

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT –A CONCEPTUAL STUDY

Dr. S.VIJAYALAKSHMI

Associate Professor,
KGR Institute of Technology & Management,
Rampally (V), Keesara (M).R.R.Dist.
E-Mail: vijayasama123@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

*Motivated and engaged employees tend to contribute more in terms of organizational productivity and support in maintaining a higher commitment level leading to the higher customer satisfaction. Employees Engagement permeates across the employee customer boundary, where revenue, corporate goodwill, brand image are also at stake. This paper makes an attempt to study the different dimensions of employee engagement with the help of review of literature. This can be used to provide an overview and references on some of the conceptual and practical work undertaken in the area of the employee engagement practices. Employee engagement is ambiguous among both academic researchers and among practitioners who use it in conversations with clients. We show that the term is used at different times to refer to psychological states, traits, and behaviors as well as their antecedents and outcomes. Drawing on diverse relevant literatures, we offer a series of propositions about (a) **psychological state engagement**; (b) **behavioral engagement**; and (c) **trait engagement**. In addition, we offer propositions regarding the effects of job attributes and leadership as main effects on state and behavioral engagement and as moderators of the relationships among the 3 facets of engagement. We conclude with thoughts about the measurement of the 3 facets of engagement and potential antecedents, especially measurement via employee surveys.*

Keywords: Engagement, psychological, behavioral, trait.

INTRODUCTION

Emotional connection an employee feels toward his or her employment organization, which tends to influence his or her behaviors and level of effort in work related activities. The more engagement an employee has with his or her company, the more effort they put forth. Employee engagement also involves the nature of the job itself - if the employee feels mentally stimulated; the trust and communication between employees and management; ability of an employee to see how their own work contributes to the overall company performance; the opportunity of growth within the organization; and the level of pride an employee has about working or being associated with them company

The concept of employee engagement is a measurement of how happy employees are with their respective jobs, working environment and how efficient their performance levels are? Managing high morale among employees can be of remarkable benefit to any organization; actively engaged workers are more productive and stay loyal to the company. Organizations with high employee engagement levels are more productive; and more profitable than those organizations with low levels of employee engagement. The notion of employee engagement is a relatively new one, one that has been heavily marketed by human resource (HR) consulting firms that offer advice on how it can be created and leveraged. Academic researchers are now slowly joining the fray, and both parties are saddled with competing and inconsistent interpretations of the meaning

of the construct. Casual observation suggests that much of the appeal to organizational management is driven by claims that employee engagement drives bottom-line results. Indeed, at least one HR consulting firm (Hewitt Associates LLC, 2005, p. 1) indicates that they “have established a conclusive, compelling relationship between engagement and profit-ability through higher productivity, sales, customer satisfaction, and employee retention.” Some practitioners view engagement as having evolved from prior research on work attitudes, directly implying that this newer concept adds interpretive value that extends beyond the boundaries of those traditions. We agree with this thought and hope to show why we agree in what follows. Although compelling on the surface, the meaning of the employee engagement concept is unclear. In large part, this can be attributed to the “bottom-up” manner in which the engagement notion has quickly evolved within the practitioner community. This is not an unfamiliar stage in the incremental evolution of an applied psychological construct. Thus, similar to the manner in which burnout was at first a construct attributed to pop psychology (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001) engagement is a concept with a sparse and diverse theoretical and empirically demonstrated homological net the relationships among potential antecedents and consequences of engagement as well as the components of engagement have not been rigorously conceptualized, much less studied. Indeed, many HR consultants avoid defining the term, instead referring only to its presumed positive consequences. At a minimum, the question remains as to whether engagement is a unique concept or merely a repackaging of other constructs—what Kelley (1927; quoted in Lubinski, 2004, p. 98) called the “Jangle Fallacy.” This is a matter of particular significance to those who develop and conduct employee surveys in organizations because the end users of these products expect interpretations of the results to be cast in terms of actionable implications. Yet, if one does not know what one is measuring, the action implications will be, at best, vague and, at worst, a leap of faith. The academic community has been slow to jump on the practitioner engagement bandwagon, and empirical research that has appeared on the topic in refereed outlets reveals little consideration for rigorously testing the theory underlying the construct (for exceptions, see May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004; Salanova, Agut, & Peiro, 2005). Thus, although research exists demonstrating that some employee attitudes called “engagement” are related to organizational outcomes like turnover and productivity (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002) these employee attitudes do not conceptually reflect the notion of engagement. Thus, further development of the construct and its measurement requires attention (for an example, see Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006).

OBJECTIVES

1. To study the different dimensions of employee engagement
2. To examine employee engagement strategies
3. To analyze the impact of employee engagement on the performance of organization

LIMITATION

The study is based on theoretical work, and information is taken from the secondary data like articles, publications, books, opinion of experts.

MEANING & DEFINITION

Definition of Employee Engagement to date, there is no single and generally accepted definition for the term employee engagement. This is evident if one looks at the definitions forwarded for the term by three well-known research organizations in human resource area, let alone individual researchers. Below are the definitions.

Perrin's Global Workforce Study (2003) uses the definition "employees' willingness and ability to help their company succeed, largely by providing discretionary effort on a sustainable basis." According to the study, engagement is affected by many factors which involve both emotional and rational factors relating to work and the overall work experience

Gallup organization defines employee engagement as the involvement with and enthusiasm for work. Gallup as cited by Dernovsek (2008) likens employee engagement to a positive employees' emotional attachment and 'commitment.

Robinson et al. (2004) define employee engagement as "a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its value. An engaged employee is aware of business context, and works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization. The organization must work to develop and nurture engagement, which requires a two-way relationship between employer and employee."

This verdict and definition forwarded by Institute of Employment Studies gives a clear insight that employee engagement is the result of two-way relationship between employer and employee pointing out that there are things to be done by both sides.

Furthermore, Fernandez (2007) shows the distinction between job satisfaction, the well-known construct in management, and engagement contending that employee satisfaction is not the same as employee engagement and since managers cannot rely on employee satisfaction to help retain the best and the brightest, employee engagement becomes a critical concept. Other researchers take job satisfaction as a part of engagement, but it can merely reflect a superficial, transactional relationship that is only as good as the organization's last round of perks and bonuses; Engagement is about passion and commitment-the willingness to invest oneself and expand one's discretionary effort to help the employer succeed, which is beyond simple satisfaction with the employment arrangement or basic loyalty to the employer (Blessing White, 2008; Erickson, 2005; Macey and Schnieder, 2008). Therefore, the full engagement equation is obtained by aligning maximum job satisfaction and maximum job contribution. Stephen Young, the executive director of Towers Perrin, also distinguishes between job satisfaction and engagement contending that only engagement (not satisfaction) is the strongest predictor of organizational performance (Human Resources, 2007). Recent researches also indicate that Employee commitment and OCB are important parts and predictors of employee engagement in that commitment is conceptualized as positive attachment and willingness to exert energy for success of the organization, feeling

proud of being a member of that organization and identifying oneself with it and OCB is a behavior observed within the work context that demonstrates itself through taking innovative initiatives proactively seeking opportunities to contribute one's best and going extra mile beyond employment contract. However, these constructs constitute the bigger construct employee engagement and they cannot independently act as a replacement for engagement (Macey and Schneider, 2008; Robinson et al, 2004).

The bad news for management is that global surveys conducted by survey houses and research organizations indicate that significant size of employees are disengaged being skeptical of any organizational initiative or communication and rather more likely indulging in contagious negativity (Dernovsek, 2008; Perrin, 2003; Ellis and Sorensen, 2007; Blessing White, 2008).

Drivers of Employee Engagement

Many researchers have tried to identify factors leading to employee engagement and developed models to draw implications for managers. Their diagnosis aims to determine the drivers that will increase employee engagement level. According to Penna research report (2007) meaning at work has the potential to be valuable way of bringing employers and employees closer together to the benefit of both where employees experience a sense of community, the space to be themselves and the opportunity to make a contribution, they find meaning. Employees want to work in the organizations in which they find meaning at work. Penna (2007)

Development Dimensions International (DDI, 2005) states that a manager must do five things to create a highly engaged workforce. They are:

- Align efforts with strategy
- Empower
- Promote and encourage teamwork and collaboration
- Help people grow and develop
- Provide support and recognition where appropriate

The Towers Perrin Talent Report (2003) identifies the top ten work place attributes Which will result in employee engagement. The top three among the ten drivers listed by Perrin are:

Senior management's interest in employees' well-being, Challenging work and Decision making authority. After surveying 10,000 NHS employees in Great Britain, Institute of Employment Studies (Robinson et al., 2004) on the basis of its survey of 2000 employees from across Great Britain indicates that communication is the top priority to lead employees to engagement. The report singles out having the opportunity to feed their views and opinions upwards as the most important driver of people's engagement. The report also identifies the importance of being kept informed about what is going on in the organization.

The oldest consulting organization in conducting engagement survey, Gallup has found that the manager is the key to an engaged work force. James Clifton, CEO of Gallup organization indicates that employees who have close friendships at work are more engaged workers

(Clifton, 2008). Vance (2006) explains the fact that employee engagement is inextricably linked with employer practices. To shed light on the ways in which employer practices affect job performance and engagement, he presents a job performance model. According to him, Employee engagement is the outcome of personal attributes such as knowledge, skills, abilities, temperament, attitudes and personality, organizational context which includes leadership, physical setting and social setting and HR practices that directly affect the person, process and context components of job performance. Most drivers that are found to lead to employee engagement are non-financial in their nature. Therefore, any organization who has committed leadership can achieve the desired level of engagement with less cost of doing it. This does not mean that managers should ignore the financial aspect of their employees. In fact, performance should be linked with reward.

4. Employee Engagement and Organizational Performance

Why should companies invest in employee engagement? The answer is because employee engagement is interwoven significantly with important business outcomes. In this part we will see how employee engagement impacts organizational performance in the light of various research works done. Studies have found positive relationship between employee engagement and organizational performance outcomes: employee retention, productivity, profitability, customer loyalty and safety. Researches also indicate that the more engaged employees are, the more likely their employer is to exceed the industry average in its revenue growth. Employee engagement is found to be higher in double-digit growth companies. Research also indicates that engagement is positively related to customer satisfaction (Coffman, 2000; Ellis and Sorensen, 2007; Towers Perrin Talent Report, 2003; Hewitt Associates, 2004; Heintzman and Marson, 2005; Coffman and Gonzalez-Molina, 2002). Engaged employee consistently demonstrates three general behaviors which improve organizational performance: Say-the employee advocates for the organization to co-workers, and refers potential employees and customers; Stay-the employee has an intense desire to be a member of the organization despite opportunities to work elsewhere; Strive-the employee exerts extra time, effort and initiative to contribute to the success of the business (Baumruk and Gorman, 2006).

5. Employee Engagement Strategies

So far we have discussed the evolution and definition of employee engagement, the factors that affect it and importance of employee engagement explaining how it is linked to business performance. Now, at this stage any inquisitive reader may ask a question: So what? Employee engagement strategies listed below answer this question. In order to have engaged employees in any organization, managers need to look at the following ten points. We can call these points "tablets" because it is believed that they will cure employee disengagement diseases. Take these ten tablets:

1. Start it on day one
2. Start it from the top:
3. Enhance employee engagement through two-way communication
4. Give satisfactory opportunities for development and advancement:

5. Ensure that employees have everything they need to do their jobs:
6. Give employee's appropriate training:
7. Have strong feedback system
8. Incentives have a part to play
9. Build a distinctive corporate culture
10. Focus on top-performing employees

FRAME WORK TO UNDESTAND EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

Trait Engagement (Positive views of life and work)	State Engagement (Feeling of Energy absorption)	Behavioral Engagement (Extra-role behavior)
Proactive personality,	Satisfaction (Affective)	Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)
Auto telic personality	Involvement	Proactive/Personal Initiative
Trail positive Affect	Commitment	Role expansion
Conscientiousness	Empowerment	Adaptive

Above figure shows that conditions of the workplace have both direct and indirect effects on work (e.g., challenge, variety) and the nature of leadership (especially transformational leadership) are the conditions that most as a boundary condition (modeator) of the interest us. Figure 1 show, for example, that work has direct effects on state engagement (e.g., Hackman & Oldham, 1980) and indirect effects relationship between trait and state engagement. With regard to leadership, Figure 1 shows it having a direct effect on trust and an indirect effect through the creation of trust on behavioral engagement (e.g., Kahn, 1990; McGregor, 1960); more.

Toward Untangling the Jangle: A Framework for Understanding the Conceptual Space of Employee Engagement;

To move the discussion of what engagement is to a more concrete level, consider the overall framework for understanding the various components that the engagement construct might subsume (see Figure 1).Figure 1 shows that engagement as a disposition (i.e., trait engagement) can be regarded as an inclination or orientation to experience the world from a particular vantage point (e.g., positive affectivity characterized by feelings of enthusiasm) and that this trait engagement gets reflected in psychological state engagement. We conceptualize psychological state engagement as and antecedent of behavioral engagement, which we define in terms of discretionary effort (e.g., Erickson, 2005; Towers-Perrin, 2003) or a specific form of in-role or extra role effort or behavior. Figure 1 also shows that conditions of the workplace have both direct and indirect effects on state and behavioral engagement The nature of work (e.g., challenge, variety) and the nature of leadership (especially transformational leadership) are the

conditions that most interest us. Figure 1 shows, for example, that work has direct effect on state engagement (e.g., Hackman & Oldham, 1980) and indirect effects as a boundary condition (moderator) of the relationship between trait and state engagement. With regard to leadership, Figure 1 shows it having a direct effect on trust and an indirect effect through the creation of trust on behavioral engagement (e.g., Kahn, 1990; McGregor, 1960); more on Figure 1 later. In our remaining comments, we outline how various traditions and models within the research and applied literatures fit the model shown in Figure 1 and detail the resulting implications. However, prior to proceeding, it is important to note that we do not choose a specific conceptualization of engagement as “right” or “true” because (a) this would not be useful at this early stage in the development of thinking about engagement; (b) any or all of these conceptualizations can be useful for specific purposes; and (c) identifying these different conceptualizations will help researchers and practitioners have a firmer idea about the locus of the issue when they work with it. Our goal is to illuminate the unique attributes of prior research that most occupy the conceptual space we would call engagement so that future research and practice can more precisely identify the nature of the engagement construct they are pursuing.

Engagement as Psychological State: Old Wine in New Bottles?

We begin our exploration of Figure 1 with engagement as psychological state because it is the state of engagement that has received more attention, either implicitly or explicitly, than either of the other perspectives. In addition, as both dependent and independent variable in Figure 1, it is central to the engagement issue. Engagement as a psychological state has variously embraced one or more of several related ideas, each in turn representing some form of absorption, attachment, and/or enthusiasm. Operationally, the measures of engagement have for the most part been composed of a potpourri of items representing one or more of the four different categories: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, psychological empowerment, and job involvement. We summarize the relevance of each of these to the concept of engagement. We then review some more recent thinking about the state of engagement, especially with regard to the effect of that state. More specifically, it becomes clear as our review unfolds that thinking and research about engagement have evolved to be both more precise and conceptually appropriate. This clarity reflects an increasing emphasis on absorption, passion, and affect and a lessening emphasis on satisfaction and perhaps also job involvement and organizational commitment. Engagement as satisfaction. To some, engagement and satisfaction are linked directly if not regarded as completely isomorphic. Thus, Harter et al. (2002) explicitly referred to their measure (The Gallup Workplace Audit) as “satisfaction-engagement” (p. 269) and defined engagement as “the individual’s involvement and satisfaction with as well as enthusiasm for work” (p. 269, italics added).

Interestingly, many traditional measures of satisfaction include items that would seemingly tap facets that fit our conceptual space for engagement. For example, one item included in Brayfield and Rothe’s (1951) measure of job satisfaction read “Most days I feel enthusiastic about my work.” Enthusiasm is regarded as a marker of engagement by some (e.g., Harter, Schmitt, &

Keyes, 2003), and the relevance of satisfaction is clear in that people invest more time in roles they find enjoyable (Rothbard & Edwards, 2003). They have designed and validated (against customer satisfaction; Salanova et al., 2005) a nine-item measure of state engagement that defines three factors that conceptually link to issues we will discuss next: dedication (i.e., commitment) absorption (i.e., involvement), and energy (i.e., positive affective state). Proposition 1 summarizes the points made with regard to the relationship between satisfaction and engagement: Proposition 1: Satisfaction when assessed as satiation is not in the same conceptual space as engagement. Satisfaction when assessed as feelings of energy, enthusiasm, and similarly positive affective states becomes a facet of engagement. Proposition 2: Organizational commitment is an important facet of the state of engagement when it is conceptualized as positive attachment to the larger organizational entity and measured as a willingness to exert energy in support of the organization, to feel pride as an organizational member, and to have personal identification with the organization. Brown (1996) indicated that a “state of involvement implies a positive and relatively complete state of engagement of core aspects of the self in the job” (p. 235, italics added). Switching now to task engagement and job commitment, these have been discussed in the engagement literature albeit in a limited form. Erickson (2005) is one exception who places the work people do as central to the state of engagement concluded that job involvement is an antecedent of organizational commitment rather than a consequence. Involvement than to organizational commitment. The measurement of these older constructs in practice leaves something to be desired with regard to the kinds of affect and sense of energy the state engagement construct we propose would require. Some measures of job satisfaction that have been used to infer engagement are not affective in nature at all and frequently do not connote or even apply to a sense of energy but represent conditions that might promote the state of engagement (e.g., Harter et al., 2002),

Schaufeli and his colleagues define engagement as a “persistent, positive affective-motivational state of fulfillment in employees that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (Maslach et al., 2001, p. 417). From a measurement perspective, questionnaire items (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002; Schaufeli et al., 2006) tap constructs similar to involvement and satisfaction but with an additional emotional, energetic, or affective tone, suggesting a high degree of overlap with PA: “I’m enthusiastic about my job” and “I feel happy when I am working intensely.” The important considerations for present purposes are (a) the distinct characterization of persistence or stability, if not consistency of experience of that state, and (b) the elevated emotional tone of the state itself (Schaufeli et al., 2002). In a related view, Shirom (2003) suggested the notion of vigor as an affective state experienced as a response to the characteristics of the job. Shirom defined vigor as an affective state but not a mood state in that individuals can attribute their feelings of vigor specifically to the job and the workplace. He positioned vigor as the feeling of physical strength, cognitive liveliness, and emotional energy. Shirom’s measure of vigor includes items such as “I feel energetic,” “I feel I am able to contribute new ideas,” and “I feel able to show warmth to others.” Shirom argued, and we agree, that vigor is not equivalent to engagement behavior, with the feeling of vigor being a

psychological state that, in combination with other positive affective states, can lead to engagement behavior. Shirom positioned vigor within the affect circumplex in a manner similar to though not perfectly aligned with PA: a mixture of moderate arousal and moderate pleasantness. Furthermore, his conceptualization of vigor is entirely consistent with the notion engagement as a relatively enduring affective state as presented here. Of particular importance, he attributed the feeling of vigor directly to workplace characteristics, especially the job itself. But it is useful to note that, like Warr (1999), Shirom is explicitly speaking

- Kahn defines personal engagement as “harnessing” of the individual self with the work role. As such, engagement is a binding force, similar to commitment as defined by Meyer et al. (2004), although Kahn (1990) also refers to the expression of that self in task behavior. Thus, the experience of personal engagement encompasses elements of both involvement and commitment as psychological states and also a sense of personal identity in role behavior. Thus, engage identity. A note on the durability of state engagement. By definition, psychological states, like engagement, have boundaries set in time (Weiss & Kurek, 2003). Different perspectives of engagement as a psychological state might vary in the limits placed on these boundaries but (a) time frames are rarely if ever explicitly referred to in perspectives related to engagement like those we have described here, and (b) the previous literatures referred to seem to implicitly assume a relatively durable engagement state. Thus, we unfortunately do not yet have either appropriate conceptual boundaries or adequate operation of those boundaries. Within the notion of a “mind-set,” engagement can be considered a relatively enduring state and one that serves to explain persistence as well as direction of job and organizationally focused behavior. As such, individual measures of engagement should be relatively stable, and intra-individual differences would be considered a reflection of measurement error. However, engagement can also be represented as a temporary transient state. Here, engagement measures would be expected to fluctuate, representing the daily ebb and flow of experiences in response to the work
- environment or other aspects of personal life.
- Existing measures of the more traditional
- concepts of satisfaction, job involvement,
- and organizational commitment frequently contain items referring to affect, energy, and identity.

(Bernthal, 2004), and some combine effort with commitment in the definition (e.g., Corporate Executive Board, 2004; Wellins & Concelman, 2005a) with similarly somewhat ambiguous frames of reference. Traditionally, effort has been regarded as comprising (a) duration, (b) intensity, and (c) direction (Campbell & Pritchard, 1976; Kanfer, 1990). Campbell (1990) suggested “demonstrating effort” as one of the dimensions of a taxonomy of performance and defined the dimension as consistency of performance, maintaining work levels under adverse conditions, and in other ways, expending extra effort when required—all of which speak strongly to the issue of persistence.

CONCLUSION

The notion of extra effort is a compelling one in that it implies that employees possess a reservoir of energy from which they can draw should they so choose; organizations that learn how to harness this potential will likely enjoy distinct competitive advantage. First and most importantly, effort is not easily defined. Second, extra effort is an overly limiting view of engagement if it simply connotes doing more of the same; what may be most important is doing something different. Third, “extra” or “atypical” implies a reference or standard that is generally left unspecified. Fourth, discretion in itself is a complex issue, leading to ambiguous boundary conditions on the meaning of engagement. Engagement behaviors include innovative behaviors, demonstrations of initiative, proactively seeking opportunities to contribute, and going beyond what is, within specific frames of reference, typically expected or required. Engagement as Extra-Role Behavior When we think of engagement behaviors this way, that is, in terms of the behaviors that extend beyond typical or expected in role performance, three major threads of research are relevant to this notion. Fundamentally, the conceptual issue is whether the behavior of interest must be discretionary—the person made a choice to do it—to be considered an example of engaged behavior. This would require all behaviors to be evaluated for the degree to which they involved making a choice to do more, to do something different, and so forth. Engagement behavior includes actions that, given a specific frame of reference, go beyond what is typical, usual, ordinary, and/or ordinarily expected. We say that engagement behavior is inclusive of behaviors normally characterized as OCB, implying that there are other behaviors that reveal other facets of engagement, and we turn to one of these, role expansion, next. For present purposes, the critical feature of these views is the common emphasis on proactivity and initiative compared to role prescriptions as the behavior of interest. Thus, engagement as adaptive behavior is a useful concept for describing a range of behaviors that support organizational effectiveness. It is easy to state that people who have passion for their work are more likely to engage in adaptive behaviors, it is more difficult to state why some people have passion for their work and others do not and why in some organizations passion characterizes employees. It is worth noting that our logic that trait PA is more relevant to engagement than to satisfaction also suggests that state engagement would be a stronger correlate of what we have called adaptive behaviors than would job satisfaction. The state of psychological engagement, encompassing the notion of “flow” or “being present,” has also been investigated in relation to the “auto telic” personality. There are clear points of view suggesting that state engagement and engagement behaviors are at least partially the result of dispositional influences. Trait engagement comprises a number of interrelated facets, including trait positive affectivity, conscientiousness, the proactive personality, and the auto telic personality. Interestingly, although the task is central, it is the degree to which the person can implement his or her preferred self in the work that is key—but certain characteristics of tasks like autonomy, challenge, and variety seem to have main effects for most people. Effective managers are those who get the work done with the people they have, do not try to change them, and attempt to

capitalize on the competencies their people have, not what they, the managers, wished they had. Engaged employees invest their energy, time, or personal resources trusting that the investment will be rewarded in some meaningful way. As the authors suggested, this supports the view that employees reciprocate on the basis of an anticipated reward, whether concrete or abstract. Feelings of trust mediate the relationship between leadership behavior and behavioral engagement such that feelings of trust is the psychological state between leader behavior and behavioral engagement, leaders create trust in followers, and it is the trust followers experience that enables behavioral engagement. In the frameworks of self-concordance and self-determination theories, motivation (and, by extension, work motivation) reflects a continuum ranging from complete external motivation to complete internal or intrinsic motivation. When the goals of the organization (or leader) and the goals of the individual are entirely consistent, it follows that the level of employee state engagement will be higher and that a variety of adaptive behaviors are likely to be displayed. When people can use their preferred selves in their work that they experience being engaged by that work (state engagement) and also perform to their fullest capacities (behavioral engagement) There is strong evidence to indicate that the organization itself, especially its goals and values, can also be a source of attachment and commitment that lead people to identify with the organization as a whole and, in turn, to display adaptive behaviors consistent with its long-term interests. It may be more complex in that when a specific combination of people and conditions exists, what results is more a product of the two than a simple addition. Trait engagement interacts with work and organizational conditions to produce state and behavioral engagement. Alternatively, work conditions not only have a main effect on state and behavioral engagement, but they also may moderate the relationships between trait engagement and state engagement as well as relationships between state and behavioral engagement.

REFERENCES:

- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 9–32. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. (1990). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor*
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 103–118. Bernthal, P. (2004). *Measuring employee engagement*. Retrieved May 4, 2005, from www.ddiworld.com/pdf/ddi_MeasuringEmployeeEngagement_wp.pdf
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 554–571.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M., & Conway, N. (2005). Exchange relationships: Examining psychological contracts and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 774–781.
- Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26, 435–462.
- Frese, M., Kring, W., Soose, A., & Zempel, J. (1996). Personal initiative at work: Differences between East and West Germany. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 37–63. Gagne, M., &

Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 331–362.

- George, J. M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Hewitt Associates LLC*. (2005). Employee engagement. Retrieved April 29, 2005, from http://was4.hewitt.com/hewitt/services/talent/subtalent/ee_engagement.htm
- Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Huelsman, T. J., Furr, R. M., & Nemanick, R. C. (2003). Measurement of dispositional affect: Construct validity and convergence with a circumplex model of affect. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*