as reciprocal determinants of work engagement behaviors and contribute in shaping the environment.

Research in work engagement has been done in various professions, including teaching. Although there is growing body of business-oriented literature that describes how engaged employees contribute to the overall success of an organization, little academic and empirical research has been conducted in human service professions (Willson, 2009) such as teaching. The issues in work engagement in teaching profession has also received important responses nowadays due to the worldwide high turnover and attrition among teachers. In USA, for example, Ingersoll (2001) has reported that up to 50% of teachers leave the teaching profession in the first 10 years of their careers. Teachers turnover and attrition also happen in other western countries with an estimated 25 to 40% of beginning teachers leaving their jobs (Ewing and Smith, 2003). In Pakistan, cases of teachers switching careers or leaving jobs is not very high and teachers remain in teaching until retirement. Therefore, teachers personality traits and work engagement is an important aspect worth investigating. This is due to the fact that quality teachers are viewed to be an important assets in the context of education in Pakistan. Thus, understanding personality traits of the teachers and their relationship with work engagement would help in identifying personality traits which are helpful in becoming engaged teachers.

A review of literature on work engagement shows that majority of research deals with its environmental correlates (Demerouti et al., 2001; Hakanen et al., 2006; Bakker and Demerouti, 2007; Chung and Angeline, 2010). The job demands-resources (JD-R) model, in which the working conditions can be grouped in to two categories: Job demands and job resources, has been the predominant way through which correlates of engagements

have been examined (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). Few researchers, (Koyuncu et al., 2006; Basikin, 2007; Wajid et al., 2011), investigated the relationship between demographic characteristics and work engagement.

The question remains as to why some people show signs of work engagement while others exhibit little or no signs of work engagement when working under similar conditions. While organizational variables and their influence on work engagement have been thoroughly researched, individual variables such as personality types have been narrowly covered in research in relation to work engagement (Willson, 2009). However, personality plays a role in the engagement process because individuals enter the workplace with their own set of personality characteristics. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to see if there is any relationship between the personality characteristics and various dimensions of work engagement among teachers of public sector universities of Lahore.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Personality: Big five dimensions, related research

Within the last two decades, there has been consensus within the organization behavior researchers that five-factor model of personality, often termed the "big five" personality framework (Goldberg, 1981, 1990; Costa and McCrae, 1992; John and Srivastava, 1999), is one of the most prominent models in contemporary psychology to describe the most salient features of personality. This title "big five" is selected not to reflect their intrinsic greatness but to emphasize that each of the factor is extremely broad. As John and Srivastava (1999: 105), pointed out that each of "these five dimensions represent personality at the broadest level of abstraction, and each dimension summarizes a large number of distinct more specific personality characteristics. The big five traits can be found in almost any measure of personality (McCrae and John, 1992), including the analysis of trait adjectives in many languages and these data strongly suggest that personality trait structure is universal (McCrae and Costa, 1997). Research evidence also indicated that the big five traits are highly stable over time (Gosling et al., 2003) and appear to be shaped by biological (genetic) factors (Digman, 1989; Polmin et al., 1990), although the environment also plays its role. Finally, McCrae and John (1992) concluded that long history, cross-cultural replication, empirical validation across many methods and instruments make the five-factor model a basic discovery of personality psychology.

The big five personality dimensions can be divided into five factors: Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, and neuroticism (Costa and McCrae, 1992; McCrae and John, 1992; John and Srivastava, 1999).

Extraversion is indicated by positive feelings (emotions) and tendency to seek company of others. It represents the tendency to be sociable, assertive, active, upbeat, cheerful, optimistic, and talkative. Such individuals like people, prefer groups, enjoy excitement and stimulation, and experience positive effect such as energy, zeal, and excitement (Costa and McCrae, 1992; John and Srivastava, 1999).

Agreeableness is the tendency to be trusting, compliant, caring, considerate, generous, and gentle. Such individuals have an optimistic view of human nature. They are sympathetic to others and have a desire to help others; in return they expect others to be helpful. In essence, agreeable individuals are prosocial and have communal orientation toward others (Costa and McCrae, 1992; John and Srivastava, 1999).

Conscientiousness individuals are purposeful and determined. They have the tendency to act dutifully, show self-discipline, and aim for achievement against a measure or outside expectation. Conscientiousness describes *socially prescribed impulse control* that facilitates task- and goal-directed behavior, such as thinking before acting, delaying gratification, following norms and rules, and planning, organizing, and prioritizing tasks (John and Srivastava, 1999: 121).

Neuroticism measures the continuum between emotional adjustment or stability and emotional maladjustment or neuroticism (Costa and McCrae, 1992). People who have the tendency to experience fear, nervousness, sadness, tension, anger, and guilt are at high end of neuroticism. Individuals scoring at the low end of neuroticism are emotionally stable and even-tempered (Costa and McCrae, 1992; John and Srivastava, 1999).

Openness to experience is the tendency of the individual to be imaginative, sensitive, original in thinking, attentive to inner feelings, appreciative of art, intellectually curious, and sensitive to beauty (Costa and McCrae, 1992; John and Srivastava, 1999). Such individuals are willing to entertain new ideas and unconventional values.

Work engagement: Definition, dimensions, measurement, and research evidence

According to Kahn (1990: 695), engagement may be defined as “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles”. At work, engaged people can use varying levels of their physical, cognitive, and emotional selves in role performances. If they find their work meaningful and safe, they tend to use their physical, cognitive, and emotional capacities fully. Since engaged employees identified themselves with the work, they put much effort into it (Kahn, 1990, 1992). The model suggests that, for individuals to be fully engaged with their job, three psychological conditions must be fulfilled in the work environment: meaningfulness that is, workers

feeling that their job tasks are worthwhile, safety that is, feeling as though work environment is one of trust and supportiveness, and availability that is, workers having physical, emotional, and psychological means to engage in their job tasks at any given moment (Kahn, 1990).

Rothbard, (2001: 656) defines engagement as psychological presence and goes further and says that it involves two critical components: attention and absorption. Attention refers to “cognitive availability and the amount of time one spends thinking about a role” while absorption “. . . the intensity of one’s focus on a role.”

Burnout researchers have defined work engagement as opposite or positive antithesis of burnout; engaged employees have a sense of energetic and effective connection with their work (Maslach et al., 2001; Maslach and Leiter, 2008). Engagement has been characterized by energy, involvement, and professional efficacy, the direct opposite of the three burnout dimensions of exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy. Therefore, an opposite scoring pattern on the three aspects of burnout as measured with the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach et al., 1996) implies work engagement (Maslach and Leiter, 1997). Thus, low scores on the exhaustion and cynicism scales and high scores on the professional efficacy scale of the MBI mean engagement.

Maslach and Leiter, 1997, believed that burnout and work engagement can be combined as one model but Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) has rightly pointed out that we should not expect that both concepts that is, burnout and engagement, are perfectly negatively correlated and the relationship between these two constructs can be empirically studied when they are measured with the same questionnaire.

Schaufeli et al. (2002: 74) defined engagement “as positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption.” They pointed out that engagement is not momentary and specific state, but rather, it is “more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state this not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior” (Schaufeli et al., 2002: 74).

Vigor is described as being highly energetic, mentally resilient, and unrelenting in the presence of difficulties while working (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Gonzalez-Roma et al., 2006). Vigorous individuals are ready to put lot of energy in their work and strongly carry on in the face of obstacles.

Dedication is characterized by “being strongly involved in one’s work and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, pride, *inspiration*, and challenge (Schaufeli et al., 2002: 74; Gonzalez-Roma et al., 2006).

Finally, absorption is described as “being fully concentrated, and deeply engrossed in one’s work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work” (Schaufeli, et al., 2002: 75; Gonzalez-Roma et al., 2006: 166).

Research on engagement and personality dimensions

The big-five model of personality is most widely used in psychology (John and Srivastava, 1999). According to Inceoglu and Warr (2012), no study has yet examined the relationship between engagement and all five dimensions of personality that is, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience. However, Mostert and Rothmann (2006) and Widermuth (2008) investigated relationship between all five traits and engagement.

Extraversion is a strong predictor of positive well-being (Diener and Lucas, 1999) and neuroticism of negative well-being (Keyes et al., 2002). Relative to neurotic individuals, extraverted individuals are more likely to experience vigor, one of the core dimensions of work engagement (Brief and Weiss, 2002).

However, Langelaan et al. (2006) found that individual differences do make a difference with respect to work engagement. Results indicated that engaged employees had lower levels of neuroticism and higher levels of extraversion. In another study, Hallberg et al. (2007) examined how "Type A" behavior relates to burnout and engagement. Type A behavior was differentiated into two factors: achievement striving was characterized as energetic, fast, powerful, enterprising, enthusiastic, ambitious, eager to discuss, talkative, extraverted and strong; and irritability/impatience was characterized as aggressive, tense, easily annoyed, self-assertive, easily irritated, and loud. Findings indicated that work engagement was related to the achievement striving aspect of "Type A" behavior. In five factor comparison controlling for some job variables Kim et al. (2009) found that only conscientiousness was significant. Finally, for the big five dimensions, emotional stability and conscientiousness were found to be the only two unique predictors of job engagement by Inceoglu and Warr (2012).

Research questions

This study will seek to answer the following question:

What personality dimensions (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience) best predict level of Work engagement in public sector university teachers of Lahore?

Research hypotheses

The conceptualization of work engagement as a three-component construct has been widely supported by literature. The three dimensions of work engagement are: Vigor, dedication and absorption. Research hypotheses

formulated for this study are as follows:

Hypothesis₁: Extraversion is positively related to work engagement.

Hypothesis₂: Agreeableness is positively related to work engagement

Hypothesis₃: Conscientiousness is positively related to work engagement

Hypothesis₄: Neuroticism is negatively related to work engagement

Hypothesis₅: Openness to experience is positively related to work engagement

Hypothesis₆: There is significant relationship between work engagement and linear combination of personality characteristics (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience) of public sector university teachers.

METHODS

Study design

Lahore is the second largest city of Pakistan having a population of over ten millions. It is also known as educational city or a city of colleges and universities. There are twelve general and professional universities and degree awarding institutions in public sector. The survey was conducted among the teachers of only public sector universities of Lahore excluding medical colleges and universities because of their different structure. A stratified random sample of size 399 was taken. Seven universities included were considered as strata. The design for this research included questionnaires. The questionnaires were self-administered by the respondents.

Measures and instruments

Two questionnaires were distributed among the subjects. Big five inventory (BFI) Appendix 2 (John et al., 1991; John et al., 2008) was used to measure five dimensions of personality. It is 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0-6 (where 1 = disagree strongly and 5 = agree strongly). It includes 44 statements that asked the respondents to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with a particular statement. These statements are related to five dimensions of personality (that is, extraversion = 8 items; agreeableness = 9 items; conscientiousness = 9 items; neuroticism = 8 items; and openness = 10 items).

According to John and Srivastava (1999: 115), "the BFI has been used frequently in research settings in which subject time is at a premium and short-phrase item format provides more context than Goldberg's (*trait descriptive adjectives (TDA)*) single adjective items but less complexity than the sentence format used by NEO questionnaires developed by Costa and McCrae (1992).

The instrument used to measure engagement is the Utrecht work engagement scale (UWES; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003; Schaufeli et al., 2002), Appendix 1 which includes three subscales: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Since the UWES is available in

Table 1. Correlations and coefficients alphas of study variables.

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation	1	2	3	4	5
Extraversion	2.971	0.397	1.0				
Agreeableness	3.095	0.398	-0.201***	1.0			
Conscientiousness	2.936	0.3785	0.213***	-0.033	1.0		
Neuroticism	3.040	0.3666	-0.104**	-0.265***	0.015	1.0	
Openness	3.051	0.3465	0.133***	0.136***	0.163***	0.012	1.0
Vigor	16.110	5.457	0.196***	0.101**	0.22***	-0.061	0.41***
Dedication	14.516	4.725	0.219***	0.157***	0.339***	-0.084	0.39***
Absorption	17.567	4.648	0.213***	0.113**	0.255***	-0.03	0.38***
Work engagement	16.117	4.556	0.235***	0.146***	0.305***	-0.07*	0.44***

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

several languages (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003), score responses have been psychometrically evaluated in many countries (Bakker et al., 2008). Factor validity studies indicate scores on the UWES are best represented by three factors across cultures (Schaufeli et al., 2006). It is a 7- point Likert scale ranging from 0-6 (where 0 = never and 6 =daily). It includes 17 items that asked the respondents how often they experience feelings that relate to work engagement. These items are related to the three dimensions of work engagement (that is, vigor (VI) = 6 items; dedication (DE) = 5 items; and absorption (AB) = 6 items). The vigor subscale assesses the feelings that refer to "high level of energy and resilience, the willingness to invest effort, not being easily fatigued, and persistence in the face of difficulties", for example "At my work, I feel bursting with energy" (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003: 5). The dedication subscale evaluates the feelings that relate to "deriving a sense of significance from one's work, feeling enthusiastic and proud about one's job, and feeling inspired and challenged by it" (for example, "I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose") (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003: 5). The absorption subscale measures the feelings of "being totally and happily immersed in one's work and having difficulties detaching oneself from it so that time passes quickly and one forget everything else that is around" (for example, "Time flies when I am working") (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003: 6). High scores on VI, DE and AB are indicative of high energy, inspiration, enthusiasm, and happiness in one's work.

Subjects

There is no agreement among researchers as to what constitutes an adequate sample size. However, there are some general guidelines for determining an adequate sample size. According to Kline (2005), samples less than 100 are considered small, while samples between 100 and 200 are medium, and samples larger than 200 are considered as large. In this study, the sample size is 399 which is considered to be large as per above guidelines. The teachers were randomly selected from all public sector universities of Lahore. Out of the total respondents, 237 (59 %) were male and 161 (41 %) were female.

Data analysis

The collected data were entered into the SPSS 15 for further analysis. The big five personality traits (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience) were the independent variables and the three work engagement dimensions (that is, VI, DE and AB) were the dependent variables of the study.

RESULTS

The results are presented in Table 1 for hypotheses 1 to 5 and the significant findings would be discussed.

The correlations provided some initial support for our hypotheses. In support of hypothesis 1, extraversion was found to be positively correlated with work engagement ($r = 0.235$, $p < 0.01$). Agreeableness was observed to be positively correlated with work engagement ($r = 0.146$, $p < 0.01$), supporting hypothesis 2. Conscientiousness was found to be positively correlated with work engagement ($r = 0.305$, $p < 0.01$) supporting hypothesis 3. In support of hypothesis 4, neuroticism was found to be negatively correlated with work engagement ($r = -0.07$, $p < 0.10$). But this association was found to be weaker. Openness to experience was positively correlated with work engagement ($r = 0.44$, $p < 0.01$). The same pattern existed for all three dimensions (vigor, dedication, and absorption) of work engagement with all five traits of personality (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness).

Table 2 shows the results of multiple regression analysis of work engagement and its dimensions (vigor, dedication, and absorption) by all five traits of personality (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness). The F values indicate that extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness have significant effect on work engagement and its dimensions separately. However, neuroticism was not found to be significant predictor in all these four models. Smaller values of coefficients of determination, R-squared, indicate that, in addition to these, there are other factors which have influence on work engagement and its dimensions.

DISCUSSION

The review of literature on the relationship between personality traits (big five) and work engagement reveal that there was a consistent pattern in the results. The present study was designed to examine whether public

Table 2. Regression results predicting work engagement, vigor, dedication and absorption.

Independent variable	Beta coefficients			
	Work engagement	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption
Constant	-14.96***	-14.557***	-16.516***	-11.446***
Extraversion	1.856***	1.839***	1.761***	1.812***
Agreeableness	1.446***	1.102***	1.664***	1.437**
Conscientiousness	2.607***	2.172***	3.291***	2.274***
Neuroticism	-0.438	-0.678	-0.630	-0.184
Openness	4.840***	5.748***	4.240***	4.297***
R ²	0.288	0.219	0.268	0.213
F	31.727***	21.614***	28.391***	20.833***

*p<0.10, **p<0.05, ***p<0.01.

sector university teachers experience work engagement in relation to big five personality dimensions. Following are discussions on the possible impact of each personality trait on work engagement and implications for university teachers.

Extraversion and work engagement

Extraversion has been shown to be having a modest positive correlation ($r < .50$) to work engagement (Diener and Lucas, 1999; Langelaan et al., 2006; Mostert and Rothmann, 2006; Wildermuth, 2008; Inceoglu and Warr, 2012). The present study found a correlation of 0.235 ($p < 0.01$) between extraversion and work engagement which clearly supported the findings of the other researches (Table 1). The same has been supported by the multiple regression analysis with partial regression coefficient being 1.856 ($p < 0.01$) (Table 2). This means that engaged teachers are naturally energetic, enthusiastic, and action oriented. They adapt quickly to new surroundings and switch easily between activities. They also seem to have a disposition towards cheerfulness, sociability and high activity. In addition, extroverts sociability and relationship building abilities can positively impact all three psychological conditions of engagement: meaningfulness, safety, and the availability of resources (Kahn, 1990) which is very important to become a good teacher.

Agreeableness and work engagement

In the present study, we found that work engagement is modestly positively related to agreeableness ($r = 0.146$, $p < 0.01$) (Table 1). This has been confirmed by the multiple regression analysis with partial regression coefficient being 1.446 ($p < 0.01$) (Table 2). This is supported by Mostert and Rothmann (2006) who reported a correlation of 0.26 between work engagement and agreeableness. However, Wildermuth (2008) did not find any correlation

between agreeableness and engagement. Engaged individuals tend to be helpful, trusting, considerate, and likes to cooperate with others. Moreover, they are kind to almost everyone and have a forgiving nature (John et al., 1991; John et al., 2008).

Conscientiousness and work engagement

Conscientiousness was moderately correlated with work engagement ($r < 0.305$; $p < 0.01$) in the present study (Table 1) and had partial regression coefficient of 2.607 ($p < 0.01$) in multiple regression analysis, Table 2. This is supported by the findings of other researches (Mostert and Rothmann, 2006; Wildermuth, 2008; Kim et al., 2012). Conscientiousness individuals have the tendency to be habitually careful, reliable, hardworking, well energized and purposeful. These people do a thorough job and perseveres until the task is finished (John et al., 1991; John et al., 2008). According to Bakker et al. (2012), work engagement was found to be positively related to task performance, contextual performance, and active learning, particularly for employees high in *conscientiousness*. Hence, conscientiousness individuals tend to be more focused and goal oriented. These qualities are very essential to be successful teacher.

Neuroticism and work engagement

Neuroticism is negatively correlated to work engagement in the previous studies (Keyes et al., 2002; Langelaan et al., 2006; Mostert and Rothmann, 2006; Wildermuth, 2008). Although the negative correlation is low (-0.07 ; $p < 0.10$) (Table 1). Our study also supported the findings of the other researchers. However, in the presence of other variables, neuroticism is found to be not significant at all (Table 2). Neurotic individuals tend to be moody, get nervous easily, depressed, tense, and worry a lot (John et al., 1991; John et al., 2008). Engaged teacher who is emotionally stable (low

neuroticism) is relaxed, even tempered, calm and can face the stressful situations without becoming upset.

Openness to experience and work engagement

In the present study we found a positive correlation between openness to experience and work engagement ($0.44 < 0.01$) (Table 1). This has been verified by the multiple regression analysis with partial regression coefficient being 4.840 ($p < 0.01$) (Table 2). To our knowledge, no other study on engagement except Wildermuth (2008), has investigated relationship between openness to experience and work engagement. She did not find significant correlations between the two (openness to experience and work engagement). According to BFI, openness to experience individuals are original, ingenious, inventive, and sophisticated in art, music, or literature. Moreover, such individuals are curious about many different things, have an active imagination, and like to play with ideas (John et al., 1991; John et al., 2008). This means that engaged teachers are innovative and creative. The findings of this article (openness to experience correlate with work engagement) are in line with other researchers (Kahn, 1990; Macey and Schneider, 2008) who connected engagement and innovation. Kahn (1990: 702) said that those who are disengaged "act as custodian rather than innovators" in the role they play in the organization. Moreover, Macey and Schneider (2008) argued that engaged workers not only work more but more importantly they work differently.

Conclusions

From the findings of the present study, it is quite evident that all the big five traits (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience) are correlated with work engagement. This is consistent with findings of the other studies, although not many studies have been conducted to examine the relationship between all dimensions of big five traits and work engagement.

Furthermore, in our study, all the big five traits were found to be significantly correlated with work engagement. This means that engaged teachers are gregarious, compassionate, trusting, organized, contented, creative and unconventional. A good teacher needs to possess all the afore-mentioned characteristics.

Moreover, a good teacher is a leader. A significant meta-analysis (Judge et al., 2002) conducted across 222 correlations obtained in 73 studies revealed that four big five traits, extraversion (0.31), conscientiousness (0.28), neuroticism (-0.07), and openness to experience (0.24) were significantly tied to leadership performance.

The strength of relationship between big five traits and

work engagement is not very strong (R-squared = 0.28). This can be due to various other situational variables (job related and/or organizational related) who may support or hinder engagement.

REFERENCES

- Bakker AB, Demerouti E (2007). The job demands-resources model: state of the art. *J. Manage. Psychol.* 22(3):309-328.
- Bakker AB, Demerouti E, Brummelhuis LL (2012). Work engagement, performance, and active learning: The role of conscientiousness. *J. Voc. Behav.* 80:555-564.
- Bakker AB, Schaufeli W, Leiter M, Taris T (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work Stress*, 22(3): 187-200.
- Bandura A (1978). Self system in reciprocal determinism. *Am. Psychol.* 33:344-358.
- Basikin B (2007). Vigor, Dedication and Absorption: work engagement among secondary school English teachers in Indonesia., Paper presented at the annual AARE Conference, 25th-29th November, Fremantle, Perth, Western Australia.
- Brief A, Weiss H (2002). Organizational Behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Ann. Rev. Psychol.* 53:279-307.
- Chung N, Angeline T (2010). Does work engagement mediate the relationship between job resources and job performance of employees? *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.* 4(9):1837-1843.
- Costa PT, McCrae RR (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor (NEO-FFI) professional manual. Odessa, Florida: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Demerouti E, Bakker A, Nachreiner F, Schaufeli W (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 86:499-512.
- Diener E, Lucas RE (1999). Personality and subjective well-being. In: Kahneman D, Diener E, Schwarz N Eds. *Well-being: New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Foundations Hedonic Psychol.* pp.215-229.
- Digman JM (1989). Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability, and utility. *J. Pers.* 57(1):195-214.
- Ewing RA, Smith DL (2003). Retaining quality beginning teachers in the profession. *English Teaching: Practice Critique* 2:15-32.
- Goldberg LR (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In: Wheeler (Ed.), *Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. Rev. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 1:141-165.
- Goldberg LR (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure. *J. Person. Soc. Psychol.* 59: 1216-1229.
- Gosling SD, Rentfrow PJ, Swan JW (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five Personality Domains. *J. Res. Pers.* 37:504-528.
- Gosling SD (2008). *Snoop: What your Staff Says about You.* New York: Basic Books.
- Gray EK, Watson D (2001). Emotion, mood, and temperament: Similarities, differences, and a synthesis. In: Payne RL, Cooper CL, *Emotions at work: Chichester: Wiley. Theory Res. Appl. Manage.* pp.21-43.
- Hakanen JJ, Bakker A, Schaufeli W (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *J. Sch. Psychol.* 43:495-513.
- Hallberg UE, Johnsson G, Schaufeli WB (2007). Type A behavior and work situation: Associations with burnout and work engagement. *Scandinavian J. Psychol.* 48:135-142.
- Inceoglu I, Warr P (2012). Personality and Job Engagement. *J. Psychol.* pp.1-9.
- Ingersoll RM (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortage: An organizational analysis. *Am. Edu. Res. J.* 38:499-534.
- John OP, Donahue EM, Kentle RL (1991). *The Big Five Inventory--Versions 4a and 54.* Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- John OP, Naumann LP, Soto CJ (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In RWOP John, *Handbook of personality: New York: Guilford Press. Theory Res.* pp.114-158.
- John OP, Srivastava S (1999). *The Big Five trait taxonomy: History,*

- measurement and theoretical perspectives. In: Pervin LA, John OP (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed.) New York: Guilford pp.102-138.
- Judge TA, Bono JE, Ilies R, Gerhardt MW (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 87:765-780.
- Kahn W (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Acad. Manage. J.* 33:692-724.
- Kahn W (1992). To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. *Hum. Relat.* 45:321-349.
- Keyes C, Shmotkin D, Ryff C (2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 82(6):1007-1022.
- Kim H, Shi KH, Swanger N (2009). Burnout and engagement: A comparative analysis using the Big Five personality dimensions. *Int. J. Hosp. Manage.* 28:96-104.
- Kline RB (2005). *Principles and practices of Structural Equation Modeling*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Koyuncu M, Burke R, Fiksenbaum L (2006). Work engagement among women managers and professionals in a Turkish bank: potential antecedents and consequences. *Equal Opportunity Int.* 25:299-310.
- Langelaan S, Bakker AB, van Doornen LJ, Schaufeli W (2006). Burnout and work engagement: Do individual differences make a difference? *Pers. Individ. Diff.* 40:521-532.
- Macey WH, Schneider B (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Ind. Org. Psychol.* 1:3-30.
- Maslach C, Jackson SE, Leiter M (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Maslach C, Leiter M (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Maslach C, Leiter M (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 1:3-30.
- Maslach C, Schaufeli W, Leiter M (2001). Job burnout. *Ann. Rev. Psychol.* 52:397-422.
- McCrae RR, John OP (1992). An introduction to the Five-Factor Model and its applications. *J. Pers.* 60(2):175-215.
- McCrae RR, Costa JP (1997). Personality trait structure as a Human Universal. *Am. Psychol.* 52(5):509-516.
- Mostert K, Rothmann S (2006). Work-related well-being in the South African Police Service. *J. Crim. Justice* 34(5):479-491.
- Polmin R, DeFries J, McClearn GE, McGuffin P (1990). *Behavioral Genetics: A Primer*. New York: W.H. Freeman & Company.
- Rothbard N (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Adm. Sci. Q.* 46:655-684.
- Schaufeli W, Bakker A (2003). Utrecht work engagement scale: In: *Preliminary Manual*. UWES . Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University. p.1.
- Schaufeli W, Bakker A (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *J. Occup. Behav.* 25:293-315.
- Schaufeli W, Bakker A, Salanova M (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educ. Psychol. Meas.* 66:701-716.
- Schaufeli W, Bakker A, Salanova M (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A Cross-National Study. *Educ. Psychol. Meas.* 66(4):701-716.
- Schaufeli W, Salanova M, Gonzalez-Roma V, Bakker A (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *J. Happiness Stud.* 3:71-92.
- Wajid RA, Zaidi NR, Zaidi MT, Zaidi FB (2011). Relationship between Demographic Characteristics and Work Engagement among Public Sector University Teachers of Lahore. *Interdiscip. J. Contemp. Res. Bus.* 3(6):110-122.
- Warr P (1999). Well-being and the work place. In ED InD. Kahneman, Well-being: The foundation of hedonic psychology. New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.
- Wildermuth C (2008). Engaged to serve: The relationship between employee engagement and the personality of human services professionals and paraprofessionals. USA: Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Bowling Green State University.

APPENDIX**Appendix 1.** Utrecht work engagement scale (UWES).

The following 17 statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, cross the '0' (zero) in the space after the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by crossing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describe you feel that way.

At my work, I feel bursting with energy.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Times flies when I'm working	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
At my job, I feel strong and vigorous	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
I am enthusiastic about my job	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
When I am working, I forget everything else around me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
My job inspires me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
I feel happy when I am working intensely	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
I am proud on the work that I do	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
I am immersed in my work	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
I can continue working for very long periods at a time	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
To me, my job is challenging	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
I get carried away when I'm working	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
At my job, I am very resilient, mentally	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
It is difficult to detach myself from my job	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

0=never; 1= Almost never (a few times year or less); 2= rarely (once a month or less); 3= sometimes (a few times a month); 4= often (once a week); 5= very often (a few times a week); 6= always(every day).

Appendix 2. The big five inventory (BFI).

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.

I see myself as someone who.....

Is talkative	1	2	3	4	5
Tends to find faults with others.	1	2	3	4	5
Does a thorough job.	1	2	3	4	5
Is depressed	1	2	3	4	5
Is original, comes up with new ideas	1	2	3	4	5
Is reserved	1	2	3	4	5
Is helpful and unselfish with others	1	2	3	4	5
Can be somewhat careless	1	2	3	4	5
Is relaxed, handles stress well	1	2	3	4	5
Is curious about many different things	1	2	3	4	5
Is full of energy	1	2	3	4	5
Starts quarrels with others	1	2	3	4	5
Is a reliable worker	1	2	3	4	5
Can be tense	1	2	3	4	5
Is ingenious, a deep thinker	1	2	3	4	5
Generates a lot of enthusiasm	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix 2. Continued.

Has a forgiving nature	1	2	3	4	5
Tends to be disorganized	1	2	3	4	5
Worries a lot	1	2	3	4	5
Has an active imagination	1	2	3	4	5
Tends to be quiet	1	2	3	4	5
Is generally trusting	1	2	3	4	5
Tends to be lazy	1	2	3	4	5
Is emotionally stable, not easily upset	1	2	3	4	5
Is inventive	1	2	3	4	5
Has an assertive personality	1	2	3	4	5
Can be cold and aloof	1	2	3	4	5
Perseveres until the task is finished	1	2	3	4	5
Can be moody	1	2	3	4	5
Values artistic, aesthetic experiences	1	2	3	4	5
Is sometimes shy, inhibited	1	2	3	4	5
Is considerate and kind to almost everyone	1	2	3	4	5
Does things efficiently	1	2	3	4	5
Remains calm in tense situations	1	2	3	4	5
Prefers work that is routine	1	2	3	4	5
Is outgoing, sociable	1	2	3	4	5
Is sometimes rude to others	1	2	3	4	5
Make plans and follows through with them	1	2	3	4	5
Gets nervous easily	1	2	3	4	5
Likes to reflect, play with ideas	1	2	3	4	5
Has few artistic interests	1	2	3	4	5
Likes to cooperate with others	1	2	3	4	5
Is easily distracted	1	2	3	4	5
Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature	1	2	3	4	5

1= Strongly disagree; 2= disagree a little; 3= neither agree nor disagree; 4= agree a little; agree strongly