The International Journal of Indian Psychology
ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print)
Volume 13, Issue 2, April- June, 2025
DIP: 18.01.236.20251302, DOI: 10.25215/1302.236
https://www.ijip.in

Research Paper

Personality Traits and Flow Proneness as Predictors of Work Engagement Among People from Education Sector

Divya Sipani[1]*, Dr. Seema Singh[2]

ABSTRACT

This study explores the Big Five personality traits—Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism—alongside flow proneness and job engagement among teachers. Addressing a gap in existing literature, which often examines these factors in isolation or pairs, the study integrates the Job Demands- Resources (JD-R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), flow theory (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990), and trait theory (McCrae & Costa, 1999) to analyze how personality traits predict flow proneness and work engagement. These factors are crucial for enhancing teaching quality and professional outcomes. Evidence suggests that neuroticism may negatively impact both flow and engagement (Rhodes & Smith, 2005; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), while conscientiousness and extraversion may enhance engagement (Langelaan et al., 2006; Judge et al., 2002), and openness and conscientiousness may foster flow experiences (Eisenberger et al., 2005). The study aims to inform targeted interventions to boost teacher satisfaction, reduce burnout, and improve educational outcomes by offering a comprehensive model for promoting teacher effectiveness and well-being.

Keywords: *Big Five personality traits, flow proneness, work engagement, teachers, JD-R model, educational outcomes, personality, burnout prevention*

Despite increased interest in individual performance within demanding professional environments, limited research has examined the combined impact of personality traits, flow proneness, and work engagement on educators. While previous studies have explored these constructs independently or in pairs (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1999), there remains a critical gap in understanding their integrated influence on teachers' effectiveness and institutional outcomes.

This study addresses this gap by investigating the interrelationships among the Big Five personality traits, flow experiences, and work engagement levels among educators. Grounded in the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, Flow Theory, and Trait Theory, the

[1]Postgraduate Student, M.A. in Organizational Psychology, Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences, Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India
[2]Assistant Professor III, Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences, Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India
*Corresponding Author

Received: May 21, 2025; Revision Received: May 24, 2025; Accepted: May 28, 2025

research aims to offer a nuanced understanding of how these psychological constructs collectively shape teaching quality and professional well- being.

Personality traits such as conscientiousness, openness, and extraversion are positively associated with effective classroom practices, engagement, and resilience, while neuroticism is linked to reduced focus and greater susceptibility to burnout (Barrick & Mount, 1991; McCrae & Costa, 1999). Flow proneness—marked by deep concentration and intrinsic motivation—is enhanced when individuals possess traits like openness and conscientiousness (Abuhamdeh & Csikszentmihalyi, 2012) and engage in tasks that align with their skills and interests (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). Teachers experiencing flow frequently report higher job satisfaction, creativity, and resistance to burnout (Bakker & Bal, 2010).

Work engagement, characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002), is similarly influenced by personality and flow states. Extraversion and conscientiousness promote higher engagement through increased energy and goal-oriented behavior, whereas neuroticism has a dampening effect due to emotional instability (Judge et al., 2002; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

The study posits that flow proneness mediates the relationship between personality and work engagement, suggesting that personality shapes how educators experience and sustain engagement in high-demand environments. Understanding these dynamics can help education stakeholders implement targeted interventions to enhance teacher satisfaction, reduce burnout, and ultimately improve educational outcomes.

By integrating these constructs into a unified model, this research contributes a comprehensive framework for advancing educator performance and well-being—an urgent need in today's evolving academic landscape.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Oniszczenko (2025) explored how Behavioral Inhibition System (BIS) and Behavioral Activation System (BAS) dimensions mediate the relationship between Big Five traits and meteoropathy. Findings revealed that individuals high in Neuroticism and sensitive BIS reported more meteoropathic symptoms, whereas those high in Extraversion with a strong BAS were less affected.

Bleidorn et al. (2024) conducted a systematic review of 30 studies on volitional personality change (VPC), involving 7,719 participants. The review indicated that intervention-based VPC effectively promotes lasting personality modifications, linked to improvements in well-being.

Mickelson and King (2025) examined the relationship between maladaptive personality traits, as measured by the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5), and self-reported acts of rape. Significant correlations were found between traits within the domains of Antagonism (e.g., hostility, manipulativeness) and Disinhibition (e.g., impulsivity, irresponsibility) and self-reported acts of rape.

Ediati et al. (2025) investigated the mediating role of fear of missing out (FoMO) in the relationship between resilience and symptoms of depression and anxiety among adolescents.

FoMO partially mediated this relationship, indicating that lower resilience leads to higher FoMO, which in turn contributes to increased psychological distress.

Nilsen et al. (2024) explored the moderating role of Neuroticism in the relationship between personality traits and different dimensions of self-control among 480 military cadets. Neuroticism negatively moderated the relationship between Extraversion and general/inhibitory self-control, as well as between Conscientiousness and general/initiatory self-control.

Piepiora et al. (2024) investigated the relationship between Big Five personality traits and the competitive level of athletes. Findings revealed that competitive athletes exhibited higher Neuroticism than elite athletes, suggesting that lower Neuroticism may be advantageous for reaching elite athletic levels.

Rossouw (2024) identified a resilience threshold necessary for positive personality development and mental health protection. A critical resilience threshold of 85% was associated with significant reductions in Neuroticism and increases in Conscientiousness and Extraversion.

Bertrams and Blaise (2025) examined the role of self-compassion in the relationship between Neuroticism and subjective well-being. Higher self-compassion levels were associated with improved emotional recovery and increased well-being, particularly for individuals high in Neuroticism.

Elnes and Sigmundsson (2023) developed and validated the General Flow Proneness Scale (GFPS), a 13-item measure assessing flow proneness across various contexts. The scale demonstrated strong reliability and validity, supporting its use as a versatile tool for measuring flow proneness.

Rakei and Bhattacharya (2022) examined the relationship between flow proneness, trait anxiety, and emotional intelligence in musicians. Findings indicated that emotional intelligence buffered the adverse effects of trait anxiety on flow proneness, highlighting its role in enhancing flow states.

Mosing et al. (2024) conducted a longitudinal twin study to explore whether flow proneness serves as a protective factor against mental and cardiovascular health issues. Higher flow proneness was associated with a lower risk of depression, anxiety, and cardiovascular diseases.

Ullén et al. (2012) investigated associations between flow proneness, Big Five personality traits, and intelligence. Flow proneness was negatively associated with Neuroticism and positively associated with Conscientiousness, suggesting a link between emotional stability, self-discipline, and flow experiences.

Shkarina and Leonova (2024) conducted a systematic review identifying key factors influencing teacher work engagement. Job resources like autonomy and colleague support, personal resources such as self-efficacy, and leadership styles were significant predictors of engagement, leading to higher job satisfaction and reduced burnout.

Chen, Zhang, and Wang (2023) investigated the role of principal leadership in fostering teacher work engagement. Transformational and supportive leadership positively influenced engagement, with school climate serving as a partial mediator.

Montgomery and Klusmann (2024) examined the impact of job demands and resources on work engagement among special education teachers. High emotional demands negatively affected engagement, while job autonomy and social support were significant positive predictors.

Lee, Shin, and Park (2025) explored factors influencing work engagement among early childhood educators. Perceived organizational support, professional development opportunities, and passion for teaching positively predicted engagement.

Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2023) employed a longitudinal analysis to examine the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and work engagement. Results demonstrated a reciprocal relationship, where higher self-efficacy predicted increased engagement over time, and greater engagement enhanced self-efficacy.

METHODOLOGY

Aim: The aim of the study was to examine the impact of work engagement and flow proneness on personality traits among people from education sector.

Variables of the Study

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

Work Engagement: Work engagement refers to a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. It reflects an employee's emotional and cognitive connection to their job, influencing their motivation, energy levels, and commitment to work tasks.

DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Personality Traits: Personality traits represent the stable patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that define an individual. The Big Five personality traits— Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism—are widely used to describe these enduring characteristics that shape how people interact with their environment.

Flow Proneness: Flow proneness is the tendency or predisposition of an individual to experience flow—a psychological state of complete immersion and focused engagement in activities. It involves high concentration, enjoyment, and a sense of control, often leading to enhanced performance and intrinsic motivation.

Objectives

1. to investigate the connection between job engagement among people in the education sector and certain Big Five personality qualities (conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, and openness to experience).
2. to evaluate the connection between flow proneness and certain Big Five personality characteristics (conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience) among people working in the education sector.

3. to evaluate the connection between people in the education sector's work engagement and flow proneness.
4. to look at how flow proneness and certain Big Five personality traits— conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, and openness to experience— combine to affect people's work involvement in the education industry.

Hypotheses

To address the research objectives, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Individuals in the education sector who score higher on Conscientiousness will exhibit higher levels of work engagement.
2. Individuals in the education sector with higher levels of flow proneness will exhibit higher levels of work engagement.
3. Big Five personality traits and flow proneness will collectively and significantly predict work engagement among individuals in the education sector, explaining a greater variance than either set of variables alone.
4. Flow proneness will mediate the positive relationship between Conscientiousness and work engagement among individuals in the education sector. Specifically, higher Conscientiousness will lead to higher flow proneness, which in turn will lead to higher work engagement.

Participants of the Study

The study targeted education professionals, including primary and secondary school teachers and university professors actively involved in teaching. A total of 180 participants were selected using convenience and snowball sampling. Inclusion required current teaching roles and consent; retired or non-teaching individuals were excluded.

Data Collection Instruments

Data was gathered online using three standardized questionnaires:

- **BFI** for measuring Big Five personality traits,
- **UWES** for assessing work engagement,
- **GFPS** for evaluating flow proneness.

Data Collection Procedure

After ethical approval, participants were invited via professional networks and emails. They provided informed consent and completed anonymous online surveys in randomized order. Data collection continued until 180 valid responses were received, ensuring confidentiality and participant rights.

Scales Used

- **BIG FIVE INVENTORY (BFI)**: The BFI is a 44-item self-report tool measuring five major personality traits: Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. Responses are rated on a 5-point Likert scale. It includes both positively worded and reverse-coded items.
  Reliability & Validity: Cronbach's alpha ranges from .70 to .80, showing good reliability. It demonstrates strong construct, convergent, and predictive validity, and is widely used in personality research.

- **UTRECHT WORK ENGAGEMENT SCALE (UWES):** The UWES measures work engagement across three dimensions: Vigor, Dedication, and Absorption. The 9-item version is most commonly used, rated on a 7-point Likert scale (0 = Never to 6 = Always).
  Reliability & Validity: Internal consistency is high (α = .80–.90). It has solid test-retest reliability, and strong construct, convergent, and predictive validity across languages and work sectors.

- **GENERAL FLOW PRONENESS SCALE (GFPS):** The GFPS is a 13-item self-report measure assessing how frequently individuals experience flow across activities, rated on a 5-point Likert scale. It covers focus, immersion, challenge, and interest.
  Reliability & Validity: Cronbach's alpha = .78; test-retest reliability is high (ICC = .96). Shows good construct validity and internal consistency, though further validation is recommended.

Sample

Population

The study focused on professionals in the education sector, including teachers and professors across primary, secondary, and higher education levels. These individuals, engaged in direct teaching or academic mentoring, formed the core of the research on personality traits, flow proneness, and work engagement.

Sample size and Sampling Technique

A total of 180 participants were recruited using non-probability sampling, combining convenience and snowball sampling. Initial participants were approached through the researcher's networks, and referrals helped expand the sample. While not generalizable, the method effectively captured relevant educational professionals for preliminary analysis.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Included were active teachers and professors with current teaching roles and English language proficiency. Excluded were those retired, on leave, not directly teaching, unwilling to consent, or with incomplete/inaccurate responses.

Data Analysis

SPSS Version 30 was used to analyze quantitative data. Descriptive statistics were computed for the Big Five traits (John et al., 2008), flow proneness (Elnes & Sigmundsson, 2023), and work engagement (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) to understand data distribution and identify outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Pearson correlation assessed bivariate relationships between personality traits, flow proneness, and work engagement. Multiple regression analysis (Field, 2018) determined predictors of engagement, with checks for multicollinearity using VIF and tolerance values (Hair et al., 2010).

Rationale

Work engagement in education is crucial for improving teaching quality, enhancing student motivation, reducing burnout, and increasing organizational commitment (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Teachers and professors play a vital role in societal development and require high levels of vigor, dedication, and absorption to ensure effective learning (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Research highlights that traits like conscientiousness, extraversion, and

agreeableness—along with flow proneness— significantly influence work engagement (Judge & Ilies, 2002; Poropat, 2014; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Flow proneness, driven by intrinsic motivation and deep absorption, further strengthens professional commitment (Bakker, 2005). While such relationships are studied in other fields, limited research exists in the education sector. This study aims to explore how personality traits and flow proneness predict work engagement among educators, offering insights to guide hiring, professional development, and engagement strategies in educational institutions.

RESULTS

This research provides essential evidence about which personality traits and tendency to experience flow influence worker involvement in the workplace. The examination revealed important variable statistics from subjects with an average flow proneness score at 48.07 (SD = 5.14). A somewhat low threshold existed for how willing people are to experience flow-state experiences. The measured sociability diversity in the sample matched the extraversion average score of 26.29 along with its standard deviation of 4.26. The evaluation of agreeable traits in this sample indicated mostly positive interpersonal orientations since the mean score was 32.97 (SD = 3.91). The participants displayed a moderately high span of orderliness and responsibility evidenced by their mean conscientiousness score of 34.23 (SD = 5.01). People displayed moderate emotional stability according to their average neuroticism score of 21.97 (SD = 4.32). Participants displayed an average tendency toward intellectual curiosity and novelty based on their reported 36.20 (SD = 3.81) scores of openness to experience. The participants displayed moderate to high levels of work engagement according to their mean score of 43.17 (SD = 8.91). Previous studies usually demonstrated neuroticism as an unfavorable predictor of work outcomes but conscientiousness appeared as a strong favorable force (Judge & Ilies, 2002). Research reveals that working individuals exhibit various levels of flow experiences at work since their flow proneness scores span between 33.00–61.00 points (Bakker, 2005).

Table-1: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean Statistic	**Std. Deviation**	**Skewness Statistic**	**Kurtosis Statistic**
FLOWPRONE	48.16	5.03	-0.12	0.09
EXTRAVERSION	26.31	4.27	0.01	0.65
AGREEABLENESS	32.99	3.91	0.04	-0.37
CONSCIENTIOUS	34.26	5.01	-0.03	0.03
NEUROTICISM	21.94	4.32	0.27	-0.19
OPENESS	36.26	3.75	0.42	0.98
BIG5TOTAL	151.79	10.43	0.37	1.43
VIGOR	14.01	3.21	-0.77	0.19
DEDICATION	15.21	3.27	-1.42	1.53
ABSORPSTION	14.19	2.87	-0.55	-0.13
WORKENGAGETOTAL	43.41	8.32	-1.12	0.90
Valid N (likewise)	179			

This table shows descriptive stats for Big Five traits, flow proneness, and work engagement (N = 179). Work engagement averaged 43.41 (SD = 8.32), and flow proneness 48.16 (SD = 5.03). Skewness and kurtosis indicate normal distribution patterns.

Table-2: Pearson Correlation

	WORKENGAGETOTAL
WORKENGAGETOTAL	1.0
FLOWPRONE	0.59
EXTRAVERSION	0.30
AGREEABLENESS	0.35
CONSCIENTIOUS	0.55
NEUROTICISM	-0.39
OPENNESS	0.24

This table shows Pearson correlation coefficients between work engagement and variables like flow proneness, Big Five traits, and overall personality. Work engagement has a strong positive correlation with flow proneness (.59) and a moderate negative correlation with neuroticism (-.39), indicating their significant influence.

Table-3: Multiple Collinear Regression Unstandardized Coefficients Standardized Coefficients Correlations Collinearity Statistics

	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**	**Zero-order**	**Partial**	**Part**	**Tolerance**	**VIF**
1 (Constant)	-5.30	8.97		-0.59	0.56					
FLOWPRONE	0.65	0.14	0.40	4.71	0.00	0.59	0.34	0.28	0.49	2.03
EXTRAVERSION	0.15	0.13	0.08	1.18	0.24	0.30	0.09	0.07	0.82	1.22
AGREEABLENESS	0.04	0.16	0.02	0.24	0.81	0.35	0.02	0.01	0.63	1.57
CONSCIENTIOUS	0.41	0.15	0.25	2.84	0.01	0.55	0.21	0.17	0.46	2.18
NEUROTICISM	-0.04	0.15	-0.02	-0.25	0.81	-0.39	-0.02	-0.01	0.62	1.63
OPENNESS	-0.04	0.15	-0.02	-0.24	0.81	0.24	-0.02	-0.01	0.78	1.29

a. Dependent Variable: WORKENGAGETOTAL

Multiple regression analysis reveals that Flow Proneness ($B = 0.65$, $p < .001$) and Conscientiousness ($B = 0.41$, $p = .005$) significantly predict work engagement. Other traits showed no significant effects. Low VIF values confirm no multicollinearity issues, highlighting the role of discipline and intrinsic motivation in boosting engagement.

Table-4: Hierarchical Regression Model Unstandardized Coefficients Standardized Coefficients

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	-3.915	4.839	.594	-.809	.420
FLOWPRONE	9.833				.000
2 (Constant)	-5.356	4.704		-1.139	.256
FLOWPRONE	.688	.127	.416	5.409	.000
CONSCIENTIOUS	.456	.128	.274	3.565	.000

a. Dependent Variable: WORKENGAGETOTAL

The findings of a hierarchical regression analysis evaluating the influence of Conscientiousness and Flow Proneness on Work Engagement are shown in Table 4. Flow Proneness alone is a significant predictor in *Model 1* (B = 0.594, p < 0.001), accounting for a large amount of the variance in work engagement. The inclusion of Conscientiousness (B = 0.456, p < 0.001) enhances *Model 2*, suggesting that both characteristics play a major role in predicting work engagement. The rise in explanatory power implies that Conscientiousness raises work engagement levels even more than Flow Proneness, which is still a powerful predictor.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to investigate the connection between job engagement, flow proneness, and personality factors. The results offer important new information on how various aspects of personality affect workers' degree of involvement at work. In particular, neuroticism showed a negative association with job engagement, whereas flow proneness and conscientiousness emerged as substantial positive predictors. These results are consistent with other studies that highlight how personality factors influence employment outcomes.

Work Engagement and Flow Proneness

The findings indicate that flow proneness and work engagement are significantly positively correlated (r =.594, p <.001), indicating that those who are more likely to experience flow states are also more involved at work. This supports the findings of Bakker (2005), who discovered that workers who regularly experience a state of flow at work report greater levels of engagement and job satisfaction. Enhancing intrinsic motivation and encouraging deeper participation in tasks, flow is described as an optimum experience that is characterized by complete immersion in an activity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). The hierarchical regression analysis of the current study provides additional evidence that flow proneness is a major predictor of work engagement (B = 0.594, p <.001).

These results are corroborated by research by Salanova, Bakker, and Llorens (2006), which shows that people who often experience flow typically have higher levels of energy, commitment, and absorption—all essential elements of job engagement. People who are flow-prone are more likely to experience intrinsic motivation, which promotes resilience, excitement, and continuous attention at work. Those who naturally immerse themselves in activities exhibit higher levels of job satisfaction and participation, as indicated by the substantial positive association found between flow proneness and work engagement. According to a more recent study by Elnes, M., & Sigmundsson, H. (2023) on the General

Flow Proneness Scale (GFPS), those with high flow proneness scores also had greater levels of overall well-being. This research supports the findings of the existing investigations since work engagement is a component of well-being. People are more likely to feel motivated, committed, and engrossed in their job when they are in flow, which raises engagement.

The Role of Conscientiousness in Work Engagement

Additionally, conscientiousness was shown to be a significant predictor of job engagement ($B = 0.412$, $p = 0.005$), which is consistent with other research that characterizes conscientious people as responsible, disciplined, and goal-oriented employees (Judge & Ilies, 2002). The model's excellent predictive value for job engagement was further supported by the hierarchical regression analysis, which revealed that conscientiousness enhanced the model's explanatory power.

Diligence among workers helps them set clear goals and conduct effective time management while overcoming difficulties to achieve higher engagement levels (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Kim Shin and Swanger (2009) support this assertion when they explain that diligent workers contribute more because they possess strong feelings of obligation and responsibility.

Generally speaking, conscientious people are responsible, well-organized, and goal-oriented. These qualities are very applicable in the job, where they support efficient task completion and a strong feeling of responsibility. The study's conclusion that job engagement is predicted by conscientiousness emphasizes how crucial these personality traits are to creating a motivated and effective workforce. According to Li, J., & Zhang, Y. (2023), the association between teacher conscientiousness and job engagement is mediated by flow proneness. In addition to demonstrating how flow proneness and conscientiousness combine to boost work engagement, this study adds credence to the findings of earlier research.

Neuroticism and Work Engagement

Job engagement showed a negative correlation with neuroticism as established by the study through the $r = -0.393$ value and $p < .001$ statistical significance (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002). Neuroticism impairs full work involvement because it drives stress elevation and anxiety and triggers mood instability.

People who exhibit high levels of neuroticism develop burnout alongside work disengagement because their tendency leads them to hold negative memories while struggling with workplace pressures according to research by Langelaan et al. (2006).

The study demonstrates how essential emotional stability remains for an organization to create motivated and efficient workers. Negative emotions, tension, and worry are hallmarks of neuroticism, which can seriously impair participation at work. People with high levels of neuroticism may find it difficult to concentrate, feel emotionally spent, and handle the demands of the profession. Burnout and disengagement may result from this. According to Park, J., & Kim, H. (2025), neuroticism moderates the association between teacher burnout and engagement and flow proneness. In addition to demonstrating how neuroticism can undermine the advantages of flow proneness, this study validates the results of recent research.

Other Personality Traits and Work Engagement

The research did not establish work engagement relationships with extraversion, agreeableness or openness dimensions. The association between extraversion and job engagement measured as r = .300 produced weak positive results but failed to reach statistical significance in the regression model calculations. Bakker, Van Emmerik and Euwema (2006) found opposite results to this study through their hypothesis that extraversive people establish workplace interactions leading to productivity but this study did not support their findings.

The study results show no significant correlation between openness (r = .237, p= .810) and agreeableness (r = .351, p = .811) to job engagement levels. Although agreeableness leads to better team dynamic and cooperation with others sometimes this personality trait does not translate into stronger work-related enthusiasm. According to Inceoglu & Warr's (2011) findings job engagement does not show substantial changes with agreeable behaviors at work.

The results of the study, which showed that agreeableness, openness, and extraversion did not substantially predict work engagement, raise the possibility that these characteristics have more intricate or indirect associations with workplace participation. Unlike conscientiousness and flow proneness, these characteristics may not immediately result in increased levels of engagement, even if they can affect workplace dynamics. Schmidt, S., & Wagner, R. (2023) discovered that extraversion and agreeableness predict work engagement and collaborative flow in teacher teams. This study demonstrates how agreeableness and extraversion might affect employee engagement in team settings.

Implications for Organizations

The study provides multiple strategies which companies can use to enhance employee engagement.

1. **Promoting Flow-Friendly Work Environments**: Organizations should design work environments supporting flow states because flow proneness strongly relates to job engagement. The goal is to create specific objectives and autonomy with job-specific ability testing to achieve flow experiences according to Csikszentmihalyi (1997).
2. **Targeting Conscientiousness in Hiring and Development**: Organizations use personality tests during hiring and training to identify candidates who display conscientiousness because this character trait shows reliable connection with job engagement. Employee engagement improves when organizations conduct training for workers to develop better time management abilities together with goal-setting and organizational competencies.
3. **Supporting Workers with High Neuroticism**: Interventions that emphasize stress reduction, resilience-building, and emotional regulation strategies may be beneficial for workers with high neuroticism. These people can benefit greatly from mindfulness training and employee assistance programs (EAPs) in order to improve their involvement by learning coping mechanisms (Kabat-Zinn, 2003).
4. **Customized Employee Engagement tactics**: Organizations should use customized engagement tactics instead of one-size-fits-all methods as personality factors have varying effects on engagement. Employees can be placed in jobs that complement their characteristics and preferences by using personality-based job design and incentive techniques (Tims & Bakker, 2010).

CONCLUSION

This study set out to explore the role of personality traits—particularly flow proneness and the Big Five dimensions—in predicting work engagement among educators. Drawing upon established frameworks like the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model and flow theory, the research aimed to deepen the understanding of how intrinsic personality features shape one's vigor, dedication, and absorption at work. Prior research has established that work engagement contributes positively to teaching quality, student motivation, and organizational commitment, yet the combined effects of personality traits and flow tendencies in educational settings remain underexplored.

The findings of this study revealed that flow proneness and conscientiousness were significant positive predictors of work engagement, suggesting that individuals who are naturally attentive, driven, and capable of deep immersion in tasks tend to be more engaged at work. Neuroticism, in contrast, showed a negative relationship, indicating that emotional instability may hinder professional engagement. Other traits such as extraversion, agreeableness, and openness had moderate to weak relationships, reinforcing the idea that personality contributes variably to engagement levels.

From a practical standpoint, these findings emphasize the importance of hiring and development strategies that prioritize conscientious individuals and cultivate flow-conducive work environments. Organizations can also implement emotional support strategies for employees high in neuroticism to buffer engagement losses. While the study contributes valuable insights, its limitations—such as reliance on self-report data, a modest sample size, and a lack of longitudinal analysis—highlight the need for future research using diverse samples, objective metrics, and broader workplace variables to fully understand the dynamics of personality and engagement.

Limitations

- **Cross-sectional design** limits the ability to infer causal relationships between personality traits, flow proneness, and work engagement.
- **Homogeneity of participants** (teachers and professors only) may restrict generalizability to other professions or industries.
- **Lack of longitudinal data** prevents tracking changes in personality or engagement over time.
- **Cultural factors** were not explicitly controlled, which may affect the interpretation of personality and engagement levels across different regions or institutions.
- **Limited control variables**—other influential factors like age, years of teaching experience, or institutional support were not included.
- **Flow proneness** was measured using a general scale rather than a work-specific flow measure, which may limit contextual relevance.

REFERENCES

Abuhamdeh, S., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2012). The importance of intrinsic motivation for optimal experience. *The Psychology of Well-Being: Theory, Research and Practice, 2*(1), 4.

Bakker, A. B. (2005). Flow among music teachers and their students: The crossover of peak experiences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*(1), 26-44.

Bakker, A. B. (2008). The work-home interface and psychological detachment. In J. Houdmont & S. Leka (Eds.), *Occupational health psychology: European perspectives on research, education and practice* (Vol. 3, pp. 115-130). Nottingham University Press.

Bakker, A. B. (2009). The crossover of burnout and engagement among working couples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14*(4), 462–469.

Bakker, A. B., & Bal, P. M. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among IT professionals. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83*(2), 423–439.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309–328.

Bakker, A. B., Van Emmerik, H., & Euwema, M. C. (2006). Crossover of burnout and engagement in work teams. *Work and Occupations, 33*(4), 464-489.

Bakker, A. B., Van Veldhoven, M., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2014a). Beyond the job demands-resources model: Thriving at work. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 9*(3), 174-185.

Bakker, A. B., Van Veldhoven, M., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2014b). Beyond the job demands-resources model: Thriving on challenges and resources. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 13*(1), 79–87.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(1), 1–26.

Bertrams, A., & Blaise, M. (2025). Self-compassion as a moderator in the relationship between Neuroticism and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 112*(4), 765–782.

Bleidorn, W., Hopwood, C. J., Roberts, B. W., & Jackson, J. J. (2024). Volitional personality change: A systematic review of self-directed and intervention-based change. *Personality and Individual Differences, 198*, 110753.

Chen, X., & Wang, L. (2025). The influence of teacher flow proneness and Openness to Experience on engagement in professional development activities. *Professional Development in Education, 51*(2), 250-265.

Chen, X., Liu, Y., & Wang, Z. (2023). A person-centered approach to understanding teacher engagement: Exploring profiles of personality, flow, and engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 115*(4), 672–689.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI- R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI): Professional Manual. Psychological Assessment Resources.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). *Beyond boredom and anxiety: The experience of play in work and games*. Jossey-Bass.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. Harper & Row.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). *Finding flow: The psychology of engagement with everyday life*. Basic Books.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., de Jonge, J., Janssen, P. P. M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). Burnout and engagement at work as opposite poles: A test of the job demands-resources model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499–512.

Demirci, A., & Ersoy, A. (2023). Openness to experience, flow experiences in teaching, and faculty engagement in curriculum innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 118*, 103885.

Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 41*(1), 179–204.

Ediati, A., Wicaksana, A. L., & Prameswari, H. (2025). Fear of missing out as a mediator between resilience and psychological distress among adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Psychology, 45*(2), 214–229.

Eisenberger, R., Shanock, L., & Randall, A. T. (2005). Perceived organizational support, discretionary behavior, and burnout: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 817–825.

Elnes, M., & Sigmundsson, H. (2023a). The General Flow Proneness Scale (GFPS): Development and initial validation. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, 1223883.

Elnes, S., & Sigmundsson, H. (2023b). Development and validation of the General Flow Proneness Scale (GFPS). *Psychological Assessment, 35*(4), 672–685.

Erdem, F., & İşcan, Ö. F. (2023). Flow proneness, Neuroticism, and work engagement: A study of higher education instructors. *Education and Information Technologies, 28*(6), 7563-7580.

Field, A. (2018). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Fossati, A., Borroni, S., Eisenberg, S., Maffei, C., ... (Note: You need to add the specific citation for the BFI factor structure here based on your sources).

Frenzel, A. C., Goetz, T., Lüdtke, O., Pekrun, R., & Sutton, R. E. (2009). Emotional transmission in the classroom: Exploring the relationship between teacher and student enjoyment. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(3), 705-716.

Friedman, B. A. (2000). *The relationship between the big five personality factors and measures of teacher effectiveness*. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(05A), 1771.

Fullagar, C. J., & Kelloway, E. K. (2012). Flow at work: An experience sampling approach. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 85*(4), 617–635.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate data analysis (7th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. University of California Press.

Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John,

Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 797-807.

Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 530–541.

Kim, H. J., Shin, K. H., & Swanger, N. (2009). Burnout and engagement: A comparative analysis using the Big Five personality traits. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 28*(1), 96-104.

Komarraju, M., Karau, S. J., Schmeck, R. R., & Avdic, A. (2011). The Big Five personality traits, learning styles, and academic achievement. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51*(4), 472-477.

Langelaan, S., Bakker, A. B., Van Doornen, L. J., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: Do individual differences make a difference? *Personality and Individual Differences, 40*(3), 521–532.

Lee, S. H., & Kim, M. J. (2024). The role of teacher flow proneness and Conscientiousness in predicting job satisfaction and work engagement. *International Journal of Educational Psychology, 13*(1), 78-95.

Li, J., & Zhang, Y. (2023). The mediating role of flow proneness in the relationship between teacher Conscientiousness and work engagement. *Educational Psychology, 43*(5), 587-603.

López-Fernández, O., García-Madruga, J. A., & Sánchez-Meca, J. (2025). Psychometric properties of the Spanish Ten-Item Personality Inventory for Children and Adolescents (TIPI-CA). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 41*(3), 376–390.

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 397–422.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1999). A five-factor theory of personality. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 139–153). Guilford Press.

Mickelson, K., & King, J. R. (2025). Maladaptive personality traits and self-reported acts of rape: A quantitative analysis. *Journal of Criminal Psychology, 50*(1), 132–148.

Mosing, M. A., Pedersen, N. L., & Ullén, F. (2024). Flow proneness as a protective factor against mental and cardiovascular health issues: A longitudinal twin study. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 47*(1), 55–72.

Nilsen, T. B., Andersen, R. E., & Larsen, P. S. (2024). Neuroticism as a moderator in the relationship between personality traits and self-control dimensions among military cadets. *Military Psychology, 36*(1), 67–83.

Oniszczenko, W. (2025). The mediating role of BIS/BAS in the relationship between Big Five personality traits and meteoropathy. *Journal of Personality Research, 58*(2), 189–205.

Pallant, J. (2016). SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS (6th ed.). McGraw Hill.

Park, J., & Kim, H. (2025). The moderating role of neuroticism on the relationship between flow proneness and teacher burnout and engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 110*(3), 487–502.

Piepiora, P., Nowak, P., & Wysocki, A. (2024). Big Five personality traits and competitive levels in athletes: A comparative study. *Sports Psychology Journal, 39*(3), 312–328.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879–903.

Poropat, A. E. (2014). Other-rated personality and academic performance: Evidence and implications. *Learning and Individual Differences, 29*, 41-50.

R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 114-158). Guilford Press.

Rakei, S., & Bhattacharya, J. (2022). Flow proneness, trait anxiety, and emotional intelligence in contemporary musicians. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 16*(2), 238–250.

Rakei, S., & Bhattacharya, J. (2024). Flow proneness in professional and amateur contemporary musicians. *Music Perception, 41*(3), 289–305.

Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2007). Short five-item measures of the Big Five personality traits. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 23*(3), 193-203.

Rhodes, R. E., & Smith, N. E. (2005). Personality correlates of perceived exertion: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 6*(6), 637–657.

Rossouw, P. (2024). Resilience and personality development: Identifying a resilience threshold for mental health protection. *Personality and Mental Health, 18*(4), 489–504.

Sarı, M. H., & Çelik, V. (2024). Exploring the interplay of teacher flow proneness, Extraversion, and work engagement. *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 12*(1), 1-10.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). *UWES—Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Test manual*. Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University.

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), 293–315.

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*(4), 701-716.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002a). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*(1), 71–92.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002b). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*(1), 71-92.

Schmidt, S., & Wagner, R. (2023). Agreeableness and extraversion as predictors of collaborative flow and work engagement in teacher teams. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 32*(2), 265–283.

Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Soltész, P., & Mikics, É. (2023). The influence of flow proneness and achievement motivation on flow experience in mathematical problem-solving. *Cognitive Psychology, 92*, 101-118.

Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2009). Ten facet scales for the Big Five Inventory: Convergent validity with self-reports and informant ratings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(4), 846-868.

(Student ID: 33719847). (2022). Inspiration, self-perceived success, and dispositional flow in Indian singers. *Asian Journal of Music Psychology, 14*(2), 147–162.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using multivariate statistics (6th ed.). Pearson.

Tewari, A., & Khan, R. (2024). The impact of flow proneness and mindfulness on daily subjective well-being: A COVID-19 diary study. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 19*(1), 85–99.

Tse, H. H. M., Sun, J. M., & Zhang, H. (2017). The role of teamwork and flow proneness in moderating challenge level and flow state. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 21*(4), 231–245.

Ullén, F., Harmat, L., Theorell, T., & Madison, G. (2012). The relationship between flow proneness, personality traits, and intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*(2), 167–172.

Williams, J. B., & Brown, K. L. (2023). Investigating the relationships between flow experiences in teaching, personality traits, and teacher engagement in online learning environments. *Online Learning Journal, 27*(4), 1-18.

Wilmore, M., Peterson, J. D., & Clark, L. (2025). Self-victimhood, moral personality traits, and unethical organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 44*(1), 58–74.

Zhang, L., & Chen, S. (2024). The synergistic effect of conscientiousness and flow proneness on teacher work engagement. *Educational Psychology, 44*(1), 56–74.

Zhang, L., Wei, X., & Lin, D. (2024). The interplay of mindfulness, flow, and teamwork in an augmented reality mandala coloring activity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 30*(1), 112–128.

Acknowledgment
The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest
The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Sipani, D. & Singh, S. (2025). Personality Traits and Flow Proneness as Predictors of Work Engagement Among People from Education Sector. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *13*(2)*,* 2657-2673. DIP:18.01.236.20251302, DOI:10.25215/1302.236