

Personality Differences Amongst the Engaged and Disengaged Associates at Various Managerial Levels in National Capital Region of India

Anu Singh Lather*, Shilpa Jain** and Vinod K. Jain***

Abstract

Organizations are investing heavily in employee engagement programmes but are not able to drive the desired results because while designing such programmes, they ignore the most basic tenet of the person-organization fit i.e. the individual personality differences. The present study was conducted on 500 associates working at entry-level management, middle-level management and top-level management of service sector organizations in national capital region of India to map the differences in the personality of engaged and disengaged associates at each level. The results of the study revealed that engaged entry-level managers are more assertive as compared to disengaged entry-level managers, whereas engaged top-level managers are more cooperative as compared to disengaged top-level managers. Engaged entry-level managers are more socially bold and venturesome as compared to disengaged entry-level managers who are more timid and shy. Engaged top-level managers are more trusting, accommodating, and agreeable as compared to disengaged top-level managers who are more skeptical and tough minded. Engaged entry-level and middle-level managers are more group oriented and socially participating as compared to disengaged associates of these levels who are more individualistic in approach and socially inhibited. Engaged associates from all the three levels of management are lower on anxiety as compared to their disengaged counterparts who are higher on anxiety.

Key Words: Engaged Associates, Disengaged Associates, Dominance, Anxiety, Openness to Change, Self-Reliance

*Pro-Vice Chancellor, Delhi Technological University, Delhi, anusinghlather@gmail.com

** Assistant Professor, University School of Management Studies, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Sec 16c, Dwarka, New Delhi

***Retired IAS Officer DANICS, jain15vinod@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Since its appearance in HR literature, 'Employee Engagement' continues to be amongst the top five concerns of HR managers every year as it has been found to drive overall productivity and performance of the organizations. As reported by Aon Hewitt (2017), a five point increase in employee engagement is linked to three point increase in revenue growth in subsequent year. Cheong (2017) reported that actively disengaged employees cost between 450 to 550 billion US dollars in terms of productivity to United States alone. In a Gallup survey, Nink & Robison (2016) reported that compared to disengaged teams, engaged teams show 24% to 59% less turnover, 21% higher profitability, 17% higher productivity, and 41% less absenteeism. Melarkode (2015) mentioned in an article on employee engagement that there is a positive correlation between employee engagement, work culture and the performance of the organization. Priyadarshi & Raina (2014) on the basis of a study of more than 200 middle and senior level executives from India, profess work engagement as an important mediator between job and personal resources, which has an impact on employees' work attitudes. Kataria et al (2014) in a study of 304 Indian IT professionals from 27 organizations in the national capital region, India reported that work engagement in terms of vigor, dedication, and absorption is significantly associated with organizational effectiveness. The study further reported the positive role of affective-motivational underpinnings through which employees' increased level of engagement probably elevated organizational effectiveness.

Understanding the importance of employee engagement, organizations are investing heavily in employee engagement programs. As mentioned by Taylor (2015) in an article on how you can improve employee engagement, nine out of ten executives' top priorities included increasing engagement in the organization. A study by Virgin Pulse also emphasized the efforts of managers to increase employee engagement and retention in 2015. But, organizations are not getting the results they are looking for. As reported by Huhman (2015), a survey of 4000 randomly selected members of the Society for Human Resource Management found 88 percent of organizations

offer professional development opportunities as a benefit for employees but, still many workers aren't satisfied. Another article by Lamotte (2015) in Harvard Business Review mentions that companies spend over \$720 million each year on employee engagement yet engagement is on record low-only 13% as reported by Gallup. Lamotte further mentions, that the prime reason for these statistics is that organizations focus their employee engagement models around the work experience and not the employees. While designing employee engagement programmes, organizations ignore the most basic tenet of person-organization fit: employees bring their whole selves to the workplace. Lamotte further argued that employee engagement is much affected by out of the office experiences of the employees.

The studies related to the behavioral effect of individuals and group at workplace dates back to the work of Mayo in late 1920s and early 1930s. Simultaneously Lewin, the father of change management proposed that behavior is a function of both person and environment [$B = f(P|E)$] in 1938. Since then number of renowned theorists like Maslow, Herzberg, Ouchi, and McGregor to name a few conceptualized and evidenced the role of individual differences at workplace. It is also extensively accepted that engagement arises from both personal and environmental sources (Macey & Schneider, 2008). If, the first ever definition of Employee Engagement proposed by Kahn (1990) is scrutinized, which goes as follows:

“The simultaneous employment and expression of a person's 'preferred self' in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional) and active, full performances” (Kahn;1990, p. 700)”

Engaged individuals are described as being psychologically present, fully there, attentive, feeling connected, integrated, and focused in their role performances. They are open to themselves and others, connected to work and others, and bring their complete selves to perform (Kahn, 1992). Kahn noted that engagement is observed through the behavioral investment of personal physical, cognitive, and emotional energy into work roles (Kahn, 1992).

A more recent definition of employee engagement proposed by Retallick (2015, online) is, 'Engaged employees work with passion and feel a profound connection to their company. They drive innovation and will ultimately move the organization forward'. This also focuses on individual differences. There is a strong need to develop understanding of engagement bases within individuals themselves.

However, theoretical discussions and empirical investigations have so far mainly highlighted engagement as a response to characteristics of the job. More engaged and less engaged workers are likely to differ in certain traits as well as in the nature of their jobs, but, few studies or models of possible personality contributors to job engagement have been published (Inceoglu & Warr, 2012).

The earlier models of employee engagement purported the role of individual differences as drivers of employee engagement (Kahn, 1990; Maslach et al., 2001; May et al., 2004; Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Christian et al, 2011) but there is dearth of studies where this relationship has been empirically tested. Literature has many conceptual evidences to support the notion that individual differences determine engagement and factors related to it. Kahn (1990), for example, argued that psychological differences may impact on individuals' ability to engage or disengage in their role performance, just as they shape a person's ability and willingness to be involved or committed at work. Portello (1996) suggested when people experience situations as unsafe, it is a matter of individual differences what coping strategies they use, and the extent to which they engage or disengage. Personal variables of employees could be important determinants of their adaptation to their work environments (Hobfoll, 1989; Judge et al, 1997). It is also argued that individual differences play a vital role in deciding an employee's potential level of engagement (Robinson, 2006). Meyer & Gangné (2008) under their self-determination theory drew similarities between autonomous regulation and behavioural outcomes suggested by Macey & Schnieder (2008), and under this theory they proposed that autonomous regulation lead to higher levels of performance, persistence,

initiative, and creativity. Inceoglu & Warr (2011) mentioned engagement to be a primary function of personality factors and sub-factors; like extraversion, emotional stability and conscientiousness. They further added that more engaged and less engaged workers are likely to differ on certain personality traits but, there are hardly any studies or models of possible personality contributors to engagement. Few researchers like Halbesleben (2010), Kim et al (2009), Xanthopoulou et al (2009), Wildermuth (2008), Langelaan et al (2006), Rich (2006) and others worked on optimism, self- efficacy, and big five factors but comprehensive studies on wider range of traits are lacking.

In employee engagement literature, most of the empirical studies are conducted by applying global factors and researchers found extraversion to be positively related with engagement (Ongore, 2014; Zaidi et al, 2012; Wildermuth, 2008; Langelaan et al, 2006; Howard & Howard, 2001), neuroticism (Anxiety) to be negatively related to engagement (Ongore, 2014; Zaidi et al, 2012; Langelaan et al., 2006), agreeableness (*opposite* Independence) to be positively related to engagement (Ongore, 2014; Zaidi et al, 2012), conscientiousness (Self Control) to be positively related to engagement (Ongore, 2014; Zaidi et al, 2012; Macey & Schneider, 2008), and open to experience (*opposite* Tough Mindedness) to be positively related to engagement (Ongore, 2014; Zaidi et al, 2012). Openness to experience and agreeableness were found to be significant predictors of job engagement (Ongore, 2014). Kim, Shin and Swanger (2009) found conscientiousness and neuroticism to be predictors of engagement. Extraversion, emotional stability, conscientiousness, and openness to experience were found to have significant positive impact of engagement (Akhtar et al., 2014; Zecca et al, 2014; Zaidi et al., 2012; Inceoglu & Warr, 2011; Wefald et al., 2011; Wildermuth, 2008). Other personality traits found to have positive impact on engagement were achievement orientation (Zecca et al, 2014; Inceoglu & Warr, 2011), social potency (Inceoglu & Warr, 2011), innovation (Inceoglu & Warr, 2011), optimism (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009), trait emotional intelligence (Akhtar et al., 2014; Brunetto et al., 2012; Ravichandran et al., 2011),

interpersonal sensitivity (Akhtar et al., 2014), ambition (Akhtar et al., 2014), and adjustment (Akhtar et al., 2014). Engaged employees were found to be higher than disengaged employees on optimism (Halbesleben, 2010; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009), high psychological capital (Paek et al., 2015), proactive personality (Bakker et al., 2012), and low neuroticism in combination with high extraversion and high levels of mobility (Langelaan et al., 2006).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Few empirical studies conducted on the linkage of personality traits and engagement in last twelve years are presented below to strengthen the argument and research gaps.

Young et al (2018) conducted a meta-analysis of 114 independent samples ($N = 44,224$) to identify the employees who are most likely to be engaged in their work. Their study provide results of relationship between eight personality traits and employee engagement. The results indicated that these personality traits explained 48.10% of the variance in engagement. Positive Affectivity was found to be strongest predictor of engagement (31.10% of the explained variance) followed by Proactive personality, Conscientiousness and Extra version.

Chandani et al (2016) conducted review of existing literature and concluded individual personality traits exhibited by engaged employees includes hardiness, high extra version, internal locus of control, low neuroticism, high self-esteem and active coping style.

Lather & Jain (2015) conducted a study to understand linkage between interpersonal need orientation and employee engagement. The data was collected form 100 employees working in public and private sector organizations. The results depicted that males high on people gatherer attitude were 12% less engaged as compared to others. Females high on inhibited, submissive, and dependent attitude were 23% less engaged as compared to others. The study further found that the individuals who were low on emotional control were 13% less engaged than others.

Akhtar et al (2015) explored the effect of big five personality traits, trait emotional intelligence and work specific personality on engagement on 1050

working professionals. They recognized that openness to experience; trait emotional intelligence, ambition, interpersonal sensitivity, adjustment, conscientiousness and extra version are all predictors of engagement. They also advocated that Trait emotional intelligence predicted engagement over and above personality.

Ongore (2014) conducted a study on 118 university personnel to examine the relationship of personality traits and job engagement on academic and administrative personnel of Kastamonu University. The results show that agreeableness, openness to experience, extra version and conscientiousness had positive relationship while neuroticism had a negative relationship with all the three dimensions of engagement (physical, emotional and cognitive). Agreeableness was found to predict cognitive and emotional dimension while openness to experience was the most significant predictor of physical, cognitive and emotional dimension of employee engagement.

Amir et al (2014) conducted a study on 100 private sector employees in Pakistan to examine the effect of five factor model on team performance. A positive relationship between openness to experience, agreeableness and team performance was found, and team performance had a negative relationship with neuroticism. Also it was seen that extra version and conscientiousness had insignificant relationship with team performance. As far as employee engagement is concerned, it moderated the relationship between agreeableness, openness to experience, extra version and team performance. However, employee engagement had no moderating effect on the relationship between neuroticism and team performance.

Reinke & Chamorro-Premuzic (2014) conducted a study to understand the relationship between personality and official email overload and their impact on work engagement/burnout. The results revealed that conscientiousness was significantly negatively related to email overload and burnout, while neuroticism was significantly positively related to official norms of email, email overload and burnout.

Arora & Adhikari (2013) conducted a study on IT professions to examine the relationship of

personality traits and employee engagement. They found that out of the sixteen personality factors (16 PF) anxiety and superego control have positive relationship with employee engagement on the other hand independence and tough poise have negative relationship with employee engagement and extra version showed insignificant relationship with employee engagement.

Woods & Sofat (2013) conducted a study on 238 working professionals of United Kingdom to assess the relationship of big five model and work engagement. They also studied the mediation effect of psychological meaningfulness. The statistical analysis revealed that assertiveness and industriousness were the strongest predictors of work engagement and both of them showed a direct as well as indirect effect when mediated with psychological meaningfulness. They also found out that neuroticism had an indirect association with work engagement that too is mediated by psychological meaningfulness.

Zaidi et al (2013) conducted a study on 399 university teachers of Lahore to identify the relationship between big five personality traits and work engagement. They evidenced a positive relationship between agreeableness, openness to experience, conscientiousness and work engagement. On the other hand they found that neuroticism is negatively related to work engagement. Statistical analysis established that agreeableness, openness to experience, extra version and conscientiousness have a significant effect on work engagement. But, the strength of relationship between work engagement and big five traits was not very strong ($R\text{-squared} = 0.28$).

Leung et al (2011) conducted a study to examine the effects of personal and situational determinants on work engagement and service performance. The study was based on the assumption that workplace ostracism will reduce work engagement and service performance and highly neurotic individuals are more vulnerable to ostracism. They conducted longitudinal study on data collected from 304 supervisor-subordinate dyads of 19 Chinese hotels. The results revealed that workplace ostracism impacted employee service performance negatively via work engagement. Neuroticism strengthened workplace ostracism's direct effect on work engagement and indirect effect on service performance.

Xanthopoulou et al (2009) argued on the basis of a study conducted on 572 Dutch employees that employees scoring high on extra version, conscientiousness, openness and agreeableness and low on neuroticism relate to higher levels of work engagement. Kim et al (2009) in their study found that the strongest predictor of engagement is conscientiousness. As conscientiousness influences work engagement through internal motivation, and work engagement is advocated to attain goals through internal drives. Kim et al (2009) in a study of full time employed front line employees of three and four star hotels in Nigeria found that trait competitiveness predicted three dimensions of engagement namely vigor, absorption and dedication. Self-efficacy also predicted absorption dimension of work engagement. Halbesleben et al (2009) added that employees high on conscientiousness display higher levels of engagement as they experience lower levels of work interference with their family.

Wildermuth (2008) conducted a study to understand the relationship of personality traits and employee engagement. The study was conducted on 420 human services professional from three different social service agencies. The results indicated that extra version and consolidation significantly predicts engagement and is also positively correlated with engagement. Need for stability is not a predictor of engagement but it had a significant negative correlation with engagement. Accommodation had insignificant correlation with engagement. Accommodation interacted with professional rank and, thus, contributed to the engagement of professionals and paraprofessionals. While professionals seemed to benefit from a medium accommodation, paraprofessionals had stronger engagement when their accommodation was lower. Lastly, originality was not related to engagement.

Lundberg et al (2007) conducted a study on a sample of 329 Swedish Information Communication Technology consultants to investigate association of Type A behavior as well as perceived work situation with burnout and work engagement. The findings indicated that both work situation and Type A behavior was correlated with work engagement and burnout but there was no interaction effect of Type A behavior and work situation on burnout and engagement.

Lather & Jain (2007) conducted a study on 100 employees working in Maruti Udyog and classified these employees as 'Dynamos' and 'Drones'. The dynamos were defined as the ones high on job satisfaction, work motivation, and performance, and low on stress, absenteeism, and role conflict. They defined drones as the ones low on job satisfaction, work motivation, and performance, and high on stress, absenteeism, and role conflict. These dynamos can also be called engaged and drones as disengaged. The authors then compared these dynamos and drones on their need behavioral orientations namely achievement, deference, order, exhibition, autonomy, affiliation, intraception, succorance, change, heterosexuality, aggression and dominance. The results of their study found that dynamos (engaged) were significantly higher on achievement, order, autonomy, and affiliation as compared to drones (disengaged). The drones (disengaged) were significantly higher on aggression and heterosexuality and poor on interpersonal relations. There were no difference between the two groups on deference, exhibition, interception, dominance, abasement and change.

3. RESEARCH GAPS AND RATIONALE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The studies related to personality and employee engagement are so far on Big Five model and few other factors like trait emotional intelligence, innovation, optimism etc. There is only one study in Indian context by Arora & Adhikari in 2013. This study also reported results of Global Five factors and not of more personality factors. Also whatever studies are available only delineate characteristics of Engaged employees. Almost no study talks about prominent personality traits of disengaged employees. The possible role of personality factors in determining employee engagement and lack of studies in this context especially in Indian scenario prompted authors to take up this study of personality differences amongst the engaged and disengaged associates working at various managerial levels in Delhi, India.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Sample

The present study involves comparison of engaged and disengaged associates working at various

levels of management for their personality differences. For this a 2 X 3 factorial design was planned and data was collected from associates working at three managerial levels (Top Level Management, Middle Level Management, and Lower Level Management) in five service industries (Higher Education, Aviation, Banking, Health, and Hospitality & Tourism) of two sectors (Public Sector and Private Sector).

A sample of 500 respondents was drawn using stratified random sampling for the present study. The sample was drawn from five service organizations (100 samples from each). Out of 100 samples allotted to each service organization, 50 each were drawn from public sector and private sector. Again, the 50 samples drawn from each sector, 5 associates were taken from top level management, 15 associates were taken from middle level management and 30 associates were taken from lower level management so as to ensure complete representation of population in the sample.

4.2 Tools Used

4.2.1 Employee Engagement Scale

A self-constructed and standardized scale of Employee Engagement was used. The scale consists of 26 items measuring six dimension namely job satisfaction (7 items), organizational commitment (5 items), advocacy (3 items), intent to stay (5 items), pride (5 items) and emotional connect (3 items). These dimensions were found to have cronbach alpha reliability score of .870 (job satisfaction), .858 (organizational commitment), .831 (advocacy), .891 (pride), .806 (intent to stay), and .784 (emotional connect). This scale is a Likert type scale, with multiple choice responses presented on a continuum. Responses range from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Table 1 shows the description of various dimensions of employee engagement.

On the basis of this scale an employee can be categorized in to 'Disengaged' and 'Engaged'. The 'Engaged Employee' accordingly is the one who feel psychological connect with the organization, find pleasure in the work he/she do. She/he is committed, and has sense of pride towards the organization, talk positive about the organization and will recommend others strongly to work for the organization. Engaged employee will always

Table 1: Showing Dimensions of Employee Engagement

Sr.No.	Dimension	Meaning
1.	Job Satisfaction	A pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the experiences of individual on the job with respect to his work and work environment.
2.	Organizational Commitment	The feelings of psychological connect with the organization and self-drawn similarities with the organization.
3.	Advocate	Recommending the organization to others.
4.	Pride	Feeling sense of pride towards the organization.
5.	Intent to Stay	Wanting to stay with the organization and develop one's own career
6.	Emotional Connect	Framing the emotional bond with the organization.
7.	Employee Engagement	Engagement is a feeling of psychological connect with the organization emerging out of pleasurable or positive emotional state leading to job satisfaction, commitment, sense of pride towards the organization, wanting to stay with the organization, forming emotional connect and recommending others also to work with the organization.

Note: These definitions are operational definitions of the constructs of Employee Engagement and are defined by authors.

talk positive things about the workplace, try to walk extra mile for the organization. She/he will put in her/his best efforts for the growth of the organization. They are also the star performers of the organization.

'Disengaged Employee' has no psychological connect with the organization. She/he finds no pleasure in working with the organization no matter whatever organization may provide. Such employees are not committed; carry a pessimistic view of the organization. She/he is silent trouble maker and remain behind the curtain and instigate people in the organization. Such employees are even at times, trouble shooters, anti-establishment and activist against the organization. She/he involves her/himself in non-work activities such as trade union activities, forming associations against the organization etc. She/he is disgruntled and spread bad news and information which is against the organization. Such employee neither leave the organization nor do any good for the organization.

4.2.2 Sixteen Personality Factors

The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), is a self-report personality test developed over several decades of empirical research by Cattell et. al. The test consists of 16 bi-polar personality factors where one extreme defines particular type of personality traits while the other extreme defines opposite personality traits. The test consists of 185 questions measuring the 16 primary traits namely warmth (A), reasoning (B), emotional stability (C), dominance (E), liveliness (F), rule-consciousness (G), social boldness (H), sensitivity (I), vigilance (L), abstractedness (M), privateness (N), apprehension (O), openness to change (Q1), self-reliance (Q2), perfectionism (Q3), and tension (Q4). The sixteen factors are converged to form five second order global traits which are extra version, anxiety, tough-mindedness, independence, and self-control (Cattell, 1956). These global traits are very consistent with the "Big Five" which are extra version, neuroticism, conscientiousness,

agreeableness, and openness to experience.

The internal consistency reliability of the test was determined using Cronbach's alpha ($n = 10,261$). The internal consistency scores of the primary scales were warmth = .69, reasoning = .75, emotional stability = .79, dominance = .68, liveliness = .73, rule-consciousness = .77, 16 Personality Factor 6 social boldness = .87,

sensitivity = .79, vigilance = .73, abstractedness = .78, privateness = .77, apprehension = .80, openness to change = .68, self-reliance = .79, perfectionism = .74, and tension = .76. The global scales of extra version, anxiety, tough-mindedness, independence, and self-control had a mean of .87 for the two week test-retest and a mean of .78 for the two month interval. Table 2 and Table

Table 2: Dimensions of Employee Engagement

<i>Factor</i>		<i>Left Meaning (Scores 1-4)</i>	<i>Right Meaning (Scores 7-10)</i>
A	Warmth	Reserved, Impersonal, Distant	Warm, Outgoing, Attentive to Others
B	Reasoning	Concrete	Abstract
C	Emotional Stability	Reactive, Emotionally Changeable	Emotionally Stable, Adaptive, Mature
E	Dominance	Deferential, Cooperative. Avoids Conflict	Dominant, Forceful, Assertive
F	Liveliness	Serious, Restrained, Careful	Lively, Animated, Spontaneous
G	Rule Consciousness	Expedient, Nonconforming	Rule-Conscious, Dutiful
H	Social Boldness	Shy, Threat-Sensitive, Timid	Socially Bold, Venturesome, Thick-Skinned
I	Sensitivity	Utilitarian, Objective, Unsentimental	Sensitive, Aesthetic, Sentimental
L	Vigilance	Trusting, Unsuspecting, Accepting	Vigilant, Suspicious, Sceptical, Wary
M	Abstractedness	Grounded, Practical, Solution-Oriented	Abstracted, Imaginative, Idea-Oriented
N	Privateness	Forthright, Genuine, Artless	Private, Discreet, Non-Disclosing
O	Apprehension	Self-Assured, Unworried, Complacent	Apprehensive, Self-Doubting, Worried
Q1	Openness to Change	Traditional, Attached to Familiar	Open to Change, Experimenting
Q2	Self-Reliance	Group-Oriented, Affiliative	Self-reliant, Solitary, Individualistic
Q3	Perfectionism	Tolerates Disorder, Unexacting, Flexible	Perfectionist, Organized, Self-Disciplined
Q4	Tension	Relaxed, Placid, Patient	Tense, High Energy, Impatient, Driven

Source: Cattell & Mead (2008), The Sage Handbook of Personality Theory and Assessment (p. 136)

Table 3: Dimensions of Employee Engagement

Factor	Left Meaning	(Scores 1-4)	Right Meaning (Scores 7-10)	Contributing Primary Factors
EX	Extraversion	Introverted, Socially Inhibited	Extraverted, Socially-Participating	(A) Warmth, (F) Liveliness, (H), Social Boldness, (N) Privatness, (Q2) Self Reliance
AX	Anxiety	Low Anxiety, Unperturbed	High Anxiety, Perturb able	(C) Emotional Stability, (L) Vigilance, (O) , Apprehension, (Q4) Tension
TM	Tough-Mindedness	Receptive, Open-Minded, Intuitive	Tough-Minded, Resolute, Unempathetic	(A) Warmth, (I) Sensitivity, (M) Abstractedness, (Q1) Openness to Change
IN	Independence	Accommodating, Agreeable, Selfless	Independent, Persuasive, Willful	(E) Dominance, (H) Social Boldness, (L) Vigilance, (Q1) Openness to Change
SC	Self-Control	Unrestrained, Follows Urges	Self- Controlled, Inhibits Urges	(F) Liveliness, (G) Rule Consciousness, (M) Abstractedness, (Q3) Perfectionism

Source: Cattell & Mead (2008), The Sage Handbook of Personality Theory and Assessment (p. 136)

3 shows the description of the primary factors and global factors of personality.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The technique of multi variate analysis of variance was applied to see the differences in the personality of engaged and disengaged associates working at different level of management. The

Wilk's Lambda values show that there is significant difference in the personality of engaged and disengaged associates (Wilks' Lambda= .789, F= 2.42, p= .000), personality of associates working at various level of management (Wilks' Lambda= .839, F= 1.76, p= .002) and engaged and disengaged associates at various levels of

Table 4: Wilks' Lambda Values of Engaged and Disengaged Associates for their Personality

Effect	Wilks' Lambda Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Level of Engagement	.789	2.421	42	808	.000
Level of Management	.839	1.763	42	808	.002
Level of Engagement * Level of Management	.835	1.811	42	808	.001

management (Wilks' Lambda= .835, F= 1.81, p= .001) as shown in Table 4.

The analysis of variance for level of engagement shows that the engaged and disengaged associates differ significantly on Emotional Stability, Liveliness, Apprehension, Self-Reliance, Tension, Extra version, Tough Mindedness, Self-Control and Anxiety (Table 5). The associates working at various levels of management differ significantly

on Warmth, Privatness, Openness to Change and Tough Mindedness (Table 5).

The level of engagement and level of management interaction shows that engaged and disengaged associates across different levels of management (i.e. Top Level Managers, Middle Level Managers, and Entry Level Managers) are significantly different on personality factors like Dominance, Social Boldness, Vigilance,

Table 5: Analysis of Variance for Significant Differences in Personality of Engaged and Disengaged Associates

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Level of Engagement	Emotional Stability	25.862	2	12.931	11.821	.000
	Liveliness	19.750	2	9.875	6.584	.002
	Apprehension	6.981	2	3.491	3.012	.050
	Self Reliance	8.799	2	4.400	3.976	.019
	Tension	14.913	2	7.457	8.943	.000
	Extraversion	7.422	2	3.711	5.347	.005
	Tough Mindedness	7.777	2	3.889	3.942	.020
	Self Control	6.623	2	3.312	3.031	.049
	Anxiety	19.430	2	9.715	11.549	.000
Level of Management	Warmth	7.821	2	3.910	3.434	.033
	Privateness	8.700	2	4.350	4.340	.014
	Openness To Change	11.340	2	5.670	4.194	.016
	Tough Mindedness	7.130	2	3.565	3.614	.028
Level of Engagement * Level of Management	Dominance	27.460	4	6.865	6.579	.000
	Social Boldness	11.329	4	2.832	3.094	.016
	Vigilance	27.925	4	6.981	4.778	.001
	Openness To Change	20.401	4	5.100	3.773	.005
	Self Reliance	25.426	4	6.357	5.744	.000
	Extraversion	10.790	4	2.698	3.886	.004
	Independence	41.930	4	10.482	9.611	.000
	Tough Mindedness	13.818	4	3.455	3.502	.008
	Anxiety	8.205	4	2.051	2.439	.046

Openness to Change, Self-Reliance, Extraversion, Independence, Tough Mindedness, and Anxiety (Table 5).

The exploration of the mean scores of engaged and disengaged associates on various personality factors (Table 6) shows that Engaged associates are significantly more Emotionally Stable, Lively, Group Oriented, Affiliative, Relaxed, Self-Controlled, Less Anxious as compared to disengaged associates. Disengaged associates are significantly more Individualistic, Serious, Restrained and Anxious as compared to Engaged associates.

Engaged associates are able to manage their emotions well at workplace, are adaptive and mature. Engaged associates are lively in their approach yet serious for their work. They are

neither too self-satisfied nor self-doubting meaning they maintain right amount of 'eustress' required for work. Engaged associates are able to maintain balance between group orientation and individualism. They are able to identify when to socialize, when to give space to others as well as maintain their personal space. They are determined yet open-minded, are able to inhibit their urges, keep high energy yet remain patient. Disengaged associates react easily and are emotionally changeable. They remain restrained, individualistic and have poor group orientation. They become impatient quickly, can't control their urges completely, are anxious, and are socially withdrawn.

Researchers found positive link between various personality factors and engagement like Extraversion (Akhtar et al, 2014; Zecca et al, 2014;

Table 6: Level of Engagement Wise Significant Mean Differences among Associates on Personality Factors

Dependent Variable	Engaged	Averagely Engaged	Disengaged
Emotional Stability	4.30 _a	4.12 _a	3.57 _b
Liveliness	5.21 _a	4.84 _b	4.41 _c
Apprehension	5.47 _b	5.67 _a	5.44 _b
Self Reliance	5.82 _a	6.41 _b	6.46 _b
Tension	5.14 _a	5.47 _b	5.50 _b
Extraversion	4.99 _a	4.60 _b	4.44 _b
Tough Mindedness	5.94 _b	5.75 _a	6.01 _b
Self Control	4.99 _a	5.12 _a	4.78 _b
Anxiety	6.14 _a	6.52 _b	6.40 _b

Note: Means with differing subscripts within rows are significantly different at the $p < .05$ based on Duncan Multiple Range post hoc paired comparisons.

Ongore, 2013; Zaidi et al, 2012; Wefald et al, 2011; Inceoglu & Warr, 2011; Wildermuth, 2008; Langelaan et al, 2004), Agreeableness (Ongore, 2013; Zaidi et al, 2012; Wefald et al, 2011), Emotional Stability (Zecca et al, 2014; Kim et al, 2009), and Superego Control (Arora & Adhikari, 2013). The negative link of engagement with certain personality factors is also established like Neuroticism (Ongore, 2013; Zaidi et al, 2012), Independence (Arora & Adhikari, 2013), Tough poise (Arora & Adhikari, 2013), and Need for Stability (Wildermuth, 2008; Langelaan et al, 2004).

A scrutiny of the Table 7 shows that associates at different managerial levels differ significantly on personality factors like Warmth, Privatensess, Openness to Change, and Tough Mindedness. The analysis of the mean values reveals that entry level

and middle level managers are significantly higher than top level managers on Warmth. This means that entry level and middle level managers are more outgoing and attentive to others while top level managers are more reserved, impersonal, and distant. It may be so because top level manager wishes to maintain a power distance. Contrarily, further results unveil that top level managers are significantly low on Privatensess as compared to entry level and middle level managers. This means top level managers are more forthright and genuine while middle level and entry level managers are more non-disclosing and discrete. This can be ascribed to the possibility that as the managers move up in hierarchy, and assume leadership positions, they better appreciate the importance of being transparent and direct. The mean scores (Table 7) further exhibit that middle

Table 7: Level of Management wise Significant Mean Differences among Associates on Personality Factors

Dependent Variable	Entry Level Managers	Middle Level Managers	Top Level Managers
Warmth	4.30 _a	4.12 _a	3.57 _b
Privatensess	5.21 _a	4.84 _b	4.41 _c
Openness to Change	5.47 _b	5.67 _a	5.44 _b
Tough Mindedness	5.82 _a	6.41 _b	6.46 _b

Note: Means with differing subscripts within rows are significantly different at the $p < .05$ based on Duncan Multiple Range post hoc paired comparisons.

level managers are significantly higher than the entry level and top level managers on Openness to change. This means they are more experimenting and unconventional as compared to their superior and subordinate counterparts. The results also show that the top level and middle level managers are significantly more resolute and less compassionate as compared to the entry level managers. This can be credited to the effect of experiences at workplace.

An exploration of the Table 8 showing the mean scores of associates on personality factors across level of engagement and level of management shows that engaged entry level managers are more assertive as compared to disengaged entry level managers who are more cooperative. Whereas, engaged top level managers are more cooperative,

trusting, accepting, receptive, selfless and agreeable as compared to disengaged top level managers who are more assertive, skeptical, tough minded, willful, wary and aggressive. Both engaged and disengaged middle level managers are average on assertiveness. At the same time, the score range according to personality test shows that all the associates except disengaged entry level managers and engaged top level managers are average on Dominance and Independence. This means all the associates have a mix of assertive, forceful, cooperative, accommodating, agreeable, persuasive and willful dispositions. While, disengaged entry level managers and engaged top level managers are by disposition deferential, cooperative, accommodating, and agreeable.

Table 8: Level of Engagement and Level of Management wise Significant Mean Differences among Associates on Personality Factors

Dependent Variable		Disengaged	Averagely Engaged	Engaged
Dominance	Entry Level Managers	3.71	4.35	4.57
	Middle Level Managers	4.49	4.46	4.64
	Top Level Managers	5.08	4.17	4.16
Social Boldness	Entry Level Managers	4.48	5.03	5.20
	Middle Level Managers	5.12	4.69	4.98
	Top Level Managers	5.00	4.67	4.97
Vigilance	Entry Level Managers	5.90	6.68	6.21
	Middle Level Managers	6.26	5.76	6.01
	Top Level Managers	6.89	5.50	5.97
Openness To Change	Entry Level Managers	4.87	5.16	5.23
	Middle Level Managers	4.71	4.61	4.83
	Top Level Managers	5.79	4.50	4.65
Self Reliance	Entry Level Managers	6.58	6.52	5.66
	Middle Level Managers	6.64	6.40	5.77
	Top Level Managers	5.52	6.67	6.37
Extraversion	Entry Level Managers	4.19	4.51	5.14
	Middle Level Managers	4.34	4.84	4.85
	Top Level Managers	4.94	4.67	4.65

Independence	Entry Level Managers	4.12	4.82	4.94
	Middle Level Managers	4.81	4.41	4.78
	Top Level Managers	5.70	4.33	4.34
Tough Mindedness	Entry Level Managers	5.77	5.69	5.96
	Middle Level Managers	6.20	6.16	6.06
	Top Level Managers	5.19	6.33	6.22
Anxiety	Entry Level Managers	6.55	6.68	6.15
	Middle Level Managers	6.79	6.27	6.17
	Top Level Managers	6.68	6.00	5.78

The further study of the Table 8 affirm that engaged entry level managers are more socially bold and venturesome as compared to disengaged entry level managers who are more timid and shy. Middle level and top level managers are average on social boldness. However, the score range according to personality test shows that all the associates are average on Social Boldness, Openness to Change, and Tough Mindedness. This means by disposition all the associates have a mix of timid, venturesome, traditional, experimenting, receptive, open-minded, stubborn and indifferent personality.

Table of means (Table 8) also demonstrate that engaged entry level and middle level managers are more group oriented and socially participating as compared to disengaged associates of these levels who are more individualistic in approach and socially inhibited. Both engaged and disengaged top level managers are average on group orientation and social participation by disposition. Also engaged associates from all the three levels of management are lower on anxiety as compared to their disengaged counterparts who are higher on anxiety. Additionally, disengaged top level managers are by disposition suspicious, skeptical and wary while rest of the associates are average on vigilance means they are trusting, accepting and wary.

6. CONCLUSION AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Employee Engagement is arguably the most critical metric for organizations in the 21st Century. Most, if not all, of the other key measures that reflect and drive organizational performance (customer satisfaction, innovation, profitability,

productivity, reputation, loyalty and quality) are products of engaged and committed employees. It has achieved sizeable attention amongst academicians and practitioners due to its link to increased financial returns and improved organizational reputation. The efforts towards employee engagement should start even before hiring, as is evident from the results of the present study. Associates at different managerial levels differ significantly on personality factors like; Warmth, Privatness, Openness to Change, and Tough Mindedness. Entry level and middle level managers are more outgoing and attentive to others while top level managers are more reserved, impersonal, and distant. Top level managers are more forthright and genuine while, middle level and entry level managers are more non-disclosing and discrete. Further, results show that Engaged and Disengaged associates working on different levels of management significantly differ on Dominance, Vigilance, Social Boldness, Openness to Change, Self-Reliance, Extraversion, Tough Mindedness, Independence and Anxiety. These traits can be accessed through using standardized personality assessment tools or by getting specific assessment tools developed from experts. Managers must prepare a detailed recruitment plan to ensure that the recruited employees possess the personality traits of Engaged associates. This would help managers to hire engaged associates in a planned and scientific manner. These traits can also be imbibed by the rigorous induction training after the recruitment. A comprehensive two year training programme comprising of structural and behavioral management can be introduced. This will help in re-socializing the employee as per the industry

need. Successful re-socialization involves completely changing an individual's mental makeup and behavioral orientation.

7. REFERENCES

- Akhtar, R., Boustani, L., Tsivrikos, D., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2015). The engageable personality: Personality and trait EI as predictors of work engagement. *Personality and Individual Differences, 73*, 44-49.
- Amir, F., Naz, F., Hafeez, S. Q., Ashfaq, A., & Dogar, Y. H. (2014). Measuring the effect of five factor model of personality on team performance and moderating role of employee engagement. *Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Science, 2* (2), 221-255.
- Arora, R. & Adhikari, B. (2013). Relationship between personality factors and employee engagement. *PES Business Review, 1* (2013), 10-18.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International, 13*, 209-223
- Bakker, A.B., Tims, M., & Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and job performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human Relations October, 2012, 65*(10) 1359-1378.
- Brunetto, Y., Teo, T. T., Shacklock, K., & Farr-Wharton, R. (2012). Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, well-being and engagement: Explaining organizational commitment and turnover intentions in policing. *Human Resource Management Journal, 22*(4), 428-441.
- Cattell, H. E. P. & Mead, A. D. (2008). The sixteen personality factor questionnaire. *In the sage handbook of personality theory and assessment*. Online available at <http://www.central.rcs.k12.tn.us/Teachers/cowartg/documents/16PFCattell.pdf>
- Chandani, A., Mehta, M., Mall, A., & Khokar, V. (2016). Employee engagement: a review paper on factors affecting employee engagement. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology, 9*(15), 1-7.
- Cheong, C. (2017). 2017 ultimate guide to employee engagement. Online available at <http://blog.engagerocket.co/2017/04/13/2017-ultimate-guide-to-employee-engagement/>
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A qualitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance, *Personnel Psychology, 64*, 89-136.
- Erdil, O., & Müceldili, B. (2014). The effects on envy on job engagement and turnover intention. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 150*, 447-454.
- Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2010). A meta-analysis of work engagement: Relationships with burnout, demands, resources, and consequences. *In: A.B. Bakker & M.P. Leiter (Eds.), Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*, New York: Psychology Press, 2010, 102-17.
- Halbesleben, J.R.B., Harvey, J. & Bolino, M. (2009). Too engaged? A conservation of resources view of the relationship between work engagement and work interference with family. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(6), 1452-1465.
- Hewitt Aon (2017). How is global uncertainty impacting employee engagement levels? Online available at <http://www.aon.com/engagement17/>
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*, 513-524.
- Howard, P. J., & Howard, J. M. (2001). *The owner's manual for personality at work*. Austin, TX: Bard Press.
- Huhman, H.R. (2015). Offer these 50 free professional resources to your employees. Online available at <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/243672>
- Inceoglu, I. & Warr, P. (2011). Personality and job engagement. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 10*, 177-181.
- 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.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 692-724.
- Kahn, W. A. (1992). To be fully there:

- Psychological presence at work. *Human Relations*, 45, 321-349.
- Karatepe, O. M. & Olugbade, O. A. (2009). The effects of job and personal resources on hotel employees' work engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28 (4), 504-512.
- Kataria, A., Garg, P., & Rastogi, R. (2013). Organizational effectiveness as a function of employee engagement. *South Asian Journal of Management* 20(4), 56-73.
- Kim, H. J., Shin, K. H., & Swanger, N. (2009). Burnout and engagement: A comparative analysis using the Big Five personality dimensions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28, 96-104.
- LaMotte, S. (2015). Employee engagement depends on what happens outside of the office. Online available at <https://hbr.org/2015/01/employee-engagement-depends-on-what-happens-outside-of-the-office>
- Langelaan, S., Bakker, A. B., van Doornen, L. J. P., & Schaufeli, W. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: Do individual differences make a difference? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40, 521-532.
- Lather, A. S. & Jain, S. (2007). Need behavioral orientation of dynamos and drones in organizations: A Maruti experience. *Vikalpa*, 32 (1), 45-54.
- Lather, A. S. & Jain, S. (2015). Interpersonal need orientation and employee engagement: empirical evidence. *American International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 12(1), 66-71.
- Leung, A. S. M., Wu, L. Z., Chen, Y. Y., & Young, M. N. (2011). The impact of workplace ostracism in service organizations. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30 (4), 836-844.
- Lundberg, U., Johansson, G., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). Type A behavior and work situation: Associations with burnout and work engagement. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 48(2), 135-142.
- Macey, W. H. and Schneider, B. (2008). The Meaning of the Employee Engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1(1), 3-30.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001), Job burnout, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- May, D. R. Gilson, R. L. and Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 11-37.
- Melarkode, A. (2015). Employee engagement psyche: A mindset for great performance. Online available at <https://www.peoplematters.in/article/employee-engagement/employee-engagement-psyche-mindset-great-performance-11349>
- Meyer, J. P. & Gagné, M. (2008). Employee engagement from a self-determination theory perspective. *Industrial and organizational psychology*, 1(1), 60-62.
- Nink, M. & Robison, J. (2016). The damage inflicted by poor managers. Online available at http://www.gallup.com/businessjournal/200108/damage-inflicted-poor-managers.aspx?g_source=EMPLOYEE_ENGAGEMENT&g_medium=topic&g_campaign=tiles
- Ongore, O. (2014). A study of relationship between personality traits and job engagement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 1315-1319
- Portello, J. (1996). Dimensions of managerial and professional women's stress: Interpersonal conflict and distress. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: the Sciences and Engineering*, US: University Microfilms International, 57 (6-B) the People and Performance Link: Unlocking the Black Box. London, CIPD
- Priyadarshi, P., & Raina, R. (2014). The mediating effects of work engagement: testing causality between personal resource, job resource and work related outcomes. *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management* 9(4). doi: 10.1504/IJICBM.2014.065203
- Ravichandran, K., Arasu, R., & Kumar, S. A. (2011). The impact of emotional intelligence on

employee work engagement behavior: An Empirical Study. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(11), 157-169.

Reinke, K. & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2014). When email use gets out of control: understanding the relationship between personality and email overload and their impact on burnout and work engagement. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 36, 502-509.

Retallick, A. (2015). *The Cost of a Disengaged Employee*. Online available at <https://www.glassdoor.com/employers/blog/the-cost-of-a-disengaged-employee/>

Rich, B. L., (2006). *Job engagement: Construct validation and relationships with job satisfaction, job involvement and intrinsic motivation*, unpublished doctoral, University of Florida.

Robinson, I. (2006) *Human resource management in organizations*. London, CIPD.

Russell, M. T., & Karol, D. (1994). *16PF Fifth Edition Administrator's Manual with Updated Norms*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

Taylor, K. (2015). *How can you improve employee engagement* (Infographic). Online available at <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/243788>

Wefald, A. J., Reichard, R. J., & Serrano, S.A. (2011). Fitting engagement into a nomological network: the relationship of engagement to leadership and personality. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(10), 1-16. DOI: 10.1177/1548051811404890

Wildermuth, C. (2008). Engaged to serve: The relationship between employee engagement and the personality of human services professionals and paraprofessionals leadership studies Ed.D. *Dissertations. Paper31*. Online Available at http://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/leadership_diss/31

Woods, S. A., & Sofat, J. A. (2013). Personality and engagement at work: the mediating role of psychological meaningfulness. *Journal of Allied Social Psychology*, 43(11), 2203-2210

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74 (3), 235-244

Young, H.R., Glerum, D.R., Wang, W., & Joseph, D.L. (2018). Who are the most engaged at work? A meta-analysis of personality and employee engagement, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(10), 1330-1346.

Zaidi, N. R., Wajid, R. A., Zaidi, F. B., Zaidi, G. B., & Zaidi, M. T. (2012). The big five personality traits and their relationship with work engagement among public sector university teachers of Lahore. *African Journal of Business Management*, 7(15), 1344-1353.

Zecca, G., Gyorkos, C., Becker, J., Massoudi, K., De bruin, G., & Rossier, J. (2015). Validation of the French Utrecht work engagement scale and its relationship with personality traits and impulsivity". *Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée/European Review of Applied Psychology*, 65(1) 19-28.