



Work Engagement And Personality

KEYWORDS

Personality, Work Engagement, Organisational growth and productivity

Neha Aiman

MSc, DOS in Psychology, Manasagangotri, University of Mysore, Mysore

Venkatesh Kumar G

Professor, DOS in Psychology, Manasagangotri, University of Mysore, Mysore

ABSTRACT

Work engagement has been threatening to cripple organizational growth and productivity; and it becomes crucial to understand whether personality acts as a predictor of employee engagement or not. The purpose of present research was to understand the relationship between Personality and Work Engagement. A survey Technique in the form of Questionnaires was used. The relevant data was collected from 100 employees working in different departments of Larsen and Toubro Limited, Mysore. The Riso- Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator is a tool used to assess Personality and Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is a tool used to assess Work engagement. Calculations were done using Correlation and t-test. The results showed that the Personality of the employees is not significantly related to the Work Engagement. There is no significant relationship between Gender, Age, Socio- Economic Status and Marital Status with

Introduction

Work engagement is a burgeoning psychological concept important for both Occupational Health Psychology and Human Resources Management as it has the potential to simultaneously serve their purposes of employee welfare and organizational performance, respectively (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007). To the individual employee, work engagement signifies good health, well-being, optimal functioning, and favorable performance which in turn mean success to the organization (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007). In other words, "what is good for the employee's health and well-being is generally good for the organization, and often vice versa" (p.139).

Interests in the concept of work engagement began as a result of research on job burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). While job burnout is characterized by emotional fatigue and mental detachment from work (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001), work or job engagement is defined as "a positive, fulfilling, work related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption" (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002 p.74).

It is important to know how situational and individual factors, alone and/or together, impact job engagement. The examination of an interaction effect between situational and individual characteristics has especially been under-explored not only in the area of engagement, but also in the area of burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). Studies of interaction effects could tell us why in certain cases, in spite of working in the same environment and having access to the same resources, some employees thrive in their jobs and others do not. Towards this end, Hallberg et al. (2007) attempted to investigate how situational aspects like job resources and job demands and personal aspects like a Type A personality interacted with each other and how this interaction affected job engagement.

Personality of the employees can be considered as an important variable to affect their engagement levels. For instance two employees working in the same environment may have different levels of engagement. This difference

can exist because of their different personality traits. However, Much research needs to be undertaken in this area to understand how individual characteristics and work situations together influence job engagement.

In the present study an earnest attempt has been made to identify and evaluate the Dimensions of Work Engagement like Vigor, Dedication & Absorption and its relationship with basic dominant personality Types like Reformer, Helper, Achiever, Individualist, Investigator, Loyalist, Enthusiast, Challenger and Peacemaker. The results can be functional for both facets of working relations. The true match of job and employee will help for the success of employee and organization facets. Employees can be conscious about what sort of jobs are convenient for themselves because inconvenient jobs can effect employees' well-being negatively. It can cause stress, pain and unhappiness. Organizations can also be effected from the inconvenient match of job and employee. Organizations cannot reach the positive outcomes like productivity, efficiency and economically as they planned. Because especially in service sector employees are the most crucial part of production.

Research Methods

Sample

A total of 100 employees working in different departments of Larsen and Toubro limited, Mysore were selected randomly between the ages of 23 to 35 years. Among them 50 were Men employees and other 50 were Women employees. Participants were from different departments such as Engineering department, Finance and few from Human Resources, Administration, Quality Assurance, Marketing etc, Considerable designation were Supervisors (Supervisors and above Supervisors) and Non- Supervisors (below Supervisors and others). Marital Status (Single or Married) was taken into consideration.

Measurement tools

The following instruments were used for measuring the variables:

1. Personal Information Schedule (2015): The Personal Information schedule was prepared by the investigator to collect some information of the employees of L &

T,Mysore. Schedule consists of information like Name, Age, Designation, Department, Job Experience and Marital Status.

2. RHETI- Riso-Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator (Riso & Hudson, 2007) test is used to assess Personality: RHETI consists of 36 questions. RHETI was developed in Enneagram Institute by Don Riso and Russ Hudson in the year 2007. The Riso-Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator (RHETI, Version 2.5) is a personality inventory which will be indicating, individual's Personality type. It measures 9 Personality types namely Reformer, Helper, Motivator, Romantic, Thinker, Skeptic, Enthusiast, Leader and Peacemaker. The basic personality type is determined on the basis of top three high scores.

3. UWES- Utrecht Work engagement scale (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) test is used to assess work engagement: The Utrecht Work engagement scale (UWES) consist of 17 questions. UWES was developed in Utrecht University by Wilmar Schaufeli and Arnold Bakker in the year 2003. The Utrecht Work engagement scale (UWES, Version 1) is a new concept of work which assesses by using three scales: vigor, dedication, and absorption.

Method and Data Analysis

This study was done in natural setting using Survey technique. Respondents were not informed in advance. They were asked to fill questionnaires in respected work setting. A total of 100 questionnaires were equally distributed as, 50 among Men employees (where 25 were from Supervisors level and other 25 were from Non-supervisor's level) and remaining 50 among Women employees (where 25 were from Supervisors level and other 25 were from Non-supervisor's level). For these employees three Tools were administered namely, Personal Information Schedule to collect personal information, Riso- Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator to assess Personality and Utrecht Work Engagement Scale to assess work engagement. After administration Calculation and Analysis of data was carried out through using Correlation and t- test. Analyses were performed using SPSS version 20.

Findings

Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant relationship between Personality and Work Engagement of employees in L & T.

Table1. Shows mean and SD of Personality, Work Engagement and its corresponding correlation of employees

N	Variables	Personal-ity	Work Engage-ment	R
100	Mean	13.45	68.96	0.092*
	SD	3.78	15.03	

* Not significant, df= 99

Interpretation:

The above table reveals the mean and standard deviation of personality in employees which is 13.45 and 3.78 respectively, whereas, the mean and standard deviation of Work Engagement in employees which is 68.96 and 15.03 respectively. The corresponding correlation (r=0.092, p>0.05) indicates that personality does not have relationship with work engagement. This hypothesis is accepted, as table 1 shows a non- significant relationship between Personality and Work Engagement of employees in L & T, Mysore.

Hypothesis2.1: There will be no significant difference between Gender and Personality.

Table2. Shows difference between Gender groups in Personality

Groups	N	Personality Scores		
		Mean	SD	t
Males	50	13.48	3.84	0.1*
Females	50	13.40	3.75	

*Not significant, df= 49

Interpretation:

The above table reveals the mean and standard deviation of Male employees in their personality are 13.48 and 3.84 respectively, whereas, the mean and standard deviation of Female employees in their personality are 13.40 and 3.75 respectively. The t value (t= 0.1, p>0.05) indicates that there is no significant difference between males and females in their personality aspects. This hypothesis is accepted, as table 2 shows a non- significant difference between Gender and Personality.

Hypothesis 2.2: There will be no significant difference between Gender and Work Engagement.

Table3. Shows difference between Gender groups in Work Engagement

Groups	N	Work Engagement Scores		
		Mean	SD	t
Males	50	69.42	14.70	0.3*
Females	50	68.50	15.50	

*Not significant, df= 49

Interpretation:

The above table reveals the mean and standard deviation of Male employees in their Work Engagement are 69.42 and 14.70 respectively, whereas, the mean and standard deviation of Female employees in their Work Engagement are 68.50 and 15.50 respectively. The t value (t= 0.3, p>0.05) indicates that there is no significant difference between males and females in their Work Engagement aspects. This hypothesis is accepted, as table 3 shows a non- significant difference between Gender and Work Engagement.

Hypothesis 3.1: There will be no significant difference between Age and Personality.

Table4. Shows difference between Age groups in Personality

Groups	N	Personality Scores		
		Mean	SD	t
23-29	69	13.22	4.19	-0.92*
30-36	31	13.97	2.64	

*Not significant, df= 98

Interpretation:

The above table reveals the mean and standard deviation of employees between age groups 23-29 in their personality are 13.22 and 4.19 respectively, whereas, the mean and

standard deviation of employees between age groups 30-36 in their personality are 13.97 and 2.64 respectively. The t value ($t = -0.92, p > 0.05$) indicates that there is no significant difference between the age groups 23-29 and 30-36 in their personality aspects. This hypothesis is accepted, as table 4 shows a non-significant difference between Age and Personality.

Hypothesis 3.2: There will be no significant difference between Age and Work engagement.

Table5. Shows difference between Age groups in Work Engagement.

Groups	N	Work Engagement Scores		
		Mean	SD	t
23-29	69	67.32	13.36	-1.64*
30-36	31	72.61	17.93	

*Not significant, df= 98

Interpretation:

The above table reveals the mean and standard deviation of employees between age groups 23-29 in their Work Engagement are 67.32 and 13.36 respectively, whereas, the mean and standard deviation of employees between age groups 30-36 in their Work Engagement are 72.61 and 17.93 respectively. The t value ($t = -1.64, p > 0.05$) indicates that there is no significant difference between age groups 23-29 and 30-36 in their Work Engagement aspects. This hypothesis is accepted, as table 5 shows a non-significant difference between Age and Work Engagement.

Hypothesis 4.1: There will be no significant difference between SES and Personality.

Table6. Shows difference between SES groups in Personality

Groups	N	Personality Scores		
		Mean	SD	t
Supervisors & above	66	13.45	3.85	0.02*
Others	34	13.44	3.69	

* Significant, df= 98

Interpretation:

The above table reveals the mean and standard deviation of supervisors & above employees in their personality are 13.45 and 3.85 respectively, whereas, the mean and standard deviation of other employees in their personality are 13.44 and 3.69 respectively. The t value ($t = -0.02, p < 0.05$) indicates that there is a significant difference between the Marital Status groups Supervisors & above and others in their personality aspects. This hypothesis is accepted, as table 6 shows a non-significant difference between SES and Personality.

Hypothesis 4.2: There will be no significant difference between SES and Work Engagement.

Table7. Shows difference between SES groups in Work Engagement

Groups	N	Work Engagement Scores		
		Mean	SD	T
Socio- Economic Status				
Supervisors & above	66	69.53	13.96	0.53*
Others	34	67.85	17.10	

*Not significant, df= 98

Interpretation:

The above table reveals the mean and standard deviation of supervisors & above employees in their Work Engagement are 69.53 and 13.96 respectively, whereas, the mean and standard deviation of other employees in their Work Engagement are 67.85 and 17.10 respectively. The t value ($t = 0.53, p > 0.05$) indicates that there is no significant difference between the Marital Status groups Supervisors & above and others in their Work Engagement aspects. This hypothesis is accepted, as table 7 shows a non-significant difference between SES and Work Engagement.

Hypothesis 5.1: There will be no significant difference between Marital Status and Personality.

Table8. Shows difference between Marital Status groups in Personality

Groups	N	Personality Scores		
		Mean	SD	T
Marital Status				
Single	47	13.62	4.04	-0.76*
Married	53	13.30	3.56	

*Not significant, df= 98

Interpretation:

The above table reveals the mean and standard deviation of Single employees in their personality are 13.62 and 4.04 respectively, whereas, the mean and standard deviation of other employees in their personality are 13.30 and 3.56 respectively. The t value ($t = -0.76, p > 0.05$) indicates that there is no significant difference between the Marital Status groups Single and Married in their personality aspects. This hypothesis is rejected, as table 8 shows a significant difference between Marital Status and Personality.

Hypothesis 5.2: There will be no significant difference between Marital Status and Work Engagement.

Table9. Shows difference between Marital Status groups in Work Engagement

Groups	N	Work Engagement Scores		
		Mean	SD	T
Marital Status				
Single	47	67.74	11.46	0.415*
Married	53	70.04	17.65	

*Not significant, df= 98

Interpretation:

The above table reveals the mean and standard deviation of supervisors & above employees in their Work Engagement are 67.74 and 11.46 respectively, whereas, the mean and standard deviation of other employees in their Work Engagement are 70.04 and 17.65 respectively. The t value ($t = 0.415, p > 0.05$) indicates that there is no significant difference between the Marital Status groups Single and Mar-

ried in their Work Engagement aspects. This hypothesis is accepted, as table 9 shows a non- significant difference between Marital Status and Work Engagement.

Conclusions

In the present study, it is found that there is no relationship between Personality and Work Engagement of Employees working in different departments of L & T, Mysore. It is found that Gender, Age and SES have no impact on Personality of Employees working in different departments of L & T, Mysore. It is found that however Marital Status has impact on Personality of Employees working in dif-

ferent departments of L & T, Mysore. It is also found that Gender, Age, SES and Marital Status have no impact on Work Engagement of Employees working in different departments of L & T, Mysore. Hence there are significant differences among the Employees working in different departments of L & T, Mysore.

REFERENCE

- Allport, G. W. (1937). A Psychological interpretation, *Personality Psychology in the workplace*, 2, pp. 11-12 | 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 with Moderating Role of employee engagement, *Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Science*, 2, pp. 221-255, ISSN: 2374-2380 | Bakker, A., Tims, T. & Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and job performance, *Advances in Psychology Research*, 25, pp. 13-30. New York: Nova Science Publishers. | Bakker, A.B. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). Socially induced burnout. Paper presented at the 5th EAWOP Congress, Prague, May 16-19. | Bakker, A.B. Demerouti, E. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). Crossover of burnout and engagement among working couples. Manuscript in preparation. | Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). The socially induced burnout model. In S.P. Shohov (Ed.), *Advances in Psychology Research* (Vol. 25; pp. 13-30). New York: Nova Science Publishers. | Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. (2007). Using the Job Demands-Resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43, 83-104 | Bakker, A.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2010). *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*. New York: Psychology Press | Bollen, K. A., & Long, J. S. (1993). Introduction. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 1-9). Newbury Park, CA: Sage, cop. | Boomsma, A. (2000). Reporting analyses of covariance structures. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 7, 461- 483. doi:10.1207/S15328007SEM0703_6. | Bouman, A.M., Te Brake, H. & Hoogstraten, J. (2002). Significant effects due to rephrasing the Maslach Burnout Inventory's personal accomplishment items. *Psychological Reports*, 91, 825-826. | Byrne, B.M. (2001). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. | Carrell Michael R., Elbert Norbert F., Hatfield Robert D. (1999), *Human Resource Management*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. | Cavazotte, F., Moreno, V. & Hickmann, M. (2012). Effects of leader intelligence, personality and emotional intelligence on transformational leadership and managerial performance, *Leadership Quarterly*, 23, pp. 443-455 | Colbert, A., Mount, M, K., Harter, J, K., Witt, L, A. & Barrick, M, R.(2004). Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance, *The Journal of applied psychology*, 89, pp. 599-609 | Cummings, L. L. (1978). *Toward Organizational Behavior*, *Academy of Management Review*, 2, pp. 90- 98 | Davis, K. (1993). *Human Behavior at work: Organizational Behavior*, 6th edi, McGraw- Hill. Inc., New York. | Gary, D. (2010). *Human Resource Management*, Prentice Hall International Editions, New Jersey. | Devid A. Decenzo, Stephen P. Robbins (2002), *Personnel/Human Resource Management*, Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi. | Díaz-Morales, J. (2007). Morning and evening-types: Exploring their personality styles, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, pp. 769-778 | Fine, S.A. & Cronshaw, S.F. (1999). *Functional job analysis: A foundation for human resources management*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. | Gruman, Jamie, A. & Alan, M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement, *Human Resource Management Review*, 21, pp.123-136 | Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2005). How dentists cope with their job demands and stay engaged: The moderating role of job resources. *European Journal of Oral Sciences*, 113, 479-487. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0722.2005.00250.x. | Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43, 495-513. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001. | Herbst, Merz, U. & Michael, A. (2011), The industrial brand personality scale: Building strong business-to-business brands , *Industrial Marketing Management*, 30, pp.1072-1081 | Inceoglu, I. & Warr, P. (2012). Personality and Job Engagement, *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 3, pp.1-9 | James, L. R., & Mazerolle, M. D. (2002). Personality in Work Organization, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, pp. 1041-1053. | Jex, S., & Britt, T. (2005). *Organizational Psychology, A Scientist-Practitioner approach*, 3rd edi - New York: Wiley | Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, pp. 692-724. | Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, pp.692-724 | Kong, Y. (2009). A Study on the Job Engagement of Company Employees, *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 1, pp.65-68 | Langelaan, S., Bakker, A. B., Van Doornen, L. J. P., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: Do individual differences make a difference? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40, 521-532. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.07.009. | 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* (pp. 1-9). London and New York: Psychology Press. | Lucas, R. & Diener, E. (2009). Personality and Subjective Well-Being, the science of subjective well-being: The collected works of Ed Diener, pp.75-102 | Luthans, F. & Peterson, S. J. (2002). Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy, *Journal of Management Development*, 21, pp.376 - 387 | Mamoria C.B., Gankar S.V., (2006), *A Textbook of Human Resource Management*, Himalaya Publishing House, New Delhi. | Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. | Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. | Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory. Manual* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press. | Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397- 422. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397 | Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(3), 397-422. | Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., & Ruokolainen, M. (2007). Job demands and resources as antecedents of

work engagement: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70, 149–171. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2006.09.002. | Mazni, O., Syed-Abdullah, S. & Lailee Hussin, N. (2010). Analyzing personality types to predict team performance, CSSR 2010 - 2010 International Conference on Science and Social Research, pp. 624-628. | Moorhead, G., & Griffin, R. W. (1995). *Organizational behavior: Managing people and organizations*, 5th edn, Boston. Houghton Mifflin, pp.4-6 | Morgan, G. & Watson (2007). *The Riso-Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator Manual*, The Enneagram Institute, Version 2.5, pp 1- 5 | Neetu, J. (2013). Personality as Predictor of Employee Engagement: An Empirical Study, *IIMS Journal of Management Science*, 4, pp 217-229, ISSN : 0976-030X | Rich, Louis, B., Lepine, Jeffrey, A., Crawford & Eean, R. (2010). Job Engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, pp. 617-635 | Robbins, S.P. (2009). *Organizational Behavior*, 10th edn, Cape Town, Pearson publication | Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., & Viechtbauer, W. (2006). "Patterns of Mean-Level Change in Personality Traits Across the Life Course: A Meta- Analysis of Longitudinal Studies," *Psychological Bulletin*, 132, pp. 1–25. | Saks, A, M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, pp.600 – 619 | Salanova, M, Llorens, S., Cifre, E., Martinez, I., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). Perceived collective efficacy, subjective well-being and task performance among electronic work groups: An experimental study. *Small Groups Research*, 34, 43-73. | Salanova, M., Carrero, V., Pinanzo, D., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). Job characteristics and proactive behaviour: The mediating role of job engagement. Submitted for publication. | Salanova, M., Llorens, S., Peiró, J.M., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). How emotions predict self-efficacy: The mediating role of job engagement. Submitted for publication. | 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), pp. 293-315. | Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire. A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 701–716. doi: 10.1177/0013164405282471. | Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzales-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002b). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71–92. doi:10.1023/A:1015630930326. | Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A.B. (2002). The measurement of Engagement and burnout: A confirmative analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92 | Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V. & Bakker, A.B. (2002a). The measurement of engagement and burnout and: A confirmative analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92. | Seligman, M. E. P. (2003). Positive psychology: Fundamental assumptions. *The Psychologist*, 16, 126–127. | Shirom, A. (2002). Job related burnout: A review. In J.C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.). *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology* (pp. 245-264). American Psychological Association: Washington DC. | Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior (2003): A new Look at the interface between non-work and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 518-528. | *Studies*," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44, pp. 10–31. | Taylor, S., & Hansen, H. (2005). Finding form: looking at the field of organizational aesthetics, *Journal of Management studies*, 42(6), pp. 1211-1231 | Viswanath, G. V. (2014). A study of personality factor role in performance evaluation issues. *International Journal of Human Resource management and research*, 10, pp.31-44 | Vollrath, M. & Svensen, T. (2002). Who takes health risks? A probe into eight personality types, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32. pp. 1185-1197 | Waegenmakers, K. (2003). Burnout, bevoegenheid en studieprestaties bij studenten [Burnout, engagement and academic performance in students]. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Psychology Department, Utrecht University, The Netherlands. | Warr, P. (1990). The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 193–210. | Wefald, A., Riechard, R. & Serrano, S. (2011). The Relationship of Engagement to Leadership and Personality, *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 18, pp. 522-537 | Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Kantas, A., & Demerouti, E. (in press). The measurement of burnout and work engagement: A comparison of Greece and The Netherlands. *New Review of Social Psychology*. | 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, pp.235–244 |