

Personality as a Predictor for Student Engagement

¹N. Sangeetha, ²Dr. V. Kannan, ³ Dr. A. Savarimuthu

¹Ph. D Research Scholar, St. Josephs Institute of Management, St. Joseph's college, Trichy
Tamilnadu, India.

²Assistant professor, St. Josephs Institute of Management, St. Joseph's college, Trichy
Tamilnadu, India.

³Professor(rtd), St. Josephs Institute of Management, St. Joseph's college, Trichy
Tamilnadu, India.

¹Sangeethamphil24@gmail.com, ²Kannanpoojaa1971@gmail.com, ³Savari19@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to see individual personality factors having influence over the respondents' engagement levels. The academic achievements of the students differ based on their personality which determines how they keep themselves engaged in their studies. Here the researcher has used the big five personality as a predictor for student engagement among the Master of business administration students (MBA) of a B-School in Tiruchirapalli. The level of engagement varies among students in their academics which results in variation in academic performance. Two different scales were used to find out student engagement and big five personality variables (BFI 10). Academic success is strongly prejudiced by entity difference in inspiration and accomplishment. The academic achievements of the students differ based on their personality which determines how they keep themselves engaged in their studies. Student engagement have been found to be significant communication-related traits linked to student classroom outcomes, together with student wisdom and student preservation.

Keywords: Student Engagement, Personality, Engagement Level

1. INTRODUCTION:

Students are entering into the college with aims to achieve their goals in career and in their life. Many students are failing to achieve their academic goals. Here, the research find out and supports those student by testing their academic engagement which is based on personality. This study results can help students to inculcate some changes in their behavior and personality. It could be useful for them achieve their goal in academic easily. The big five [personalities are extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, conscientiousness, openness. The findings indicated that more of extraverted people are highly significant with the teaching methodology of teachers.

Personality traits

The module of Big-Five personality traits is built on a model which described the nature of individual differences as the human in five directions (McCrae & John, 1992). These five directions of Personality traits are gathered, summarized, explained and defined in five factors are: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to experience. Every factor contains take the direction of wide-ranging of the variety of traits rather than a single trait direction (Goldberg, 1993; John & Srivastava, 1999).

Metrics to measure Personality using Five Factors

Sl. No.	Big Five Dimensions	Facet	Correlated Trait Adjective
1	Extraversion vs. introversion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gregariousness • Assertiveness • Activity • Excitement-seeking • Positive emotions • Warmth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sociable • Forceful • Energetic • Adventurous • Enthusiastic • Outgoing
2	Agreeableness vs. antagonism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust • Straightforwardness • Altruism • Compliance • Modesty • Tender-mindedness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forgiving • Not Demanding • Warm • Not Stubborn • Not Show-off • Sympathetic
3	Conscientiousness vs. lack of direction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competence • Order • Dutifulness • Achievement striving • Self - discipline • Deliberation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficient • Organized • Not Careless • Thorough • Not Lazy • Not Impulsive
4	Neuroticism vs. emotional stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anxiety • Angry hostility • Depression • Self-consciousness • Impulsiveness • Vulnerability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tense • Irritable • Not Contented • Shy • Moody • Not Self-confident
5	Openness vs. closeness to experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas • Fantasy • Aesthetics • Actions • Feelings • Values 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curious • Imaginative • Artistic • Wide Interests • Excitable • Unconventional

Student Engagement:

Student engagement is used to measure the interest level of a student in participating school or college activity such as doing projects and assignment regularly, show interest in answering, involvement in learning etc. The engaged student will be enthusiastically participate in academics learning and other extra-curricular. They always show happy face and coordinate with all other students and teachers, especially they give respects and obey their masters. Engagement is not only how far they listening and doing work. Beyond that it increases their knowledge and skills, which leads to better learning. Increasing the engagement level of the student will result's in better performance over their academics. Here the researcher has find out which personality is highly engaged and also low level of engagement. So it can be useful for the student learners to modify attitude and behavior in learning for the best outcome and academic growth. While 'student engagement' has enjoyed considerable attention in the literature since the mid-1990s, its beginnings

can substantively be seen a decade previously, seminally in Alexander Astin’s work on student involvement (Astin 1984) . Following on from ‘the student experience’ and ‘research-led teaching’ before it, ‘student engagement’ has become the latest focus of attention among those aiming to enhance learning and teaching in higher education, headlining meeting agendas and theming conferences in campuses around the world .Student engagement has been defined as “participation in educationally effective practices, both inside and outside the classroom, which leads to a range of measurable outcomes” (Kuh et al., 2007), and as “the extent to which students are engaging in activities that higher education research has shown to be linked with high-quality learning outcomes” (Krause and Coates, 2008, 493) Similarly, Hu and Kuh (2001, 3) define engagement as “the quality of effort students themselves devote to educationally purposeful activities that contribute directly to desired outcomes”.

2. Review of literature:

According to Meerakomarraju, Steven J Karau, and Ronald R. Schmeck, their study is to predicting college student’s academic performance, the author focused on academic achievement among young students, and to which extent personality traits relate academic motivation. The study finds the important role of personality traits and motivation in explaining achievement. The researcher used regression analysis to find out and indicate that conscientiousness, openness, extra version, and agreeableness are showed variance in intrinsic motivation. This study results in what educators can do to motivate the students for their achievement. Adam qureshi, Helen wall et. al (2016) find out whether can personality traits can modulate student engagement with their learning and attitude to employability. Here, they had tested the relationship between personality and different model in engagement. They also predicted the staff and student perception of employability using different variables, and also found that role of personality on student engagement were evaluated and predicted, the trait of conscientiousness was an important factor. Particularly it was significant with all aspects of engagement except emotional engagement. Agreeableness was suitable predictor for engagement such as all cognitive, emotional and behavioral engagement. Staff and students attitude, perception towards employability had found as similar, that student needs training which is lacking for employment.

3. Objectives:

- To determine the engagement level of the students who are pursuing doing post graduate degree in Management.
- To analyze types of personality using five factor model (FFM).
- To find out the interrelationships between student personality and their engagement level.

4. Methodology:

The primary data was collected through questionnaire N= 110. It was taken from the students using validate questions. The reliability was tested using cronbach alpha value is more than 0.7. Two different scales were used to measure the student engagement in their academics along with demographic questions.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
0.741	35

The reliability of the data has been tested by employing Cronbach's Alpha and the value for a sample of 35 from 110 samples and test is found to be 0.741 which is between 0.8 and 0.7. Hence the test statistic and the data were found to be reliable.

Hypothesis:

- H₀:** There is no association between under graduation and engagement in post graduate degree.
H₁: There is association between under graduate degree and engagement in post graduate degree.
HO: There is no relation between personality and student engagement.
H1: There is relation between personality and student engagement

1. Data Analysis and Interpretation:

Demographic variables:

1. Gender of the Respondents:

Gender	No. of Respondents	Percentage
1. Male	62	57
2. Female	48	43
Total	110	100

With a proportionate and rational sampling, most of the respondents are male who constitute 57 per cent and rests of the sample are female with 43 per cent.

2. The UG Programme Qualified by the Respondents

Under Graduation	No. of Respondents	Percentage
1. B. Sc	18	16
2. BBA/B. Com	62	56
3. B.A	13	12
4. B.E / B. Tech	6	5
5. Others	11	10
Total	110	100

Among the respondents who have been chosen for the study, most of the respondents have qualified by pursuing BBA and B.Com with 56 percent contribution followed by B.Sc, BA and BE and or B.Tech with 16 percent, 12 percent and 5 percent respectively. 10 percent respondents have qualified with other degrees like B. Arch, BDS etc.,

Percentage of marks scored by the Respondents during the first semester in PG Programme

Percentage in first semester in PG	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Below 60	32	29
Between 60-70	54	49
Between 70-80	18	16
80 and above	6	5
Total	110	100

With respect to the percentage of marks scored by the respondents in the UG Course, most (49 percent) of the respondents fall between 60 – 70 percent of marks. Below 60 per cent of the marks scored by 29 per cent of the respondents. Almost 21 percent of the students have scored more than 70 per cent of the marks in their UG Courses.

Opinion of Learning Atmosphere during PG

Sl. No.	Opinion of Learning Environment during PG	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Weighted Mean
1	I have the resources to my studies well.	27	49	21	9	4	110	27.73
2	Most of the days, I see positive results of my preparation.	22	51	24	7	6	110	27.07
3	My skills valued by this institution.	31	54	18	4	3	110	29.07
4	I have received the training I need to set my job well.	18	45	36	6	5	110	26.33
5	The amount of work I am expected to do is reasonable.	21	57	26	4	2	110	28.07

The weighted mean of the opinion of learning has been presented in the above table. With respect to the weighted mean, most of the respondents agreed that the work assigned during their course of study is found to be reasonable. Comparing the weighted means of rest of the opinions, there is no much difference among the weighted mean which is concluded that the opinions of the learning environment is significant.

Relationship with the class-mates

Sl. No.	Relationship with the class-mates	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Weighted Mean
1	My class mates accountability for results.	29	47	23	8	3	110	28.07
2	My class mates treat me with respect.	24	49	27	6	4	110	27.53
3	My class mates and I openly talk about what needs to be more effective.	23	46	28	7	6	110	26.87

The weighted mean of the respondent perception on relationship with the class-mates has been presented in the above table. With respect to the weighted mean, most of the respondents agreed that the relationship with the class-mates is found to be fair and cordial. Comparing the weighted means of rest of the opinions class mates accountability for results, treat me with respect and they openly talk about what needs to be more effective, hence there is no much difference among the weighted mean which is concluded that the perception on relationship with the class-mates is significant.

Relationship with the Teachers (Professors)

Sl. No.	Relationship with the Teachers	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Weighted Mean
1	My teacher helps me to understand how my studies are important to the institution and me.	26	49	21	9	5	110	27.47
2	My teachers are approachable and easy to talk to.	23	48	23	9	7	110	26.73
3	My teachers create motivating and energizing environment.	29	54	18	5	4	110	28.60
4	My teachers set high expectation for our class performance.	26	47	24	7	6	110	27.33

The weighted mean of the respondent perception on relationship with the teachers has been presented in the above table. With respect to the weighted mean, most of the respondents agreed that the relationship with the teachers is found to be fair. Comparing the weighted means of the opinions; the teachers helps me to understand how my studies are important to the institution and me, the teachers are approachable and easy to talk to, the teachers create motivating and energizing environment and the teachers set high expectation for our class performance, hence there is no much difference among the weighted mean which is concluded that the perception on relationship with the teachers is significant.

How better did I understand my Institution

The weighted mean of the respondent perception about the institution of their study has been presented in the above table. With respect to the weighted mean, most of the respondents agreed that the institution provides a conducive atmosphere for learning. Comparing the weighted means of the opinions; the institution provides attractive opportunity for training and development, opportunities for my advancement in this institution, sought after on issues that affect me and my studies, institution cares well about students and they recommend this institution as a great place to study, hence there is no much difference among the weighted mean which is concluded that the perception about the institution of their study is significant.

How better did I understand my Institution

Sl. No.	How better did I understand my Institution	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Weighted Mean
1	The vision and goals of this institution are important to me personally.	29	54	18	5	4	110	28.60

2	The institution provides attractive opportunity for training and development.	25	49	21	9	6	110	27.20
3	There are opportunities for my advancement in this institution.	22	51	24	7	6	110	27.07
4	My opinions are sought on issues that affect me and my studies.	31	54	18	4	3	110	29.07
5	This institution cares well about students.	18	45	36	6	5	110	26.33
6	I would recommend this institution as a great place to study.	21	57	26	4	2	110	28.07

Measuring the Perception of Personality Development using Big Five Dimensions

With respect to the five dimensions of personality which particularly focused on the students engagement in their course of study. The weighted mean of the selected dimensions: Extraversion, Neuroticism, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness are equally distributed as personality attributes and found to be significant in learning engagement of the PG Students

Interpretation(Table)

Measuring the Perception of Personality Development using Big Five Dimensions

Sl. No.	Personality Development Attributes	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Weighted Mean
I. Extraversion:								
1	I see myself as someone who is reserved.	33	52	18	4	3	110	29.20
2	I see myself as someone who is outgoing and sociable.	27	46	24	7	6	110	27.40
II. Neuroticism								
1	I see myself as someone who is relaxed, handles stress well.	23	40	36	6	5	110	26.67
2	I see myself as someone who gets nervous easily.	29	47	21	9	4	110	27.87
III. Openness								
1	I see myself as someone who has few artistic interests.	21	49	24	10	6	110	26.60
2	I see myself as someone who has active imagination.	27	43	30	6	4	110	27.53

IV. Agreeableness								
1	I see myself as someone who is generally trusting.	29	45	23	7	6	110	27.60
2	I see myself as someone who tends to find fault with others.	26	53	18	5	8	110	27.60
V. Conscientiousness:								
1	I see myself as someone who tends to be lazy.	27	49	21	9	4	110	27.73
2	I see myself as someone who does job thoroughly.	22	51	24	7	6	110	27.07

With respect to the five dimensions of personality which particularly focused on the students engagement in their course of study. The weighted mean of the selected dimensions: Extraversion, Neuroticism, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness are equally distributed as personality attributes and found to be significant in learning engagement of the PG Students.

Descriptive Statistics

		My Class-Mates Treat Me With Respect	My Education	My Classmates	My Teachers	My Institution	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness
N	Valid	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.19	3.65	3.25	3.78	3.56	3.41	3.50	3.25	3.19	3.52
Median		3.00	3.60	3.33	3.75	3.58	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.50	3.50
Std. Dev.		1.32	0.56	0.68	0.66	0.57	0.70	0.66	0.72	0.82	0.75
Skewness		-0.24	-0.23	-0.12	-0.83	-0.57	-0.12	0.35	-0.31	-0.13	0.28
Std. Error of Skewness		0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23
Kurtosis		-1.10	-0.17	-0.28	1.46	1.30	0.06	-0.05	0.55	-0.17	-0.65
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46

The mean, median and standard deviation are found to be equally distributed and the differences among the responses on the learning engagement of students. Hence it is concluded that the personality attributes considered for studying the engagement of the students in their learning process is significant.

Findings & Suggestions:

This student engagement on their learning environment such as conducive environment defined by the relationship with peer students, professors and the infrastructure are found to be significant as the weighted means are not much deviated from the mean. The responses recorded the impact of the attributes are impacted by the five factor personality components hence it is concluded that the five

factor personality attributes are significant in influencing the learning engagement of the students in their learning atmosphere.

The findings of this study suggest that there is positive relationship between personality and student engagement. Further research has to be done in this area to find out impact of the relationship based on personality. Promoting the engagement among the students is done by changing their personality and also training can be given also them.

5. Conclusion

The current study has endeavored to do this through an examination of the associations between student personality and psychosocial development traits and student interest and rendezvous in course content. Teachers have the ability to greatly impact their students' lives. Innovative and motivational teachers who can make class content pertinent and momentous to their students have the power to inspire students in transformational ways. Engagement was found to be particularly advantageous to those groups of students least prepared for higher education, though these students were more likely to view engagement as a negative process owing to feelings of isolation, alienation or being overwhelmed. Student engagement is a positive attitude to achieve their academic goals. The relationship between personality and student engagement would be stronger if they get good guidance and training in their college days. In fact it will be useful for their future career. It helps them to improve their overall personality as well as cleverness in life time.

6. References

1. Adam qureshi, Helen wall, Joyce Humphries, Alex BahramiBalani,(2016). Can personality trait modulate student engagement with learning and their attitude to employability? Learning and individual differences.
2. Adrian Furnham, Jeremy Monsen and GorkanAhmetoglu (2010). Typical intellectual engagement, Big Five personality traits, approaches to learning and cognitive ability predictors of academic performance. The British journal of educational Psychological.pp 769 -782.
3. Bidjerano, T., & Dai, D. Y. (2007). The relationship between the big-five model of personality and self-regulated learning strategies. Learning and Individual Differences, 17, 69-81.
4. Meerakommaraju, Steven J. Karau, Ronald R. Schmeck, AlenAvdic(2011). The big five personality traits, learning styles and academic achievement. Personality and individual differences,pp. 472- 477.
5. Zaidi, Wajid and GhazalaBatulZaidi (2012). The big five personality traits and their relationship between work engagement among public sector university teachers of Lahore African journal of Business Management, Vol. 7(15),pp. 1344 – 1353.
6. McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P T.. Jr. (1985b). Openness to experience. In R. Hogan & W. H. Jones (Eds.). Perspectives in personality (Vol. 1. pp. 145-172). Greenwich. CT: JAI Press.
7. Grusky, D. B., Bird, B. R., Rodriguesz, N., & Wilmer, C. (2013). How much protection does a college degree afford?: The impact of the recession on recent college graduateRetrievedfromhttp://www.pewstates.org/uploadedFiles/PCS_Assets/2013/Pew_college_grads_recession_report.pdf.
8. Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 59. 1216-122
9. Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.). Review of personality and social psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 141-165). Beverly Hills: Sage.
10. Goldberg, L. R. (1982). From ace to zombie: Some explorations in the language of personality. In C. D. Spielberger& J. N. Butcher (Eds.). Advances in personality assessment (Vol. 1. pp. 203-234). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
11. Astin, A.W. (1984) Student Involvement: A Developmental Theory for Higher Education. Journal of College Student Development. 25, pp. 297–308.
12. Kuh, G.D. (2001) Assessing What Really Matters to Student Learning: Inside the National Survey of Student Engagement. Change. 33 (3), pp. 10–17.
13. Kuh, G.D. (2007) How to Help Students Achieve. Chronicle of Higher Education. 53 (41), pp. B12–13.
14. Kuh, G.D. (2008b) Diagnosing Why Some Students Don't Succeed. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 55 (16), p. A72.