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Abstract

Purpose – Worker well-being continues to be fundamental to the study of work and a primary consideration for how organizations can achieve competitive advantage and sustainable and ethical work practices (Cartwright and Holmes; Harter, Schmidt and Keyes; Wright and Cropanzano). The science and practice of employee engagement, a key indicator of employee well-being, continues to evolve with ongoing incremental refinements to existing models and measures. This study aims to elaborate the Job Demands-Resources model of work engagement (Bakker and Demerouti) by examining how organizational, team and job level factors interrelate to influence engagement and well-being and downstream outcome variables such as affective commitment and extra-role behaviour.

Design/methodology/approach – Structural equations modelling of survey data obtained from 3,437 employees of a large multi-national mining company was used to test the important direct and indirect influence of organizational focused resources (a culture of fairness and support), team focused resources (team climate) and job level resources (career development, autonomy, supervisor support, and role clarity) on employee well-being, engagement, extra-role behaviour and organizational commitment.

Findings – The fit of the proposed measurement and structural models met criterion levels and the structural model accounted for sizable proportions of the variance in engagement/wellbeing (66 percent), extra-role-behaviour (52 percent) and commitment (69 percent).

Research limitations/implications – Study limitations (e.g. cross-sectional research design) and future opportunities are outlined.

Originality/value – The study demonstrates important extensions to the Job Demands-Resources model and provides researchers and practitioners with a simple but powerful motivational framework, a suite of measures, and a map of their inter-relationships which can be used to help understand, develop and manage employee well-being and engagement and their outcomes.
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Introduction

Researchers have provided clear evidence that the experience of work can have both positive and negative influences on the health and well-being of individual workers (Warr, 1999). Consequently, employee well-being remains fundamental to the study of work and a primary consideration for how organizations can achieve competitive advantage and sustainable and ethical work practices (Cartwright and Holmes, 2006; Wright and Cropanzano, 2007). Job demands such as role conflict, role ambiguity and work-overload have consistently been shown to lead to adverse employee psychological outcomes such as anxiety, depressive symptoms, ill-health and negative work-family spill-over (Bakker et al., 2003; Quick et al., 1986; Soderfeldt et al., 2000). In contrast job resources such as autonomy, skill utilization, professional development and social support have consistently been shown to be related to functional individual well-being related outcomes such as engagement, job satisfaction and health (Halbesleben, 2010). While Warr (1990) some 20 years ago suggested that researchers and practitioners need to broaden their focus from stress to also include a focus on employee well-being, more recently there has been a proliferation of research into positive well-being related constructs such as engagement (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008), passion (Gorgievski and Bakker, 2010), thriving (Cameron, 2010), flourishing (Seligman, 2011) and flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990).

So how do the constructs of well-being and engagement relate or overlap? Schaufeli et al. (2008) explicitly conceptualized employee engagement as a form of well-being. Schaufeli et al. argued that the concept of work engagement “emerged from burnout research in an attempt to cover the entire spectrum running from employee unwell-being (burnout) to employee well-being” (p. 176). Similarly, Harter et al. (2002) argued that within the broad category of employee well-being, engagement is associated with more frequent experiences of positive affect, which then lead to “the efficient application of work, employee retention, creativity and ultimately business outcomes” (pp. 1-2). Given that both engagement and employee well-being are characterized, at least in part, in terms of positive affective states such as enthusiasm, happiness, interest and vigor, the conceptual association between engagement as an indicator of employee well-being has been well established (Bakker and Oerlemans, 2011). The present research focuses on identifying the relationships between job-, team- and organizational-level predictors of the positive psychological construct of well-being, operationalized in terms of employee engagement.

Employee engagement remains a hot topic within both the academic and practitioner domains. The field continues to grow and to grow rapidly. Macey et al. (2009) recently noted that “rarely has a term [y] resonated as strongly with business executives as employee engagement has in recent years” (p. xv). Similarly, the body of scholarly work focused on work engagement continues to flourish and the number of books (e.g. Albrecht, 2010; Bakker and Leiter, 2010; Salanova and Schaufeli, 2009), research papers, conference papers and conference presentations emanating from the academic domain continues to grow. As previously mentioned, the conceptual overlap between employee well-being and employee engagement is well established (Bakker and Oerlemans, 2011).

Despite the enormous advances in understanding how best to conceptualize, measure and manage engagement, recent research and reviews of the state of play of employee engagement (e.g. Bakker et al., 2011; Crawford et al., 2010) have identified a number of issues yet to be fully resolved. For example there are still unresolved issues about how best to conceptualize and measure engagement. Additionally, more research is needed to ascertain the influence that organizational- and team-level variables such as organizational culture, organizational climate and team climate exert on employee engagement (Albrecht, 2010).
With respect to how best conceptualize engagement, Schaufeli and colleagues’ defined work engagement as “a positive, fulfilling, work related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (Schaufeli et al., 2002, p. 74). Engaged employees experience well-being related positive emotions such joy and enthusiasm. Although Schaufeli et al.’s definition and measure remain widely accepted in the academic domain, there may be additional dimensions of engagement not fully encompassed by their conceptualization. Macey et al. (2009), for example, argued in support of a definition of engagement that, amongst other things, more explicitly acknowledges an alignment between work effort and organizational goals. More generally, Seligman (2011) argued that, in addition to engagement, positive emotion, relationships, meaning and achievement are core constituents of psychological well-being.

A broad range of models, theories and frameworks have been invoked to understand and explain the importance, emergence and maintenance of employee engagement and employee well-being. Such theories and models include conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989); self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan, 1985); social exchange theory (Blau, 1964); social identity theory (Tajfel, 1974); role theory (Kahn, 1990); broaden-and-build theory of positive emotion (Fredrickson, 2001); job characteristics theory (Hackman and Oldham, 1980); the circumplex model of affect (Russell, 1980, 2003); and the job demands-resources model (JD-R, Bakker and Demerouti, 2007, 2008). The JD-R model, the most widely cited and widely used theoretical model in the engagement literature, shows how job resources (e.g. autonomy, feedback, support) and personal resources (e.g. self-efficacy, optimism, resilience) directly influence work engagement, which in turn influences outcomes such as commitment, in-role performance, extra-role performance, creativity and financial outcomes. Furthermore, the JD-R explains how job demands (e.g. workload, time pressure) moderate the relationship between job resources and engagement such that the motivational influence of resources on engagement is enhanced when employees experience demands as being moderately high, high or “challenging” (e.g. Hakanen et al., 2005). The present research focuses on the motivational, engagement and well-being components of the JD-R and looks to determine what drives engagement and well-being and the relationship engagement and well-being has with key attitudinal and behavioural outcomes.

Recent meta-analyses and qualitative reviews have helped identify the strongest and most reliable predictors of engagement (e.g. Crawford et al., 2010; Christian and Slaughter, 2007; Halbesleben, 2010; Mauno et al., 2010; Simpson, 2008). Halbesleben’s (2010) meta-analysis, consistent with the JD-R (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007), showed that feedback, autonomy, social support and organizational climate are consistently associated with engagement or particular facets of engagement. Crawford et al.’s meta-analysis identified work role fit, job variety, rewards and recognition, recovery and opportunities for development as reliable predictors of engagement. Warr (1990), along with many other researchers, has found similar job characteristics (e.g. role clarity) to be predictive of work-related well-being. Halbesleben’s meta-analysis also showed that personal resources (e.g. self-efficacy and optimism) are strongly related to engagement.

Overall, although researchers have identified a broad range of predictors of engagement and well-being, opportunities remain to organize such theoretically and empirically derived key drivers in an overarching framework or taxonomy. The JD-R (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007, 2008) has to date provided such an integrating framework, integrating earlier models (e.g. demand-control model Karasek, 1979; Karasek and Theorell, 1990) and providing a flexible yet robust account of how job factors may be salient across a broad range of job and organizational contexts (Bakker et al., 2011). Albrecht (2010), however, suggested elaborating the JD-R framework by recognizing and including more “distal” organizational-level resources such as senior leadership support, clarity of
organizational vision, organizational climate, organizational support and supportive HRM policies. Although Halbesleben (2010) identified organizational climate as an antecedent of engagement and Xanthopoulou et al. (2009) identified that “team atmosphere” influences engagement, job-resources have primarily been assessed with more “proximal” job-related variables such as autonomy, job feedback, skill utilization, supervisor support and opportunities for career development (e.g. Schaufeli et al., 2009). The explicit recognition of organizational- and team-level resources might also prove helpful to researchers and practitioners interested in differentially focusing resources toward the development of employee engagement, employee well-being, positive attitudes (e.g. organizational commitment) and performance (e.g. extra-role performance). In support of this claim, Richardson and West (2010) suggested that a supportive organizational context which reinforces the effectiveness of team-based structures will help ensure the alignment of team and organizational values, and therefore facilitate effective leadership and employee engagement. The modeling proposed in Figure 1 therefore shows organizational- and team-level resources influencing engagement. Furthermore, and consistent with meta-analytic evidence (see Parker et al., 2003), organizational-level and team-level variables are modeled to directly influence organizational-level outcomes such as organizational commitment and extra-role behaviour in addition to their influence being partially mediated by engagement. Additionally, given the relative advantages of higher-order modeling of constructs over first-order individual constructs (Newman et al., 2010), Figure 1 models a number of job resources subsumed under a higher order factor. Higher order modeling also has the advantage of potentially capturing synergistic effects beyond the additive effects of the individual first-order factors (Chadwick, 2010; Combs et al., 2006).

At a somewhat broader level, another unresolved issue or challenge in the engagement literature centres on the research-practice divide. Both scientists and practitioners have suggested that the research and the practice of engagement are, in large part, progressing along different paths. Macey and Schneider (2008), for example, noted that “scholars and practitioners think and speak about engagement in different ways” (p. 76). As an example, many organizations use proprietal or self-developed measures of engagement which have not been peer-reviewed and which have limited or no supporting psychometric evidence. Additionally, many practitioner surveys focus on engagement scores per se and do not focus on establishing causal relations among the full array of constructs measured. To help bridge the science-practice divide, academics might usefully help practitioners analyse data derived from practitioner developed measures with reference to validated models such as the JD-R (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007, 2008).

To sum up, the aim of the present research was to test a model showing how organizational-, team- and job-level resources directly and indirectly influence employee engagement as an indicator of job-related well-being and to model their impact on extra-role performance and organizational commitment (see Figure 1). The research further aimed to cross-reference the findings with a well-established model of work engagement, and to thereby help ascertain the ecological validity of existing engagement-related models, theories and research. More specifically the study aimed to identify how the “job resources” component of the JD-R might be reconceptualized to additionally reflect the influence of organizational- and team-level experiences of work.
Figure 1. Organizational, team and job resources influencing engagement/well-being, commitment and extra-role performance

Note: All parameter estimates significant at \( p \leq 0.001 \); percentage variance explained shown in brackets; items and errors not shown for ease of representation; no correlated errors included in the modelling

Method

Participants and procedure

Participants were recruited from a large multi-national mining company. All employees were invited to anonymously complete a hard-copy questionnaire and then mail their responses in a self-addressed envelope to an independent data management company. The data management company provided the researcher with a compiled data file which was used to provide the client organization with a report. Of the total 4,182 employees within the company, 3,515 usable responses were received (response rate \( \approx 73 \) per cent). Respondents worked across a range of roles (e.g. operator, process technician, administrative support, manager, senior manager) in one of 15 major work sites across Australasia. A total of 46 per cent of respondents were female and 54 per cent were male. The age of participants ranged between 18-19 years (1 per cent), 20-29 years (16 per cent), 30-39 years (29 per cent), 40-49 years (33 per cent), 50-59 years (18 per cent) and 60 and above (3 per cent). Tenure ranged between less than one year (13 per cent), one to five years (32 per cent), six to ten years (14 per cent) and more than ten years (41 per cent).

Measures

Measures were adapted from pre-existing published academic scales, adapted from commercially developed scales previously used by the client organization, or developed new by a panel of internal HR/OD consultants and managers from the client organization in consultation with the researcher.
Responses to 42 items selected to measure organizational culture of support, team climate, supervisor coaching, career development, autonomy, engagement, extra-role behaviour and organizational commitment were included in the analyses. All items were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1¼ “strongly disagree” to 5⅓ “strongly agree”. A “Don’t Know/Not Applicable” response option was also provided. Given that the items were adapted or developed for the present analysis and no pre-existing validity and reliability information is available, the psychometric properties of the measures needed to be established. Evidence in support of the validity and reliability of the measures is described in the results section.

The measure of organizational culture was designed to assess the extent to which employees perceived a culture of openness, fairness and support. Example items included: “[organization] has a culture where people can challenge the usual way of doing things” and “[organization] has good workplace policies to support me when I have non-work related issues”. Team climate was assessed with items such as: “There is a strong sense of teamwork amongst employees in my [unit]” and “Differing opinions are openly discussed in making decisions in my team”. The job resources of supervisory coaching, career development, role clarity and autonomy were assessed with items such as: “my leader coaches me on improving my skills”, “there are sufficient opportunities for me to receive training to increase my suitability for a better job”, “I understand how my work helps my site achieve its goals” and “I have the authority to carry out my work tasks”. Engagement, as an indicator of well-being, was measured with four items, including “I am enthusiastic about the work I do” and I am motivated to do the best work possible”. Extra-role behaviour was assessed with items including “I work beyond what is required to help [organization] succeed” and “I often look for ways to do my job better”. Commitment was assessed with items such as “I strongly believe in the goals and objectives of [organization]” and “I feel a strong sense of belonging at [organization]”.

Analyses

As a first step in the analyses, given that the set of adapted or developed items had not been previously validated, exploratory factor analysis was conducted on a randomly selected sub-sample of responses in order to identify structure within the data and to determine the highest loading items on the constructs of interest (see author for details). Nine clearly interpretable factors emerged and the three to five highest loading items on each of these factors were retained. Next, and in line with Anderson and Gerbing’s (1988) recommendations, the dimensionality of alternative measurement models was more rigorously tested with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS 18 and the raw data as the input. Model fit was assessed with reference to a range of recommended “fit indices” (Marsh et al., 1996). After calculating descriptive, reliability and correlation statistics for all variables, the viability of modelling job resources as a higher order construct was assessed with reference to the target coefficient 2 (TC2, Marsh, 1987). Finally the proposed structural relations between the constructs (see Figure 2) were evaluated using structural equations modelling.
Results

Measurement model

CFA of the full measurement model consisting of 36 items measuring organizational culture, team climate, supervisor coaching, career development, role clarity, autonomy, engagement, extra-role behaviour and organizational commitment was conducted with the 3,437 cases having no missing

Figure 2 Parameter estimates (standardized) for proposed model

Note: All parameter estimates significant at $p \leq 0.001$; percentage variance explained shown in brackets; items and errors not shown for ease of representation; no correlated errors included in the modelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.68*</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team culture</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor coaching</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.69*</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role clarity</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement/Well-being</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-role behaviour</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.77*</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I.

Means, standard deviations, Cronbach’s a’s (on diagonal in italics) and correlations between the modelled variables.

Notes: n ≥ 3,437; **significant at the p≤0.01 level, (two-tailed)
data on any of the variables of interest. The RMSEA (0.043), RMSEA 90 per cent confidence interval (0.042–0.044), the CFI (0.949) and the TLI (0.942) suggested the model had good fit to the data. All standardized factor loadings were significant at po0.001 and ranged between 0.543 and 0.898. Means, SDs, internal consistencies (Cronbach’s as) and correlations among all studied variables are presented in Table I. All but one of the reliabilities exceeded the generally accepted criterion of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978) and the bivariate correlations were consistent with the proposed relationships.

As previously mentioned, the viability of modelling job resources as a higher order construct (a higher order “job resources” factor explaining the covariance among the first factors of supervisory coaching, career development, role clarity and autonomy), was assessed with reference to the TC2 (Marsh, 1987). The TC2 of 0.92 exceeded the recommended criterion value of 0.90 (Marsh, 1987), thus suggesting the appropriateness of the higher-order modelling. Furthermore, the loadings of each first-order factor on the higher order factor (ranging from 0.54 to 0.77) exceeded the recommended criterion of 0.50 (Kline, 1998). Additionally, χ² difference tests (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988), conducted to assess the discriminant validity of the higher order job resource factor in relation to the organizational culture and the team climate variables, indicated that the constructs were significantly distinct (Δχ² (df,1) = 1,391.1; Δχ² (df,1) = 1,747.5, respectively). Finally, the CFA of the overall measurement model which included the higher order modelling of “job resources” and the organizational, team and the outcome variables yielded a good fitting model: RMSEA (0.048), RMSEA 90 per cent confidence interval (0.047–0.050), the CFI (0.954) and the TLI (0.948). All standardized factor loadings were significant at po0.001, ranging between 0.482 and 0.901.

Having established a defensible measurement model, the analysis proceeded to test the fit of the proposed structural model (see Figure 2). The estimation of the proposed model yielded acceptable fit indices: χ² =5,150.283, df=580, χ² ratio= 8.874, GFI = 0.919, AGFI = 0.907, TLI = 0.929, CFI = 0.934, RMSEA = 0.048, RMSEA 90 per cent CI = 0.047-0.049. All of the proposed parameter estimates were statistically significant and the model explained a sizable proportion of the variance in engagement (66 per cent), team culture (45 per cent), higher order job resources (82 per cent), extra-role behaviour (52 per cent) and organizational commitment (69 per cent). Beyond the significant direct effects shown in Figure 2, the results of bias corrected bootstrap procedures available in AMOS revealed significant indirect effects. For example, the standardized indirect effect from organizational culture through team and job resources to engagement was 0.554 (confidence interval 0.544-0.708, p = 0.001). The indirect effect from team resources through job resources to engagement was 0.441 (p = 0.002). Organizational resources, team resources and higher order job resources all exerted significant indirect effects through engagement on extra-role behaviour and organizational commitment.

Discussion

The research aimed to test an expanded model of the JD-R model (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008) showing how organizational, team and job resources directly and indirectly influence engagement as an indicator of employee well-being and the downstream attitudes of commitment and extra-role behaviour. The results showed that, as proposed: organizational culture was directly and positively associated with team resources, job resources, engagement, commitment and extra-role behaviour; team climate was positively associated with engagement and job resources; the job resources of supervisory coaching, career development, role alignment and autonomy, modelled as part of a higher factor, were positively associated with engagement; engagement was directly associated with
commitment and extra-role performance; organizational culture, team climate and job resources exerted significant indirect effects on commitment and extra-role behaviour; and the final structural model achieved a satisfactory level of overall fit and explained sizable amounts of variance in the variables included in the model.

The pattern of findings support the motivational processes proposed in the JD-R model (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008), suggesting that the provision of job resources (i.e. supervisory coaching, career development, role clarity and autonomy) can serve to intrinsically motivate employees and result in increased positive affect, commitment and positive attitudes towards work. The identification of role clarity (incorporating role alignment with organizational goals) as a job resource, adds to the list of job resources previously identified in the engagement literature. While conceptually similar dimensions have been previously acknowledged in the engagement literature (e.g. Macey and Schneider, 2008) the current study is the first to explicitly recognize and measure role clarity within the JD-R framework.

The results also extend the JD-R, engagement and well-being literature by suggesting that job resources can be conceptualized and operationalized as a higher-order factor. The successful modelling of job resources as a higher order factor facilitates the efficient empirical testing of the motivational processes described by the JD-R. Additional research is warranted to test the possibility of extending the higher order factor to include additional previously identified job-level resources such as performance feedback and co-worker support (Halbesleben, 2010).

Importantly, the results also showed that organizational- and team-level resources exert a direct influence on engagement and well-being and hence have direct input into the motivational processes proposed in the JD-R. Although the direct effects of organizational and team culture on engagement were not as strong as job resources, some of their direct influence on engagement was no doubt diluted through their direct influence job-level resources. Both organizational climate and team climate were shown to have relatively strong associations with job resources. Additionally, both organizational resources and team resources were shown to have significant indirect effects on engagement through their influence on job resources. The results therefore served to extend the JD-R by suggesting that organizational- and team-level resources are additional and distinct resources which inter-relate with job-level resources as a “system” of resources to influence engagement. Consistent with calls to more fully recognize the social context of work engagement (Leiter and Bakker, 2010), consideration of additional organizational factors such as clarity of organizational goals (Patterson et al., 2005), communication of vision (Griffin et al., 2010) and strategic alignment (O’Reilly et al., 2010), as more distal organizational- and team-level resources likely to influence employee engagement, is warranted. Further research aimed at identifying if such variables can be modelled as part of a higher order organizational resources factor or a higher order team resources factor is also warranted.

Overall, the results suggest that to motivate and engage employees, and thereby contribute to employee well-being, performance and commitment, organizations should create open, supportive and fair organizational and team cultures, and ensure jobs are clearly aligned with organizational goals and have appropriate levels of autonomy, support and career development opportunities. More generally, the results suggest that the JD-R model could usefully be elaborated to explicitly include organizational- and team-level resources and to operationalize job resources as a higher order factor. Such elaborations need to be modelled within the context of the full JD-R where demands and individual resources are also included.
Practical implications
The results of the current study have several practical implications. Given the direct effects found for job resources on employee engagement and well-being, organizations might usefully look at implementing a range of job-level training and development programs aimed at setting systems and supports to more widely, deeply and effectively embed discretion and decision-making authority, supervisory coaching and support, role clarity and career development within the organizational context. More widely, such systems and supports might include establishing senior management’s active commitment to the establishment of more participative work cultures, climates and practices; job re-design; broad spectrum training and development focused on engagement principles and practices; and the redesign of supervisor performance criteria to incorporate the effective management of participation and autonomy. Regular administration of organizational climate and engagement surveys and multi-rater feedback processes might provide useful indicators of the extent to which such processes are being effectively implemented. Similarly, interventions aimed directly at developing employee engagement should be implemented. There is an increasing literature describing how to intervene to develop engagement at the level of the individual, the job and the organization (e.g. Schaufeli and Salanova, 2010).

Limitations
While the present research has provided new insights into the relationships between job resources, organizational resources, team resources, engagement, extra-role behaviour and commitment, some limitations need to be acknowledged. Although rigorous confirmatory and structural modelling technologies were used, the cross-sectional data does not enable the determination of causal relations. Longitudinal analyses, preferably drawn over three time periods, would enable much stronger claims to be made about causality and potential reciprocity of influence among the variables. Multi-level analysis, determining the extent that different teams, business units and organizational units account for variance in the relationships identified, is also warranted. Additionally, given that all of the data were collected through self-report procedures, the usual caveats around “common method variance” apply. However, given that the measurement model demonstrated acceptable fit to the data, and given that the correlations between the measured constructs were moderate and varied quite considerably, the issue of common method variance appears not to be overly problematic. Another important limitation centers on the generalizability of the findings. All of the participants were employed in the resources sector. It would be useful in future studies to obtain data from various additional types of organizations and industry sectors to enable comparison of the results.

Conclusion
There has been increasing and widespread academic and practitioner interest in understanding positive organizational constructs such as engagement and well-being. While job resources have been found to significantly influence engagement and well-being, the contributions of contextual and team-level resources in the motivational processes implicit in the JD-R model have yet to be fully explored. The results of the present study showed that beyond the provision of job-level resources, organizational- and team-level resources are also key motivational constructs which help explain how greater levels of engagement and well-being can be generated. Additional job resources (e.g. job involvement) and additional up-stream organizational and team climate factors (e.g. vision
clarity, psychological safety) could also be assessed for their direct and indirect impact on job resources and engagement (Bakker et al., 2011).

As a final observation and call for action, the results presented derive from a collaborative applied research project involving internal organizational practitioner perspectives and an academic perspective. The analyses help show how collaboration and communication between academics and HR, OD and operational staff can help bridge the scientist-practitioner divide (Anderson et al., 2001) using practical models such as the JD-R (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007, 2008). The expanded JD-R model, as shown in Figure 2, maps a number of potential research opportunities within the broader ongoing engagement and employee well-being research agenda.
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