

A Study of Relationship among Personality Traits, Psychosocial Well-being and Job Engagement of Para-medical Staff

Mazhar Iqbal,¹ Muhammad Javed Iqbal,² & Akhlaq Ahmad³

Abstract:

The present study examined the relationship among personality traits, psychosocial well-being and job engagement of Para-medical staff. The cross-sectional research design was used in the present study with sample (N=140) of employed youth, (n=70) from female and (n=70) from male paramedical staff using purposive sampling technique. SPSS was used for data analysis alongwith descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. In the findings; the bivariate analysis showed that, Honesty-Humility, Extraversion, and Agreeableness as personality traits were significantly and positively correlated with psychological well-being and job engagement while, emotionality as personality trait was significantly negatively associated with psychological well-being. The mediating analysis showed that psychosocial wellbeing as a mediator variable considered positive and partial mediator among personality characteristics like (extraversion, agreeableness, honesty, openness to experience and consciousness) and job engagement.

Keywords: Personality traits, job engagement, psychosocial well-being.

INTRODUCTION

Recently, measurement of personality traits, related to work or work engagements has progressively become a vital function for the recruitment and selection of employees in Human Resource Department (HRD). The main domain regarding personnel assessment only focuses on the job-related knowledge, skills, and abilities. It has now been expanded by including other personnel traits and characteristics such as personality traits (Levy, Richardson, Lounsbury, & Stewart, 2011). Assessment of personality traits may increase the chances of success because personality characteristics will be matched with their career (Rahman, Ibrahim, Idris, & Razak, 2007). Judge and Bono (2001) explained personality as a durable model of behaviour or action; personality traits and characteristics are the aptitudes proposed by individuals in the same manners across the situations and settings.

Furthermore, Ryckman (2004) defined personality as a dynamic and structured pattern of traits proposed by individuals which distinctively affect their cognition, motivation, and behaviour in different circumstances. Like that, personality traits can affect the job performance. This was suggested by Judge and Bono (2001) that personality characteristics can be dispositional predictors of the job performance. It can be said that, this type of situation may be true among the teachers, where they have different capabilities and personality traits that later can influence their job performance directly (Ali, Azizollah, Zaman, Zahra, & Mohtaram, 2011).

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: mazhar.iqbal@iiu.edu.pk

² MS Scholar, Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan. Email:

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: akhlaq.ahmad@iiu.edu.pk

Work engagement consists of three major dimensions, which are; vigor, dedication, and absorption. These dimensions are said to be firmly positive and negatively stable signs of occupational wellbeing (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002b). Pakistan is counted among the emerging economies of the world. New job opportunities and avenues are opening up due to China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC). Therefore, it is necessary to explore this phenomenon related to jobs and their psychosocial aspects. Different models have been developed to explain the personality; however HAXECO model of personality is discussed in details because it is most relevant model of personality in the current scenario. The HEXACO model of personality comprises six personality factors model. This model is presented by Lee and Ashton (2005) which is based on a succession of linguistic researches including several European and Asian languages. The six personality factors of HEXACO includes; Honesty-Humility (H), Emotionality (E), Extraversion (E), Agreeableness (A), Conscientiousness (C), and Open to Experience (O). The existing literature indicates that, mostly researches were carried out on personality with satisfaction and wellbeing or the assessment of personality traits in the recruitment process. However, the present study determines the relationship between personality traits, psychosocial wellbeing, and job engagement among para-medical staff.

REVIEW LITERATURE

Personality and Job Engagement

How and why are personality traits related to work engagement? The answer to this question could give a better understanding of some people's more engagement at work than others. Moreover, this information could be used to develop interventions to foster and promote work engagement. Engagement has emerged as an important construct in the applied psychological and management literatures (e.g. Maslach & Leiter, 2008), yet research on the dispositional antecedents of engagement is unclear about the influences of personality traits.

In studying workers' wellbeing, attention has traditionally been focused on the construct of job satisfaction, a relatively passive experience of low-to-moderate activation. This type of well-being has recently been complemented by the more energized form referred to as job engagement. Engaged workers feel positive about their situation. Beyond mere satisfaction, they are motivated to expend energy on a task. Thus, Leiter and Bakker (2010) defined job engagement as "a positive, fulfilling, affective-motivational state of work related wellbeing." The review by Bakker, Albrecht, and Leiter (2011) identified a "growing consensus that engagement can be defined in terms of high levels of energy and high levels of involvement in work."

It is widely agreed that engagement arises from personal and environmental sources (Macey, & Schneider, 2008). However, theoretical discussions and empirical investigations have emphasized one of those, mainly examining engagement as a response to characteristics of the job. Thus, Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), and others (not denying the role of within-person factors) have investigated key job features such as autonomy, demands, conflicts, and good relations with other people. While Rich, Lepine, and Crawford (2010) developed and tested a model incorporating organizational support. However, there is a need to create understanding of engagement bases within individuals themselves. More engaged and less engaged workers are likely to differ in

certain traits and the nature of their jobs. However, few studies or models of possible personality contributors to job engagement have been published.

Psychosocial Well-being and engagement

Donaldson-Feilder and Podro (2012) stated that there has been a shift from an industrial to a more knowledge-based economy in countries such as the UK. This has changed the emphasis from physical health in the workplace to psychological health. They further argued that positive employee engagement is linked to factors such as trust in management, employees' ability to participate in workplace decisions, and a sense of achievement with the work performed. Conversely, lack of employee engagement has been linked to increased absenteeism, presenters, and lower levels of performance and productivity (Purcell, 2008). Schaufeli et al. (2008) analyzed data from 587 middle managers and executives of a Dutch telecom company, demonstrating that work engagement is distinct from and negatively correlated with burnout ($= -0.65$). Burnout, conceptualized by Maslach (1993) as consisting of feelings of exhaustion, cynicism and a lack of professional adequacy, has been linked with the incidence and duration of work absences (e.g., Schaufeli et al., 2008) as well as health problems (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004).

METHODOLOGY

The present study used cross-sectional research method.. This study compares the gender, **SES**, education level of the participants on different levels of personality traits, job engagement and psychosocial wellbeing. The population of this study was the para-medical staff working in Public Hospitals in District Bhakkar. The present study sample consisted of ($N = 140$) para-medical staff of District Bhakkar. There were ($n =70$) males (Dispensers and Health Technicians) and ($n =70$) females (Nurses and Lady Health Visitors). The sample was selected from Public Hospitals (DHQs, THQs, RHCs and BHUs) of District Bhakkar. In the present research, purposive sampling technique was used to collect the data.

In the present study, different instruments likeThe Informed Consent Form, Demographic Sheet, HEXACO-PI-R, Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), and mental health continuum short form (MHC-SF) are used. For collecting the information from the participants, the informed consent form was developed, and the respondents were guaranteed the confidentiality of the information. The personality traits were measured using the Lee & Ashton's (2005) Hexaco Personality Inventory Revised (HEXACO-PI-R) which was originally developed by Lee & Ashton (2005). The scoring method of HEXACO-PI-R is with normal mean of every item but items pointed out with R reversed keyed items 5. HEXACO comprises 60 items scales with six dimensions, and each dimension has 10 items. Actually, sub-scale scores were calculated as mean after assessing of reversed keyed items. The Sixty-item version of the HEXACO Big-six is short and was not planned to be away from the above-ground levels of internal consistency and reliability. These are suggested for the use as predictors of conceptually related criterion variables and signs of Big-Six personality factors. Psychosocial wellbeing was measured using a short form of mental health Continuum consisted of 14 items which was derived from a long form of mental health Continuum consisted of 29 items Keyes (1998) of social wellbeing model. The maximum score on this scale indicated a higher level of psychosocial wellbeing and the minimum score on this scale indicated a lower level of psychosocial wellbeing.

An excellent internal consistency of (>.80) has been shown of the short form of mental health Continuum and discriminate validity in adults and adolescents (ages 12-18) in the U.S, Netherlands, and in South Africa (Keyes, Wissing, Potgieter, Temane, Kruger, & Rooy, 2008). Test-retest reliability estimates of 4-weeks of the long-form scale ranged from .57 for the overall domain of psychological wellbeing, .64 of the overall emotional wellbeing domain, and .71 of the overall social wellbeing domain (Rohbitschek, & Keyes, 2009). Over successive 3 months periods, the test-retest reliability of the Mental Health continuum is averaged .68 and the nine months test-retest reliability was .65 (Lamers, Westerhof, Bohlmeijer, Klooster, & Keyes, 2011). The mental health Continuum short form is validated for the use with individuals aged twelve or older. Utrecht Work Engagement Scale was developed by Schaufeli and Bakker (2003). In this study, the short form with 17 items was used. The reliability analysis exposed that three sub-scales of the work engagement scale showed the satisfactory high internal consistencies ($\sum\alpha=0.87$ & $r=0.65$). Besides this, the exploratory factor analysis revealed that all of the items had mean factor loadings-up to 0.80, which determined the construct validity of the Utrecht work engagement scale.

Moreover, the results of confirmatory factor analysis showed that Utrecht work engagement scale enclosed three topic of job engagement; the universal explanation of VI: vigor (e.g., "At my work, I feel bursting with energy"), the 2nd is DE: dedication (e.g., "I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose"), and the last one domain of the Utrecht work engagement scale is AB: absorption scale (e.g., "Time flies when I am working"). The descriptive statistics were used for all variables' psychometrics properties, while inferential statistics were carried out -and Pearson r correlation technique was used on the SPSS 23.0 version. After getting the proper permission from the respective authors, the assessment tools were used. The informed consent was also taken from the participants under the inclusion criteria and legal authorities for data collection. Before collecting data, the objective and purpose of the research were clearly introduced to the participants. Relevant instructions were also given to the participants regarding the questionnaires. It took approximately one month to complete all the forms. After getting back the filled questionnaires, each participant was thanked for the cooperation in the study. Finally, the incomplete and partial data were excluded, and omissions were filled out.

Data Analysis

Table 1: Bivariate Correlation among all of study Variables (N=140)

IV, DV, & Mediating Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Honesty-Humility		-.39**	.47**	.69**	.67**	.66**	.53**	.23**
2. Emotionality			-.42**	-.41**	-.39**	-.36**	-.23**	-.14*
3. Extraversion				.57**	.56**	.49**	.35**	.19*
4. Agreeableness					.78**	.65**	.47**	.22**
5. Conscientiousness						.78**	.52**	.29**
6. Openness to experience							.43**	.18*
7. Job Engagement								.70**
8. Psychosocial wellbeing								

**p < .01; *p < .05

This table shows that the honesty-humility was significantly positively correlated with ($r = .53, p < .01$) job engagement and ($r = .230, p < .01$) Psychosocial wellbeing. Further, emotionality was significantly negatively correlated with ($r = -.228, p < .01$) job engagement and ($r = -.138, p < .05$) Psychosocial wellbeing. Where, extraversion was positively significantly associated with ($r = .348, p < .01$) job engagement and ($r = .185, p < .05$) Psychosocial wellbeing. Furthermore, agreeableness was significantly positively linked with ($r = .468, p < .01$) job engagement and ($r = .217, p < .01$) Psychosocial wellbeing. Thus, conscientiousness was significantly positively correlated with ($r = .518, p < .01$) job engagement and ($r = .286, p < .01$) Psychosocial wellbeing. Additionally, openness to experience was positively significantly associated with ($r = .428, p < .01$) job engagement and ($r = .173, p < .01$) Psychosocial wellbeing. Finally, job engagement was significantly positively correlated with ($r = .795, p < .01$) Psychosocial wellbeing.

Table 2: For the effect of Honesty-Humility and Psychosocial Well-being on Job Engagement (N=140)

Predictors	Job Engagement		
	Model 1 β	β	95% CI
Constant	37.45**	-5.61	[-13.56, 2.34]
Honesty-Humility	1.41**	.97**	[.81, 1.04]
Psychosocial Wellbeing		.92**	[.73, 1.20]
R ²	.27	.75	
F	51.86**	210.15**	
ΔR^2		.05	
ΔF		7.73**	

** $p < .01$, B for Unstandardized regression coefficient, CI for Confidence interval

The above table's results showed that psychosocial wellbeing endured a significant positive mediator between honesty-humility and job engagement.

Table 3: For the effect of Emotionality and Psychosocial Well-being on Job Engagement (N=140)

Predictors	Job Engagement		
	Model 1 β	β	95% CI
Constant	79.83**	17.59**	[9.15, 26.04]
Emotionality	-.18**	-.09*	[-.17, -.02]
Psychosocial Well-being		1.01**	[.88, 1.14]
R ²	.05	.65	
F	7.55**	125.43**	
ΔR^2		.02	
ΔF		2.66	

** $p < .01$, B for Unstandardized regression coefficient, CI for Confidence interval

The results showed that psychosocial wellbeing endured a non-significant negative mediator between emotionality and job engagement.

Table 4: For the effect of Extraversion and Psychosocial Well-being on Job Engagement (N=140)

Job Engagement		
----------------	--	--

Predictors	Model 1 β	Model 2	
		β	95% CI
Constant	64.99**	10.75**	[3.18, 18.32]
Extraversion	.33**	.20**	[.11, .29]
Psychosocial Well-being		.98**	[.85, 1.11]
R ²	.12	.67	
F	19.05**	141.88**	
ΔR^2		.03	
ΔF		4.89*	

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$ B for un-standardized regression coefficient, CI for Confidence interval

The above table's results showed that psychosocial wellbeing endured a significant positive mediator between extraversion and job engagement.

Table 5: For the effect of Agreeableness and Psychosocial Well-being on Job Engagement (N=140)

Predictors	Model 1 β	Job Engagement	
		β	95% CI
Constant	58.99**	8.36**	[1.33, 15.39]
Agreeableness	.60**	.40**	[.28, .51]
Psychosocial Well-being		.94**	[.83, 1.06]
R ²	.22	.70	
F	38.76**	292.35**	
ΔR^2		.05	
ΔF		6.83**	

** $p < .01$, B for Un-standardized regression coefficient, CI for Confidence interval

The results showed that psychosocial wellbeing endured a significant positive mediator between agreeableness and job engagement.

Table 6:

Predictors	Model 1 β	Job Engagement	
		β	95% CI
Constant	60.26**	11.74**	[4.86, 18.61]
Conscientiousness	.60**	.36**	[.26, .47]
Psychosocial Well-being		.91**	[.79, 1.03]
R ²	.27	.72	
F	50.66**	180.12**	
ΔR^2		.08	
ΔF		12.31**	

** $p < .01$, B for un-standardized regression coefficient, CI for Confidence interval

The results of the above table showed that psychosocial wellbeing endured a significant positive mediator between Conscientiousness and job engagement.

Table 7: For the effect of Openness to Experience and Psychosocial Well-being on Job Engagement (N=140)

Predictors	Model 1 β	<i>Job Engagement</i>	
		β	95% <i>CI</i>
Constant	63.77**	9.94**	[2.93, 16.94]
Openness to Experience	.48**	.33**	[.23, .43]
Psychosocial Well-being		.96**	[.85, 1.08]
R ²	.18	.72	
F	30.98**	175.61**	
ΔR^2		.03	
ΔF		4.27*	

** $p < .01$, B for Unstandardized regression coefficient, CI for Confidence interval

The results of the above table showed that psychosocial wellbeing endured a significant positive mediator between openness to experience and job engagement.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The aim of this quantitative study was to measure the personality traits as predictors of job engagement among para-medical staff: mediating role of psychosocial wellbeing. The total sample (N=140) Para-medical staff was collected from District Bhakkar Punjab-Pakistan. For this study, three questionnaires were employed to collect the quantitative data, HEXACO Personality Inventory, Work and Well-being Survey for Work Engagement and Mental Health Continuum Short Form for Psychosocial wellbeing.

Various studies have been conducted in Western culture but in Pakistan, few researches are conducted to explore personality traits and job engagement: the mediating role of psychosocial wellbeing. Macey and Schneider (2008) agreed that engagement is a source of personal and environmental factors. Though empirical investigations and discussion have so far accentuated one of those, largely probing engagement is a response of job characteristics. However, Shirom (2010), Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) have discussed autonomy, conflicts, demands and good relationship with other as key features of job.

The results of the present research exhibited for H₁, that honesty-humility as a personality trait is significantly positively correlated with psychosocial wellbeing and job engagement. The results of the current study supported through past researches that had concluded a positive association between honesty-humility and Psychosocial wellbeing. Honesty-humility, a new trait is part of big six personality traits also known as HEXACO personality traits (Lee & Ashton, 2005). In the past researches, Aghababaei and Arji (2014) found honesty-humility is significantly positively related with psychosocial wellbeing. The same findings are also discussed in other researches that supported present research results, means a person with high score on Honesty (H factor) has a positive link with Psychosocial wellbeing. The present study's findings are similar to the previous researches so the H₁ of this research is accepted.

Furthermore, for the H₂, the results presented that emotionality as a factor of personality traits was significantly negatively associated with psychosocial wellbeing and job engagement. Sufficient studies discussed that emotionality is negatively connected with psychosocial wellbeing (Hosseinkhanzadeh, & Taher, 2012). The findings of Chaturvedula and Joseph. (2007) asserted the

same results. A research showed that emotional disturbance in individuals with high prevalence leads to low prevalence of psychosocial wellbeing. In another study, Hills and Argyle (2001) accomplished the negative relationship between emotionality personality traits and well-being. Furthermore, Keyes, Shmotkin and Ryff (2002) also concluded the same findings supported in the results of the current study.

Conclusively, personality traits e.g. honesty-humility, extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness and openness to experience positively enhanced the level of job engagement and psychosocial wellbeing among para-medical staff. While emotionality as personality trait endured negative contributor in job engagement and psychosocial wellbeing. On the other hand, in mediation, psychosocial wellbeing as a mediator variable is considered positive and partial mediator among personality characteristics like (extraversion, agreeableness, honesty, openness to experience and conscientiousness and job engagement). The findings of this study will be necessary for the para-medical staff recruitment process. The results will be important to understand the gender differences regarding the level of psychosocial wellbeing and job engagement and the comparison of marital status regarding the level of psychosocial well being and job engagement in Para medical staff.

References:

- Aghababaei, N., & Arji, A. (2014). Wellbeing and the HEXACO model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 56*(1), 139-142.
- Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. S (2011). Key questions regarding work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20*(1), 4-28.
- Chaturvedula, S., & Joseph, C. (2007). Dimensions of psychological wellbeing and personality in military aircrew: A preliminary study. *Indian Journal of Aerospace Medicine, 51*(2), 17-27.
- Feilder, D., & Podro, S. (2012). The future of health and well-being in the workplace: An Acas future of work discussion paper. London: ACAS.
- Hosseinkhanzadeh, A. A., Taher, M., & Esapoor, M. (2012). Attitudes to sexuality in individuals with mental retardation from perspectives of their parents and teachers. *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology, 4*(4), 134-46.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 80-92.
- Keyes, C. L., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C. D. (2002). Optimizing wellbeing: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(6), 1007-22.
- Keyes, C. L. M., Wissing, M., Potgieter, J. P., Temane, M., Kruger, A., & Rooy, S. (2008, May.-Jun.). Evaluation of the mental health continuum-short form (MHC-SF) in setswana-speaking South Africans. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy, 15*(3), 181-92.
- Lamers, S. M. A., Westerhof, G. J., Bohlmeijer, E. T., ten Klooster, P. M., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2011). Evaluating the psychometric properties of the mental health continuum-short form (MHC-SF). *Journal of clinical psychology, 67*(1), 99-110.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism in the Five-Factor Model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*(7), 1571-82.

- Leiter, M. P., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Work engagement: An introduction. In A. B. Bakker and M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and practice*. (1-9). London: Psychology Press.
- Levy, J. J., Richardson, J. D., Lounsbury, J. W., & Stewart, D. (2011). Personality traits and career satisfaction of accounting professionals. *Individual Differences Research*, 9(4), 238-49.
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.
- Maslach, C. (1993). Burnout: A multidimensional perspective. In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research*. (19-32). New York: CRC Press.
- Maslach, C. & Leiter, M. P., (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(3), 498-512.
- Rahman, N. N. A., Ibrahim N. J., Idris, M. Y. I., & Razak, Z. (2007). Automated tajweed checking rules engine for Quranic learning. *Multicultural Education & Technology Journal*, 7(4), 275-87.
- Purcell, J. (2008). Building employee engagement: ACAS policy discussion paper. London: ACAS.
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-35.
- Robitschek, C., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2009). Keyes' model of mental health with personal growth initiative as a parsimonious predictor. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56, 321-29.
- Ryckman, R. M. (2004). *Theories of personality* (8thed.). Belmont, CA: Thomas/Wadsworth.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293-15.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two-sample confirmatory analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & van Rhenen, W. (2008). Workaholism, burnout, and work engagement: Three of a kind or three different kinds of employee well-being? *Applied Psychology*, 57(2), 173-203.
- Ali, S. S., Azizollah, A., Zaman, A., Zahra, A., & Mohtaram, A. (2011). Relationship between personality traits and performance among school principals. *Higher Education Studies*, 1(1), 38-45.