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ABSTRACT

- **Purpose** – The purpose of this study is, at first, to understand the concept of work engagement, its roots and implications. Secondly, from an empirical perspective, a number of detected theoretical relationships are checked, by highlighting the relationship between work engagement and the job resources.

- **Design/methodology/approach** – The document is presented as two parts of a whole, the first is a theoretical review of the work engagement, which is based on the existing literature related to work engagement and the Positive Occupational Psychology, obtained from the database and the library of the Jaume I University. The second, through an empirical and quantitative analysis, it contrasts various hypotheses obtained from the theoretical review and intensifies the study in relation to the roots of work engagement (more specifically the job resources) and its relationship with work engagement. The statistical sample is composed of 40 employees of two recognised companies in the province of Castellon.

- **Originality/value** – The work contributes to deepen a concept within the new paradigm of positive psychology in organisations, such as work engagement. Moreover, as an empirical study, it exemplifies (in small scale) what would be an experimental, quantitative preliminary study, which would enable an organisation to infer the state of engagement of its employees in connection (in my case) with Job Resources. From the findings, the HR department, to support the rest of the organisation, can develop and implement actions, both to correct and prevent the possible scenarios as for optimizing and extend (improve) the status of employees and the climate generated by them.

- **Research limitations** – It is difficult to form generalisations from the research into only 40 individuals. A future study might go further increasing the number of independent variables and with new hypotheses, trying to be more representative.

- **Key-words** – Work engagement, job resources, Positive Occupational Health Psychology, HRM and performance.

- **Paper type** – Literature Review & Empirical Study
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

Nowadays in the age of information and knowledge in which we coexist, and in front of the new direction we are taking in relation to the type of organisation (dynamic, flexible, oriented to participation ...) and the environment we are facing (turbulent, unpredictable, complex and hectic), the concept of "jobs for life" has given way to "learning for life". The concept of a paternalistic management career in the 50's and 60's years has disappeared. Now the labour market is dynamic and less predictable. This paradigm shift has resulted in a greater emphasis on efficiency, individual ambition, proactivity, learning, searching for challenges and personal development in virtually limitless environments (Brown & Hesketh, 2004; Defillippi & Arthur, 1994).

At present, and in that environment, a good Human Resources Management (HRM) can create competitive advantages for the organisation, with more effective and adaptable employees. HRM has evolved from an administrative function to a strategic, but there are companies that do not pay attention to HR but still succeed (not all has his origin in HR advantages, e.g. property resources). There are (stable) environments favouring those other resources. But it is a fact that the environment is changing and becoming more uncertain and turbulent. This has prompted the HRM to have a strategic function with a macro perspective, i.e., managing people to achieve strategic objectives, as an investment in the medium and long term and proactively (Bonache & Cabrera, 2006; Huub, Bondarouk & Van der Velde, 2006; Johnason, 2009).

With regard to such HRM, practices such as recruitment, training and employee development are considered increasingly important to the success of organisations (Collings & Mellahi, 2009; Spence & Petrick, 2000).

This reality explains why many organisations have policies of HRM and psychological applications that can improve and enhance the health, safety, motivation and wellbeing of its employees (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2009).

Psychologically speaking, the work can have both positive and negative effects. So far there has been a long tradition in studying those negative aspects that affect how people feel, either at work or outside. Specifically in the work environment, for example, occupational health surveys made at official level have tended to focus on negative factors that may be influencing the health of workers. This is the case of the National Survey on Working Conditions, developed by the National Institute for Safety and Health at Work (INSHT) in Spain, the analysis focuses on aspects of discomfort, such as stress, depression, tiredness chronic, etc. (Rodríguez & Cifre, 2012). Other examples could be
found in numerous books and articles by well-known authors such as: Freudenberger (1974), Zimmerman (2010), Hart & Cooper (2001) or Demerouti, Bakker & Nachreiner & Schaufeli (2001).

This trend, however, is beginning to change in international contexts. In this vein, the Fourth European Working Conditions Survey, conducted by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, in its pursuit of quality of life, includes indicators of subjective well-being such as employee satisfaction. On the other hand, recognised authors are also increasing their number of works in relation to positive aspects of psychology at work, namely: Goleman (1995), Turner, Barling & Zacharatos (2002), Harter, Schmidt & Keyes (2003), Mayer, Salovey & Caruso (2004); or Bakker, (2010).

The reason for this paradigm shift is that modern organisations are adapting to the times in which we live, in a context of continuous change; and in order to survive and prosper, they need motivated and psychologically healthy employees. For this reason, modern organisations are changing in a direction that is increasingly based on psychological knowledge and the experience of people in their own careers. Companies are increasingly looking for employees proactive, collaborative, committed and responsible for their own career development and performance. Obviously, this cannot be achieved with a healthy workforce in the traditional style. That needs to go a step further to evaluate the strengths and enhance them and has given rise to a new approach to research, increasingly applied to the intervention. This is the Positive Occupational Psychology (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2009).

From the topic of Positive Occupational Psychology, the next work will gradually be Positive Occupational Health Psychology (POHP), until reaching an emerging concept (increasingly fashionable), which falls within this novel approach of (POHP), the work engagement, which it is understood as a positive, fulfilling, affective motivational state of work-related well-being that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá & Bakker, 2002, p.74; Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter & Taris, 2008)

With respect to the objectives of this project, these could also be framed as two parts of a whole:

Firstly, it explores theoretically the concept of work engagement and its roots and implications for organisations and employees; through the new paradigm of Positive Occupational Health Psychology (POHP), and its growing impact on HRM.
Secondly, from an empirical and quantitative study, carried out with the information gathered from two questionnaires (integrated into a single survey) taken from 40 employees of two companies in the province of Castellon, starting from the most general to the most specific:

- Will be discussed the average level of work engagement and frequencies, for both companies, compared to the normative data of Salanova & Schaufeli, (2009).
- Furthermore, more specifically, a number of hypotheses, extracted from the theoretical review, will be contrasted. They will be summarized at the beginning of empirical study.
- Finally an exploratory hypothesis will arise, where the focus will be on the job resources. It is this part that brings more added value to this work.
2. **POSITIVE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY**

**Introduction**

For decades, the focus in the area of psychology has been about people's negative aspects, forgetting the complementary goal: to improve human life (Seligman, 2002). While clinical psychologists spent most of their time on the study, diagnosis, and treatment of pathologies, social psychologists focused on illusions, prejudices, and errors of the human being.

Moreover, from the Spanish context, Carmelo Vazquez (2006) reinforces the thesis of Seligman, and highlights the gap in terms of methods to restore happiness and promote wellbeing.

This situation is also seen by observing the number of publications displayed in one of the leading international journals in this field, such as the 'Journal of Occupational Health Psychology’, where it is observable that 90% of the published articles are negative issues such as absenteeism and stress (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2009).

It seems difficult to promote employees to achieve good work, progression or satisfaction. Being critical is occasionally confused with being negative and discouraging. Nevertheless, in the competitive fight between organisations, employee input becomes a critical business issue, because in trying to produce more output with less employee input, firms have no choice but to try to engage not only the body but the mind and soul of every employee. Obviously, this objective is not achieved with the prevalent four D's approach (damage, disease, disorder, and dysfunction), based on the medical model, that focuses on preventing poor performance, low motivation, depression, ill-health, and disengagement (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008).

Nowadays, employees’ expectations of their job have changed. The best employers are no longer those that promise lifetime employment and a good retirement fund, but rather those that provide their employees with opportunities, resources, and flexibility for sustainable growth (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). There is a growing need for a more innovative and emerging positive approach that focuses on the strengths of the employee. Positive psychology is emerging as a viable and necessary new paradigm today (Snyder & Lopez, 2002).

Positive psychology appeared in the late 1990s with a renewed emphasis on what is right with people in contrast to the preoccupation psychology has had over the years with what is wrong with people (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Snyder & Lopez, 2002).
This approach rehabilitated the focus on positivity and people’s strengths and virtues (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). In addition, Sheldon & King (2001), claim that Positive psychology attempts to adopt a more open and appreciative perspective regarding human potentials, motives, and capacities.

**Figure 1. Character Strengths**

Source: Peterson, Christopher; Seligman, Martin E. P. (2004). Character strengths and virtues When we want to apply Positive psychology’s principles in the work and inside the organisations, Luthans (2002), pointed out the need for a proactive approach to the research in this field that he denominated Positive Organizational Behaviour (POB).

For psychological capacities and strengths to be included in this concept they have to meet certain criteria. Specifically, they must be positive and relatively unique to the field of organisational behaviour, they must be theory and research based, measurable, state-like or developmental, and related to work performance outcomes (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007).

Positive psychology and organisational theory merge in the new approach of positive organizational behaviour (POB) defined as ‘the study and application of positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace’ (Luthans, 2002; Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008).

However, from today's perspective in Human Resources Management (HRM), the focus on improving organisational performance also extends to improving the quality of working and organizational life in a broader sense, where it is suitable for the improvement of the
psychosocial health, wellbeing and the employees’ satisfaction. Furthermore, it is demonstrated in the scientific research that the performance improvement lies in an increased quality of work and organizational life in the broader sense. This is the approach of Positive Psychology applied to occupational health (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2009).

Therefore, when we apply psychological knowledge to the organisational world, and specifically to occupational health, we could define the Positive Occupational Psychology (POP) as the scientific study of optimal functioning of individuals and groups in organisations and their effective management. The focus of POP is to discover the characteristics of ‘good organizational life’ (Llorens, Salanova & Martinez, 2008).

2.1. Positive Occupational Health Psychology (POHP)

The emphasis on search and study of the positive factors that characterize organizations, and thus the search of the employee’s health and of the organisation, represents a new challenge in the study of organisations today and gives rise to what it’s known as Positive Occupational Health Psychology (POHP). Positive Occupational Health Psychology arises, therefore, integration of positive psychology with comprehensive Occupational Health notion, and its goal is to discover the characteristics of the positive and significant organizational life (Llorens, Salanova & Martinez, 2008).

Positive Occupational Health Psychology (POHP) includes both approaches – POB and POP – and has its own specific emphasis. Occupational health and well-being are central to the POHP approach, but of course, researchers and organizations are simultaneously interested in causes of occupational health, e.g. job design; and possible consequences, e.g. the performance. Important is that the focus is, again, on the positive side of work life, and not limited to the negative side, e.g. risk factors, job demands, burnout, etc. (Bakker & Derks, 2009; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2009).

On the other hand, the original definition of Occupational Health Psychology (OHP) proposed by the US National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) captures the field rather well; accordingly, OHP concerns ‘the application of psychology to improving the quality of work life, and to protecting and promoting the safety, health, and well-being of workers’ (Schaufeli, 2004, p. 503). Although this definition focuses on the positive side of OHP by mentioning quality of work life, and the promotion of safety, health and well-being, research has typically followed the four D’s approach.
According to Bakker & Schaufeli (2008), OHP needs a radical shift away from the four D’s. A focus on POHP illuminates how work contexts (such as jobs, units, work groups, professions, and organisations) affect, and are affected by positive relationships, positive emotions, and positive meanings (Fredrickson & Dutton, 2008). In sum, POHP is the study and application of optimal functioning in the workplace. It promotes occupational health and flourishing, and examines how positive phenomena (contexts, personal resources) can be used to protect against occupational risks (Bakker & Derks, 2010).

Additionally, at the same time that POHP can be used to promotes occupational health and examines how positive phenomena can be used to protect and treat against occupational risks, Salanova & Schaufeli (2009) incorporate the concept of "amplification", based on the principle of improving promote, increase and improve the health and wellbeing of employees, including the engagement. The amplification is a step beyond, because it includes the entire workforce and that is based on the belief that improving the health, welfare and engagement is a mission without end that requires continuous effort and sustained. "Amplification" becomes an integral part of organizational management.

On the other hand, taking a look to the future, since it is a very recent perspective, (Vazquez, 2006) notes that the future of positive psychology, like all its ramifications, should share the future with the rest of the psychology in general, without the adjective of positivity. It should be integrated into a more holistic perspective, thus being more faithful to the human, social and organizational reality.

2.2. Healthy organisations

The term ‘healthy organisation’ is quoted in many places and numerous informative articles and papers have been published to date in scientific journals. It is a new and current term, but as with new things, it has also generated a lot of confusion about the concept and its meaning. Under the term, literature and research are grouped in many different areas, and often, the concepts used are similar in meaning and in personal and organisational consequences. However, the knowledge generated in research from various perspectives and scientific disciplines seems to develop in parallel (Salanova, 2009).

1 Flourishing is living within an optimal range of human functioning, one that connotes goodness, generativity, growth, and resilience. It’s the opposite of both pathology and languishing, which are described as living a life that feels hollow and empty (Fredrickson & Losada, 2005).
Broadly speaking, (Cameron & Chase, 2004) suggest that the concept of 'Healthy organisation' is part of the positive organisational researches, and is a new concept in organisational studies, focusing on the dynamics leading organisations and individuals to achieve exceptional performance.

In the previous figure, Gueso-Hinestroza, Patricia Merlin, King-Sarmiento & Claudia Fabiola (2013) present a summary chart with some of the models of 'Healthy organisation' according to some authors and organisations, with their respective variables that defined it.

In professional practice, and from business consulting there have also been efforts to understand better how the ‘Healthy organisations' work. Among them, we must highlight the work of the ‘Great Place to Work’ (http://greatplacetowork.com), which through the ‘Fortune 100’ offers consulting services and tools that help diagnose and generate more effective and positive organisations. The essence of a ‘Great Place to Work’ is a place where employees trust the people they work with, enjoy get on well with, and believe in

**Figure 2. Models of healthy organization focused on employee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Embedded variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Healthy organizations' model (Wilson et al, 2004) | Central attributes of the organization  
Organizational climate  
Job design  
Future work  
Psychological adjustment to the work  
Healthy employees and welfare |
| Healthy organizations' model (Selatova, 2008) | Healthy practices  
Employee health, positive psychological Capital  
Healthy Results: Products and/or services of excellence and positive relationships with the environment and the community. |
| Healthy Labour Organization Canada (NOI, 2007) | Healthy workplaces and corporate policies  
HR and organization of work  
Planning for health promotion in the workplace  
Implementation of actions to promote health in the workplace  
Social responsibility |
| Quality Criteria for Health Promotion ENWHF (1999) | Organizational principles  
Leadership  
Planning and scheduling  
Linking people  
Process management and risk assessment |

**Source:** Gueso-Hinestroza; Patricia Merlin, King-Sarmiento & Claudia Fabiola (2013). Toward the Construction of an Integral Model for Healthy Organizations
what they do. All this happens through the concurrence of three types of interconnected relationships: good relations between employees and management; good relationships between employees; adaptation and good relations between employees and their work/business (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2009).

Nowadays, in view of the lists, already published, of best companies, it is possible to draw generalised characteristics (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2009): more flexible companies, with more opportunities to adapt to the environment; with continuous learning environments; more diverse in terms of women and minorities; they provide feedback and social support and more democratic, open (communication) and error-permissive behaviour.

At this point, Salanova & Schaufeli (2009) are interested in the possibility of establishing a set of basic elements that contain 'Healthy organisations', that stand to generate excellence related to organisational results, and maintain excellent relations with the organisational environment and community.

**Figure 3. 'Healthy organization's heuristic model'.**

![Healthy organization's heuristic model](image)

**Source:** Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2009). Work Engagement: When Work Becomes Passion
3. WORK ENGAGEMENT

Introduction

'William loves his work and talks about it enthusiastically. Every day he throws himself into his work passionately. He finds his job challenging, exciting and enjoyable, and he does more than is requested, just for the fun of it. William has the autonomy to be creative, and he learns new things all the time. Although he is always busy and is often completely immersed in his work, he is rarely tired or exhausted. Instead, work seems to give him energy, and every day he is happy to start working again. Even if he sometimes faces difficulties, he persists. He is really dedicated to his work and finds that he deals with interesting and important issues. Nevertheless, he can relax and disengage from work and he knows how to downplay his work. Although he often gets totally absorbed in his work, there are also other things outside work that he enjoys to the full' - Anonymous engaged worker- (Bakker & Leiter, 2010).

Because of the emergence of positive occupational psychology, it is not surprising that positive aspects of health and well-being are increasingly popular in Positive Occupational Health Psychology. One of these positive aspects is 'work engagement', which is considered to be the antipode of burnout. While burned-out workers feel exhausted and cynical, their engaged counterparts feel vigorous and enthusiastic about their work (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003).

'Engagement' has become a very fashionable concept. First in the field of business consulting and recently also in academia. The daily conditions of engagement refer to linking, involvement, commitment, passion, enthusiasm, effort and energy. This is reflected in the Merriam-Webster dictionary, which describes the engagement as "an involvement or emotional commitment". However, despite this description, there is no agreement among professionals about their meaning (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2009).

In addition, although the expressions 'Work engagement' and 'Employee engagement' are usually used as synonyms, it is important to distinguish these two concepts, pointing out that work engagement refers to the relationship of the worker to his work; whilst employee engagement may also include the relationship with the organisation (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2009).
3.1. **The concept of Work Engagement**

According to Bakker & Leiter (2010), contemporary organisations need employees who are psychologically connected to their work. The information and service economy of the 21st century requires employees who are willing and able to invest themselves fully in their roles. Organisations need employees who are energetic and dedicated. It is therefore not surprising that, since the turn of the century, work engagement has gained significant popularity in management (e.g., Macey, Schneider, Barbera, & Young, 2009) and scientific literature (e.g., Bakker & Leiter, 2010).

(Kahn, 1990) introduced the concept of engagement, conceptualizing it as the ‘harnessing of organization members to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances’ (p. 694). Thus, engaged employees put a great deal of effort into their work because they identify with it. According to Kahn (1990, 1992), a dynamic, dialectical relationship exists between the person who drives personal energies (physical, cognitive, emotional, and mental) into his or her work role, on one hand, and the work role that allows this person to express him or herself, on the other.

Remarkably, it is a study on burnout that has stimulated most current research on work engagement (Bakker et al. 2008). In contrast to those suffering from burnout, engaged employees have a sense of energetic and effective connection with their work, and they consider their work as stimulating, as opposed to stressful and demanding.

In respect to this earlier comparison, between 'Work Engagement' and 'Burnout', there are two schools of thought. On the one hand Maslach & Leiter (1997), assumed that a continuum exists with burnout and engagement as two opposite poles. These authors argue that, in the case of burnout, energy turns into exhaustion, involvement into cynicism, and efficacy into ineffectiveness. By implication, engagement is assessed by the opposite pattern of scores on the three dimensions of the MBI-GS: low scores on exhaustion and cynicism and high scores on professional efficacy.

Furthermore, as stated by Bakker & Demerouti (2007), the second school of thought operationalizes engagement in its own right (a separate and independent concept), as the positive antithesis of burnout. According to this approach, work engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling, and affective-motivational state of work-related wellbeing that can be seen as the antipode of job burnout; that is characterized by three dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá & Bakker, 2002, p.74; Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter & Taris, 2008 and Bakker & Leiter, 2010).
Regarding their dimensions, Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker (2002) and Bakker, Demerouti & Sanz-Vergel (2014), noted that 'vigor' is characterised by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one’s work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties; 'dedication' by being strongly involved in one’s work, and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge; and 'absorption' by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one’s work, whereby time passes quickly. Accordingly, vigor and dedication are considered direct opposites of exhaustion and cynicism, respectively, the two core symptoms of burnout. The continuum that is spanned by exhaustion and vigor has been labelled energy, whereas the continuum that is spanned by cynicism and dedication has been labeled identification (González-Romá et al. 2006).

3.1.1. Measurement

Based on the initial concept of personal engagement Kahn (1990), May, Gilson and Harter developed a 13-item scale (Personal Engagement Questionnaire), consisting of three dimensions: cognitive, emotional and physical engagement. Unfortunately, after conducting a factor analysis, instead of three factors, only one emerged. This means that empirically speaking, cognitive, emotional and physical dimensions cannot be distinguished as different aspects of engagement (Salanova, & Schaufeli, 2009).

Moreover, based on the definition of Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Roma & Bakker (2002) and Bakker & Leiter (2010), the three aspects of work engagement (vigor, dedication and absorption) are assessed by the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), which is currently available in 20 languages and can be used freely for non-commercial purposes. In addition a short form and a student version are available. The reliability, certification and factorial validity of the UWES is documented in various studies (Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006; Schaufeli, 2007).

On the other hand, the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) is an alternative instrument for the assessment of work engagement. It consists of two dimensions: exhaustion-vigor and cynicism-dedication (Demerouti & Bakker, 2008; Demerouti, Bakker & Mostert, 2010)
In the below figure can observe normative scales for the UWES, based on a heterogeneous sample of 1.275 Spanish workers (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2009), which can be used as complement to the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale.

**Figure 4.** Normative scales for the UWES, based on a heterogeneous sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vigor</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>Absorption</th>
<th>Work Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very low</strong></td>
<td>≤2,17</td>
<td>≤1,60</td>
<td>≤1,60</td>
<td>≤1,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>2,18 - 3,20</td>
<td>1,61 - 3,00</td>
<td>1,61 - 2,75</td>
<td>1,94 - 3,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong></td>
<td>3,21 - 4,80</td>
<td>3,01 - 4,90</td>
<td>2,76 - 4,40</td>
<td>3,07 - 4,66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>4,81 - 5,60</td>
<td>4,91 - 5,79</td>
<td>4,41 - 5,35</td>
<td>4,67 - 5,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very high</strong></td>
<td>≥5,61</td>
<td>≥5,80</td>
<td>≥5,36</td>
<td>≥5,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>3,99</td>
<td>3,81</td>
<td>3,56</td>
<td><strong>3,82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2009). Work Engagement: When Work Becomes Passion

### 3.2. Related concepts

Below are defined several concepts closely related to 'Work engagement' (in many cases share idiosyncrasy) to help enhance their understanding:

- **Extra-role behaviour.** Extra-role performance behaviours are certain behaviours of employees, which are not part of their formal job requirements as they cannot be prescribed or required in advance for a given job but they help in the smooth functioning of the organization as a social system. Some of the extra role performance behaviours are: helping co-workers with a job related problem; accepting orders without fuss; tolerating temporary positions without complaint; maintaining cleanliness and physical hygiene of the work place; promoting a work climate that is tolerable and minimizes the distractions created by interpersonal conflict; and protecting and conserving organizational resources etc. (Bateman & Organ, 1983).

- **Personal initiative.** Personal initiative (PI) can be defined as a behaviour syndrome that results in an individual taking an active and self-starting approach to work goals and tasks and persisting in overcoming barriers and setbacks (Frese, Fay, Hilburger, Leng, & Tag, 1997; Frese, Kring, Soose, & Zempel, 1996).
• **Job involvement.** Job involvement is defined as the measure of the degree to which an employee is involved in his job and takes part in decision-making. Employees' job involvement increases if employees have decision making authority, and responsibility (Bass, 1965). Furthermore, (Lodhal & Kejner, 1965), define job involvement as: ‘the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work, or the importance of work in his total self-image’.

• **Organisational commitment.** Organisational commitment is a psychological state of attachment and identification, but unlike job involvement, it is a building force between individual and organisation. On the other hand, according to Northcraft & Neale (1996), commitment is an attitude reflecting an employee's loyalty to the organization, and an ongoing process through which organization members express their concern for the organization and its continued success and wellbeing.

• **Job satisfaction.** One of the most widely used definitions in organisational research is that of Locke (1976), who defines job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences" (p. 1304). Others have defined it as simply how content an individual is with his or her job; whether he or she likes the job or not (Spector, 1997). A more recent definition of the concept of job satisfaction is from Hulin & Judge (2003), who have noted that job satisfaction includes multidimensional psychological responses to an individual's job, and that these personal responses have cognitive, affective and behavioural components

• **Flow.** In positive psychology, flow, also known as the zone, is the mental state of operation in which a person performing an activity is fully immersed in a feeling of energized focus, full involvement, and enjoyment in the process of the activity. In essence, flow is characterized by complete absorption in what one does (Csikszentmihályi, 1990).

• **Workaholism.** Although at first glance there might be some similarities between workaholics and engaged employees, it has been argued elsewhere that engaged employees lack the compulsive drive that is typical for work addicts (Schaufeli, Taris & Bakker, 2006).
3.3. **The importance of engagement**

Work engagement has broad implications for employees’ performance. The energy and focus inherent in work engagement allows employees to bring their potential to the job. This energetic focus enhances the quality of their core work responsibilities. They have the capacity and the motivation to concentrate exclusively on the tasks at hand. Furthermore, work engagement supports extra-role performance. With initiative, employees anticipate new developments in their professions and strive to position themselves as leaders in their fields. Through their actions, they go beyond living within the confines of their job description to create their job into something that dynamically adapts to an ever-changing work life that has become the norm (Bakker & Leiter, 2010).

According to Fredrickson (1998, 2001, 2005), ‘work engagement resonates with their broaden-and-build perspective’. Cognitive broadening lies at the core of this perspective and it is based on research demonstrating that positive emotions increase the flexibility, creativity, integration and efficiency (Isen, Daubman & Nowicki, 1984, 1987; Isen, Rosenzweig & Young, 1991). Accordingly, positive affect produces a broad and flexible cognitive organisation as well as the ability to integrate diverse material.

Fredrickson’s theory gives additional substance to the concept of work engagement. It goes beyond the general notion that a positive affinity with work increases an employees’ attachment to the setting or its activities. In short, work engagement is both efficient as well as fulfilling (Bakker & Leiter, 2010).

On the other hand, according to Bakker & Leiter (2010) and Sonnentag (2003), work engagement can predict, as well, the proactive behavior, the personal initiative and the job performance.

Additionally, the graph below, as determined by research conducted by Gallup (2013), shows that highly engaged organisations perform significantly better, have better customer satisfaction, have higher employee satisfaction and are overall more productive.
Figure 5. Engagement affects key business outcomes

**EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AFFECTS KEY BUSINESS OUTCOMES**

Work units in the top quartile in employee engagement outperform bottom-quartile units by 10% on customer ratings, 21% in productivity, and 22% in profitability. Work units in the top quartile also saw significantly lower absenteeism (37%), turnover (26% in high-turnover organizations, 65% in low-turnover organizations), and shrinkage (29%) and fewer safety incidents (48%), patient safety incidents (41%), and quality defects (41%).

**Source:** Susan Sorenson – Gallup © (2013). How Employee Engagement Drives Growth

### 3.4. State Work engagement (SWE)

Generally, work engagement is conceptualised as a relatively stable phenomenon. This can be explained by the presence of specific job and organisational characteristics (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Building on the existing knowledge of trait work engagement, Bakker & Leiter (2010) introduced State Work engagement (SWE) and its conceptualisation, to help to answer questions like: ‘why person feels more engaged at work on specific days and not on others days?’.

Although the general approach of examining fluctuations of experiences and behaviours within people is not new, in recent years, researchers in work and organisational psychology and related fields became increasingly interested in such processes: ‘the within-person approach’ (Beal, Weiss, Barros & MacDermid, 2005).

The stability of work engagement seems to depend to some extent on the timeframe within which it is measured. Results of follow-up studies with shorter time-lags, from a few days to a few weeks, have shown that work engagement actually fluctuates within these short periods of time (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Sonnentag, 2003; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Heuven, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2008; see also Sonnentag, Dormann, & Demerouti, 2010). Thus, it seems there are days and weeks during which employees experience stronger work engagement; for example, on some days a supervisor may
provide more support and feedback and thus affect employees’ work engagement. Nevertheless, despite these brief, temporary fluctuations, work engagement seems to return to its usual level over longer periods of time (Seppälä, Hakanen, Mauno, Perhoniemi, Tolvanen & Schaufeli, 2015).

Sonnentag (2003) was the first to challenge the prevailing view that engagement refers to a persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state (Schaufeli et al., 2002). She proposed that work engagement should not only be seen as an enduring experience. Rather, she argued and showed that levels of work engagement may vary within the same employee from one day to another, in response to specific situational and personal conditions (see also, Sonnentag et al., 2010). Thus, daily work engagement was introduced as complementary to enduring work engagement.

Before to continue strengthening the thesis of Sonnentag (2003) and Bakker & Leiter (2010) and its conceptualisation of SWE; it is of interest to review others approaches. Macey & Schneider (2008) portrayed engagement as an attitude-like construct. They distinguished between the attitudinal component (i.e., cognitions and effects) of engagement and its behavioural consequences (e.g. extra-role activities) and describe state engagement as ‘relatively durable over time’ (p.13). Others viewed work engagement as a state that can vary within people over short periods of time (Dala, Brummel, Wee & Thomas, 2008; Sonnentag, 2003).

Returning to the thesis of Bakker & Leiter (2010), they believe that a state perspective on work engagement is particularly worthwhile. This perspective follows the three-dimensional conceptualisation of Schaufeli et al. (2002, 2004), in which work engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling, and affective-motivational state, characterised by three dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption. And it is observed as a detached state: the level of engagement can even fluctuate on a weekly or day-to-day basis (Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2009).

In addition, investigating SWE is maybe even more significant than investigating trait engagement; while SWE as an experimental state is a continuous stream of reflections on our work-life and, thus, part of our very existence; trait engagement is perhaps only present in those few times when we actively reflect on our past work experiences. Probably, trait work engagement reflects more of an attitude, whereas SWE reflects a vivid experience (Bakker & Leiter, 2010).
Besides, in relation to the measurement of work engagement, some researchers have now adapted the UWES on a daily basis (Sonnentag, 2003; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009), and their research confirms that there is substantial variation in work engagement within persons. However, the UWES was originally developed to measure work engagement in general and not to measure work engagement on a daily basis. Although most diary studies show the good internal consistencies of the UWES subscales, the factor structure of the state version of the UWES has never been established using multilevel analysis (Breevaart, Bakker, Demerouti & Hetland, 2012).

3.5. **Drivers of work engagement**

According to COR theory (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001), ‘people pursue to obtain, retain, and protect resources, and stress occurs when resources are threatened, or when individuals fail to gain resources after substantive resource investment’. Thus, resources play a central motivational role in this theory.

**Job resources**

Previous studies have reliably shown that job resources such as social support from colleagues, performance feedback, skill variety, autonomy, and learning opportunities are positively associated with work engagement (Albrecht, 2010; Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Job resources refer to those physical, social, or organisational aspects of the job that may reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs; be functional in achieving work goals; or stimulate personal growth, learning, and development (Demerouti et al., 2001; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Therefore, resources are not only necessary to deal with ‘high’ job demands, they are also important in their own right.

Job resources are assumed to play either an intrinsic motivational role because they foster employees’ growth, learning, and development or an extrinsic motivational role because they are instrumental in achieving work goals. In the former case, job resources fulfil basic human needs, such as the needs for autonomy, relatedness, and competence (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

According to these ideas about the motivational role of job resources, several studies have shown a positive and direct relationship between job resources and work engagement. For instance, in their 3-year panel study among 2,555 Finnish dentists,
Hakanen, Perhoniemi, and Toppinen-Tanner (2008) found that job resources, such as the opportunity to be creative and the positive feedback and acknowledgment about the direct results of work, predicted work engagement. In the same line, in their study among managers and executives of a Dutch telecom company, Schaufeli, Bakker, & Van Rhenen (2009) found that changes in job resources predicted engagement over a period of one year. Specifically, results showed that increases in social support, autonomy, opportunities to learn, and performance feedback were positive predictors of future work engagement, (Bakker, 2011).

In addition, recent longitudinal studies have also shown that psycho-social job resources are positively related to work engagement over time (for a review, see, Mauno, Kinnunen, Mäkikangas, & Feldt, 2010), and that the relationship between work engagement and job resources can also be reversed or reciprocal (e.g., De Lange, De Witte, & Notelaers, 2008; Hakanen, Perhoniemi, & Toppinen Tanner, 2008; Simbula, Guglielmi, & Schaufeli, 2011; Weigl et al., 2010; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, De merouti, & Schaufeli, 2009).

Job resource that have been perceived by employees, have been classified by many authors, studying in many cases their relationship to the work engagement, job satisfaction or wellbeing. In this line, the global performance-management consulting company, Gallup, Inc. (http://www.gallup.com/corporate/177680/gallup.aspx), provides research and strategic consulting to large organisations in many countries, focusing on analytics and advice to help leaders and organisations solve their most pressing problems (Boudway, Ira, 2012). This consultancy, after an iterative process of item formulation and testing that took several decades, the final wording of the Gallup questionnaire was established in 1998. It was dubbed Q12 since it includes 12 items. Meanwhile, the Q12 has been administered to more than 7 million employees in 112 countries (Harter, Schmidt, Killham & Asplund, 2006). According to Harter et al. (2002), the Q12 taps into the employee’s perceived job resources. In other words, the Q12 assesses the perceived level of resources in the employee’s job. Bakker & Leiter (2010), reinforced the thesis of (Harter et al., 2002) and they claimed that Q12 has been designed as a managerial tool.

In addition, Harter, Schmidt, Killham & Asplund (2012), in a Q12® Meta-Analysis present and explain the 12 items of such questionnaire. Namely: role clarity and expectations; material resources; opportunity for skill development (opportunity to do what I do best); social support and positive feedback; supervisor support; coaching; voice (opinions count); meaningfulness; quality culture; social support; feedback and learning opportunities.
Personal resources

According to Hobfoll et al. (2003), personal resources are ‘positive self-evaluations that are linked to resiliency and refer to individuals’ sense of their ability to control and impact upon their environment successfully’. It has been convincingly shown that such positive self-evaluations predict goal-setting, motivation, performance, job and life satisfaction and other desired outcomes (Judge et al., 2004). Individuals with goal self-concordance are intrinsically motivated to pursue their goals and as a result they trigger higher performance and satisfaction (see also Luthans & Youssef, 2007).

Some authors such as (Xanthopoulou et al., 2008, 2009), have investigated the relationships between personal resources and work engagement. For instance, it has been shown that self-esteem, self-efficacy (the power of believing you can), locus of control, and the emotional intelligence are positive predictors of work engagement (Albrecht, 2010).

Noteworthy is the self-efficacy, which is associated with the persistency, the commitment, the satisfaction with the actions we take and the motivation (Llorens, Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2007).

Besides, in their longitudinal studies, Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, and Schaufeli (2009) examined the role of three personal resources (self-efficacy, organisational-based self-esteem, and optimism) in predicting work engagement. Results showed that engaged employees are highly self-efficacious; they believe they are able to meet the demands they face in a broad array of contexts.

3.5.1. JD-R Model

The origin of the JD-R Model can be traced back to several balance models of job stress, such as the demands-control model (DCM) of Karasek (1979). According to these balance models, job stress is caused by high job demands (work overload) and low job control), (Bakker & Leiter, 2010).

The JD-R model, like a predictor/driver of work engagement, goes one step further than the DCM, and it’s a heuristic model that includes two specific sets of working condition, job demands and job resources, regardless of occupational group (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner & Schaufeli, 2001).

The first set concerns job demands that, according to Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti & Xanthopoulou (2007, p.275), ‘represent characteristics of the job that potentially evoke
strain, in case they exceed the employee’s adaptive capability’. More specifically, job demands are ‘those physical, social, or organisational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or psychological effort on the part of the employee and are therefore associated with certain physiological and/or psychological costs’ (Demerouti et al., 2001). Examples of job demands are time and work pressure, the emotional demands of client work, among others (Bakker & Leiter, 2010).

Though job demands are not necessarily negative, they may turn into job stressors when meeting those demands entails great effort to sustain an expected performance level, thereby occasioning negative responses such as chronic fatigue and burnout (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). In this negative point, Rudow (1999), argued that teachers’ cognitive and emotional workload may evoke chronic fatigue and burnout, which may lead to psychosomatic disorders and in the performance.

The second set refers the extent to which the job offers resources to individual employees. Job resources, as discussed above, are those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs, are functional in achieving work goals, or stimulate personal growth, learning, and development (Demerouti et al., 2001).

Generally, job demands and resources are negatively related because high job demands may prevent the mobilisation of job resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). In a similar vein, high job resources, such as social support and feedback, may reduce job demands (Bakker, Demerouti, Taris, et al., 2003).

Moreover, an important assumption in the JD-R model is that the two sets of working conditions may evoke two psychologically different processes. In the first so-called health impairment process, the demanding aspects of work may lead to and eventually to exhaustion and ill-health (Bakker & Leiter, 2010; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Exhaustion, in turn, may lead to negative consequences for the organisation, such as absenteeism (Bakker, Demerouti, De Boer, & Schaufeli, 2003) and impaired in-role performance (Bakker et al., 2004). In the second, so-called motivational process, job resources lead to engagement and positive outcomes (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

A central theme of the JD-R model is the link between job resources and employee well-being, for example: motivation, engagement and positive work attitudes. Thus, the JD-R model is not only an extension of the DCM but also has similarities with earlier motivational theories, using resources as a starting point for positive motivational outcomes, e.g. Herzberg’s Motivational Theory, (Bakker & Leiter, 2010).
The figure below illustrates the relationships and interconnections between components that explains the model.

**Figure 6.** The JD-R Model of work engagement

4. **EMPIRICAL CASE STUDY**

**Introduction**

The empirical study will consist of the quantitative analysis, carried out with the information gathered from two questionnaires (integrated into a single survey) accumulated from 40 employees of two recognised companies in the province of Castellon, 20 per company.

The first objective to study is the average level of work engagement and frequencies, for both companies, compared to normative data (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2009).

Subsequently, a series of hypotheses are contrasted, which have been observed during theoretical review.

- **H1:** Registered companies in the "Great Place to Work", have employees with more predisposition to be engaged.
- **H2:** Job resources are positively related to work engagement.
- **H3:** Males, and older people have higher levels of work engagement

Finally an exploratory hypothesis will arise, where the focus will be on the job resources. It is this part that brings more added value to this work.

- **H4:** Exploratory hypothesis. Studying causality, detect which job resources are incident on the work engagement.

4.1. **Presentation of both companies**

- **BP OIL Spain, Refinery of Castellon**

BP Oil Spain, is one of the leading energy companies in the country and ranks third in the Spanish oil market. The activity that is carried out at Castellon's refinery is mainly the refining of petroleum products.

The refinery focuses its daily work in the following areas: industrial, commercial and scientific, directly or indirectly related to crude oil and all other hydrocarbons activities, as well as their derivatives and substitutes.
The BP brand encompasses all employees, the products they sell, the technologies they develop and the relationships they build day by day. It has four values:

- **Security.** Everything they do is based on the safety of its employees and the communities around them.
- **Respect.** Respecting the environment in which they operate.
- **Excellence.** In the risk sector in which they operate, they are committed to excellence through the systematic and disciplined management of its operations.
- **Courage.**
- **A unique team.** Without detracting from the individual strengths, they excel by working together.

- **Leroy Merlin Castellon**

Leroy Merlin is a specialised company in packaging and home decoration with a firm commitment to quality, people and the environment. Its business is in the retail DIY products, decoration, building and gardening sector.

Its purpose is to offer products and solutions that contribute to improving the quality of life of their customers and help create more personal, practical, comfortable, safe and sustainable homes. The company Leroy Merlin Spain is not internationalised, but it is part of the French group ADEO.

Like all the GROUPE ADEO companies, Leroy Merlin is built around 7 values: **closeness, commitment, respect, generosity, simplicity, honesty** and **confidence**.

Furthermore, it holds the seventh place in Spain in the list 'Great Place to Work', already explained during this work, based mainly on the perception of employees about their company and its management but also in the corporate culture of the organisation through their policies and HR processes.

**4.2. Why these companies?**

On the one hand, in respect of BP OIL Spain's refinery in Castellon, I have had the chance to carry out my curricular and extracurricular practices as an intern in the refining accounting department, during nine months.

This has given me the opportunity to observe the workings of a multinational energy company, its structure, hierarchy and procedures. It also offered me the opportunity to
perform part of my empirical study through two questionnaires to 20 employees from whom I have obtained part of my empirical results.

On the other hand, regarding Leroy Merlin in Castellon, through a job interview that I had in September 2015, I take advantage of this situation and I requested HR department use my surveys with 20 of their staff, and to return them to me completed. They very kindly granted me the opportunity.

4.3. **Scales and Methodology**

To obtain the information (to carry out the analysis) I have used two questionnaires. The first one is the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), to measure the level of work engagement and its dimensions. It is based on the definition of engagement that includes vigor, dedication and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002), and is currently available in 20 languages and can be used freely for non-commercial purposes. The reliability, certification and factorial validity of the UWES is documented in various studies (Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006; Schaufeli, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES)*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At my work, I feel that I am bursting with energy* (Vi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose (De)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Time flies when I’m working (Ab)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous (Vi)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am enthusiastic about my job (De)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When I am working, I forget everything else around me (Ab)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My job inspires me (De)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work (Vi)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel happy when I am working intensely (Ab)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am proud on the work that I do (De)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am immersed in my work (Ab)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I can continue working for very long periods at a time (Vi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To me, my job is challenging (De)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I get carried away when I’m working (Ab)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. At my job, I am very resilient, mentally (Vi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It is difficult to detach myself from my job (Ab)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well (Vi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Copyright © 2003 Schaufeli & Bakker. All rights reserved.
The second one is the Gallup’s Q\textsuperscript{12}, it was dubbed Q\textsuperscript{12} since it includes 12 items. According to Harter et al. (2002), the Q\textsuperscript{12} taps the employee’s perceived job resources. In other words, the Q\textsuperscript{12} assesses the perceived level of resources in the employee’s job.

Figure 8. \textbf{Gallup’s Q\textsuperscript{12}}

1. Do you know what is expected of you at work? \textit{(role clarity)}
2. Do you have the materials and equipment you need to do your work right? \textit{(material resources)}
3. At work, do you have the opportunity to do what you do best every day? \textit{(opportunity for skill development)}
4. In the last seven days, have you received recognition or praise for doing good work? \textit{(social support, positive feedback)}
5. Does your supervisor, or someone at work, seem to care about you as a person? \textit{(supervisor support)}
6. Is there someone at work who encourages your development? \textit{(coaching)}
7. At work, do your opinions seem to count? \textit{(voice)}
8. Does the mission/purpose of your company make you feel your job is important? \textit{(meaningfulness)}
9. Are your associates (fellow employees) committed to doing quality work? \textit{(quality culture)}
10. Do you have a best friend at work? \textit{(social support)}
11. In the last six months, has someone at work talked to you about your progress? \textit{(feedback)}
12. In the last year, have you had opportunities at work to learn and grow? \textit{(learning opportunities)}

\textbf{Source:} Reprinted with permission. Copyright \textcopyright{} 1993–1998 Gallup Inc., Washington DC. All rights reserved.

Regarding methodology, to carry out the analysis (to test the hypotheses) and get the results (based on the information obtained in the 40 surveys) the statistical tool: ‘SPSS’ has been used. In addition, Microsoft Excel tool has been used to produce some graphs and tables.
4.4. **Results. Hypotheses to study**

4.4.1. **Descriptive statistics**

As already mentioned above, the sample comprises 40 employees of two companies in the province of Castellon, 20 per enterprise.

![Pie chart showing gender distribution with 60% female and 40% male.](image)

*Source:* Own elaboration

![Pie chart showing age distribution with 45% less than 30, 35% between 30 and 45, and 20% older than 45.](image)

*Source:* Own elaboration

In the above figures, it is significant to note that of the whole sample, 60% are women, and nearly 50% are between 30 and 45 years.
4.4.2. Assessment of the work engagement

Regarding the first objective of the empirical analysis, below you can see the average level of work engagement and frequencies, for both companies, compared to normative data of Salanova & Schaufeli (2009).

**Figure 11.** Assessment of work engagement per company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vigor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>4,28</td>
<td>0,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEROY MERLIN</td>
<td>4,94</td>
<td>1,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dedication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>4,94</td>
<td>0,91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEROY MERLIN</td>
<td>4,70</td>
<td>0,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absorption</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>3,84</td>
<td>0,88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEROY MERLIN</td>
<td>4,37</td>
<td>0,87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORK ENGAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>3,99</td>
<td>0,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEROY MERLIN</td>
<td>4,67</td>
<td>0,78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Own elaboration

Both in the table as in the graph, at first sight, is observable that Leroy Merlin has a higher average level of work engagement and of all its dimensions. Comparing the data obtained for each company with the normative data (presented before) of Salanova & Schaufeli (2009), it is remarkable that both are above the average (3,82).

To complete this information, in the tables below are shown the frequencies of work engagement for both companies with reference to the normative data of Salanova & Schaufeli (2009). This could generate valuable information for the HR department of both
companies, since it would detect if there is any segment of employees who have very low levels of work engagement compared with the rest, for example.

To this sample, 80% and 90% are between moderate and high level of work engagement. It is not noteworthy any set of employees with a low or very low engagement.

4.4.3. Hypotheses obtained from the theoretical review

H1. Registered companies in the "Great Place to Work", have employees with more predisposition to be engaged.

This first hypothesis obtained from the theoretical review is clearly observed in in the previous section. Leroy Merlin (company registered in the seventh place of the list 'Great Place to Work' in Spain), with an average level of work engagement well above average (4,67), has a difference, compared to BP, of 11.33 percentage points, with regard to the normative data.

With this hypothesis, the comparisons end between the two companies, from now on, being a relatively small sample, the data will be treated as a whole.

H2. Job resources are positively related to work engagement.

In the table below, it is observed the correlation between each of the job resources, of Gallup's Q12, with the work engagement and its dimensions. It is noteworthy that 50% of the 'Job resources' are positively and significantly correlated. These are: the positive feedback, the supervisor support, the voice (opinions count), the meaningfulness, the quality of the culture and the learning opportunities.
**Figure 15.** Correlation between work engagement and each job resource

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Resource</th>
<th>VIGOR Correlation</th>
<th>DEDICATION Correlation</th>
<th>ABSORPTION Correlation</th>
<th>WORK ENGAGEMENT Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JR1  Role clarity</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role clarity</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR2  Material resources</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material resources</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR3  Opportunity for skill development</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for skill development</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR4  Positive feedback</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.518**</td>
<td>0.432**</td>
<td>0.394**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive feedback</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR5  Supervisor support</td>
<td>0.361*</td>
<td>0.546**</td>
<td>0.423**</td>
<td>0.495**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR6  Coaching</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.501**</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR7  Voice</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.628**</td>
<td>0.484**</td>
<td>0.508**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR8  Meaningfulness</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.457**</td>
<td>0.383**</td>
<td>0.403**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR9  Quality culture</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.380*</td>
<td>0.385*</td>
<td>0.358*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality culture</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR10 Social support</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.217</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR11 Feedback</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR12 Learning opportunities</td>
<td>0.326*</td>
<td>0.515**</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.424**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning opportunities</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (bilateral)**

*Source:* Own elaboration
Looking to have a broader and more general view, in the table below is observed the correlation between work engagement and the job resources, as a whole. The result leaves no doubt that the second hypothesis is proven. Grouping 'job resources' (detected by GALLUP) as part of a whole, correlates positively and significantly with the work engagement and with all of its dimensions, less with vigor.

**Figure 16.** Correlation between work engagement the job resources, as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JRs GENERAL</th>
<th>VIGOR</th>
<th>DEDICATION</th>
<th>ABSORPTION</th>
<th>WORK ENGAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>.601**</td>
<td>.498**</td>
<td>.509**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (bilateral)</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (bilateral).

Source: Own elaboration

**H3. Males and older people have higher levels of work engagement**

From a sample of 25,000 employees from 13 different countries, it was concluded that work engagement correlates positively with age, i.e. older employees feel more engaged than younger. It was also concluded that, in terms of gender, men tend to score higher levels of engagement than women, but the differences are not too significant (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2004).

To contrast this third hypothesis, has been carried out an analysis of the variance (the ANOVA procedure) in both cases.

In relation with the males, in the below figure is observed that the average level of engagement for men is higher than women, as concluded in the theoretical review. Furthermore, with a (p value > 0.05), it is observed that the difference is not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis is confirmed, but without a clear significance.

**Figure 17.** Average level of work engagement by gender and its significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (bilateral)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIGOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMAN</td>
<td>4,6736</td>
<td>-0,593</td>
<td>0,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN</td>
<td>4,5208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMAN</td>
<td>4,0917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN</td>
<td>4,4875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSORPTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMAN</td>
<td>3,9861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN</td>
<td>4,2813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMAN</td>
<td>4,2598</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN</td>
<td>4,4265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration
Moreover, in the next figures, you can see that older people of the sample is a bit more engaged. However, through of the analysis of the variance (ANOVA), is observed that the difference is not significant (p value > 0.05) and occur the same that in male’s case: the hypothesis is confirmed, but without a clear significance.

**Figure 18.** Average level of work engagement by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than or equal to 30</td>
<td>4,1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 30 and less than or equal to 45</td>
<td>4,3758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 45</td>
<td>4,4412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source*: Own elaboration

**Figure 19.** Analysis of the variance (ANOVA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Root mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>0,382</td>
<td>0,191</td>
<td>0,246</td>
<td>0,783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source*: Own elaboration

### 4.4.4. Exploratory hypothesis. Causality study

To end the empirical research, an exploratory hypothesis arise, where the focus is on the job resources. Noting the positive correlation between the work engagement and the job resources, it has raised a study of causality (through a linear regression) to see which of the resources (within the Gallup Q12) predict the work engagement.

**H4*. Exploratory hypothesis. Studying causality, detect which job resources are incident on the work engagement.**

In the figure below, it is observed that the regression linear function is significant (p value < 0.05). The function explains 29.7% of the variance of engagement; and the variables that comprise the equation and significantly predict the criterion variable (work engagement) are JR7 (voice) and JR5 (supervisor support).

Although the sample is not truly representative nor extrapolated to any sector or location, it provides useful guidance, since it highlights two job resources over the rest. A correct implantation of these job resources, could improve the level of work engagement of a part of your staff.
4.4.5. Research findings and limitations

The results confirm the model and the research hypotheses. The general findings could have important implications both for the HR department of both companies (seeking to know the situation of their staff to carry out strategies and actions), as for other companies of the locality of Castellon in form of benchmarking.

This study offers empirical evidence that exist a positive correlation between the work engagement and the job resources. In addition, deepening in this relationship, through a study of causality has been observed that the ‘supervisor support’ and the ‘voice’ significantly predict the criterion variable (work engagement).

On the other hand, have been successfully contrasted the other assumptions. First, companies registered in the ‘Great Place to Work’ have employees with higher levels of work engagement. Second, males and older people have higher levels of work engagement, even though without a clear significance.

In regard to the research limitations, first of all, it is difficult to form generalisations from the research into only 40 samples, 20 employees per company do not constitute a representative statistical sample, for each enterprise. In addition, since they are two companies from different sectors, we cannot group these to make the results more representative, in regard to a sector (e.g. only retail) in the locality of Castellon.
A future study might go further extending the sample in terms of number of companies and employees and increasing the number of independent variables (e.g. personal resources). It also could be completed through a qualitative study, proposing at the organisational level, various HR policies to improve the medium level of work engagement and correcting deviations.

In summary, even though the sample is not actually representative nor extrapolated to any sector or location, it contrasts several theoretical hypotheses and provides a useful guidance (in small scale) for business managers, those responsible of the HR department and, ultimately, for anyone keen on business management. Since it, among other things, highlights two job resources over the rest, and a correct implantation of these job resources, could help to improve the medium level of work engagement of your staff.
5. **CONCLUSIONS**

This study has its background in the growing interest by modern organisations and HR managers, on the new paradigm with regard to occupational psychology, the Positive Occupational psychology, as a way to adapt its organisation and its staff to new changing and turbulent environments, stimulated by the rise of the phenomenon of globalisation (Bonache & Cabrera, 2006; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2009).

To summarize, the work is composed of a two parts of a whole. A theoretical review and an empirical study.

On the one hand, the theoretical review starts with the concept of ‘Positive Occupational Health Psychology’ such as an integration of positive psychology with comprehensive Occupational Health notion. Its goal is to discover the characteristics of the positive and significant organisational life (Llorens, Salanova & Martinez, 2008).

From the topic of Positive Occupational Health Psychology (POHP), the work reaches an emerging concept which falls within this novel approach, the work engagement, becoming the focus of this work. To remember, it is understood as a positive, fulfilling, affective motivational state of work-related well-being that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá & Bakker, 2002). In addition, according to Bakker (2011), work engagement is predicted by job resources and personal resources and leads to higher job performance.

The work continues with the implications of work engagement and according to Bakker (2011), ‘engaged employees are physically, cognitively, and emotionally connected with their work roles’. Furthermore, it is remarkable its relation with the flexibility, creativity, integration and efficiency (Isen, Daubman & Nowicki, 1984, 1987).

On the other hand (to complement the theoretical review, and add value to this work), regarding the empirical study, as it has been commented above, the findings confirm the model and the research hypotheses. This study offers empirical evidence that exist a positive correlation between the work engagement and the job resources and, in addition, deepening in this relationship, it is concluded that ‘supervisor support’ and the ‘voice’ are the predictors of the dependent variable (work engagement) in the sample. This general results could have important implications for business managers, those responsible of the HR department and, ultimately, for anyone keen on business management.
After everything said, it is remarkable the great importance, demonstrated, of the work engagement for an organization.

In addition to its implications on the performance, flexibility and efficiency among others, a quantitative study, conducted with valid scales, and properly interpreted, can help a company, firstly, to detect segments uncommitted employees and satisfied with their work, or departments score low on work engagement and its antecedents. Therefore, companies can realize and learn where to focus its interventions, most usefully. Secondly, to empower (amplify) those groups or teams with good levels of work engagement.

To facilitate work engagement among their employees, HR managers can do several things, once the correct measurement has already been carried out, e.g. to enhance those job resources that are predictors of work engagement; lean on the JD-R Model to promote both the extrinsic as the intrinsic motivation of employees.

Finally, regarding my personal opinion, conducting this project has involved me to delve into a matter in which I was already interested: the positive occupational psychology and the HRM. Certainly, it has been a very productive work which has offered me the opportunity to expand my theoretical knowledge (internalizing some concepts) and to carry out a quantitative analysis through statistical tools.
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