Flourishing through identification and engagement: Sustaining employee health and effectiveness

by

Sean Peter Tinker
B App Sci, Health Promotion
B App Sci, Psychology (Honours)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Deakin University

November 2014
I am the author of the thesis entitled

Flourishing through identification and engagement: Sustaining employee health and effectiveness

submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Psychology)

This thesis may be made available for consultation, loan and limited copying in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968.

'I certify that I am the student named below and that the information provided in the form is correct'

Full Name: Sean Tinker

Signed: .................................................................

Date: 27-3-2015
DEAKIN UNIVERSITY
CANDIDATE DECLARATION

I certify the following about the thesis entitled (10 word maximum)

Flourishing through identification and engagement: Sustaining employee health and effectiveness

submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

a. I am the creator of all or part of the whole work(s) (including content and layout) and that where reference is made to the work of others, due acknowledgment is given.

b. The work(s) are not in any way a violation or infringement of any copyright, trademark, patent, or other rights whatsoever of any person.

c. That if the work(s) have been commissioned, sponsored or supported by any organisation, I have fulfilled all of the obligations required by such contract or agreement.

I also certify that any material in the thesis which has been accepted for a degree or diploma by any university or institution is identified in the text.

'I certify that I am the student named below and that the information provided in the form is correct'

Full Name: Sean Tinker

(Please Print)

Signed: [Signature Redacted by Library]

Date: 19/11/2014

Deakin University CRICOS Provider Code 00113B
Acknowledgements

My deepest gratitude goes to my family for believing in me. Your unqualified support at all times allowed me to break through each and every obstacle along the way. Please share in this achievement with me.

To my son Jackson, you are a source of infinite pride and happiness. You brought light to bear whenever I could not see my way ahead. Life after this thesis awaits both of us.

To my beautiful wife Soranee, you have been so generous with your love. Your strength and wisdom has brought peace to my life. My heartfelt thanks and deepest love goes to you.

To my Mum and Dad, the support and love you have shown me will never be forgotten. My aspiration is to be like you.

To my supervisor Professor Joe Graffam, thank you for your guidance and wisdom, but most of all, thank you for your faith.

This thesis is dedicated to my late grandmother, Elsie Tinker.

You taught me to be myself.
# Table of Contents

Chapter 1 ............................................................................................................................. 15  
Flourishing Workforces and Organisational Effectiveness ............................................ 15  
1.1. Workforce as a sustainable, self-generating organisational resource .......... 16  
1.2. Flourishing as Eudaimonic and Hedonic Well-being ............................................ 33  
1.3. Flourishing Workforces in Organisations ................................................... 42  
1.4. Conclusion .................................................................................................. 47  

Chapter 2 ............................................................................................................................. 49  
Workplace Identification and Resource Accumulation .................................................. 49  
2.1. Introduction .................................................................................................. 49  
2.2. Theories of Identification ........................................................................... 51  
   Social Identity Theory ....................................................................................... 55  
   Self-Categorisation Theory ............................................................................... 58  
2.3. Identification in Organisations ................................................................. 61  
2.4. Resource Accumulation Related to Identification and Circumstances at Work 65  
2.5. Conclusion .................................................................................................. 69  

Chapter 3 ............................................................................................................................. 73  
Employee Health as a Sustainable Outcome of Identification and Flourishing ............ 73  
3.1. Introduction .................................................................................................. 73  
3.2. Employee Health and the Relationship to Identification and Flourishing .... 77  
3.3. Conclusion .................................................................................................. 90  

Chapter 4 ............................................................................................................................. 93  
Study 1: A Model of Workforce Flourishing .......................................................... 93  
4.1. Work Identification and Flourishing .......................................................... 93  
4.2. Identification and the Capacity to Flourish ................................................ 96  
4.3. Exploring Two Model Variants of Workforce Flourishing ...................... 103  
4.4. Method ...................................................................................................... 105  
   Workforce Flourishing Measures ................................................................. 108  
   Employee Health Measures ............................................................................. 111  
   Work identification .......................................................................................... 112  
4.5. Results ....................................................................................................... 115  
4.6. Discussion .................................................................................................. 123  
4.7. Conclusion .................................................................................................. 132  

Chapter 5 ........................................................................................................................... 134  
Study Two: Employee Engagement and the Construct of Engagement Climate ....... 134
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.</td>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.</td>
<td>Work Climate and Defining Engagement Climate</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.</td>
<td>Engagement Climate Characteristics</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.</td>
<td>Qualitative Study: Refining the Characteristics of Engagement Climate</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.</td>
<td>Qualitative Study Discussion</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.</td>
<td>Quantitative Study: Further Examination of the Construct of Engagement Climate</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10.</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11.</td>
<td>Quantitative Study Discussion</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.12.</td>
<td>General Discussion</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13.</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement Climate</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce Flourishing Measures</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFA of Workforce Flourishing</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.</td>
<td>Summary of Theoretical Implications</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.</td>
<td>Workforce Flourishing through Work Identification</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.</td>
<td>Engagement Climate as Effective Organisation Practice</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.</td>
<td>Final Comments</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of Tables

Table 4.1. Factor Analysis Fit Indices for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Latent Factor of Workforce Flourishing ..................................................115

Table 4.2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Fit Indices for Employee Health, Including Model Re-specification. .................................................................118

Table 4.3. Fit Indices for Workforce Flourishing and Employee Health Predicted by Work Group Identification ...........................................................................119

Table 4.4. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations, and Alphas for the Model of Workforce Flourishing Predicted by Work Group Identification ..............120

Table 4.5. Fit Indices for Workforce Flourishing and Employee Health Predicted by Organisation Identification (theorised model). ...........................................120

Table 4.6. Fit Indices for Workforce Flourishing and Employee Health Predicted by Organisation Identification (re-specified). ....................................................122

Table 4.7. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations, and Alphas for the Model of Workforce Flourishing Predicted by Organisation Identification ..........123

Table 5.1. Demographic Characteristics for Respondents answering each of Two Qualitative Questions .....................................................................................147

Table 5.2. Inter-rater Reliability Contingency Coding for the "Peoplewise" Question ............................................................................................................151

Table 5.3. Inter-rater Reliability Contingency Coding for the "Belong" Question 152

Table 5.4. Fit Indices for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) with Re-specification Iterations for the Latent Factor of Engagement Climate ...........................164

Table 5.5. Engagement Climate CFA Re-specification Iterations, Changes Made, and Change Justification. .................................................................164

Table 5.6. Fit Indices for the CFA Models Involving Exhaustion and Cynicism for Convergent Validity of Engagement Climate. .................................................167

Table 6.1. Structural Model Fit Indices for Engagement Climate in Relations to Two Identification Targets .....................................................................................186

Table 6.2. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations, and Alphas for the Model of Engagement Climate and Work Group Identification ........................................187

Table 6.3. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations, and Alphas for the Model of Engagement Climate and Organisation Identification ...............................187

Table 6.4. Fit Indices for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Construct of Workforce Flourishing with a Second Sample ..............................................189

Table 6.5. Correlations for Multiple Regression Analysis of Engagement Climate on Workforce Flourishing, Controlling for Organisation Identification ............191
Table 6.6. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Organisation Identification, Workforce Flourishing, and Engagement Climate.................. 192

Table 6.7. Correlations for Multiple Regression Analysis of Engagement Climate on Workforce Flourishing, Controlling for Work Group Identification.............. 193

Table 6.8. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Work Group Identification, Workforce Flourishing, and Engagement Climate.................. 193
## Table of Figures

**Figure 4.1.** Simplified Model of the Relationship Between Work Related Identification, Workforce Flourishing, and Employee Health ........................................ 94

**Figure 4.2.** Full Model of Workforce Flourishing and Employee Health Predicted by Identification ................................................................................................................... 105

**Figure 4.3.** Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Latent Construct of Workforce Flourishing ........................................................................................................... 116

**Figure 4.4.** Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Latent Construct of Employee Health ........................................................................................................... 118

**Figure 4.5.** Structural Model Relationships for Workforce Flourishing and Employee Health as Predicted by Work Group Identification. ........................ 119

**Figure 4.6.** Structural Model Relationships for Workforce Flourishing and Employee Health as Predicted by Organisation Identification (theorised model). ........................................................................................................... 121

**Figure 4.7.** Structural Model Relationships for Workforce Flourishing and Employee Health as Predicted by Organisation Identification (re-specified model). ........................................................................................................... 122

**Figure 5.1.** Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Latent Construct of Engagement Climate ........................................................................................................... 165

**Figure 5.2.** Convergent Validity Assessment using CFA of Engagement Climate and Exhaustion ........................................................................................................... 167

**Figure 5.3.** Convergent Validity Assessment using CFA of Engagement Climate and Cynicism ........................................................................................................... 168

**Figure 6.1.** Structural Model for the Relationship between Engagement Climate and Work Group Identification ........................................................................................................... 186

**Figure 6.2.** Structural Model for the Relationship between Engagement Climate and Organisation Identification after Re-specification of the Model ........................................ 186

**Figure 6.3.** Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Latent Construct of Workforce Flourishing ........................................................................................................... 190
Abstract

This thesis examined the relationship of work identification with workforce flourishing and employee health, engagement climate was added as an antecedent to work identification. Identification affects people’s definitions of themselves in terms of group memberships, which reconcile behaviours, values, and objectives that guide activity at work. Therefore, identification has substantial bearing on important organisational issues such as workforce flourishing and employee health. Furthermore, a climate of engagement contributes positively to identification and flourishing. This thesis applied quantitative and qualitative methods to examine work identification and a sustainable approach to workforce flourishing.

Study one commenced by testing the workforce flourishing model, employing an evolving approach to model development in this thesis. Structural equation modelling (SEM) results demonstrated good model fit. However, re-specification of the model was required when predicted by organisation identification, but not when predicted by work group identification. The hypothesis that identification predicts workforce flourishing was supported. Work group, rather than organisation identification had a stronger association with workforce flourishing and health, supporting the hypotheses two and three respectively.

Study two was undertaken in two stages; the first, a qualitative examination of the newly proposed construct of engagement climate tested the theoretically derived contribution of communication, feedback/recognition, participation, and organisation support. Qualitative data was consistent with the four factors proposed, and confirmatory factor analysis provided quantitative support in stage two of this
study. Results supported further examination of this construct in the development of the model resumed in study three.

Study three used SEM analysis to test the veracity of the model found in study one with a second data set, then test the relationship of engagement climate to model constructs using regression analysis. The model in study one was replicated by the data in study three. The hypothesis that engagement climate predicts identification was supported. Engagement climate added additional predictive capacity towards flourishing after controlling for identification, however, it was hypothesised that identification would account for this relationship in full.

In terms of the theoretical aims of this thesis, workforce flourishing and engagement climate, two newly introduced constructs, made important contributions to the model of workforce flourishing. Furthermore, engagement climate provides a non-competitive means to facilitate identification in the workplace that enables a workforce to flourish. The relationships are also sustainable because they lead to better health outcomes for employees. Results are discussed in terms of theoretical and practical implication in this thesis.
Introduction

This thesis proposed that the effectiveness of an organisation was largely determined by the capacity of its workforce to function well. Optimal functioning through a flourishing workforce was also argued to produce a sustainable approach to organisation effectiveness because it leads to better employee health. Key to workforce flourishing is the social environment in which activity takes place; and to this extent social identification and the climate for engagement were found to make important contributions to flourishing and health. In order to examine these propositions, new constructs of workforce flourishing and engagement climate were developed and tested, then applied to a model of workforce flourishing that was evolved in this thesis.

Organisation effectiveness is a major concern for managers and leaders of organisations for reasons that markets and opportunities rapidly change (Singh & Singh, 2010), robustness is needed in the face of financial challenges (Prottas, 2013), and the need to maintain relevance over the long term (Senge, 2006). Other stakeholders such as employees, local communities, and investors also have an interest in the effectiveness of an organisation (Jaffe, 1995; Pfeffer, 2010; Wilson, De Joy, Vandenberg, Richardson, & McGrath, 2004). However, the ways in which effectiveness is understood, and therefore, influenced by organisation practice, can vary among organisations.

Typically, financial turnover and profits are thought of as key indicators of effectiveness (Pfeffer, 2010; Riordan, Vandenberg, & Richardson, 2005; Shoaf, Genaidy, Karwowski, & Samuel, 2004). Demonstrations of the priority given to financial indicators are the daily reports of stock market activity presented on each regular news bulletin or broadcast. A different perspective of effectiveness is that of
sustainability, gaining interest in recent times in the context of organisation effectiveness (e.g., De Joy & Wilson, 2003; Ertürk, 2010; Hobfoll, 2001; Pfeffer, 2010). Curiously, sustainability is also argued to lead to profitability and productivity for organisations (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008; Pfeffer, 2010; van den Heuvel, Demerouti, & Bakker, 2014).

Sustainability for an organisation is often related to the impact an organisation has on the physical environment (Pfeffer, 2010). However, Bakker and Schaufeli (2008) and Pfeffer (2010) argued that the human or social dimensions of sustainability have not received sufficient attention, representing a profound opportunity to better enable organisations and employees to flourish. In these terms, sustainability suggests that the human activity taking place in an organisation is thought of as an eco-system with the goal of maintaining and preserving activity within that system (Pfeffer, 2010). The literature reviewed, and the studies conducted in this thesis examined how a workforce might function well through identification and engagement climate. The role of workforce flourishing in facilitating better employee health was also investigated with the purpose of understanding how sustainable practice for organisation effectiveness might be approached.

The thesis consists of three literature review chapters that provide information and assessment of the constructs of flourishing, identification, and health. The literature review chapters are followed by three studies that were used to develop the constructs of workforce flourishing and engagement climate. The three studies also contributed to the evolution of the workforce flourishing model. The description of the method used for each of the studies was imbedded in each study chapter prior to the results for reasons of continuity within each study.
The first study in this thesis tested the relationship between work identification, workforce flourishing, and employee health. After finding that these constructs related well together, the second study addressed the development of engagement climate as a new construct that provides a number of antecedents to identification. Following this, engagement climate was examined against other model constructs in study three, continuing the development of the workforce flourishing model in this thesis. A brief introduction to the main arguments formed from literature review and the findings from each of the three studies follows.

The literature review introduced organisations in terms of systems of activity dependent on the contributions of the workforce (Wilson, et al., 2004). The capacity of the workforce to function well was therefore proposed as a key resource for effectiveness (Pfeffer, 2010). A number of constructs were considered that represent workforce functioning (e.g., health, integrity, resiliency, dynamics) before flourishing clearly stood out as the best fitting construct to examine the psychological, social, and emotional resources that contribute to organisation performance. In Chapter 2, work related identification was argued to lead to personal and social resources that are consistent with workforce flourishing. Therefore, the inclusion of identification in the model of flourishing was important. The last of the three literature review chapters (Chapter 3) described how employee health is positively affected by identification and workforce flourishing, primarily through the psychological and social resources that are associated with flourishing and identification (e.g., Dutton et al., 2010, 2011; Ryff, 2013). Overall, the literature review proposed that the activity of the workforce is positively shaped by identification, so that identification leads to workforce flourishing. Furthermore, a
flourishing workforce creates healthier outcomes for employees that, in turn, sustain such activity in an organisation and generates further momentum for effectiveness.

The conclusions drawn from the literature review were tested in the first study of this thesis (Chapter 4). The findings demonstrated that identification had a significant association with workforce flourishing. Flourishing, in turn, related positively to employee health. An assessment of the factorial structure of workforce flourishing supported the three factor structure consisting of psychological, social, and hedonic well-being.

The analysis of the model of workforce flourishing also included testing variants of the model based on either organisation or work group identification. Compared to organisation identification, the work group identification variant of the model demonstrated a stronger and more complete relationship with flourishing and employee health. Not all manifest variables of flourishing contributed when organisation identification was used to predict flourishing and employee health. Social well-being, one of three flourishing factors, only directly related to flourishing when predicted by work group identification, but not organisation identification. This was attributed to the capacity of work group identification to initiate social interaction more so than organisation identification (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). However, both work group and organisation identification contributed significantly to workforce flourishing. Therefore, the decision was made to examine potential antecedents of identification in the next study of this thesis as potential antecedents would have important benefits to organisation practice, such as flourishing.
Theories of social identification focus attention towards competition or comparison with out-groups as the primary mechanism driving identification (Rabinovich, Morton, Postmes, & Verplanken, 2012). However, competition between groups within an organisation may have negative consequences towards effectiveness such as withholding information or resources from rival groups. Study two of this thesis drew from the literature on engagement (e.g., Bakker & Demerouti, 2014) in order to develop a set of antecedents to identification that would bypass the need for out-group comparisons or competition. The review of the literature on engagement suggested that communication, recognition/feedback, participation in decision making, and organisation support were good candidates for construct development.

The new construct was named engagement climate. Qualitative data was collected for the first stage in assessing and confirming the four factor construct derived from the literature. The qualitative data was gathered from the same municipal council involved in study one. Results from analysis of this data were consistent with the four factors derived from the literature as representative of engagement climate. Following this, quantitative data for the purpose of empirical evaluation of the new construct was gathered from workers at an employment agency operating throughout four states in Australia. Confirmatory factor analysis revealed that the four factor structure of engagement climate was a good fit to data collected. Therefore, the findings from study two supported the four factor construct of engagement climate and its inclusion for testing against other variables in study three in this thesis, continuing the development of the workforce flourishing.

Using data collected from the employment agency based in Australia, the third study found that engagement climate had a significant relationship to both
organisation and work group identification. The fit found between engagement climate and work group identification was excellent and did not require modification. In contrast, the fit between engagement climate and organisation identification did require some modification to find adequate fit with the data. The modification involved the removal of the manifest variable of participation in decision making from the latent construct of engagement climate. The factors of engagement climate interact differently according to the identification foci involved. With respect to organisation identification, engagement climate factors that promote the exchange of information such as communication, recognition/feedback, and organisation support seem to be particularly suited to identification with this group. The effect may have also been enhanced by the characteristics of the organisation involved, as there was an emphasis by this organisation on centralised issues in their communications to promote unity in a geographically disperse organisation. In contrast, the socially oriented engagement climate factor of participation was more clearly related to work group rather than organisation identification.

A series of regression equations were also performed to assess the relationship between engagement climate, workforce flourishing, and identification. Firstly, it was found that identification had a similarly significant relationship with workforce flourishing to that found in study one. Secondly, a hierarchical regression found only three of the four engagement climate factors (communication, feedback/recognition, and participation) to be significantly related to workforce flourishing when organisation identification was entered at the first step. In contrast, all factors of engagement climate were significant contributors to flourishing after controlling for the effects of work group identification. It was concluded that work group identification had a greater capacity than organisation identification to facilitate the
social aspects of engagement climate into workforce flourishing, suggesting it has some advantage over organisation identification in relation to positive impact.

The outcomes of this thesis have a number of implication for theory relating to self-categorisation theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherall, 1987), eudaimonia and flourishing (Keyes, 2007; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Seligman, 2011), conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989, 1998, 2011), and the organisational literature in general (e.g., Bakker & Demerouti, 2008, 2014; Dutton et al., 2010, 2011). The findings of the research undertaken in this thesis also have a number of practical applications that may bring about sustainable and effective outcomes for organisations through better leadership practices that address engagement climate factors. This thesis presents an argument that sustainable approaches to organisation effectiveness are possible through the implementation of positive engagement climate practices that support identification, workforce flourishing, and health. Therefore, this thesis makes a valuable contribution to both theory and practice.
Chapter 1

Flourishing Workforces and Organisational Effectiveness

Organisations are systems of activity involving patterns of interdependence that produce both intended and unintended outcomes (Senge, 2006; Wheatly, 2006). Some outcomes, often the unintended ones, can diminish the capacity of a system such as an organisation, to sustain activity into the future (Capra, 1997). Capra, applied a systems approach to organisations, arguing that if the networks and patterns of interdependence are ignored, system stocks and resources can be depleted and lead undesirable or unsustainable outcomes. Organisations that place all or most of their attention towards profitability and production may be at risk of diminishing the very resources that maintain their ability to perform those functions (Lutz, 2008; Senge, 2006).

The workforce is one such resource important to an organisation’s capacity to function effectively and sustainably. As such, DeJoy & Wilson (2003), Pfeffer (2010), Quick and Quick (2004), and Wilson et al. (2004) concluded that the fate of an organisation is inextricably linked to the capacity of its employees to contribute to the organisation. The objective of the research that follows was to examine the capacity of the workforce to function in a manner that is likely to contribute to the effectiveness of an organisation. However, the capacity of the workforce to function as a resource for effectiveness must be approached with sustainability in mind if the depletion of that resource is to be avoided. Sustainability in these terms relates to the relationship between examined factors and the ability to maintain activity without depleting important resources such as employees (Pfeffer, 2010).
According to Pfeffer (2010), the notion of sustainability complements organisation effectiveness when applied to an organisation’s workforce. Sustainability within the context of an organisation’s workforce shifts understanding of the workforce more towards that of a resource for effectiveness and elevates the importance of employee well-being as a key component of effectiveness. To illustrate, the market place or social environment in which organisations exist is constantly changing in terms of the demands organisations face and the opportunities that arise for growth (Ertürk, 2010; Hart & Cooper, 2001). The capacity of organisations to adapt and grow in response to challenges is largely dependent on the workforce’s ability to respond (Clark, 1962; Jaffe, 1995; Keller & Price, 2011; McHugh, 2001). In this sense, Pfeffer (2010) argued that sustainability is interwoven with workforce well-being, which helps determine the capacity for mobilising resources to meet the demands of change. Similarly, Dutton et al. (2011), Keyes (2007), and Ryan and Deci (2001) explained that well-being is not merely a state of satisfaction, but is dependant largely on functional capacity, development, and processes of self-actualisation. Presently, organisations are confronted by unprecedented rates of change (Bhamraa, Daniab, & Burnard, 2011; Dewe & Cooper, 2012), while at the same time their workforce is becoming more integral to their capacity to respond and grow within a dynamic environment (Fredrickson & Dutton, 2008). These trends are likely to continue, therefore, the need for research that addresses sustainable workforce functionality is undeniable.

1.1. **Workforce as a sustainable, self-generating organisational resource**

A number of constructs have featured in organisational literature over the last two to three decades that have attempted to capture elements of the workforce that signify its properties as a resource. One of the more prominent of these constructs
has been organisational health (Cox, 1988; Cox & Howarth, 1990; Cotton & Hart, 2003; Quick, Macik-Frey, & Cooper, 2007; Pfeffer, 2010). However, other constructs have also been described in terms that reflect a capacity of workers or the workforce to become a resource for organisational effectiveness and performance. Many of which have been defined in ways that are both adaptive and sustainable. For example, Leroy, Palanski, and Simons (2012) and Young (2011) noted that organisational integrity provides a force for coherency, consistency, and commitment. Kay and Goldspick (2012) described organisational resiliency as a capacity of an organisation to persist, adapt, and demonstrate agency over their environment. Organisational dynamics is a term used to capture qualities of work and the workforce that Ali, Peters, and Lettice (2012) argued was consistent with co-ordination and learning capabilities within organisations. Another term that might be applied to organisational contexts is flourishing. Flourishing was described by Keyes (1998, 2007), Seligman (2011), and Dutton et al. (2011) as the social, psychological, and emotional properties people experience that contribute to sustainable, effective functioning, as well as engagement and overall well-being.

The following review argues that the construct of organisational health has been applied ubiquitously to explain all manner of organisational phenomena creating conjecture about what the term actually represents. While organisational health has been successful in raising awareness of the importance of relationships between organisational functioning and effectiveness, alternative constructs are needed that will enable a sharper focus to be applied to issues of functionality in organisations. Several constructs are reviewed briefly, specifically assessing the elements of organisational functioning that each construct addresses.
1.1.1. Organisational Health

Health generally denotes a state, or capacity, to function effectively and is
descriptive of entities such as organisations as well as individuals (Cotton & Hart,
2003; Cox, 1988; DeJoy, Wilson, Vandenberg, McGrath-Higgins, & Griffin-Blake,
2010; Shoaf et al., 2004; Jaffe, 1995). Shoaf et al. (2004) chronicled the
development of the construct of organisational health explaining how a humanistic
research focus shed light on the links between job content and individual well-being.
According to Shoaf et al., the common belief up until that point was that
organisational productivity and employee well-being were antagonistic, meaning
that gains in one would come at the expense of the other. Early studies into
organisational health such as Cooper and Williams (1994), Cox (1988) Cox and Cox
(1992), and Jaffe (1995), described functional benefits of organisational health such
as a more creative, committed, and enthusiastic workforce. However, Shoaf et al.
(2004) noted at the time that few studies had addressed the factors within an
organisation that manifest themselves as organisational health. Shoaf et al. cautioned
that any attempt to articulate the conditions that lead to organisational health should
move beyond the narrow spectrum of employee health and into the broader spectrum
of organisational activity. Despite an apparent relationship between employee health
and organisational health, they are not one in the same. Indeed, efforts to understand
the processes and impacts of organisational health have attracted many perspectives,
some quite diverse, that have featured in reported research.

The complexity now associated with the construct of organisational health is
largely associated with the use of the term health. Midway through the twentieth
century, the World Health Organisation (WHO) (1946) attempted to broaden
accepted understanding of the concept of health. Importantly, WHO challenged the
notion that health was exclusively a physical attribute. Health was described by the WHO as the physical, mental, and psychological properties that act as a resource for living rather than just as a goal to be attained. By defining health in this way, the WHO had made a substantial paradigm shift in the way health is understood and promoted. Defining health as a resource was an important shift in the way health was thought and meant approaches to health would change. As a resource, health suggested continual promotion and maintenance rather than sporadic attention in order to maintain a homeostatic ideal as a remedy of a problem or negative event. Sustainability and health were complimentary constructs under the WHO’s definition. In addition, a broader understanding of health beyond that of a simple physical dimension, that now included social and psychological dimensions, meant that the application in research attracted many different interpretations of health in an attempt to capture such sweeping dynamics.

As the number of dimensions included in descriptions of health became greater, so too has the number of influential factors that are needed to explain how each of these health dimensions vary. The effect has been that there are now a large number of health definitions used in research that are focused primarily on the select array of constructs of interest in the research. For example, applying Senge’s (2006) and Wheatly’s (2006) systems perspectives to organisational health, the interactions and interdependence within an organisation becomes a resource for health rather than the health of employees per se. Similarly, DeJoy et al. (2010), Shoaf et al. (2004), and Wilson et al. (2004) suggested that organisational health has more to do with the structures and practices governing activity within an organisation than it does with the level of health of any other factor. These systems based perspective are in contrast to other researchers who have placed importance on particular factors
such as the health of employees (Jaffe, 1995), financial performance (Cooper & Cartwright, 1994), or organisational norms, policies, and culture (Fallon, 2001).

Pfeffer (2010) claimed that organisational health is more likely to ensue when a broad approach is taken towards the determinants of health. The interaction between these elements is also important. However, the expansive catalogue of potential determinants and consequences associated with organisational health suggests that subjectivity would increase, and as a consequence, the level of contentiousness is also likely to rise. The spiralling list of determinants and relationships covering a diverse range of perspectives in relation to health creates difficulty with decisions about the number of factors to include or exclude, which relationships are a priority, and how to accurately represent each factor involved. Conceptualisations of health have become increasingly diversified as a consequence of the complexity now understood to determine health and related outcomes (Dewe & Cooper, 2012). The benefit has been that deeper understanding of health has extended our appreciation and acceptance of the diversity of factors that contribute to health, which in short has advanced our understanding of health. However, the consequence has been that applying this concept in research terms is now a complex and treacherous enterprise.

Notwithstanding the idea of organisational health has merit when applied to generating knowledge about effective organisational activity and employee well-being, the term as a research construct has become too liberal and diversely defined over time to adequately serve specific research agendas (cf, Cotton & Hart, 2003; Cooper & Williams, 1994; Jaffe, 1995; Quick et al., 2007). Research can become confounded when tailored definitions of organisational health are applied that align with research objectives, and in so doing, neglect a myriad of alternative
conceptualisations. In contrast, a definition of organisational health that embraces all that organisational health might be is very likely to become too generalised for effective, focussed inquiry, except that regarding a basic overview. Therefore, for the purpose of exploring the sustainable capacity of the workforce to function in a manner, such that it is likely to add to organisational effectiveness, as well as contribute to the well-being of employees, an alternative construct to organisational health is more fitting for this thesis.

1.1.2. Organisational Integrity

According to business literature, the term integrity has been used to describe organisational characteristics consistent with the capacity of the organisation to foster functional assets or resources (Palanski, Kahai, & Yammarino, 2011; Petrick & Quinn, 2001; Prottas, 2013). Drawing from the premise that integrity denotes a quality akin to completeness, Palanski and Yammarino (2007) defined integrity as the consistency of an entities words and actions. The potential of integrity to function as a resource for organisations can be linked to trust within the working environment and the positive attitudes and behaviours of the workforce that are more likely to exist when trust and integrity are salient (Prottas, 2013). Similarly, Palanski et al. (2011) found that consistency of communication in the form of transparency from leaders was related to behavioural integrity, which was also related to trust and performance in work teams. Therefore, Palanski et al. located the source of integrity firmly within the domain of leadership.

While leader integrity or systemic integrity may well be an asset or resource present within an organisation, it is one step removed from workforce performance, and therefore, less informative of a workforces’ effectiveness in terms of their capacity to gain further resources. For example, Young (2011) pointed out that the
context in which integrity is considered is relevant to understanding the potential impact on an organisation. In relation to organisational effectiveness and employee well-being, integrity might be equivocal in relation to exploring workforce functionality. For example, one might reasonably argue that in times of change and the need for innovation, ethical integrity may provide an effective framework for successfully navigating such challenges. Alternatively, you might also reasonably argue, that ethical integrity is independent of performance. For example, ethical integrity might involve unconditional commitment regardless of convenience or benefit (Maak, 2008). Under these circumstances, performance may be diminished due to conflicted commitment or lack of personal benefit.

To summarise, the construct of integrity appears to represent a potential resource to organisations, particularly in terms of structural integrity. However, research in this area is directed almost exclusively to issues of leadership and organisational processes (e.g., Petrick & Quinn, 2001; Quick & Goolsby, 2013; Prottas, 2013) with only a few forays into workgroup integrity such as Palanski et al.’s (2011) study of team behavioural integrity. The other dominant perspective of integrity is ethical integrity, which can easily be independent of performance and therefore, workforce functionality. The construct of integrity applied to workgroups has some potential to inform and improve practice. However, due to a level of ambiguity and imprecision between integrity and workforce functioning, other constructs will be considered that may have a more discernible relationship between the workforce and organisational effectiveness.

1.1.3. Organisational Resiliency

The term organisational resiliency has attracted an assortment of different interpretations (Bhamraa et al., 2011; Kay & Goldspink, 2012). Kay and Goldspink
(2012) stated that much of the variation when defining organisational resiliency relates to the contextual recognition required of the term. It also follows that a generic definition would be limited and somewhat inappropriate, having cast off reference to contextual relationships. Despite these limitations, there are some common features about the way organisational resilience is understood. Firstly, according to some researchers (e.g., Bhamraa et al., 2011; Kay & Goldspink, 2012; Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003), resilience is a capacity almost exclusively linked to a response to some form of negative occurrence or threat. Secondly, it appears that the primary aim of resiliency is to restore normal functionality to an organisation after disruption (e.g., Kay & Goldspink, 2012; Powley, 2009; Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003). Drawing on contextual relationships, Powley (2009) and Powley and Powley (2012) recently considered resiliency as a resource located within the network of social relationships existing within a workforce. Powley and Powley (2012) proposed that the socially enacted and embedded capacity for resilience, founded in social relationships, has positive and promotional qualities that go beyond homoeostatic abilities to return to normal functioning, such that the accumulation of further resources and growth is made possible.

The positive properties attributed to organisational resiliency would suggest that it has some potential to advance our understanding of sustainable action towards promoting workplace functioning and also employee well-being. Knowledge gathered about better functioning within organisations is similarly informative of organisational effectiveness. However, in terms of resiliency, benefits related to functioning and effectiveness may be confined to contexts of adversity while neglecting circumstances that are positive or opportune. Taking a systems perspective of organisations (e.g., Barnett & Pratt, 2000; Capra, 1996), not all forms
of disruption or instances of turmoil are damaging in the sense that they are threats to existence (Wheatley, 2006). Indeed, from turbulence there can often emerge new and creative solutions that enhance an entities capacity to thrive or flourish in the aftermath of a challenging event (Capra, 1996; Wheatley, 2006). Adopting a resiliency framework that aims to return to some previous state of activity, and to do so through historically sourced solutions, may be in fact detrimental in the long term through the failure to embrace the need for change. The need for change is often signalled by the disruption that warrants the need for resiliency in the first instance. Furthermore, there may be opportunities to change and grow that are not accompanied by a threat or disaster. In such circumstances, there would be no trigger to bring about a resilient response, the status quo would continue, and the opportunity for change would pass.

1.1.4. Organisational Dynamics

The notion of dynamics has been applied to organisational contexts in order to describe a form of organisational resource that promotes the maintenance of viability, even in a changing environment (Lopez, 2005). Zollo and Winter (2002) defined the resource that is dynamics as the capacity of an organisation to learn, explaining that dynamic capabilities are stable patterns of collective activity through which the organisation generates and modifies its operating routines systematically in pursuit of improved effectiveness. Others have used similar descriptions, referring to processes and strategies that support systematic learning within an organisation (Ali et al., 2012; Romme, Zollo, & Berends, 2010). Variations of the theme of dynamics can also be found. For example, Lamberg, Tikkanen, Nokelainen, and Suur-Inkeroinen (2009) used the term competitive dynamics to describe adaption and change, but with the objective of maintaining competitiveness rather than
effectiveness. Smith and Lewis (2011) employed the term dynamic equilibrium to
describe an organisation’s ability to maintain a balanced approach between imputed
paradoxical tensions such as learning and performing. Their conceptualisation of
dynamic equilibrium has much in common with a systems perspective of competing
outcomes.

Although the application of the term dynamics to organisational contexts
might vary according to the features of the context under examination, the consistent
theme to emerge when applied has been the description of organisational structural
issues. This places management, governance, and systems at the centre of
understanding dynamics, but often leaves the workforce on the periphery of
consideration. What seems apparent is that organisational dynamic capabilities,
particularly in relation to systemic approaches to learning, are indeed organisational
assets and resources. However, the term does not fit well with the intent of this
thesis to explore the resource potential of an organisation’s workforce. A more
suitable construct is required that is specific to the functionality of the workforce,
and also the prospects of that functionality translating into organisation
effectiveness.

1.1.5. Flourishing

Employee well-being enables the workforce to perform effectively at work
and contribute to the likelihood of organisational success (Harter, Schmidt, &
Keyes, 2003). The relationship between well-being and organisational success can
be explained through meaningful and challenging tasks that give rise to employees’
positive appraisals of work; thereby motivating their deeper involvement in the work
they do (Harter et al., 2003; Oishi, 2012; Quick & Macik-Frey, 2007; Slemp &
Vella-Brodrick, 2014). Recently, researchers have turned their attention toward a
new conceptual understanding of well-being referred to as flourishing (Huppert & So, 2013; Keyes, 2007; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Seligman, 2011). Flourishing is a relatively new construct to the domain of organisational research, the origins of the concept emerged via attempts to understand well-being related to both positive emotion and positive functionality, known respectively as hedonic and eudaimonic well-being (Henderson & Knight, 2012). In particular, eudaimonic well-being appears to have greater agency in relation to personal development and growth than hedonic well-being, although both contribute to such outcomes (Keyes, 2007; Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2014; Straume & Vittersø, 2012; Waterman, 2008).

In their editorial on the topic of flourishing within organisational contexts, Fredrickson and Dutton (2008) proposed that there were three important domains that are somewhat interdependent of each other that combine and contribute towards a flourishing workforce. These domains are psychological and social functioning (functioning synonymous with well-being), and emotional well-being (Dutton et al., 2011; Fredrickson & Dutton, 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2001). Broadly, the domains of psychological functioning and social functioning can be equated with eudaimonia, because they are consistent with living true to one’s self, and suggest processes moving toward personal growth and self-actualisation (Keyes, 2007; Ryan & Deci, 2001). Emotional well-being is associated with hedonic well-being, or a positive state based on feelings of pleasure and satisfaction (Ryan & Deci, 2001).

The emphasis on eudaimonic well-being as an embodiment of high functioning and engagement is noted here. Waterman, Schwartz, and Conti (2008) explored the role of both eudaimonia and hedonia in intrinsic motivation and found the addition of eudaimonic experiences was important to intrinsic motivation because it enhanced feelings of self-realisation and competency through application
of skills and effort. Howell (2009) gathered data from around 400 undergraduate psychology students, dividing them into those that were flourishing, moderately mentally healthy, or languishers. Findings from this research revealed that flourishing students (those high in psychological and social well-being - eudaimonia) were better functionally in terms of mastery goal orientation, low procrastination, high self-control, and higher self-reported grades relative to non-flourishing students.

In terms of flourishing, the combination of hedonia and eudaimonia may be necessary to achieve higher levels of overall well-being (Keyes & Simoes, 2012). Indeed, Diener et al. (2010) operationalised flourishing as social-psychological prosperity to complement measures of subjective well-being which captured hedonic aspects of well-being. As Waterman et al. (2008) and Slemp and Vella-Brodrich (2014) argued, hedonia alone is unlikely to lead to intrinsically motivated activity or self-actualisation without the accompaniment of eudaimonic experience.

It would appear that hedonic well-being is an important component of flourishing that complements functional well-being (eudaimonia) (e.g., Henderson & Knight, 2012). Although, hedonic well-being has an important role towards flourishing, the functional aspects may be the critical components. Researchers, such as Keyes (2007) and Diener et al. (2010) take the view that functional well-being, is essential to flourishing because it allows self-actualisation and personal growth to be attained, more so than hedonic experiences. Still other researchers such as Seligman (2011) have suggested additional elements might also contribute to flourishing such as self-esteem, optimism, resilience, vitality, and self-determination, which he collectively characterised as strengths and virtues. While the extent and nature of the role strengths and virtues has in flourishing is yet to be fully determined, it would
seem more pragmatic as this point to address the three fundamentals of emotional, social, and psychological well-being before pursuing any ancillary contributions. Therefore, consistent with definitions of flourishing reported by Dutton et al. (2011); Huppert and So (2013), and Keyes (2007), in this thesis workforce flourishing refers to the positive functionality obtained from both social and psychological experiences, in addition to the hedonic experience of satisfaction in relation to work.

According to Fredrickson & Dutton (2008), a key to flourishing at individual, group, and organisational levels is the capacity for positive organising. They described positive organising as a generative process that taps into individual or group strengths in order to activate the energy and engagement of a workforce. By targeting psychological, social, and emotional mechanisms in a constructive and positive manner, the resources of individuals or collectives in the form of energy, respect, optimism, and insight are cultivated and available. Furthermore, through positive organisation, the resources developed at an individual and organisational level are likely to be sustainable as a consequence of using past positive experience to generate future positive experience (Quick & Macik-Frey, 2007). The self-perpetuating nature of building resources of this nature within a workforce has obvious benefits for organisational effectiveness.

In terms of psychological well-being, and the contribution to optimal functioning, Quick and Macik-Frey (2007) and Slemp and Vella-Brodrich (2014) highlighted the role that meaning and purpose plays in helping to connect individuals’ to the activities they perform in the course of their work. Similarly, Harter et al. (2003) described how meaning and purpose are important for flourishing (as well-being) by way of increased engagement. Mastery goal orientation has also been implicated as a contributing factor towards psychological
functioning and for flourishing in general (Seligman, 2011; Keyes, 1998; Diener et al., 2010; Dutton et al., 2011). Psychological factors that promote flourishing in the workplace, by means such as the focus on mastery orientation and creating a sense of purpose and meaning related to work, may help to improve engagement with work.

Meaning and purpose link work activities with the values held by individual workers (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004; Slemp & Vella-Brodrich, 2014) and this may facilitate the internalisation of work activities by employees. In motivational terms, the activity becomes more autonomously regulated as the link between work activities becomes more imbedded in the identity of the employee (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Dutton et al., 2011). Furthermore, social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and self-categorisation theory (Turner et al., 1987) describe the process of internalisation as one of group identification in which alignment between group and individual values, norms, and goals occurs. Therefore, when psychological well-being is enhanced, the increase in workforce flourishing is likely to produce organisational resources in the form of motivated and engaged employees that have heightened levels of identification related to their work.

In addition to psychological resources such as group identification, intrinsic motivation, and engagement, the resources generated through a flourishing workforce are likely to have a beneficial impact on social or interactive activity that also promotes organisational effectiveness (Dutton et al., 2011). For example, Slemp and Vella-Brodrich (2014) found that the need for relatedness is associated with functional well-being. Dutton et al. (2011) proposed that higher levels of social coherence, social actualisation, integration, acceptance and social contribution are likely to contribute to workforce flourishing. Such pro-social behaviours are
instrumental in promoting persistence, performance, and productivity in an organisation (Grant, 2008). Keyes (2007) reported that flourishing adults were indeed more socially oriented in the form of psychosocial functioning such as their closeness to others. Dutton et al. (2011) explained that pro-social orientations such as engaging with and helping others have implications for self-actualisation and promoting flourishing.

Furthermore, it is not just the sense of belonging that fosters well-being, although this has a direct positive benefit (Diener & Seligman, 2004). Making a contribution to the group through positive social functioning also plays a role in promoting high levels of well-being or flourishing (Diener et al., 2010). The relationship between flourishing and the effective social functioning of a workforce appears to be straightforward. Organisations that promote a sense of belonging and inclusion, that also includes opportunities for the group and individuals to contribute to the social well-being of the group, are likely to establish a work environment in which their workforce can flourish.

When a workforce is flourishing, positive emotions generated may help create an additional form of resource that complements psychological and social functioning (Dutton et al., 2011). Grant (2008) argued that positive emotional states are related to intrinsic motivation as this form of motive is inherently focused on the pleasure and enjoyment derived from performing a task. For example, intrinsic motivation also leads to feelings of satisfaction and self-esteem (Kernis & Paradise, 2002) – equating to positive emotional states that can define the purpose for action in their own right. Satisfaction with work can, as Harter et al. (2003) explained, lead to increased positive functioning such as citizenship behaviour and increased job performance. Indeed, Fredrickson’s broaden and build theory (Fredrickson, 1998,
2001; Fredrickson & Losada, 2005) describes how positive emotions extend thought-action repertoires which contribute to building resources socially as well as psychologically. Fredrickson and Losada (2005) found that the higher the ratio of positive to negative emotions in workgroup activity, the better the workgroup was able to function and the more likely individuals in the group were to flourish.

Ryan and Deci (2000), using a self-determination theory framework, suggested that attaining goals or meeting needs through eudaimonic living may produce a hedonic or positive emotional response. Indeed, Slemp and Vella-Brodrich (2014) found that intrinsic needs such as autonomy, competence, and relatedness, that are associated with functional well-being or eudaimonia, were related to subjective well-being (satisfaction and positive affect). Furthermore, functional well-being was also found to be closely linked to subjective well-being. Positive emotional outcomes then help to increase persistence with eudaimonic practices, or in other words, provide positive feedback that reinforces the relationship between positive functioning (eudaimonia) and hedonia. Positive emotion or hedonia would appear to complement flourishing through enhancing the functional domains of social and psychological well-being.

In organisational contexts, job satisfaction is often used as an indicator of the subjective assessment of work by employees or a workforce as a whole and is consistent with the concept of hedonia (Wright & Cropanzano, 1997). Although Wright and Cropanzano question the use of job satisfaction as a measure of work
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1 A correction was made to the original Fredrickson and Losada (2005) paper based on the withdrawal of the modelling assumptions used in this paper to arrive at certain ratios of positive to negative emotions. However, the finding that positive ratios were significantly higher for flourishing individuals compared to non-flourishing individuals was affirmed - only the specific magnitude of the ratio was withdrawn based on incorrect modelling. (2013, September 16). Correction to Fredrickson and Losada (2005). *American Psychologist*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0034435
related affect, in an hedonic sense that involves subjective evaluations of work, job satisfaction is consistent with hedonia (see, Diener, Sapyta, & Suh, 1998; Waterman et al., 2008). According to Waterman et al. (2008), the presence of both hedonia (job satisfaction) and eudaimonia (psychological and social well-being) would be an indication of self-determined regulation of behaviour in the workplace which would increase the likelihood of flourishing. It is also important to note that not all eudaimonic pursuits bring a sense of satisfaction or positive emotional response (Slemp & Vella-Broadrich, 2014). Fulfilment of needs or goal attainment may play a facilitative role in this association (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Therefore, functional well-being may be present, but it is the fulfilment of goals that helps generate positive evaluations and emotions that help to create the reinforcing processes that are associated with flourishing. The presence of positive emotions suggests that a state of flourishing, inclusive of healthy social and psychological functioning, is more likely to exist.

1.1.6. Summary of constructs representing sustainable organisational resources

In this chapter, a number of constructs were reviewed that have attracted some attention in the literature due in some part to their capacity to facilitate effective organisational practice. Organisational health has featured prominently in research for a number of years (see Cox, 1988; Cox & Cox, 1992; Cooper & Williams, 1994; Jaffe, 1995) and has been instrumental in drawing attention to a vast array of factors that represent resources for organisational effectiveness. The reach of organisational health, as an explanatory framework in organisational effectiveness, has culminated in a large assortment of definitions and applications (cf, Cotton & Hart, 2003; Cooper & Williams, 1994; Jaffe, 1995; Quick et al., 2007). Effectively, this has reduced the precision with which organisational health can be applied in research. A
range of alternative constructs were assessed in this chapter with the goal of finding a concept that would represent the capacity of a workforce to become a resource for organisational effectiveness.

Concepts related to organisational effectiveness such as integrity, resiliency, dynamics, and flourishing were explored as alternatives to organisational health. Flourishing, or in this case, workforce flourishing, was argued to be the most suitable representation of the workforce as a resource for organisational effectiveness compared to the other constructs discussed. Flourishing represents positive functioning in the form of psychological and social well-being (Fredrickson & Dutton, 2008; Dutton et al., 2011; Huppert & So, 2013; Keyes, 2007). The association of hedonic well-being with flourishing (Diener et al., 2010; Waterman et al., 2008) also provides a mechanism by which a resource such as flourishing is positively reinforced (Dutton et al., 2011) and thereby more sustainable. These qualities attributed to flourishing and applied to the context of workforce flourishing provide a grounded argument for the adoption of this construct to explore the workforce as a resource for organisational effectiveness.

1.2. Flourishing as Eudaimonic and Hedonic Well-being

Flourishing has been associated with both eudaimonic and hedonic well-being (Huppert & So, 2009; Keyes & Annas, 2009; Keyes & Simoes, 2012; Waterman, 2008). A more detailed examination of these dimensions of well-being will provide further insight into the potential benefits that may result from a flourishing workforce. Therefore, a review and explanation of eudaimonic and hedonic well-being constructs follows.
Research into hedonic well-being, including happiness and satisfaction, has been well established (Henderson & Knight, 2012; Deci & Ryan, 2001). In general, hedonia has been associated with the pursuit of pleasure (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Waterman (2008) argued that subjective well-being (SWB) and hedonia were essentially the same construct. Waterman’s conclusion was based on Kraut’s (1979) definition of SWB as ‘the belief that one is getting the important things one wants, as well as certain pleasant effects that go along with this belief’. Hedonia therefore, is associated with pleasure and is subjectively interpreted.

Similar to hedonia, eudaimonia has also been described as a subjective state which Waterman et al. (2008) referred to as the feelings present when one is moving towards self-realisation, consistent with developing one’s potential and furthering one’s purposes in living. However, Keyes and Annas (2009) had a different view arguing that eudaimonia is not a state that arises in individuals, but instead describes the activity one is engaged in. The two perspectives are not necessarily exclusive in that eudaimonia embodies functional components of well-being such as interest and inspiration that are distinct from hedonia (see Straume & Vittersø, 2012; Vittersø & Søholt, 2011). Indeed, at a fundamental level, Keyes and Annas (2009) concluded that the eudaimonic domains of psychological and social well-being are distinct from hedonia in that they relate to functioning. Hedonia is identified more closely with emotional outcomes such as feelings of pleasure and satisfaction. Similarly, Ryan and Deci (2001) described eudaimonia as a fully functioning state involving growth through autonomy, competency, and relatedness, or in other words, self-actualisation. To summarise, the distinguishing feature of eudaimonia appears to be the activity and well-being derived from the capacity to function well while hedonia is more firmly associated with positive and pleasurable feelings.
While the distinction between these sources of well-being seems reasonably clear, Waterman et al. (2008) found correlations that ranged from .83 to .87 between hedonia and eudaimonia in three samples of college students. The considerable overlap between constructs was argued to relate to the degree of affect that each form of well-being generates. For instance, Waterman (2008) stated that eudaimonia is a subjective state, similar to that of hedonia in that it can give rise to positive emotional states. However, the presence of positive emotions associated with eudaimonia may not be a necessary condition in optimal functioning. Rather, eudaimonia appears to be related, but not reliant on happiness per se (Ryan & Deci, 2001; Vittersø & Søholt, 2011) and has more in common with personal goal pursuits and acting in accord with personal values (Waterman, 2008; Vittersø & Søholt, 2011) than solely as a pathway to happiness. Furthermore, Staume and Vittersø (2012), Schueller and Seligman (2010), and Vittersø and Søholt (2011) found that eudaimonic well-being (e.g., growth consisting of curiosity, absorption, complexity, and competence) was not consistently predictive of states of happiness (hedonia). Positive emotional states are central to hedonia but not necessary for eudaimonia.

In addition, researchers such as Vittersø and Søholt (2011) and Waterman (2008) claimed that eudaimonia is a more robust predictor of overall well-being, in terms of flourishing. However, considering eudaimonic and hedonic well-being together appears to provide a more reliable means of predicting flourishing than when accounting for these well-being dimensions separately (Henderson & Knight, 2012). In contrast, Kashdan, Biswas-Diener, and King’s (2008) claimed that eudaimonia was not clearly defined and appeared to overlap with hedonia. They therefore suggested that eudaimonia was effectively redundant. However, research by Waterman et al. (2008), Vittersø and Søholt (2011), and Schueller and Seligman
(2010) had a different view of eudaimonia. According to these researchers, there is an asymmetrical relationship in which eudaimonia offers distinctive insight into states of well-being and ultimately flourishing, and complements hedonic perspectives, despite high correlations that are often present between to two constructs. The proposition that hedonic and eudaimonic well-being make unique contributions to overall well-being or, in this case, flourishing was adopted here. Therefore, both eudaimonic and hedonic well-being dimensions were adopted in this thesis to examine flourishing and its relationship to other workforce variables that are indicative of the capacity of an organisation to function effectively.

1.2.1. Hedonia

The hedonic perspective of well-being emerged out of lines of inquiry that were essentially explorations of subjective well-being (SWB) (Keyes, Shmolkin, & Ryff, 2002; Slemp & Vella-Brodrich, 2014; Waterman et al., 2010). Waterman (2008) explained that happiness and pleasure are central to SWB and underpin what is referred to as “a good life”. In reference to SWB research, happiness and pleasure are described with the understanding that they are enduring characteristics more so than fleeting experiences. Therefore, it follows that happy people are likely to perceive events more positively than those low on happiness if such positive states persist beyond brief momentary episodes (Diener et al., 1998; Fredrickson, 1998, 2001). Indeed, a dominant characteristic of subjective well-being is that it is inherently subjective, and therefore, evaluative (Diener et al., 1998; Fredrickson, 1998, 2001; Keyes et al., 2002; Waterman et al., 2010).

Similar to SWB, hedonic well-being (HWB) is sometimes used to refer to states of pleasure or happiness. Waterman (2008) argued strongly that HWB and SWB were indeed conceptually equivalent and to avoid confusion, particularly
given the well-established research record of SWB, the term SWB should be preferred. However, this should not preclude discussion of hedonic subject matter in relation to SWB, and vice versa. As conceptual companions, it is also argued that knowledge of one provides extensive knowledge of the other. Furthermore, in terms of discussing the concept of flourishing, the two well-being domains most consistently called upon are hedonic and eudaimonic well-being (Keyes, 2007; Vittersø & Søholt, 2011; Waterman et al., 2010). Few researchers have adopted the term SWB for use in developing an understanding of flourishing, despite it being interchangeable with the concept of hedonia (see Waterman et al., 2010 for an example of where SWB was used as the emotional component of flourishing). It would seem that hedonia is preferred rather than SWB when research into flourishing is undertaken. In this thesis, hedonia was used in reference to flourishing to refer to states of happiness and satisfaction, although SWB may be used interchangeably on occasion to maintain consistency with reported research.

According to Keyes and colleagues, SWB or hedonia has two apparent features; happiness and satisfaction (Keyes et al., 2002; Keyes, 2007). Although, Howell, Kern, and Lyubomirsky (2007) suggested that while these features of hedonia (SWB in their research) may be distinguishable, they often correlated highly and often yield a single higher order factor. In this regard, high levels of either happiness or satisfaction would appear to indicate high levels of hedonia. Indeed, there is a substantial record of accumulated research linking the presence of SWB, in terms of happiness, satisfaction, or both, to beneficial outcomes (e.g., Kaplan, Warren, Barsky, & Thoresen, 2009). In relation to flourishing, Tay and Diener (2011) found SWB in the form of life satisfaction and positive/negative feelings to be associated with satisfying needs such as social support, respect and pride,
mastery, and autonomy. Interestingly, in the same study, social need fulfilment predicted SWB beyond individual need fulfilment indicating a desire of those in the study to belong to flourishing communities, supporting the notion that social well-being is an important aspect for flourishing at individual and group levels. In a meta-analysis involving 212 samples, SWB (incorporating both positive emotion and satisfaction) was found to be associated with a 14% increase in life expectancy for individuals reporting high levels of SWB compared to their counterparts reporting low SWB (Howell et al., 2007). In their analysis, SWB was found to associate most strongly with short term health issues largely related to immune functioning and pain tolerance. From the point of view that SWB or hedonia appears to capture relationships between elements of well-being not captured by eudaimonia, and also because of the strong links with health, the inclusion of hedonia is necessary in the endeavour to fully understand workforce flourishing.

Another important reason for the inclusion of hedonia in flourishing was based on Fredrickson’s broaden and build theory of the behavioural implications of positive emotional states (see Fredrickson, 1998, 2001). Fredrickson (1998, 2001), and Fredrickson and Branigan (2005), proposed that positive emotions broaden the range of experience accessible to individuals in terms of their perception of events and related behavioural response repertoires. In turn, these perceptions and behavioural responses have a bearing on the accumulation of resources including social and psychological resources. Ouweneel, Le Blanc, and Schaufeli (2011) applied Fredrickson’s (1998, 2001) broaden and build theory of positive emotion to the study of engagement of university students and found a positive gain spiral existed between positive emotions, personal resources, and engagement. Positive emotions allow a broader range of thoughts and potentialities to arise, which
contribute to the accumulation of resources such as self-efficacy, hope, and optimism. Resources such as these may lead to engagement in the form of increased vigour, dedication, and absorption. Reciprocally, increased engagement was linked to a rise in positive emotion and thus a positive reinforcing cycle prevailed.

Clearly, findings for hedonia and SWB reported here suggest that the emotionally based forms of well-being contribute to health and functioning. Functioning is the signature feature of eudaimonic well-being and hedonia appears to encourage further effective functioning (eudaimonia) through the accumulation of resources and the fulfilment of needs. The proposition that hedonia is essential for flourishing is adopted in this thesis, and is particularly relevant in terms of sustainability. However, hedonia on its own is not sufficient to propagate flourishing without the accompanying effects of eudaimonia. For organisations, there are obvious advantages for a workforce where hedonia prevails. A workforce characterised by hedonia is likely to accumulate addition resources in the domains of social and psychological functioning to those predominantly gained through eudaimonia. In this way hedonia would also effectively contribute to satisfying important needs critical to personal growth and self-actualisation. Hedonia, accompanied by eudaimonia, is likely to promote a positive gain spiral in which the benefits of hedonia provide the means for further eudaimonic gains, for example, towards employee engagement or identification.

1.2.2. Eudaimonia

Eudaimonia as a construct in science is undergoing a process of development and exploration having emerged from conceptual origins as a philosophical construct based on the Aristotelian idea of “a good life” (Henderson & Knight, 2012). Because the term is relatively new in scientific terms, some complexity and
difference remains regarding the interpretation of eudaimonia (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2014). Alan Waterman’s research began the translation of eudaimonia from the field of philosophy to that of science, with the aim of including positive functioning as a component of general well-being and an augmentation to hedonic well-being (Waterman, 1993). Waterman described functional aspects of well-being as psychological well-being. Later, in a review of well-being research, Ryan and Deci (2001) introduced the term eudaimonic well-being to the scientific community in reference to optimal functioning in groups or individuals. A large portion of the complexity and uncertainty that arose after the introduction of the concept of functional well-being centres on the relationship between eudaimonia and hedonia (e.g., Kashdan et al., 2008; Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2014). For example, Ryan and Deci (2001) based the value of eudaimonia to scientific inquiry on its ability to explain the emergence of positive emotions similar to that of hedonia or SWB. Alternatively, Huta and Waterman (2013) explained that many studies treat hedonia as an emotional-cognitive experience while eudaimonia is approached as psychological or social functioning. While these perspectives are not incompatible, Huta and Waterman cautioned against confusing differences between the constructs with differences in their symmetry, except where each is representing a different aspect of a higher order construct. In this thesis the higher order construct would be flourishing.

Eudaimonia may be closely related to hedonic outcomes. However, eudaimonia remains sufficiently distinct from hedonia so that the unique contributions of eudaimonia to well-being are evident. For example, Vittersø and Soholt (2011) found that eudaimonia contributed to well-being directly in its own right, and not just as a consequence of its contribution to hedonic outcomes. This
conclusion challenged Ryan and Deci’s (2001) understanding at the time that eudaimonia was valuable because it explained hedonia. Despite the conjecture, the conceptualisation of eudaimonia has progressed and is viewed by most to be distinct from hedonia in that eudaimonia is fundamentally associated with functioning whereas hedonia is more concerned with feelings or emotional states (Huppert & So, 2013; Keyes & Annas, 2009; Vittersø & Soholt, 2011; Waterman, 2008). On this basis, both elements of well-being are acknowledged as making unique contributions to flourishing, as well as acting synergistically to enhance further gains in flourishing (Keyes, 2007; Keyes & Simoes, 2012; Waterman et al., 2010).

Therefore, the application of both hedonic and eudaimonic domains in the research that follows represents a primary opportunity to understand with detail, the relationship between flourishing and organisational effectiveness.

In terms of the commonality between hedonia and eudaimonia, Straume and Vittersø (2012) explained that the positive feelings associated with both eudaimonia and hedonia may be categorically different and impact behaviour in different ways. For example, they found that the eudaimonic experience of inspiration increased when task difficulty also increased, but that task difficulty had the opposite effect on the hedonic experience of happiness. They suggested that conditions conducive to eudaimonia, such as complexity and challenge at work, are more likely to result in productivity improvements than would actions aimed at promoting happiness within the workforce. Straume and Vittersø claimed that the balance of studies investigating the premise of the happy-productive worker may indeed have generally found equivocal findings primarily because they were pursuing the wrong determinate. While Straume and Vittersø have instead argued for the virtues of the eudaimonic—productive worker thesis, in this thesis the alternative theory may be
stated slightly more broadly as the flourishing – productive worker. This later suggestion is an acknowledgement of the unique but complimentary roles of eudaimonia and hedonia in producing a flourishing and effective workforce.

Not all well-being research into eudaimonia carries the argument that functional well-being is superior to hedonia in terms of outcomes. For example, Keyes and Simoes (2012) found that only when both eudaimonic and hedonic aspects of flourishing were combined was the data able to predict mortality. In a large sample in excess of 3000 adults, they found the likelihood of death increased by 62% for those not flourishing over a period of 10 years. Furthermore, Waterman et al. (2008) found that a combination of eudaimonic and hedonic factors increased motivation for university and college students, strengthening their intrinsic motivation beyond that incurred through hedonia (pleasure) alone. These findings suggest that there is more benefit to workforce functionality and organisational effectiveness by including both eudaimonic and hedonic well-being (SWB) as flourishing. Waterman et al.’s (2010) findings provide supportive argument for the use in this study of both constructs to research workforce flourishing as the basis for organisational effectiveness. Waterman et al. found that eudaimonia benefits psycho-social well-being to a greater extent than hedonia, whereas hedonia has a greater impact upon the reduction of negative emotional states such as anxiety and depression. Therefore, hedonia and eudaimonia appear to be complementary elements of flourishing and may have mutually beneficial properties.

1.3. Flourishing Workforces in Organisations

The functional determinants in a flourishing workforce are more likely to relate to eudaimonic factors, broadly categorised as social and psychological well-being (Keyes, 2007; Ryan & Deci, 2001). In terms of social well-being, positive
identification can provide important resources within a workplace that enable effective functioning to occur more consistently and frequently (Dutton, Roberts, & Bednar, 2010). Positive identification for workers promotes prosocial behaviours that build inter-connectivity in a workforce and thereby increase social resources within that workforce. Work identification may also influence flourishing beyond social well-being and social resources. Dutton et al. (2011) argued that positive work identities enable flourishing because of the contribution to enhanced psychological functioning, positive feelings, and social functioning, all key factors of flourishing.

Waterman’s eudaimonistic identity theory (Waterman, 1992, 2004) describes how identity formation can be positively shaped when activities are pursued that are associated with both eudaimonic and hedonic experience. Waterman et al. (2008) argued that people come to associate those activities that embody eudaimonic and hedonic experience with feelings of self-expressiveness. Identification is more successfully established when people are able to engage in self-expressive activity, which Waterman claimed are the processes of self-actualisation. Therefore, workplace identification may be important to establishing a flourishing workforce within an organisation. Not only is positive work identification likely to contribute to social well-being and social resources, but it may also contribute to emotional and psychological well-being. Furthermore, the environment in which a workforce performs may impact on positive identification in so far as it encourages self-expressiveness, or indeed, self-actualisation.

As well as the contribution workforce flourishing might make towards organisational effectiveness through performance linked to functional well-being, flourishing may also contribute to employee health by helping to sustain such performance benefits. With the exception of Keyes & Simoes’ (2012) investigation
into mortality rates, very few studies have explored the link between flourishing and health. Keyes and Simoes’ research assessed the relationship of emotional, social, and psychological well-being to health. They found that each of the three factors that together represent flourishing were not independently reliable predictors of health in terms of mortality, however, when combined as a measure of flourishing they predicted a 62% increase in mortality for non-flourishing participants. Eight out of every ten participants in Keyes and Simoes’ sample of over 3000 adults from across the United States were found to be non-flourishing and when considered against the findings for increased mortality rates, flourishing would appear to play a prominent role in health and related issues such as a reduction in functional capacity. Therefore, the concept of flourishing warrants exploration in terms of employee health and organisational effectiveness.

Other studies have examined components of flourishing such as the relationship between eudaimonia and health. For example, Ryan and Fredrick’s (1997) found that subjective vitality, a measure of eudaimonic well-being, co-varied with reported physical health symptoms. Lewis, Kimiecik, Horn, Zullig, and Ward (2013) assessed an intervention designed to improve eudaimonic well-being against levels of physical activity. They found that increased eudaimonia corresponded with increased physical activity, deemed to be indicative of a healthy lifestyle. Measures of personal growth, subjective vitality, self-determination, and life engagement were used as indicators of eudaimonia in the Lewis et al. (2013) study. Ryff (2013) argued that if being the best we can is the right way to live, consistent with eudaimonia, then it would be expected that other beneficial outcomes would occur, including outcomes related to health.
Ryff (2013) claimed that, as a consequence of the capacity to cultivate positive aspects in one’s lives, eudaimonic well-being provides the psychological and social resources that contribute to the promotion of health. Ryff’s argument is illustrative of Hobfoll’s (1989, 1998, 2001) conservation of resources (COR) theory that was first developed to explain variation in the occurrence and consequences of stress. COR theory centres on the accumulation of personal and social resources that buffer and remedy threats to health. The theory has been more broadly applied to a range of different phenomena in recent years, including work engagement (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007), self-belief (Llorens, Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2007), intent to leave (Halbesleban & Wheeler, 2008), self-determination or autonomous motivation (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2014), and flourishing (Dutton et al., 2010). Although not directly referring to COR theory, Fredrickson (1998, 2001), in her broaden and build theory of positive emotion, describes a process of resource building through positive affect. Fredrickson and Losada (2005) argued that these resources help foster flourishing. Therefore, it would seem that different domains of well-being (emotional, social, and psychological) that contribute to flourishing have an effect on health through the accumulation of resources. These resources are likely to be congruent with certain well-being domains, such as social resources for social well-being. The effect of flourishing and the accumulation of resources, particularly in relation to eudaimonia, appear to explain the relationship that may exist between flourishing and health. However, there are few studies exploring these relationships and therefore, further research is needed to make further contributions to our understanding of such relationships.
The relationship between hedonia (SWB) and health is more complex than the relationship of eudaimonia to health according to Ryan and Deci (2001). In their review of well-being, Ryan and Deci reported that studies often found people with high levels of SWB were more likely to report poor health. They also claimed that in other studies, low SWB was sometimes found to associate with better health. Ryan and Deci concluded that the relationship between SWB (hedonia) and health was not straightforward. While their conclusion might result in some researchers excluding hedonic well-being from exploration of the link between flourishing and health, other studies have shown a small but consistent relationship. Howell et al. (2007) integrated the findings from 150 experimental, ambulatory, and longitudinal studies that tested the impact of SWB on objective measures of health. They found correlations of \( r = .15 \) for short term outcomes, \( r = .11 \) for long term outcomes, \( r = .13 \) for disease and symptom control, and \( r = .14 \) for all health combined. At first glance these relationships appear modest; however, small increases in the health of employees can translate into marked improvement in organisational and individual effectiveness through reduced absenteeism and improved productivity (Diener & Seligman, 2004). It is also argued here that SWB or hedonia makes a vital contribution to flourishing by rewarding or reinforcing eudaimonic achievement.

Such benefits warrant investigation of the role of hedonia with health despite the uncertainty about the independent relationship with health. As Keyes and Simoes (2012) revealed, the combination of emotional (hedonia), social, and psychological well-being together seems to predict health outcomes more reliably than applying each independently. Furthermore, the effect of hedonic well-being on health is likely to have a similar health promotional effect to that of eudaimonia and is not merely effective by reducing ill-health (Howell et al., 2007). Therefore, to understand the effect of well-being as flourishing towards employees’ health, the inclusion of
hedonic well-being would contribute to the predictability of employee health outcomes.

1.4. Conclusion

To summarise this chapter, an organisation is a dynamic system of activity and interrelationships in which workforce flourishing is a key issue related to the ability of the organisation to remain effective in a sustainable and self-perpetuating manner. The ability of the workforce or organisation to function in optimal ways has therefore become an important subject for organisational research. A number of constructs have been the subject of inquiry into workforce or organisational functionality, exploring such capacities as sustainability and adaptability, most of which are consistent with a systems perspective of organisations. These constructs having included organisational health, integrity, resilience, dynamics, and more recently, flourishing.

Of the constructs reviewed in this chapter, workforce flourishing provides an account of sustainable, optimal functioning through social and psychological well-being (eudaimonia), as well as the contributing impact of emotional well-being that enables a broader array of opportunities and behaviours to prevail. The opportunities and positive behaviours arising from hedonia contribute further resources that propagate optimal functioning. Workforce flourishing is also linked to employee identification related to work, that helps develop social and psychological resources within a workforce through eudaimonic experiences. Flourishing is also likely to advance organisational effectiveness through improved employee health, which in turn suggests improved functional capacity through sustainable and mutually supportive reinforcing cycles. Therefore, in this thesis, the construct of workforce flourishing was examined as a resource for organisational effectiveness, facilitated
through work related identification. The relationship of workforce flourishing to employee health was also deemed to be indicative of the sustainability of the functional capacity experienced through flourishing. To proceed, a review of social identification and work related health literature was required for a more complete understanding of the relationships both have with workforce flourishing. The next chapter examines work related identification, highlighting the links with emotional, social, and psychological well-being.
Chapter 2

Workplace Identification and Resource Accumulation

2.1. Introduction

Who we are and how we see ourselves has important implications for the way we behave and our welfare in general. Put another way, identification has an important impact on our ability to flourish or function optimally (Dutton et al., 2010, 2011). Much of the beneficial effect of identification in relation to flourishing is based on the ability of identification to facilitate the accumulation of resources that are complimentary to the circumstance of flourishing (Dutton et al., 2011). Identification with a group such as an organisation helps to foster various forms of behaviour or positive functioning that might support the group or organisation (Haslam, 2014; Kim, Chang, & Ko, 2010). For example, Gecas (2001) suggested that identification is a reflexive process that enables psychological resources in the form of meaning and symbolism to emerge from social contexts. Tajfel and Turner’s (1979) social identity theory accounts for how individuals come to incorporate group values, norms, and goals as their own and thereby build social resources through actions that are consistent and beneficial to the group. Identification at work is likely to be associated with behaviours useful to group functioning as well as individual functioning within the group and therefore, identification is associated with resources for functioning and flourishing.

Tajfel’s (1982) description of the term identification included references to the importance of evaluative and affective processes, so that identification is more likely whenever people feel more positive about a particular group. Given a hedonic
perspective, positive feelings associated with identification are consistent with Fredrickson’s (2001) broaden and build theory in which positive emotions enable the accumulation of further resources. According to Fredrickson, positive feelings such as interest, joy, and pride can foster a broader repertoire of responses towards events, creating or enhancing the opportunities for resource gain. Taken together, work identification is likely to contribute to the accumulation of psychological, social, and hedonic resources that increase the capacity of individuals and groups to flourish and be more effective in their organisation.

According to Tajfel (1981, 1982) and Tajfel and Turner (1979), identification provides a sense of self reference to the social context. In other words, identification involves the internalisation of social factors in a way that enables a person to make sense of, and respond effectively to, social contexts (Turner et al., 1987). In this regard, identification would appear to have a direct influence on flourishing due to the capacity to increase positive functioning within a particular social context (Dutton et al., 2011). From Dutton et al.’s perspective, the role of social identification formation can have an impact on the ability of individuals and workgroups to flourish through social resources. Haslam (2014) suggested that identification is likely to bring about outcomes such as greater meaning, purpose, and self-worth. These outcomes are all consistent with psychological resources for flourishing.

Hobfoll (2001) states that resources are entities, valued in their own right for their ability to facilitate desirable outcomes. Halbesleben, Neveu, Paustain-Underdahl, and Westman (2014) helped to concentrate the understanding of resources even further by suggesting that the desirable outcomes were valued goals. As such, identification reflects a degree of congruence between a group and its
individual members that would seem to indicate elevated value of group related activities directed towards important goal achievement (Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000; Haslam, Eggins, & Reynolds, 2003). Identification would therefore evoke the accumulation of resources valued by group members because they increase group functioning, enable goals to be met, and contribute to the group’s ability to flourish. Flourishing includes both functional and emotional elements that goal achievement helps support (e.g., Ryan & Deci, 2001). Several theories exist that explain the interaction between social context and identification and contribute to our understanding of how psychological, social, and hedonic resources are gained. These identification theories and the relationship to resource accumulation are presented in the following sections.

2.2. Theories of Identification

Identification has often been defined in terms of a person’s cognitions (Ashforth, Harrison, & Corley, 2008) that relate to internalisation of a group’s values, norms, and goals (van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, & Christ, 2004). Essentially, definitions of identification such as these describe the extent of congruence between an individual’s values, norms, and goals with those of the relevant group. However, Tajfel’s (1982) description of the term identification included reference to evaluative and affective processes in addition to cognitive processes. Ellemers, Kortekaas, and Ouwerkerk (1999) proposed that cognitive, evaluative, and affective processes of identification act independently or co-vary in some way to create greater diversity in the patterns of identification that might occur. This, in turn, would have correspondingly diverse outcomes in terms of behaviours and attitudes in response to social circumstances. For the purposes of this
identification is defined as an individual’s sense of unity with a group to the extent that the group has personal value and emotional significance.

The concept of identification is linked to the concept of identity or identities which Gecas & Mortimer (1987) described as specified entities that enable an understanding of a given situation of context. Ramarajan (2014) defined identities as subjective knowledge, meanings, and experiences that are self-defining. According to Deaux (1992), identities provide flexibility and adaptability in social contexts given the inherent dynamic nature typical of social contexts. Having self-defining qualities and allowing adaptability in social contexts suggests that identities provide a mechanism to find meaning within social contexts. Identification on the other hand relates to the actual congruence between an individual and their cognitive, evaluative, and emotional fit with the social context. Identities relate to the range of self-referenced entities that individual’s may draw upon to help find such congruence. Identities can be considered similar to the tools in a toolbox, whereas identification is the application of those tools. Identities can also be considered as components of an overall sense of self or self-concept (Gecas & Mortimer, 1987). Therefore, the concepts of identification, identity, and self-concept can be considered related but also distinct in terms that they each have their own specific application to research. This thesis is concerned mainly with identification because it captures how a person makes sense of a situation and arrives at a feeling of accord with their circumstances. However, because identities and self-concept are constructs related to identification, they are also informative and will be discussed briefly although they are not central to this thesis.

Indeed, these terms can be closely mapped against theories related to identification and a sense of self linked to social contexts. James (1892) and
Baldwin (1899) were among the first social scientists to propose theories of self that reflect the importance of the social context. From the perspective of James (1892), we have many selves that represent the many circumstances and people we encounter in our day to day activities. This view aligns closely with concepts of identification and identity. Identification is the extent of congruence between the person and the context or circumstance. Identity is the array of different perspectives of self that help one find a meaningful fit to each different context. Mead (1913, 1934) introduced a constructionist perspective in relation to the self within social contexts to which the social context was a source of reflection for understanding the self. From Mead’s (1934) perspective, people attribute different qualities about themselves based on the information they receive or perceive in social contexts. Mead’s perspective is one in which the focus is on self-concept, or a global sense of self but also highlights how individual and contexts interact and shape meaning with those contexts.

The initial attempts to explore the self in relation to social context by James (1892) and Mead (1913, 1934) have helped to produce two distinct theoretical pathways that have since been applied to understand behaviour in social contexts. Gleason (1983) described the contrast between these two paradigms as the “unity of self” debate. This debate centres on a conflict between understanding the self as a single, unitary sense of self as opposed to a sense of self that is composed of many versions of self. Although this distinction is noted here, the intention is not to engage in a detailed, extensive review of the merits of each in this thesis. The purpose of this thesis is to examine elements of the interaction between employees and their work contexts that enable them to flourish and thereby function effectively. In this regard, theories that are centred on identification and, to a lesser extent identities, are
more applicable to the intent of this thesis. However, self-concept and the understanding of how individuals and context can shape meaning that is both consistent (such as unity of self), or context specific (many selves), has implications towards understanding functioning in social contexts and is therefore, briefly noted here.

2.2.1. Social Identification – Theories of Social Behaviour

Two related theories have been most prominent in progressing our understanding of identification, and of how groups and the social context shape people’s behaviour. Tajfel and Turner’s (1979) social identity theory was the product of Henry Tajfel’s earlier contemplation of prejudice and the cognitive and social processes that create such devastating social divides (Tajfel, 1981). Turner et al.’s (1987) self-categorisation theory was an extension of the earlier social identity theory adding an explanation of the psychological processes that described categorisation of the salient qualities of groups within the social context. These two theories maintain that social behaviour results from an interaction between the social context and the person and may result in varying levels of identification and concordant group based behaviour.

In addition, two theories from the field of sociology are also worth mentioning here for their contribution to understanding the impact of social contexts on people’s behaviours. McCall and Simmons’ (1978) identity theory and Strykers’s (1980, 2002) role identity theory are founded on constructionist principles and informed by the earlier work of Mead (1934). While these theories have much to offer to an understanding of social behaviour, they are more oriented towards exploring issues of self-concept rather than identification. However, both offer accounts of context specific behaviour that help inform how people function well in social contexts.
contributing to their ability to flourish. For example, within Stryker’s (2002) role identity theory, he described circumstances in which people adopt different social roles within groups thereby fulfilling functional niches within the group and enabling optimal functioning of that group.

Both McCall and Simmons’ (1978) identity theory and Stryker’s (1980, 2002) role identity theory emphasise the negotiation that takes place within a group that shape behaviour. The negotiation is both implicit and explicit but helps to direct behaviour towards group endorsed outcomes or goals. Therefore, describing a negotiated process for resources that facilitate group functioning and potential flourishing. In comparison, Tajfel and Turner’s (1979) social identity theory and Turner et al.’s (1987) self-categorisation theory have a stronger emphasis on context, these theories are more central to revealing the specifics of a particular context such as work, that might facilitate resources that enable optimal functioning and flourishing within a group. As such, an overview of both social identity theory and self-categorisation theory follows.

Social Identity Theory

Social identity theory describes group-based behaviour as a product of perceived similarities between group members and differences with out-group members (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Tajfel (1974) defined social identity as the part of an individual’s self-concept that derives from knowledge of their membership in a social group or groups, together with the emotional significant attached to that membership. This comparative process is motivated by a need for a positive sense of self and therefore, the extent to which an in-group enhances one’s self-concept will help to determine the extent of identification with that group (Ellemers & Haslam, 2011). The more one identifies with a particular group, the more group identification
determines one’s inclination to act in accord with other group members (Ellemers et al., 1999). In addition, identification with a particular group manifests by people becoming active in maintaining their in-group’s distinctiveness (Haslam et al., 2003; Turner & Haslam, 2001).

Actively enhancing one’s own group in contrast to other groups may be motivated by a need to maintain the value of one’s group in terms of one’s sense of self. For example, competition between groups may increase identification with one’s own group and, as such, accentuate stereotypical judgements about the out-group (Oakes, 1996; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Virtues of one’s group are elevated, in conjunction with the faults and failures of out-groups. This helps maximise the value of one’s own group in comparison to other groups. Furthermore, people may act in ways that advance their groups’ interests, with the consequence that perceived differences with other groups are exaggerated (Haslam et al., 2003). Therefore, the motive to enhance self-worth through group affiliation may drive people to act in ways that not only distinguish their group from others, but also exaggerates these differences to obtain greater benefit from their group alliances. In terms of resources to meet goals and therefore, enhance effectiveness, the processes described suggest that resources effective in maintaining conflict would be valued. However, it is difficult to argue that such resources might lead to flourishing and well-being in a workforce.

Social identity theory has a more general application of the qualities leading to identification than primarily drawing on inter-group conflict (Turner & Haslam, 2001). For example, Amiot and Sansfaçon (2011) applied social identification and self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2002) to explain both positive and negative behaviours and the consequences arising from identification.
They found support for the notion that when identification was motivated by autonomous regulation, the outcomes or consequences of identification were more likely to be positive, for instance, greater well-being. Workman (2001) used social identity theory to examine group cohesion and suggested that the existence of group cohesion reflects homogeneity of group members’ values and beliefs. Ellemers et al. (1999) used social identity theory to examine a number of group related outcomes such as self-esteem, self-categorisation, and group commitment. Ellemers and Haslam (2011) concluded that the search for positive identification may involve forms of social mobility and creativity as alternative pathways to that of competition and conflict. In essence, social identity theory attempts to describe how group values, norms, and goals contribute to the development of beliefs that become shared between group members and impact on the behaviour of that group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Therefore, while conflict might enhance group identification, there are other aspects to identification that are similarly able to facilitate identification although with more positive consequences, some of which may contribute to flourishing.

In summary, social identity theory explains some important situational or contextual characteristics that may lead to a predilection for one identity over another based on in-group similarities and out-group differences. It has been suggested that we judge both similarities and differences based on our motivation to regard our self-concept positively. This motivation may also lead to exaggerating similarities within the group and differences outside the group, culminating in prejudice and even conflict. Such outcomes are not conducive to flourishing, nor are they in the interests of organisations. However, social identity theory has been used to explore more positive, affirmative outcomes such as cohesion and commitment
and can help explain how group membership can influence functionality and therefore flourishing. As Amiot and Sansfaçon (2011) found, motives aligned with autonomy and development rather than external control and ego defensive are more strongly associated with positive outcomes from identification such as well-being. However, social identity theory is not clear about how positive motives or goals might be determined in shaping identification in ways that enhance the potential to flourish. Another related theory, self-categorisation theory (Turner et al., 1987) is more detailed about how people might begin to identify with particular groups and how this might lead to flourishing.

Self-Categorisation Theory

The reliance of social identity theory on positive self-assessment as a driving force for group membership has some limitations identified in the previous section and a more elaborate explanation of the subjective processes leading to identification was argued. Turner et al.’s. (1987) self-categorisation theory attempted to pay closer attention to these subjective processes by incorporating a cognitive explanation of the interaction between the environment and the person to account for identification and social behaviour. This cognitive process relates to the assimilation of group or category based norms, values, and goals with those norms, values, and goals of individual group members. An individual becomes a group member in psychological sense, a process Turner et al. (1987) termed depersonalisation. Turner et al. described depersonalisation as the product of circumstances by which group norms, values, and goals are shared throughout membership within the group, thus leading to more uniform behaviours based on these shared attributes. Such circumstances would seem to favour group functioning and therefore, flourishing.
Sharing group norms, values, and goals has a positive effect on group functioning (Haslam, 2014; Ramarajan, 2014) and therefore, flourishing, however there are multiple group with which identification can occur (Ramarajan, 2014). The determination of which group or category might be evoked in a given context was an important development in self-categorisation theory (Turner & Reynolds, 2011). According to both self-categorisation theory (Turner et al., 1987) and social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), there is an interaction between the social context and an individual that determines which group identification contributes best to sense making in that context. However, self-categorisation theory extends this idea by detailing cognitive processes that increase the likelihood of identification and the impact that identification may subsequently have on social behaviour (Haslam, Powell, & Turner, 2000; Hogg & Terry, 2000). One of the principle aspects of the cognitive process of identification explained by self-categorisation theory is identity saliency (Turner et al., 1987).

Self-categorisation theory links saliency to the notion of group selection based on intra-group similarities and inter-group differences, and as such, is consistent with social identity theory. However, self-categorisation theory offers far more insight into the processes resulting in group saliency. According to Turner et al. (1987), identity saliency occurs when group membership becomes cognitively pre-potent in one’s self-concept. As mentioned, Turner and Reynolds (2011) state that saliency varies as a process involving perceived similarity with members of a category and differences with members of other categories. These perceived similarities and differences are also known as the degree of fit with context and expectation (Turner et al., 1987). Accordingly, the context determines the field from which similarities and differences become perceptually available for evaluation. In
addition, accessibility or personally available schema help determine which groups are applicable to the context. It follows that changes in context may result in a shift in which identification is salient, and thereby cognitively dominant leading to identification related behaviours. This process is important in the context of work and organisations because the outcome behaviour of employees may vary depending on what is happening in the work context at any given time. In addition, the alignment of member expectations and perceive capacity of group membership to meet expectations would also appear to be a critical transaction in the process of identification.

In terms of flourishing, fluctuations in the saliency of some groups may have corresponding effects on the level of identification and the capacity to accumulate resources linked to optimal functioning and flourishing (Dutton et al., 2011). The implication for flourishing suggested by variable group saliency highlights the importance of processes by which saliency of groups is determined. Turner et al. (1987) claimed that both fit and accessibility of a group category are instrumental in determining group saliency. Turner and Reynolds (2011) refer to fit as the personal relevance of a group category. The degree of fit may vary depending on the demands of the context at the time. Millward and Haslam (2013) refer to accessibility as the cognitive availability of a group or category and this may be influenced by such things as expectations, past experience, and culture. As such, identification with particular groups may enhance or diminish the capacity of a group member to function effectively in a situation if the level of fit was low or accessibility was not congruent with high identification groups. Therefore, in terms of flourishing in the context of work and organisations, an understanding of identification in work contexts is warranted.
2.3. Identification in Organisations

Organisations are structured groups that also include smaller sub-groups such as divisions, work units, or teams (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Riketta & van Dick, 2005). Organisation based groups may also intersect with other work groups such as professions or socio-demographic categories (e.g., Hogg & Terry, 2000; van Dick et al., 2004). Regardless of the target group, identification with a group means that within the group individuals perceives themselves in terms of the characteristics they share with others in that group (Brickson, 2013; Turner et al., 1987). Brickson (2013), Cole and Bruch (2006), Dutton, Dukerish, and Harquail (1994), Mael and Ashforth (1992), and Riketta and van Dick (2005) proposed that organisational identification is a form of psychological attachment that occurs when members of the organisation group adopt the defining characteristics of the organisation as similarly self-defining. According to Reade (2001), employees of an organisation are likely to be members of at least two work groups, the organisation as a whole and an organisational department or section. However, the potential number of groups an employee may belong to in the workplace and therefore, evoke identification with, are numerous (Hogg & Terry, 2000).

Variations in the level of identification with different work groups may be explained by a desire to achieve or maintain positive self-esteem as well as a need to confirm perceptions of self (self-verification) (Ashforth et al., 2008; Brickson, 2013; Gecas, 2001). Ashforth et al. (2008) also suggested identification was motivated by uncertainty reduction, or put another way, sense making. Differences in group member’s level of identification may also be attributed to balancing the need to belong with the need for individuality (Brewer, 1991, 2008). Millward and Haslam (2013) argued that the self-esteem and self-verification motivations, manifest as fit
and accessibility, had greater explanatory ability than Brewer’s (1991, 2008, 2009) optimal distinctiveness explanation. Brewer’s optimal distinctiveness theory predicts that group size is a key aspect of identification. Groups that consist of just a few members do not typically evoke a sense of belonging, as would a larger group. In contrast, large groups reduce affirmations of individuality and are less often the target of identification. In terms of identification in organisations, Brewer’s (1991, 2008, 2009) optimal distinctiveness theory would predict that work groups rather than the organisation are likely to attract the highest levels of identification (see Riketta & van Dick, 2005; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000).

However, Millward and Haslam (2013) predicted that when the culture of an origination is predisposed to promoting accessibility of groups other than the work group, then other work related targets of identification are likely to more applicable within that work context. For example, they found that for organisations with a culture of individualism in which team work was not emphasised, career identification was higher than work group identification. This finding indicates that the accessibility of a group for identification can be shaped by the work context, in their example, work culture and values. As such, a culture in which work groups are extremely permeable and fluid and in which a high priority is placed on the organisation as unified group, the impact is likely to be that organisational identification levels would be greater than levels of work group identification.

In contrast, other studies have typically found that work group identification is generally higher than organisation identification (e.g., Riketta & van Dick, 2005; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). Indeed, Millward and Haslam (2013) suggested that work group identification is normally at higher levels than identification with other target group such as the organisation because work groups
are typically more salient within most work contexts. Notably, their argument for greater saliency is premised on an argument drawing on accessibility and fit which becomes a circular explanation. Nevertheless, in most typical work environments, identification with the work group can be expected to be higher than identification with the organisation (see Riketta & van Dick, 2005, for a meta-analysis of research comparing the two identification foci).

Determining whether self-esteem (fit) and continuity (accessibility) are primarily responsible for determining strength of identification, or alternatively, if the balance of competing needs to belong and for individuality are more influential is beyond the scope of this thesis. Rather, as Brickson (2013) states, the value of an identification target relates to the ability of group membership to satisfy individual identification motives. According to Brickson, such motives are to a large extent idiosyncratic and likely to vary between members of a group. Although, for almost all people, the motives for identification with a group are likely to have some relationship to personal development, or more broadly stated as seeking positive outcomes from current circumstances (Ramarajan, 2014). Amoit and Sansfaçon’s (2011) research findings also support this assertion by showing that autonomy and intrinsic motivation predicated positive outcomes from identification in the form of greater well-being. As such, it is assumed that most employees wish to become group members at work for positive reasons, although, it is accepted that on occasions good intentions may have misguided consequences and diminish a group’s capacity to function well and thereby flourishing. For the purpose of this thesis, it was accepted that work group identification levels would be higher than organisation identification. It was also anticipated that the difference between
identification targets would correspond to different patterns of resource availability and accumulation, culminating in differences in flourishing.

Bartel (2001) and van Knippenberg (2000) explained that when identification is at high levels, employees are more inclined to see their group’s interests (e.g., organisation and/or work group) as their own. This process of depersonalisation increases the likelihood of behaving and thinking in terms of the interests aligned to that group which may include protecting or defending the group’s image and values (Turner et al., 1987; Ellemers & Haslam, 2011). Strength of identification has a comparable effect on employees’ attitudes and behaviour linked to their membership (Dutton et al. 1994; Ellemers & Haslam, 2011; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). For example, Dukerich, Golden, and Shortell (2002) found that physicians with high levels of identification were more likely to engage in co-operative and citizenship behaviours. Bartel (2001) reported that when employees of an organisation engaged in work outside of their organisation, identification with their organisation was enhanced and was claimed to result in increased co-operation and work effort. Work based identification, as an individual’s incorporation of group characteristics as their own, suggests that the level of identification has a commensurate effect on an individual’s behaviour consistent with the group. Therefore, identification is an important construct when considering functioning and flourishing in an organisation.

To date, only a few studies such as Dutton et al. (2010, 2011) and Waterman (1992, 2004) have explored the link between identification and flourishing. The likelihood that work group identification will be higher than organisation identification, and thus have distinct effects on workforce flourishing, also opens a new field of inquiry for social identification theories, as well as scholarship.
surrounding flourishing and functional well-being. Dutton et al. (2011) explained that identification may enhance employee’s capacity to accumulate important psychological and social resources that help to create a state of flourishing. Given that work group and organisation identification levels are likely to be weighted in favour of work group identification, differences may exist between these two identification targets with regards to facilitating workforce flourishing.

However, the capacity to facilitate flourishing may not be wholly attributable to identification levels per se. Capacity to flourish may also depend on characteristics of the identification group (Dutton et al., 2010), and also on the context that helps facilitate the emergent behaviours and attitudes of identification (Dutton et al., 2011). Identification, in partnership with the context at work, interacts to shape resources that can enable flourishing within a workforce (Dutton et al., 2010). To explore these relationships further, a discussion of the characteristics of identification and work contexts that facilitate resource accumulation follows in the next section.

2.4. Resource Accumulation Related to Identification and Circumstances at Work

Organisational identification, indicative of group membership, reflects important dimensions of an organisation’s social environment in terms of the cohesion among employees (Haslam, 2014; Reade, 2001). Cohesion arising from identification may take the form of a shared understanding among group members that includes goals, attitudes, and norms applicable to each foci of identification or group (Turner & Reynolds, 2011). According to Tajfel (1981) and Ellemers and Haslam (2011), members of a group, including work groups, will shape their behaviour by what they deem appropriate within the social circumstances and
accompanying social parameters presented to them. How certain behaviours are
determined as appropriate is governed by the system of norms and values belonging
to that group and the level of identification attributed to that group at that moment in
time (Turner et al., 1987).

Identification not only involves a level of awareness of group norms and
values, but identification with an organisation or work group also means that
employees share that group’s goals or ambitions (Stryker, 1980, 2002). Therefore,
identification helps to bring a degree of consistency among members of an
organisation with respect to the norms, values, and goals that each member uses to
guide their behaviour in the context of the organisation’s day to day operations (Lee,
Farh, & Chen, 2011). However, for employees’ behaviour to be guided by the
norms, values, and goals of a work group, a certain threshold of cognitive awareness
needs to be meet (Ellemers & Haslam, 2011; Turner et al., 1987). In other words, an
employee needs to be thinking as a group member to act as a group member.

The cognitive activation of group membership, or identification, is necessary
to generate group related behaviours, however, this does not necessarily lead to
resource accumulation (van den Heuvel et al., 2014). Rather, van den Heuvel et al.
found that positive relations with leaders in an organisation were associated with
identification based resources than were group consistent behaviours, and that
relations with leaders contributed to effective adaptation to change. Dutton et al.
(2010) proposed that positive identification, in contrast to just identification, is a key
ingredient in resource accumulation leading to flourishing. Four mechanisms were
discussed by Dutton et al. as qualities of positive identification that facilitate
resource accumulation. These qualities were; when a group has virtue, or good
character; evaluations of the group result in perceptions of value; the group in
question is dynamic and capable of development and change; and lastly, when identification is in harmony and consistent with other group memberships and members self-concept. Accordingly, each of the four aspects contributes to identification in ways that enable positive outcomes in the form of job resources.

Work engagement is also implicated in the accumulation of job resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014; van den Heuvel, Demerouti, Schaufeli, Bakker, 2010). Engagement at work is described by Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Roma, and Bakker (2002) as a positive, fulfilling, work related state of mind characterised by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Work engagement translates into positive behaviours within the context in which the engagement occurs (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). In this regard, there are similarities with identification in that both have effects on behaviour and both involve varying levels of cognitive activation.

However, according to Bakker and Demerouti (2014) engagement is often the outcome of job and personal resources, whereas Dutton et al. (2010) and van den Heuvel et al. (2014) claimed that identification helps generate resources, especially social and psychological resources. The effect of resource accumulation for both identification and engagement is that in both instances the relationships may evolve into a positive feedback or positive gain cycle. A positive gain cycle (Salanova, Schaufeli, Xanthopoulou, & Bakker, 2010), with respect to engagement, implies that initial engagement helps to build additional resources which adds further to levels of engagement. A similar reciprocal relationship between identification and resources may also exist. For example, Dutton et al. (2011) explained that valuing an identity more or engaging in positive interactions associated with identification may increase motivation for identification. Essentially, the generation of resources may create a
more positive work context in which further benefits arise that promote both
engagement and identification further. In one way or another, these positive gain
cycles seem to depend on the relationship of employees with their work being
positive in the sense that an employee is motivated by positive outcomes.

In Bakker and Demerouti’s (2008, 2014) job demand-resources theory, job
resources, and personal resources, have been argued to be important facilitators of
positive outcomes such as employee engagement. Job resources refer to physical,
social, and organisational aspects of the job that help reduce demands, add to
functional capacity to achieve goals, and stimulate personal growth (Bakker &
Demerouti, 2008). More recently, personal resources were included in the model of
job demands-resources (Bakker & Sanz-Vergel, 2013) and were used to describe
positive self-evaluations linked to resiliency, sense of control, and efficacy (Hobfoll,
Johnson, Ennis, & Jackson, 2003). Van den Heuvel et al. (2014) found that personal
resources in terms of self-esteem and meaning making enhanced the relationship
with organisation leadership adding further to personal resources. Although this
thesis is not concerned with distinguishing between the two resource domains, the
generation of resources in a work place provides a useful framework for explaining
how identification produces positive outcomes such as flourishing. Resources
generated by identification, such as extending social networks, trust, positive
emotions, social affirmation, personal-group congruency, communication (Dutton et
al., 2010), organisation based self-esteem, and meaning making (van den Heuvel et
al., 2014) all relate back to the work environment or work context. Therefore, the
key effect of identification in terms of flourishing and increased effectiveness is
likely to be via the impact of identification on the work context or environment,
aided by the resources generated through positive interaction within the work environment.

2.5. Conclusion

Identification has an impact on people’s behaviour and their ability to function optimally, or put another way, to flourish (Dutton et al., 2010). Identification enables us to interpret social contexts in order that we respond effectively (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Responding to social contexts effectively is helpful with respect to acquiring important resources (e.g. Hobfoll, 1998, 2001; van den Heuvel et al., 2014) that can further strengthen identification and contribute to flourishing (Dutton et al., 2011; Salanova et al., 2010; van den Heuvel et al., 2014). Two social psychology theories, social identity theory and self-categorisation theory, have provided useful frameworks from which to understand identification processes, including how identification contributes to resources and positive outcomes from group activity that sustain flourishing.

Tajfel and Turner’s (1979) social identity theory explains how behaviour can be shaped by social contexts that evoke perceptions of group identification. Turner et al.’s (1987) self-categorisation theory provides an understanding of the cognitive processes that lead to group based behaviour that stems from personal adoption of norms, values, and goals attributed to the group. Together, these theories offer an outline of social processes that result in member perceptions of identification and behaviours that advance the interests of the group and help build socially derived resources for flourishing to emerge. The capacity of identification to enable effective responses to social contexts, build important resources, and contribute to a state of flourishing suggests that identification offers substantial utility in application to work and organisational contexts.
Identification in work contexts with groups such as the organisation or work group has an impact on the effectiveness of such groups in the form of group behaviour directed at promoting group benefit (Ashforth et al., 2008; Haslam, 2014; Riketta & van Dick, 2005). In terms of flourishing, behaviour that follows from a shared understanding of group goals, norms, and values is likely to make a positive contribution to group and individual outcomes and build important work related resources (Dutton et al., 2010; van den Heuvel et al., 2014). Much of the literature on job and personal resources in the workplace has been focussed on employee engagement and the job demands – resource model (e.g., Bakker & Demerouti, 2014; van den Heuvel et al., 2010). However, van den Heuvel et al. (2014) found a positive relationship between identification based resources and adaptation during organisation change. In the engagement literature, the accumulation of resources related to work has a positive reinforcing impact on further engagement. Dutton et al., (2010) proposed a similar reinforcing cycle between job resources and identification. Such reinforcing cycles are also known as positive gain spirals (e.g., Salanova et al., 2013).

The positive gain spiral predicted by identification and the positive effect on work related resources provides further justification for the research undertaken in this thesis. The aim here is to advance understanding about the mechanisms by which identification contributes to flourishing at work. The presence or potential for a positive gain spiral between identification and work related resources would arguably make a valuable contribution to the literature and practice given that achieving high levels of identification would not require intergroup competition or conflict. In such circumstances, the value of a positive cycle represents sustainability for the strategies an organisation might engage in to promote flourishing through
identification. In a systems sense, Capra (1997) argued that the inter-relationships that help to produce positive resources and build stocks should assume a level of sustainability. Pfeffer (2010) claimed that practices contributing to workforce functioning in a sustainable manner would also be contributing to organisational outcomes in the long term. Identification, as a sustainable approach to workforce flourishing through the accumulation of resources, is one such approach to ongoing, sustainable effectiveness in organisations.

One resource that may be evident in terms of identification and flourishing is employee health. Indeed, the World Health Organisation (WHO) (1986, 1997) described health as a resource for everyday living. The notion that health is a resource for living is consistent with Halbesleben et al.’s (2014) definition of a resource as being something that is instrumental in achieving goals. For example, Karasek (1979), Hobfoll (1989, 1998, 2001), and Bakker and Demerouti (2007, 2014) have argued that health, in terms of the absence of stress, enables employees to perform more effectively and contribute to the social context that would include work and the organisation.

Antonovsky (1987) outlined a sense of coherence theory in which the ability to make sense of demands, the ability to make use of resources, and the level of meaningfulness, in combination, enabled the development and maintenance of health. Identification provides a sense of coherence to emerge within work contexts, and therefore, contributes to the health of employees within that work context. For example, Pahkin, Väänänen, Koskinen, Bergbom, and Kouvonen, (2011) found that higher levels of coherence helped to protect employees’ mental health from the negative consequences of an organisational merger. Antonovsky’s (1987) sense of coherence theory would also suggest that functionality plays an important role in
promoting health as the criteria for coherence all involve a level of effectiveness within a particular context. Therefore, it is likely that identification is associated with a range of resources including employee health. Identification is likely to facilitate health through the advantages gained in optimal functioning in the workplace in terms of workforce flourishing. It is proposed that identification contributes to workforce flourishing, and that flourishing through functionality, promotes healthier outcomes for employees. A review of the employee health literature in relation to work related resources and enhanced functioning is addressed in the next chapter.


Chapter 3

Employee Health as a Sustainable Outcome of Identification and Flourishing

3.1. Introduction

Participation or involvement in the workplace indicates some level of identification with groups associated with the work undertaken (Haslam, 2014). Within an organisation, employee identification is an important component of a healthy workforce (Jaffe, 1995; van den Heuvel et al., 2014). Identification with a group related to the work being undertaken facilitates a sense of shared beliefs, norms, and values for employees (Turner et al., 1987). These shared group dimensions motivate individual workers to behave in group oriented ways, such as considering and assisting others (Ashforth et al., 2008; Haslam, 2014; Haslam, McGarty, & Turner, 1996; van Knippenberg, 2000). Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, and Toth (1997) suggested collaborative, supportive work environments provide employees with resources that help deal with work demands, enabling greater stability, and therefore predictability, in the work environment.

Greater stability related to work can also lead to a reduction in threats and conflict. For example, van den Heuvel et al. (2014) found that identification related resources such as meaning making and organisationally linked self-esteem provide organisational stability through the capacity for successful adaption in the face of change. In addition, identification helps ward off the experience of stress and thereby improves psychological health (Jaffe, 1995). The benefits derived from identification and cohesion in the workplace, such as those suggested by Cropanzano et al. (1997) and van den Heuvel et al. (2014), support employee
functioning and their health. The relationship may be explained by the personal and social resources that identification helps to build (Dutton et al., 2011; van den Heuvel et al., 2014), as well as the sense of control over work demands that arises (Karasek, 1979; Hobfoll, 2001; Hobfoll et al., 2003). Identification may also contribute to better emotional health (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003) and to improved general physical health (James, Lovato, & Khoo, 1994) and well-being (van den Heuvel et al., 2014). In summary, increasing levels of identification within the workplace may benefit the organisation in terms of increased productivity (Haslam, 2014) and flourishing (Dutton et al., 2010), and is also likely to have a positive effect on employee health and well-being (e.g., Haslam, 2014; van den Heuvel et al., 2014).

Past concepts of employee health, predominantly under the title of occupational health, have tended to place work and health in juxtaposition (Cox & Cox, 1992). Contemporary conceptualisations of health in an organisational context have drawn mainly upon knowledge gained from research examining occupational stress (Cotton & Hart, 2003; Cox & Cox, 1992; Shoef et al., 2004) that has highlighted the effect that working environments have on employee health and an employees’ ability to contribute productively to the organisation. According to Dutton et al. (2010) and van den Heuvel et al. (2014), personal and social resources are critical for both employee well-being and effectiveness. Indeed, Keyes and Simoes (2012) found that functional well-being in the form of flourishing was linked to health in terms of mortality. Although studies addressing flourishing and health are scarce, Keyes and Simoes’ findings suggest that functionality or effectiveness and health are not at odds but mutually beneficial.
Access to resources through identification and flourishing that support both functioning and health could explain the positive association between identification, flourishing, and employee health (van den Heuvel et al., 2014; Dutton et al., 2011). Hobfoll’s (1989, 2001) conservation of resources (COR) theory initially emerged as an explanation of stress and has evolved to become an effective framework for health and well-being in general. Hobfoll’s COR theory, with an emphasis on positive gain cycles involving resources (e.g., Hobfoll, 2011), has provided as strong argument for employee health to be understood as an asset to organisational functioning. This view challenges perceptions that addressing employee health is a drain on time and finances. For example, Bakker and colleagues (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008, 2014; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) have adapted the principle of resource accumulation to explain the phenomena of employee engagement. Dutton et al. (2010, 2011) also applied the concept of resource accumulation to explain advances in flourishing. Van den Heuvel et al. (2014) found personal resources were associated with adaption to changes at work. Indeed, Hobfoll’s (1989, 2001) COR theory has set the foundation for a much broader understanding of employee health beyond the original focus that highlighted employee stress. Furthermore, the fundamental principle that employees might have available personal and social resources that help them engage in their activities with greater efficacy is a simple, yet effective premise from which to understand employee health.

Indeed, as Hobfoll’s (1989, 2001) COR theory illustrates, the extent and availability of resource an individual has to draw from is an important determinant for outcomes such as health and well-being. Not only do resources enable better health, Hobfoll (2011) and Salanova et al. (2010) claimed that resource gain enables further resource accumulation. Hobfoll (2001) termed these reciprocal resource gain
cycles as “resource caravans”. As such, employee health becomes a resource in itself and has a positive impact on further resource accumulation such as flourishing or positive functionality (e.g., Dutton et al., 2011). In this thesis, both flourishing and employee health are understood to be resources, enabled to some extent by the level of identification employees have in association with work related groups. Therefore, employee health is an indicator of the sustainable qualities of flourishing in a process akin to Hobfoll’s (2011) resource caravans that involve a process of positive gain cycles.

Flourishing may have an effect on employees’ health in a number of ways. For example, Keyes and Simoes (2012) found flourishing was related to physical health status in the form of better mortality or longer life expectancy, recording a 62% increase over non-flourishing adults. Ryan and Fredrick (1997) and Lewis et al. (2013) also found a relationship between aspects of flourishing (e.g., subjective vitality) and physical health. Ryff (2013) suggested that flourishing would provide psychological and social resources that would be expected to promote better health. Indeed, specific resources like these may have specific effects on health such as emotional health (e.g., Fredrickson & Losada, 2005) and psychological health (e.g., Hale, Hannum, & Espelage, 2005). In general, resources available to employees enabled by flourishing may enhance employee physical, emotional, and psychological health given flourishing encompasses similar domains. In addition, identification aligned with work is likely to contribute to resource accumulation through flourishing and thereby enhance employee health, physically, mentally, and emotionally. Complementary and beneficial relationships between identification, flourishing, and employee health suggest that strategies supporting these relationships would also be sustainable. Reciprocal benefits such as these support
the pursuit of further knowledge through research into the relationships between these constructs undertaken in this thesis.

3.2. Employee Health and the Relationship to Identification and Flourishing

Despite the potential for identification, flourishing, and health to associate strongly, few studies have been undertaken to explore such relationships. Researchers Keyes and Simoes (2012) examined the relationship between flourishing and health (mortality rates). Ryan and Fredrick (1997) examined vitality, a component of flourishing, in relation to physical health. Lewis et al. (2013) examined eudaimonic well-being as a motivation for physical activity. Dutton et al. (2010, 2011) has argued that identification, if positively constructed, would result in flourishing. However, no studies are known to date that have bridged the relationship between identification, flourishing, and employee health and done so empirically as well as theoretically. As mentioned previously, the aim of this research is to explore these constructs in a way that reveals their potential to contribute to organisational effectiveness and the well-being of employees, and do so sustainably. However, an overview of employee health, broadly conceptualised in terms of psychological, physical, and emotional health, would make a worthwhile extension to the research proposed here highlighting the relationship between identification and flourishing.

3.2.1. Psychological Health

Within psychological health research centred on the workplace, stress research has dominated, leading to the view that stress or distress is a primary factor leading to mental disorders among employees (Nieuwenhuijsen, Bruinvelds, & Frings-Dresen, 2010; Szeto & Dobson, 2013). As such, the discussion of psychological
health in this thesis will be centred on a review of workplace stress. Few studies have examined the role that organisation identification plays in workplace stress. Despite this, some studies have found links between stress and an employees’ relationship with their work. For example, stress has been found to associate with employees’ relationship with their leaders (Walsh, Dupré, & Arnold, 2014), as well as cognitive alignment of interests and values with an organisation (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2014).

Identification captures an employee’s relationship with their work in which high identification suggests concordance with organisational activities (Haslam, 2014). Concordance between employee norms, values, and goals and those of the organisation enhances motivation and control by enhancing positive self-evaluations (van den Heuvel et al., 2014). Sparks, Faragher & Cooper (2001) argued that when an employee perceives himself or herself as choosing an activity, as opposed to being directed to do so, they experience a greater sense of control over that action. Having a sense of control is an important ingredient in reducing the impact of environmental demands or stressors (Karasek, 1979). Identification implies that the goals of a group, such as those in an organisation or workplace, have been incorporated to some extent, and are consistent with an individual’s personally held goals (Dutton et al., 2010; Turner et al., 1987). In such circumstances, identification with a workplace group, including acting as a member of that group, is likely to promote a greater sense of perceived control over such actions compared to those with lower identification with that group.

Control over work demands is a key component of the job-demands- control (JD-C) model of stress (Karasek, 1979). More recently, the JD-C model has evolved into the job demand – resources model (JD-R) (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007;
Demerouti, Bakker, Nachneiner, & Schoufeli, 2001) in which resources are dimensions linked to work activity that improve functioning, reduce demands, and stimulate growth and development. Positive identification provides important resources for employees that enhances their effectiveness in the workplace and enables them to ward off negative outcomes from stress (Dutton et al., 2010). Dollard and Bakker (2010) similarly reported that employee resources are linked to better employee health. Furthermore, resources are also motivational, leading to improved effectiveness through further resource gains (Hakanen, Perhoniemi, & Toppinen-Tanner, 2008). Identification would appear to enable the acquisition of resources such as control over work demands, which helps employees avoid the negative consequences of stress (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2014). Resources can include those aspects of work that improve functionality (Asha, 2008) which in turn, equates with a state of flourishing (Dutton et al., 2011). In this regard, flourishing is both a resource for health, and an outcome of identification, as discussed previously.

The role of identification in the accumulation of resources that are consistent with flourishing suggests that the social environment related to work has an important role contributing to flourishing and employee health.

Theories of work related stress such as Karasek’s (1979) D-C model of stress, Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) cognitive appraisal model of stress, and Hobfoll’s (1989, 1998, 2001) conservation of resources (COR) theory of stress, all draw upon the social context or environment to some extent in the experience of stress. For example, Karasek (1979) described the potential for stress as the interplay between the demands of the environment and an employees’ ability to exert some control over those demands. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) claimed that the potential for work related stress arises firstly from an appraisal of the environment as either
threatening or beneficial, and secondly, from an assessment of coping strategies to deal with these threats or benefits. COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989, 2001) states that the work environment is critical to outcomes of resource gains or losses.

The prominence given to the working environment in assessing the potential for stress is most notable in Hobfoll’s (1989, 1998) COR theory in which the resources required to deal with work demands are largely determined by social processes with a strong association with social norms, values, and goals. Hobfoll (2011) introduced the term ecology to describe resource supportive environments consisting of employee relationships with supervisors, co-workers, and sometimes clients. According to Hobfoll, such ecologies (interchangeable with social environments in this thesis) support positive gain spirals or resource caravans that lead to effectiveness, productivity, and health through a reduction in employee stress. Therefore, social dynamics such as group identification contributes to health outcomes such as stress through resources. Furthermore, resources within a social environment or ecology are determined by characteristics of that environment such as norms, values, and goals that may or may not align with identification. Alignment would likely lead to greater access to resources and a benefit in terms of health.

For example, organisational identification is quintessentially associated with greater norm, value, and goal congruency between organisations and their employees (Turner et al., 1987). Norm, value, and goal congruency is likely to increase co-operation (Haslam et al., 2003) and contribute to predictability in a working environment (Cropanzano et al., 1997). Working environments characterised by co-operation and predictability are likely to facilitate an increased sense of control through resources that improve the capacity to meet demands and foster social support from collaboration (e.g., Sluss & Ashforth, 2007). Furthermore,
an employee’s adoption of organisational goals as their own, arising from identification with the organisation, may contribute to greater employee efficacy and better coping strategies through the reduction in role ambiguity, along with increased certainty regarding agreed goals (Lazarus & Folkmen, 1984). In addition, social support, another important workplace resource linked to employee stress in the workplace (van der Doef & Maes, 1999), is likely to be more plentiful in workplaces where levels of identification with an organisation or workgroup are high and co-operation is common place.

Given the potential of work identification to have an impact on a number of key components that associate with workplace stress, and its reduction, an examination of identification in relation to workplace stress is warranted. In organisations where employee identification with the organisation is heightened, these employees are likely to be well resourced and flourishing (Dutton et al., 2010), have a greater sense of control (Turner et al., 1987), and be more motivated for further resource accumulation obtained through effective work practices (Dollard & Bakker, 2010). The proposal presented here is that organisations characterised by high levels of identification would demonstrate an inverse relationship between identification and stress due to the effect of identification on flourishing and associated resource ecologies.

3.2.2. Emotional Health

Workplace demands, like those associated with the potential to produce stress, may involve the expression or suppression of particular emotions required by the organisation in the course of workplace activities (Hochschild, 1979, 1983). Expectations about the emotional displays desired of employees by their organisations are conveyed by way of emotional norms (Hochschild, 1979).
Emotional norms are conveyed to employees during socialisation processes (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987) and, as such, socialisation processes, which may include identification, contribute to emotional health in the workplace. The effort by employees to comply with these emotional norms is termed by Hochschild (1983) as emotional labour. As Sluss and Ashforth (2007) and Slemp and Vella-Brodrick (2014) argued, identification helps motivate employees to be congruent with organisational norms which would suggest they are likely to increase their efforts in meeting emotional norms.

According to Adelmann (1995) emotional work may result in positive outcomes for employees, such as increased financial rewards, feelings of happiness, and greater efficacy. The last two of these outcomes are consistent with flourishing (see Keyes & Annas, 2009). However, as Hochschild (1983) described, negative consequences may also result from emotional labour, such as alcohol abuse, increased experience of headaches, and more frequent absenteeism. Hochschild (1983) described the state of disconnection between displayed emotion and felt emotion as emotional dissonance.

Organisations may require employees to subscribe to certain emotional expressions, or alternatively, emotional suppression, when performing their duties for the organisation (Abraham, 1998; Hochschild, 1979; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). Requests for particular emotional conduct reflect the organisation’s expectations of those emotional standards and therefore represent the emotional norms associated with roles employees perform (Morris & Feldman, 1996; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). The ability to fulfil emotional requirements and the impact of performing such emotional work on the emotional health of employees is important to the way employees’ function, strongly suggesting that it effects
workforce flourishing (Bakker & Sanz-Vergel, 2013). Among the concepts used in association with emotional health, emotional labour and emotional dissonance are frequently used.

Rather than the amount of effort or emotional labour per se being responsible for any adverse employee outcomes regarding compliance with emotional norms, Morris and Feldman (1996) claimed that emotional dissonance was more likely to explain adverse health outcomes. Dissonance in this instance is a conflict between felt emotions and the emotional expectations conveyed through social norms. According to Morris and Feldman (1996) and Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) emotional dissonance reflects poor fit between employees’ personally held values and norms and those values and norms of the organisation or institution. Such circumstances are highly compatible with a lack of identification.

The organisation is a source of expectations regarding emotional expression by their employees in the execution of their work roles. Organisational identification, by definition, represents the degree to which employees’ values and norms are congruent with those of the organisation (Turner et al., 1987) and may therefore be a factor associated with employees’ experience of emotional dissonance. Indeed, Brotheridge and Lee (2003) found that identification was negatively correlated with employees acting out emotions they did not feel, with a positive correlation found between emotional displays and felt emotions. Furthermore, low identification that culminates in discord between felt and expressed emotion is likely to contribute to an employee’s inability to function, suggesting that flourishing may also be inversely related to emotional dissonance.
Identification and workforce flourishing may therefore represent key elements in the determination of positive or negative employee outcomes arising from their emotional labours. Lower levels of organisational identification may create a greater likelihood that employees’ emotional norms and values will not match those of the organisation and consequently, emotional dissonance may result for these employees. Similarly, flourishing, arising from identification and contributing to better functioning (Dutton et al., 2011; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Seligman, 2011), may help to reduce dissonance because flourishing also involves positive emotion or hedonia (Hutta & Waterman, 2013). It is assumed that most emotional norms for organisations involve the expression of positive emotion in which flourishing is likely to assist and thereby reduce dissonance. Emotional expression, or labour without dissonance, is likely to facilitate resource gains if supported by a positive social ecology (see Hobfoll, 2011), or, in other words, if functioning through flourishing is positive, resource gain is likely to result from emotional labour, further enhancing health.

Positive outcomes for employees engaged in emotional labour were found by Tidd and Lockard (1978). They reported that the better the smile displayed by waitresses, the higher their monetary rewards received from customers in the form of tips. Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) suggested that the successful accomplishment of job related tasks aided by emotional labour may facilitate a sense of satisfaction as well as protect workers from ill feeling in times where emotional neutrality is needed in the carriage of their duties (e.g., health workers and social workers). In a similar way, Bakker and Sanz-Vergel (2013) found that nurses performing emotional work as an expectation of their work roles strengthened their engagement with work and flourishing when emotional demands were high. When there is an
acceptance and embodiment of the emotional work within the role, consistent with identification, then normative work such as emotional work can become positive and affirming helping to produce outcomes such as flourishing.

Given the apparent importance of identification and flourishing in determining the emotional health of employees, measurement of emotional health in a multi-faceted measure of employee health is warranted. Exploring the relationships of identification and workforce flourishing in relation to emotional health will also contribute to our understanding of the social, psychological, and functional prerequisites for improving employee health that will contribute to effective organisational strategies.

The role of emotional labour in determining organisational health and employee related outcomes is equivocal according to research findings. Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) suggested that emotional labour may contribute to the workplace becoming more predictable because an understanding of the expectations associated with emotional labour means that situations are formalised, scripted, and in time, practiced. A different perspective is offered by others such as Abraham (1998), Adelmann (1995), Lewig and Dollard (2003), Morris and Feldman (1996), Rafaeli and Sutton (1987), all of whom have argued that emotional labour per se is not associated with negative outcomes; rather, it is emotional dissonance that may be responsible for such adverse outcomes.

Indeed, Mishra and Bhatnagar (2010) reported that identification was negatively related with emotional dissonance that, in turn, predicted turnover intent and low emotional well-being. Furthermore, Abraham (1998, 1999), Morris and Feldman (1996), and Lewig and Dollard (2003) found that employee’s emotional
dissonance was related to lower job satisfaction (hedonic well-being). Whereas, Bakker and Sanz-Vergel (2013) found that a sample of nurses embraced emotional demands as being consistent with the role of a nurse and, as such, the performance of emotional work by these nurses helped to build personal resources and promote flourishing. In this last study, it would appear that identification, to some extent, helped align the emotional norms of these nurses with the emotion norms required at work, reducing dissonance and contributing to functionality. Therefore, emotional dissonance is likely to be an effective indicator of employee emotional health in the context of identification and flourishing compared to emotional labour per se.

3.2.3. Physical Health

An organisation’s workplace environment, that includes the social dynamics of that environment, contributes to the physical health of their employees (Asha, 2008; Cooper & Cartwright, 1994; James et al., 1994; Wilson et al., 2004). Theories of social identification, and more specifically, organisational identification, help to explain the social dynamics in organisational contexts and how such dynamic might affect health. Haslam (2014) argued that, as humans are social by their nature, identification with social group’s matters as a determinant of health. In other words, identification is an important determinant of health. However, few studies have examined the relationship between employees’ work based identification and their health in general. Fewer studies have explored work based identification and physical health specifically.

Of the few studies to explore identification and physical health (as well as other health outcomes) was a combined qualitative and quantitative study by Tinker and Moore (2002). In this study, support was found for an association between identification and physical health in an analysis of responses to the question,
“discuss the main reasons you are in or remain in your current job”. Responses were classified into either professional identity salient (emphasising group affiliations) or self-identity salient (emphasising individual motivations). Participants classified into the professional identity salient group reported significantly lower somatic symptoms, less anxiety, and lower social dysfunction compared to the self-identity salient group. While this research is less than definitive, the findings suggest the further exploration of the relationship between identification, flourishing, and employees’ physical health is warranted.

Despite a lack of research specifically examining the impact of work identification on employee’s physical health, other fields of inquiry have explored social supports, attachment, and belonging in relation to physical health outcomes. For example, some studies have examined the relationship between physical health and a sense of belonging (e.g., Begen & Turner-Cobb, 2011). Raque-Bogdan, Ericson, Jackson, Martin, and Bryan, (2011) explored attachment in relation to physical health. Hale et al. (2005) investigated various forms of social support in relation to health outcomes comparing men and women. Studies adopting these different perspectives of social connection and support suggest that work identification is likely to have similar positive effects on physical health.

Related constructs to organisational identification, such as social support and a sense of belonging, have been examined in relation to their effect on physical health. For example, Leppin and Schwarzer (1990) and Janevic, Airouch, Merline, Akiyama, and Antonucci (2000) found that the quality of social support was an integral component associated with physical health outcomes. Hale et al., (2005) found that of four dimensions of social support explored, a sense of belonging was the only domain that directly predicted physical health for men and general health.
perceptions for women. More recently, Holt-Lunstad, Smith, and Layton (2010), in a meta-analysis of 148 studies, found a 50% increase in the likelihood of survival for participants with strong social relationship, a finding that was consistent across both age and gender. Furthermore, the magnitude of health differences found in the Hunt-Lunstad et al. (2010) study was comparable to other established risk factors for mortality such as obesity, lack of physical activity, alcohol consumption, and cigarette consumption. A sense of belonging, strength of social relationships, and the quality of social supports are all indicative of the level of identification a person may experience with a social group. Therefore, it is likely that identification within the work context will have a positive impact on employee’s physical health similar to the other social constructs that have attracted some support in research.

The studies connecting social constructs with health outcomes are also informative of the mechanisms by which health is affected. Thoits (2011) suggested that social ties may have two pathways that impact on physical health outcomes; a direct pathway, and an indirect pathway involving stress reduction. In terms of the indirect pathway involving stress reduction, identification with an organisation can become a means by which a greater sense of control is established for these employees (Terry & Hogg, 1996). Identification may also facilitate problem focussed rather than emotionally focussed coping in employees, and help promote a greater sense of social support in the workplace (e.g., Dutton et al., 2010). Alarcon, Edwards, and Menke (2011) found that students with high levels of social support were more likely to use problem focussed coping than emotion focussed coping when it came to dealing with study demands. They argued that social supports may provide problem focussed solutions and the larger the network of support, the greater the number of viable solutions to problems are likely to be available.
Adaptive coping, of which problem focussed strategies are an integral part, were found by Alarcon, Edwards, and Clark (2013) to be related to academic performance. Results such as these suggest that social support, similar to arguments made for identification, would positively affect flourishing by increasing functional capacity, which in turn would benefit health including physical health.

Furthermore, problem focussed coping strategies help reduce workplace stress (Terry & Jimmieson, 2003). Stress has been linked to poorer physical health outcomes such as high blood pressure (Lazarus, 1984), higher incidence of cardiovascular disease (Theorall & Karasek, 1996) and declines in general physical health (Sparks & Cooper, 1999). Therefore, the relationship between identification and physical health may emerge through the impact that identification has on both flourishing (including functioning) and also reducing workplace stress that contributes towards better physical health.

An organisation’s working environment can have wide ranging effects on employees’ health, including their physical health, which may eventually lead to reduced organisational effectiveness (Wilson et al., 2004). Healthy work environments and organisational effectiveness are central to a flourishing workforce (Dutton et al., 2010, 2011). Wilson et al. (2004) proposed that employees’ health is influenced by the organisational climate, including perceptions of organisational support, co-worker support, and the degree of participation and involvement in the organisation. In other words, the social and interpersonal resources available within an organisation are likely to have an impact on employees’ physical health through improving functional capacity and also through stress reduction that contributes towards better physical health.
Functional qualities appear to be important to positive health outcomes. However, few studies have examined the relationship between workforce flourishing and employees’ physical health. Willson et al. (2004) examined aspects of flourishing such as job satisfaction and found a negligible relationship with reported physical health, although the study did not examine flourishing per se. There have, however, been studies exploring such relationships in settings outside of the work context. In a sample of adults from across Europe, Keyes and Simoes (2012) found that non-flourishing respondents had a 62% increase in mortality over a 10 year period. Similarly, Thoits (2011) reported that a range of factors including mastery, belonging, support, self-esteem, and purpose and meaning have links to physical health outcomes. Aspects of the social environment such as those featured in Thoits’ review are also fundamental to flourishing (see Keyes, 2007; Seligman, 2011).

While research linking employee physical health to workforce flourishing may be scarce, there are grounds to explore such a relationship based on the claimed association between identification and flourishing discussed in the previous chapter. Given that identification and flourishing are indeed associated, flourishing has been found to positively relate to physical health outcomes (e.g., Keyes, 2007). Therefore, physical health was also included as a component of employee health in this thesis so that a comprehensive assessment of the relationship between identification, flourishing, and health outcomes could be made.

3.3. Conclusion

Identification with a group is likely to contribute to productivity by way of workforce flourishing (Dutton et al., 2010) and may also have a positive effect on employee health (van den Heuval et al., 2014). One explanation for this association is that identification generates resources, both social and personal, that benefit health.
and reduce the impact of threats to health (see COR theory, Hobfoll, 1989, 2001). Identification may also increase function of a workforce resulting in that workforce flourishing, with flourishing having been shown to have a direct effect on health (Keys, 2007; Keyes & Simoes, 2012). Similar to identification, flourishing may enable resource gains that benefit health and protect against health threats (Ryff, 2013). Furthermore, health is likely to have a positive impact on employees’ ability to function and therefore flourish (Dutton et al., 2011). The contribution of employee health towards creating a positive gain cycle with flourishing, apart from the obvious benefit of a healthier workforce, warrants that health is included in an examination of identification and flourishing in this thesis.

Health is conceptualised in this thesis in terms of psychological, physical, and emotional health. Consistent with demand oriented theories of stress and health (e.g., Bakker & Demerouti, 2014; Hobfoll, 1989, 2001; Karasek, 1979), it is argued here that identification and flourishing contribute to the capacity for meeting demands and benefit psychological health through resource accumulation and deployment to meet demands. Regarding emotional health, identification is likely to increase knowledge and therefore, the predictability of emotional expectations associated with social group activities. This would contribute to aligning personal emotional norms with those expected at work (see Brotheridge and Lee, 2003) and reduce dissonance (Mishra & Bhatnagar, 2010) and increase flourishing (Bakker & Sanz-Vergel, 2013). Flourishing is also likely to be associated with positive emotional outcomes that, in turn, would feedback positively to contribute further to flourishing (Bakker and Sanz-Vergel, 2013). Studies linking identification to physical health are rare and even more so in the context of work. Nonetheless, studies examining social interactions or exchanges such as social supports (Hale et
al., 2005), attachment (Raque-Bogdan et al., 2011), and sense of belonging (Began & Turner-Cobb, 2011) have found links to physical health. The evidence for a link between flourishing and physical health is also scarce but an extensive study by Keyes (2007) found significant inverse links to mortality rates.

The following sections of this thesis examine the relationship between the constructs of identification, workforce flourishing, and employee health. Identification was predicted to associate with workforce flourishing and, in turn, workforce flourishing was predicted to associate with employee health. The constructs of identification and workforce flourishing, that support the accumulation and maintenance of resources contributing to health, were also explored in detail in the following sections of this thesis.
Chapter 4

Study 1: A Model of Workforce Flourishing

According to Dutton et al., (2011), identification may have an effect on the capacity of a workforce to flourish. Different groups represented within particular work contexts may therefore have distinct effects on workforce flourishing. For example, Brewer’s (1991, 2008) optimal distinctiveness theory suggests that functioning, also a primary outcome from flourishing, is optimised when group identification offers a balance between the need to belong and the need to maintain a sense of individuality. Identification that culminates in workforce flourishing should also contribute to employee health (Keyes & Simoes, 2012; Ryff, 2013) via positive functionality (Ryff, 2013) adding to the sustainability of such circumstances. Two variations of a model of workforce flourishing are presented in this study. Each variation of the model is distinguished by different targets of identification, work group or organisation, and each target is predicted to associate with flourishing in different ways. The model variants will be compared in terms of their influence on workforce flourishing and also their contribution to sustainable practice through employee health.

4.1. Work Identification and Flourishing

As members of a workforce, individual employees may identity to varying degrees with the different groups that embody work contexts (Haslam et al., 2000). As conditions within the work context change, so too does the likelihood that identification with certain groups will shift in order to make sense of that context (Dutton et al., 1994; Ellemers et al., 1999). The capacity of identification to enable sense making in a particular situations is also linked to the capacity to respond
effectively in these situations, including the workplace (Ashforth et al., 2008). Therefore, a deeper understanding of the effect identification at work has on workforce functioning, such as eudaimonic well-being or flourishing, will also contribute to understanding the circumstances that may enhance organisational effectiveness.

One way in which work related identities enable workers, and indeed a workforce, to be more effective and to flourish is through the accumulation of social resources (Dutton et al., 2010). Hobfoll’s (1989, 2001) conservation of resources (COR) theory explains that social resources enable more positive functioning that also promotes employee health. Furthermore, the joint promotion of employee health and effectiveness in the workplace are positive outcomes that enhance the sustainability of an identification approach to organisational performance (see Scharmer & Kaufer, 2013). A model representing the relationship between work related identities, effective workforce functioning through flourishing, and employee health is presented in Figure 4.1. This model will form the basis of discussion and testing of two model variants, each variant featuring a different work related identity. Comparisons between the model variants featuring either work group identification or organisation identification will be made in relation to workforce flourishing and employee health.

\[\text{Identification} \rightarrow \text{Workforce Flourishing} \rightarrow \text{Employee Health}\]

*Figure 4.1. Simplified Model of the Relationship Between Work Related Identification, Workforce Flourishing, and Employee Health.*
A flourishing workforce is important to organisational effectiveness because flourishing is positively associated with engagement, motivation, personal growth, and learning (Dutton et al., 2011). Dutton et al. (2010) proposed that work related identification contributes to workforce flourishing by building and developing resources commensurate to the quality of relationships experienced at work. Furthermore, such resources can facilitate the accumulation of other valuable resources such as information, access, and trust, further extending the potential for a gain in functioning and organisational effectiveness. Hobfoll (2001, 2011) proposed that such positive gain spirals are motivational and are supported by positive work ecologies, or in other words, work environments. It is suggested here that work related identification is an important factor within the context of work that promotes resource gain leading to optimal functioning at work.

According to Brewer (2009), optimal functioning is most likely to occur as a member of a group. As a group member, a person has access to important social resources rather than relying predominantly on their own capacities. However, being a member of a group also has costs such as providing resources to others for their benefit rather than one’s own benefit. Dutton et al. (2010) argued that identification that achieves a balance in terms of meeting the contrasting needs for inclusion and uniqueness is likely to be positive because it facilitates peak functionality thereby helping employees to flourish. Bakker and Demerouti (2007, 2014) explained functioning in terms of engagement proposing that resources are the key to meeting demands and attaining positive outcomes through engagement. The relationship between involvement at work such as engagement or identification with the capacity to generate and maintain resources appear to play an important role in functioning at work and employee effectiveness. Maintaining balance between the need to belong
and the need to be independent described by Brewer (1991, 2008) in her theory of optimal distinctiveness, may contribute to the ability to accumulate and maintain resources through identification, leading to workforce flourishing.

4.2. Identification and the Capacity to Flourish

An imbalance between the need to belong and the need for individuality sparked by events such as feeling excluded, or feeling underappreciated, may initiate the activation of responses to counter the imbalance. This would require the use of an employee’s resources. For example, according to Brewer (2009), threats to a person’s sense of belonging or self-worth are also indicative of potential threats to their social resources and the capacity to build additional resources. In organisation terms, the groups that facilitate flourishing, and therefore, optimal functioning, are likely to be those groups most capable of balancing the two competing needs.

Brewer (1991, 2008, 2009) suggested that as the level of abstraction of a group increases, finding a balance between competing needs of individuation and group belonging becomes harder to reconcile. According to Brewer (2008), when the number of members within a group becomes large, groups with smaller membership numbers become more distinguishable from larger groups within that context. These smaller groups have a greater capacity to facilitate group member bonds or interpersonal connections between members of the group. As such, within organisations of a certain size (Brewer suggests groups of 30 or more), the drive to form smaller networks or groups to satisfy competing needs to belong while also maintaining a sense of individuality becomes greater. Large organisations, therefore, should be characterised by contrasts between larger group membership such as organisation identification and smaller group memberships such as the work group. Smaller groups, such as the work group, should also be better at facilitating the accumulation
and preservation of social resources that, according to Dutton et al. (2010), facilitate flourishing in the workforce. A study examining the contrast between different identification targets in the workplace with workforce flourishing outcomes has not been undertaken to date.

4.2.1. Social Well-Being

Differences, and indeed similarities, between the capacity of organisation or work group identification to promote workforce flourishing may be further understood by considering the distinct components of flourishing; social, psychological, and hedonic (emotional) well-being. Commencing with social well-being, Brewer’s (1991) optimal distinctiveness theory contends that the level of group abstraction has a direct relationship with the ability to accumulate social resources. Social resources are akin to social well-being (Dutton et al., 2010) and according to optimal distinctiveness theory should be more easily facilitated in a work group as opposed to an organisation group.

Work group identification is more accessible and therefore has greater influence over employee attitudes and behaviour compared to organisation identification (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2008). Van Knippenberg & van Schie argued that employees are more likely to perceive work groups as more familiar and attractive, having more in common on an individual employee level compared to the organisation as a whole. In terms of social well-being, it would appear that for reasons of optimal distinctiveness and accessibility work group identification may facilitate social well-being, and therefore flourishing, more so than organisation identification. In this regard, the contribution of social well-being to workforce flourishing is expected to be greater in the model variant featuring flourishing
predicted by work group identification compared to the other model variant featuring flourishing predicted by organisation identification.

4.2.2. Psychological Well-Being

The two identification foci of work group and organisation identification are discussed here in relation to psychological well-being. Psychological well-being is a functional resource described by Keyes (2007) and Seligman (2011) as signifying a sense of meaning, commitment, and autonomy in relation to one’s endeavours. Turner and Reynolds (2011) claimed that defining one’s self at different levels of abstraction makes little difference to the meaningfulness of that social categorisation. Identification is a process that links membership of a particular group to the present context, generating a meaningful interpretation of that context through the perspective of a particular foci of identification. Therefore, identification that brings a meaningful understanding of a context and enables autonomous responses to that context, and promotes further commitment, would appear to enhance psychological well-being. Furthermore, the level of abstraction per se seems to have little direct bearing on the capacity of identification to enable meaningful interpretation of a context and therefore, enhance psychological well-being. Rather, the correspondence between the identification target or foci and the context, and the level of identification would be most influential in enhancing psychological well-being.

The implication for psychological well-being and the different foci of identification is that qualities such as meaningfulness appear to vary as a function of saliency and context rather than the level abstraction per se (Thoits, 1992). However, it is also acknowledged that identification via group saliency is more likely for work groups compared to the organisation as a group because typical work
contexts are more frequently focussed on work group activity (Riketta & van Dick, 2005). Despite the likely prevalence of work group identification, situations may occur in which organisation identification may influence meaningfulness or sense making at an equal or greater extent to that of work group identification. For example, meaningfulness might be associated with an organisation identity more so than the work group when the organisation has a very dominant and highly salient set of values such as an NGO or charity organisation.

Nevertheless, psychological well-being in terms of meaningfulness does not appear to directly fluctuate with the level of group abstraction. Instead, context and group saliency seem more likely to influence meaningfulness, and therefore psychological well-being, which suggests predicting differences between work group and organisation identities is less straightforward. However, the probability within a typical work context is that work group identification is more likely to be contextually salient than organisation identification and suggests that any difference in psychological well-being may therefore favour work group identification.

Other contributing factors to psychological well-being such as commitment and autonomy may similarly be linked to contextual factors rather than the level of group abstraction. Positive attitudes towards a group and willingness to continue involvement are aspects of commitment requiring an evaluative process in relation to the context of a situation (Kalliath, O’Driscoll, & Gillespie, 1997). Autonomy, according to Ryan and Deci (2000), is experienced when an internal locus of causality or volition is perceived rather than feeling constrained to act by external pressures. As such, autonomy involves an assessment of actions within a context. Commitment and autonomy, components of psychological well-being, appear to be more dependent on contextual features rather than group level abstraction.
Keyes et al., (2002) and Vittersø and Søholt (2011) deemed that functional well-being was predominantly an evaluative psycho-social processes. It follows that if evaluations of contexts are at the centre of psychological well-being, then different foci of identification may only demonstrate differences in the relationship to psychological well-being if the particular foci are distinguished by their capacity to facilitate an understanding of that context. Such processes are comparable to meaningfulness in which an evaluation of the purpose of actions and the contribution to goals takes place (Schueller & Seligman, 2010). Properties of identification that help account for contextual features of work may assist the evaluative process but these properties are not bonded to the level of group abstraction. Therefore, it is expected that any difference between work group identification and organisation identification associated with psychological well-being will be due to the capacity to make sense or meaning from a situation, which may also implicate identification saliency. In this study, there is unlikely to be differences between the work group and organisation’s capacity to facilitate workforce flourishing derived from psychological well-being.

4.2.3. Hedonic Well-Being

Evaluations related to hedonic well-being such as satisfaction with work, are more ubiquitous than psychological well-being which is assessed on specific qualities (Diener et al., 1998). Hedonic well-being in the workplace, represented by job satisfaction, embodies a positive emotional evaluation of one’s work (Locke, 1976). According to Wright, Cropanzano, and Bonett (2007), job satisfaction is probably the most common and one of the oldest operationalisations of workplace ‘happiness’ or hedonia. Job satisfaction is likely to arise when employees identify strongly with groups within the workplace (van Dick et al., 2004). Identification
with a group such as an organisation or work group suggests that an employee is likely to perceive that group more positively and therefore, form more favourable evaluations of that group and associated activities. Van Dick, van Knippenberg, Kerschreiter, Hertel, and Wieske (2008) tested the relationship of work group identification and organisation identification to job satisfaction, exploring the combined effect of both identification foci as well as comparing instances when only one target was reported high. They argued that high levels of identification across multiple work related group foci was likely to be associated with positive outcomes such as job satisfaction. Results were consistent with their prediction, revealing that the combination of high identification with both the work group and organisation was a much better predictor of job satisfaction than when only one identification foci was reported at high levels.

Indeed, job satisfaction was found to be unrelated to work group identification when organisation identification was low. Furthermore, correlations in the van Dick et al. (2008) study suggested that in their first study, work group identification correlated with job satisfaction to a lesser extent than organisation identification (.34 and .43 respectively). In their second study, the emphasis was reversed with work group identification demonstrating a higher correlation (.31 and .22 respectively). Overall, the study by van Dick et al. indicates that work related identification is associated with job satisfaction. However, the relationship does not appear to be related to the level of abstraction of the target of identification as evident in the contrast between correlations found in two studies by van Dick et al. Instead, contextual differences may better explain variation in the findings of the two studies featured in their research.
Other studies have reported findings that also suggest the association between identification and job satisfaction is shaped by context rather than the level of group abstraction. Van Knippenberg and van Schie (2000) found that for a sample of local government employees there was no significant difference between organisation identification and work group identification in terms of predicting job satisfaction. In the same study involving a sample of university employees, work group identification was more strongly associated job satisfaction ($t(151) = 3.39, p < .001$).

The contrast between the groups in their study is consistent with the assertion that context, more so than the degree of abstraction, determines how certain foci of identification relate to hedonic well-being as represented by job satisfaction. In addition, Harter et al. (2003) found a relationship between the level of success of a work group and job satisfaction, with more successful work groups reporting greater job satisfaction. These findings related to group success firmly implicate work contexts in the relationship between identification and job satisfaction, and therefore, hedonic well-being.

While work contexts may shape the relationship between identification and hedonic well-being, identity saliency in typical work circumstances may favour work groups over organisation identity in shaping hedonic well-being (Riketta & van Dick, 2005). In relation to work contexts, the suggestion proposed here is that work group identification may have a greater potential to provide a meaningful interpretation of typical work contexts. Therefore, work group identification may be superior to some extent compared to organisation identification in predicting job satisfaction and hedonia in general. However, saliency is determined by context (Randel, 2002) and it would be expected that circumstances may arise where organisation identification is more frequently salient than work group identification.
4.3. Exploring Two Model Variants of Workforce Flourishing

It would appear that identification in the workplace plays an important role in driving workforce flourishing, for example, through opportunities for acquiring social resources (Dutton et al., 2011). However, there are multiple group memberships available within a work environment for employees to assent to and apply in work situations (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). These multiple group targets differ by their capacity to facilitate the acquisition of social and psychological resources in a given situation and can therefore, be distinguished by the advantages they offer in enabling flourishing in those situations (Dutton et al., 2010, 2011). Variation in the ability to facilitate flourishing may be done to the level of abstraction in the case of social well-being, or due to context in terms of psychological or hedonic well-being.

In this study, the relationship between work related identification and workforce flourishing will be tested using two model variants. One model will examine the relationship between work group identification and flourishing, and another model will examine the relationship between organisation identification and flourishing. Flourishing in both models will be represented by social, psychological, and hedonic well-being. The following hypotheses are predicted;

**Hypothesis 1:** Work group and organisation identification will demonstrate a positive relationship to workforce flourishing as represented by social, psychological, and hedonic well-being.

**Hypothesis 2:** Compared to organisation identification, work group identification will have a stronger association with workforce flourishing, manifest
predominantly through the association between work group identification and social well-being.

4.3.1. A Sustainable Model of Workforce Flourishing through Employee Health

From a systems theory perspective, sustainability is closely linked to the extent to which the activity of a system produces little waste or negative outcomes (Scharmer & Kaufer, 2013). The less waste or negative outcomes, the more sustainable the system is. Therefore, organisational activities that produce positive outcomes rather than negative outcomes can be deemed more sustainable.

Flourishing, involving optimal functioning (Keyes, 2007) benefits employees by promoting personal growth and self-actualisation (Ryan and Deci, 2001; Seligman, 2011), but also benefits the organisation through greater effectiveness (Dutton et al., 2010; Keyes & Annas, 2009). Identification that leads to workforce flourishing should also help facilitate better employee health (Keyes & Simoes, 2012; Ryff, 2013). The relationship between flourishing and better employee health is argued by Ryff (2013) to occur through effective living practices involving the capacity to cultivate successful and rewarding outcomes, in other words, positive functionality.

Bakker and Demerouti (2007, 2014) and Hobfoll (2001) argue that a successful outcome in terms of meeting work demands is facilitated through accumulated work resources. Keyes and Simoes (2012) found that when the three components of flourishing were all in evidence (social, psychological, and hedonic), flourishing demonstrated a positive relationship with lower mortality rates. Whereas, when the three elements of flourishing were assessed independently, none of the measures were separately predictive of mortality rates. Flourishing may therefore be a resource for employee health. Given the earlier prediction (hypothesis 2) that work
group identification will have a more comprehensive, and therefore, stronger relationship with workforce flourishing, a similar asymmetrical relationship with employee health is likely when comparing the two flourishing model variants. The following hypothesis is proposed;

**Hypothesis 3:** The model of workforce flourishing featuring work group identification will have a stronger relationship with employee health than the variant model featuring organisation identification.

A further aim will be to explore the underlying factorial composition of the construct of work-force flourishing, specific to a work environment. Figure 4.2 shows the relationship between identification, workforce flourishing, and employee health, and the manifest variables predicted to contribute to either workforce flourishing or employee health. This model will be used to test the three hypotheses argued in the first study of this thesis.
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*Figure 4.2.* Full Model of Workforce Flourishing and Employee Health Predicted by Identification.

### 4.4. Method

#### 4.4.1. Participants

Three hundred and sixty five questionnaires were provided to staff at a municipal council in the outer suburbs of Melbourne, Australia. Of these, three were
provided via email and the remainder was handed out during team or management meetings. In response, a total of 227 questionnaires were returned, 30 electronically and 197 by mail or collection at the conclusion of team meetings, providing a response rate of 61.7%. Three questionnaires were either blank or contained insufficient data to be included in the analysis, giving a tally of 224 questionnaires. A total of 153 respondents were female (68.3%) and 71 male (31.7%), with ages ranging from 19 to 65 ($M = 42.35, SD = 11.04$). Number of children reported ranged from 0 to 5 with 57.6% reporting having more than one child and 22.3% reporting having more than two children. The average length of time with the organisation was 7.92 years ($SD = 7.30$). Twenty five per cent were secondary school educated, 23.2% were educated to certificate level, 20.9% had done some university, 15.1% had completed an undergraduate university course, 13.8% had completed a post graduate university course, and 2.2% reported the category of *other* as their standard of educational attainment.

### 4.4.2. Procedure and Design

The municipal council located in the eastern suburbs of Melbourne, Victoria, was approached by mail and invited to participate in this study. The council agreed to make their employees available through a series of team or management meetings that are routinely conducted as normal business practice. To facilitate high response rates and for participant’s convenience, a paper version and an electronic web based version of the questionnaire were made available. Team leader meetings were small, consisting of around 8-14 employees. At these meetings the research was introduced and explained, and then employees were invited to voluntarily complete a questionnaire either during the meeting or in their own time. Questionnaires completed during meetings were collected at the end of the meeting.
completed at participant’s discretion were either posted back to the researcher or sent to the researcher by email. Three participants were invited to complete a questionnaire by email rather than at a team leader meeting due to the group’s small size and infrequency of team meetings. All employees of the council were informed that their participation was on a voluntary basis and that all responses were confidential and only the analysed group results would be made available to the council.

A cross sectional design was used in this study to assess the relationship between work related identification, workforce flourishing, and employee health. The dependent variables were workforce flourishing and employee health. Two work related foci of identification formed the bases for the model variants of workforce flourishing; one variant featuring work group identification, the other featuring organisation identification. The construct of workforce flourishing was composed of measurement items derived from scales that correspond to the three components of flourishing; social, psychological, and hedonic well-being. Social well-being was represented by items of organisational citizenship behaviour, psychological well-being was represented by items from a measure of work commitment, and hedonic well-being was represented by items belonging to a measure of job satisfaction. Employee health was assessed using measures of psychological health (e.g., anxiety and perceived stress), emotional health (emotional dissonance), and physical health (somatic symptoms). The independent variable was work identification as indicative of a sense of belonging to important work related social groups, which included items measuring organisation identification and work group identification. Ethics approval was granted to proceed with this study.
4.4.3. Questionnaire

Workforce Flourishing Measures

**Hedonic well-being** - Job satisfaction: Warr, Cook, and Wall’s (1979) 15 item global job satisfaction scale formed the starting point towards deriving a measure of hedonic well-being. The process to establish a set of items to represent each of the three components of flourishing was the same in each instance. First, the scale was assessed, and items selected based on face validity relative to construct being explored, in this instance, hedonic well-being. Secondly, the selected items then underwent reliability analysis to assess the contributions and cohesiveness of the group of items. Selection, based on the reliability analysis followed Blunch’s (2013) recommendations for such procedures in which the amount of variance represented and vicinity of the mean to the mid-point in the scale range were used as criteria. Items with larger variance and means close to the scale range midpoint were selected. The rational provided by Blunch was that items with these statistical properties contained more information (variance) by which relationships with other variables can be assessed. Finally, Cronbach’s alpha was considered in order to remove any remaining anomalous items.

Based on the above procedure, items 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, and 12 were selected based on face value to represent hedonic well-being. Items 1, 2, 6, 8, and 14 were removed because they displayed lower standard deviations than the remaining items. The remaining items 4, 10, 11, and 12 provided a parsimonious measure of hedonic well-being. Items were answered using a 7 point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*not satisfied*) to 6 (*completely satisfied*). The four items used are listed below and for each item, participants were asked to rate how satisfied they were with certain aspects of their work. Cronbach’s alpha for items used in this study was .88. Mean
scores were used to represent each subscale. The items representing hedonic well-being were linked by common inference to the value, or satisfaction with organisational or management responses to activities that arguably promote effectiveness in the organisation. This interpretation is consistent with the description of hedonic well-being in relation to flourishing (e.g., Keyes & Simoes, 2012; Ryff & Keyes, 1995)

- The recognition you get for good work (item 4).
- Your chance of promotion (item 10).
- The way your firm is managed (item 11).
- The attention paid to suggestions you make (item 12).

**Psychological well-being** - Organisational commitment: Allen and Meyer’s (1990) sub-scale for affective commitment provided the set of items from which a measure of psychological well-being was obtained. The process used to derive a measure of psychological well-being was the same used for hedonic well-being described above. Inspection of the items for face validity in relation to psychological well-being (i.e., related to psychological functioning) revealed a number of items that have considerable similarity to the concept of identification and therefore these items were removed. Items 1, 2, 7, and 4 (reversed) remained. After assessing item variance, means, and reliability statistics item 4 was subsequently removed due to poor loading. The three items used in this study to represent psychological well-being are listed below. Items were measured on a seven point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *do not agree* to 7 = *strongly agree*. Cronbach’s alpha for the three items was .75. Summed and averaged scores were used to represent psychological well-
being. The three items used in this study are consistent with aspects reported to associate with positive psychological functioning, namely; meaning, commitment, and autonomy (see, Keyes, 2007; Ryff, 2013; Seligman, 2011).

- I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organisation (item 1 – commitment).
- I enjoy discussing my organisation with people outside it (item 2 – autonomy).
- This organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for me (item 7 – meaning).

**Social well-being - Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB):** Smith, Organ, and Near’s (1983) sub-scale of altruistic work behaviours formed the initial item pool from which a measure of social well-being was obtained. The procedure described earlier for selecting items used for hedonic and psychological well-being was used once more. Based on face validity representing positive social interaction, or social well-being, items 1, 3, 5, 7, and 13 were selected for further examination. All remaining items had similar variance and means, however reliability analysis showed that the removal of item 5 would improve Cronbach’s alpha and it was also considered, on second inspection, that the item was somewhat ambiguously stated. Item 5 was therefore removed. Items representing social well-being in this study are listed below. Respondents were asked to think of an employee who worked or had worked with them and to rate how characteristic each item was of that employee. Scores are based on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1 = not characteristic to 5 = totally characteristic. Cronbach’s alpha in the current study was .82. Items were summed and averaged as a measure of social well-being, with each item sharing a common theme of positive social functioning.
• Help others who have been absent (item 1).

• Volunteers for things that are not required (item 3).

• Helps others who have heavy workloads (item 7).

• Makes innovative suggestions to improve department (item 13).

Employee Health Measures

**Psychological Health:** The Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen & Williamson, 1988) consisting of 14 items (e.g., “Felt nervous and stressed”) was used to represent psychological health. Items were answered using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 0 = never to 4 = always. Higher scores indicate a greater level of psychological distress. All 14 items were assessed for factor contribution and only those with high loading were used. Item 12 had a mean that was substantially higher than other items, and item 4 negatively correlated with the scale (after being reversed scored), therefore these two items were removed. To achieve a parsimonious scale representing psychological health, the better loading items were then selected. Six items from the original scale were used in the present study to measure psychological health (items 1, 2, 3, 8, 11, and 14). Cronbach’s alpha was .82 for the six items in the present study. Items were summed and averaged to provide a single score measure of psychological health (employee stress).

**Emotional health (emotional dissonance):** Brotheridge and Lee’s (2003) surface acting sub-scale from the Emotional Labour Scale (ELS) was used in the present study to assess emotional health. The surface acting sub scale contains three items and is indicative of emotional dissonance. Item examples include “how often do you hide your true feeling about a situation” and “how often do you pretend to
have emotions that you don’t really have”. Items in the surface acting sub-scale were scored on a 5-point Likert scale with the following anchors: *never* (1), *rarely* (2), *sometimes* (3), *often* (4), and *always* (5). In the present study, Cronbach’s alpha was .79 for the emotional dissonance subscale. Items were summed and averaged to obtain a single score representing emotional health.

**Physical health (somatic symptoms):** The somatic health sub-scale of the General Health Questionnaire – 28 (Goldberg & Hillier, 1979) was used to assess physical health. Examples of questions include “been feeling run down and out of sorts” and “felt that you are ill”. Items were answered using a four point Likert scale ranging from 0 = *better than usual* to 3 = *much worse than usual*. High scores are indicative of more symptoms and therefore, poorer physical health. Inspection of item variance, means, and reliability statistics resulted in the removal of items 4, 6, and 7. The remaining items (1, 2, 3, and 5) were used in this study to assess physical health. Cronbach’s alpha was .78 for the four items. Items were summed and averaged to obtain a single score for physical health.

Work identification

**Two foci of identification** were measured using Tropp and Wright’s (2001) inclusion of in-group in the self (IIS) measure. The inclusion of in-group in self is argued to represent norm, value, and goal congruency (Turner et al., 1987). The scale features Venn diagrams to represent the level of identification with the nominated group and responses were scored on a Likert response range from 0 = *low identification* to 6 = *high identification*. As with Venn diagrams, the degree of overlap between each pair of circles represents the extent to which an individual (represented by one of the circles) perceive themselves as belonging to a group (represented by the other circle). The more overlap the greater the level of
identification or sense of belonging is represented. The scale can be examined by referring to the reproduced questionnaire in Appendix A. Respondents were asked to indicate the pair of circles that “you feel best represents your own level of identification with your group”. Because the IIS is a one item measure, internal consistency could not be obtained, however, previous test-retest reliability measures by Tropp and Wright over a period of one to three weeks revealed $r (143) = .76, p< .001$. Other test-retest reliabilities for this measure ranged from .73 to .80 (Shamir & Kark, 2004; Tropp & Wright, 2001). Higher scores indicated greater levels of identification and incorporation of group characteristics (e.g., norms, values, and goals) into one’s self-concept. The two targets of identification measured for this study and forming the basis of the two model variants were organisation and work group identification.

4.4.4. Data Preparation

Questionnaire data were screened using SPSS (v21.0) statistical software. A small number of randomly distributed missing data were detected for some questionnaire items. High instances of missing data related to demographic items were for age (2.7% missing), years in role (2.7% missing), and number of children (2.2% missing). Highest instances of missing data for model scale items were for item three for the organisational citizenship behaviour (1.3%), and item 10 for the job satisfaction scale (1.3% missing). These instances of missing data were randomly distributed and of sufficiently low frequency to conclude there was little likelihood of underlying problems arising from the missing data. Missing data that were randomly distributed were replaced using the regression replacement technique in SPSS.
Univariate outliers were found for the number of hours worked, the number of years in role, and the number of years at organisation. In all instances the number of outliers was small and adjustments were made to these scores, modifying them to three standard deviations from the mean of the respective measures. Skewness was checked for each scale total, and two scales were found to exceed skewness ratio criteria of seven. These scales were years in role and years in organisation. For years in role and years in the organisation the skewed distributions were presumed to reflect naturally occurring characteristics for the measure, and because they were distinctly included for demographic profiling and were not central to the analysis, these measures were not altered.

4.4.5. Analysis

The practical consequences of the model of workforce flourishing and employee health, contrasted by either work group identification or organisation identification as model variants is a priority for the analysis undertaken here. Testing the factorial structures featured in the model of workforce flourishing preceded hypothesis testing as the model and constructs featured in the model have been theoretically rather than empirically derived. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of the theoretical constructs (latent variables) of workforce flourishing and employee health was undertaken to confirm the structure of each set of variables contributing to their respective latent structures. The structural model of workforce flourishing and employee health was then tested and the model variants compared using the data set for this study. For both the factor analyses and model testing, structural equation modelling with AMOS (v21.0) was used to determine the factorial fit and model fit respectively. Parameter estimation in the structural equation modelling analysis was based on maximum likelihood for both factor analyses and structural model testing.
4.5. Results

4.5.1. Factor Analysis: Latent Construct of Workforce Flourishing

Measures contributing to the latent construct of workforce flourishing were derived from a process of matching theoretical propositions to item content to arrive at scales representing social, psychological, and hedonic well-being. The sets of items representing each of the three components of workforce flourishing were then assessed for the amount of variance, distribution around the scale midpoint, and item and scale reliability. Items remaining from this process formed measures for social, psychological, and hedonic well-being that combined, represented the latent factor of workforce flourishing. To assess the contributions of the three scales to workforce flourishing, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed (see Figure 4.3). Results revealed a good fit for the data to the factorial structure, $\chi^2(41) = 56.25, p < .057$ (see table 4.1), with eigenvalues confirming a three factor solution to the data. Inspection of standardised residual co-variances and modification indices did not reveal aspects of the model that would improve data fit beyond marginal gain.

Table 4.1.
Factor Analysis Fit Indices for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Latent Factor of Workforce Flourishing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56.248</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.2. Factor Analysis: Latent Construct of Employee Health

Measures theoretically consistent with the three health domains of psychological, physical, and emotional health were used to form the latent factor of employee health. Items representing each of the three measured health domains were first subjected to an evaluation of the amount of variance, central tendency with scale midpoint, and item and scale reliability. Items meeting these criteria formed the measures of psychological, physical, and emotional health. A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed for employee health. Table 4.2 summarises the factor model fit indices for the initial factor model and each major re-specification point.
The items tested in the initial factorial model indicated the model was not a good fit to the data, $\chi^2 (62) = 125.215, p < .000$. Inspection of modification indices revealed that items 11 and 14 for psychological health (stress) were cross loading with emotional health (emotional dissonance). These items were removed sequentially beginning with item 11, retesting the model after each item was removed. After the items had been removed, standardised residual co-variances revealed that item 2 of the general health questionnaire, an item referring to the need for a ‘good tonic’ was sharing a large amount of variance with item two for emotional health (emotional dissonance). On face value this item appeared to be out dated and potentially ambiguous. The decision was made to remove this item and the factor model was re-run. Results indicated that the data fit the re-specified model well (see Table 4.3.). Figure 4.4 shows the correlations and item loadings for the factorial model in step three of re-specification.

Comparison of the re-specified models at step two and step 3 indicated that the later factor model was not statistically superior with improvement below significance level $\Delta \chi^2 (9) = 14.641$. However, the model in step 3 is a more parsimonious factor solution than the model at step 2 and was therefore retained and incorporated into the structural model in order to contrast and compare model variants featuring work group and organisation identification’s relationship with workforce flourishing and employee health.
Table 4.2.
Confirmatory Factor Analysis Fit Indices for Employee Health, Including Model Re-specification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>125.215</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.020</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (psych health items removed)</td>
<td>50.164</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 (final model – GHQ item removed)</td>
<td>35.523</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Latent Construct of Employee Health.

4.5.3. Structural Model Analysis: Model Variants of Workforce Flourishing

The principle purpose of the structural model analysis was to run the model depicted in figure 4.1 for each variant of the model based on respective predictor
variables, either work group or organisation identification. The two model variants were then compared regarding their contribution to workforce flourishing and employee health. First, the model variant predicted by work group identification and represented in Figure 4.5 was run using AMOS (v21.0). Results indicated the model was a good fit to the data $\chi^2 (13) = 13.435, p < .415$, and fit indices supported a good fitting model (see table 4.3).

Table 4.3.
Fit Indices for Workforce Flourishing and Employee Health Predicted by Work Group Identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.435</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5. Structural Model Relationships for Workforce Flourishing and Employee Health as Predicted by Work Group Identification.

The model of workforce flourishing predicted by work group identification explained 43% of the variance in flourishing and 21% of the variance in employee health. Work group identification had a direct effect on workforce flourishing of $\beta = .53$ and an indirect effect on employee health of $\beta = .14$ via workforce flourishing. Correlations for the work group identification variant model of flourishing are presented in table 4.4.
Table 4.4.
Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations, and Alphas for the Model of Workforce Flourishing Predicted by Work Group Identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>1. WG Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Workforce Flourishing</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employee Health</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Well-Being</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hedonic Well-Being</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Psychological Health</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Physical Health</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>ā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, the model variant featuring organisation identification predicting workforce flourishing and employee health was tested (see Figure 4.6). Results indicated that the model did not fit the data, \( \chi^2 (13) = 45.177, p < .000 \), and only the GFI (.944) of the fit indices showed modest fit of the data (see Table 4.5). Inspection of the standardised residual co-variances indicated that social well-being and hedonic well-being were sharing high levels of variance as was hedonic well-being with emotional dissonance.

Table 4.5.
Fit Indices for Workforce Flourishing and Employee Health Predicted by Organisation Identification (theorised model).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( \chi^2/df )</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45.177</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.475</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In response to the standardised residual covariance figures, hedonic well-being was loaded onto the latent variable of employee health as well as workforce flourishing. The model was re-tested. Modification indices for the model re-test revealed that the model fit would improve if the parameter between social well-being and hedonic well-being was included in the model. In other words, hedonic well-being as a partial or full mediator of the relationship between the manifest social well-being and the latent workforce flourishing would improve model fit. Changes were made incrementally and data assessed before implementing each change. After the two changes were made, the path from social well-being to workforce flourishing was no longer significant and was therefore removed. This additional change meant that the impact of social wellbeing was fully mediated by hedonic well-being. The results for the respecified model indicated good fit to the data, $\chi^2 (12) = 16.158, p < .184$, with other fit indices supporting the good fit of the model (see table 4.6). Figure 4.7 shows the final model for workforce flourishing predicted by organisation identification featuring correlations and explained variance of latent variables.
Table 4.6.
Fit Indices for Workforce Flourishing and Employee Health Predicted by Organisation Identification (re-specified).

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>$\chi^2$/df</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>RFI</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>NFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.158</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7. Structural Model Relationships for Workforce Flourishing and Employee Health as Predicted by Organisation Identification (re-specified model).

The model of workforce flourishing predicted by organisation identification explained 61% of the variance in flourishing\(^2\) and 12% of the variance in employee health. Organisation identification had a direct effect on flourishing of $\beta = .76$ and an indirect effect on employee health of $\beta = .12$ via workforce flourishing. Correlations are presented in table 4.7.

\(^2\) The latent construct of workforce flourishing was altered to enable model fit and therefore, represents a derivative of the construct and not the theorised construct per se.
4.6. Discussion

The hypothesis that work group and organisational identification would demonstrate a positive relationship to workforce flourishing was supported with some qualification needed. In the model of workforce flourishing predicted by organisation identification, social well-being loaded onto hedonic well-being rather than directly onto the latent construct of workforce flourishing, thereby departing from the theorised structure. Consequently, the hypothesis that work group identification would have a stronger association with workforce flourishing than organisation identification was also supported. The third hypothesis that work group identification would have a stronger association with employee health than organisation identification was also supported by the data. Identification with groups within the workplace had an important role in enabling optimal functioning via workforce flourishing, quite possibly made sustainable by the positive effect on employee health that accompanies workforce flourishing.
Comparing the two model variants of workforce flourishing, work group identification showed distinct advantages over organisation identification in relation to flourishing and employee health. For work group identification, the factorial structure for flourishing proposed by Keyes and adopted by Dutton (Dutton et al., 2011; Fredrickson & Dutton, 2008; Keyes, 2007; Keyes & Annas, 2009) that included social, psychological, and hedonic well-being was consistent with the data. The three components of workforce flourishing combined explained 17% of the variance in employee health in relation to work group identification. This compares to the model variant featuring organisation identification which did not demonstrate the same three component structure for flourishing, and also explained a smaller amount of variance in employee health (12%). The principal difference between these model variants of workforce flourishing appears to be the relationship of social well-being with flourishing. In the organisation identification variant of the model, social well-being did not directly load onto the latent construct of workforce flourishing. Instead, social well-being loaded onto hedonic well-being that, in turn, contributed to both the latent constructs of flourishing and employee health directly.

The capacity of work group identification rather than organisation identification to promote social well-being directly may be an inherent quality linked to the level of group abstraction and having balance between group membership and individual needs (Brewer, 1991, 2008, 2009).

According to Turner et al. (1987), group abstraction is associated with the process of self-categorisation and refers to perceptions of inclusiveness. The higher the level of group abstraction, the less concrete the group entity is and the more diffused the sense of inclusiveness is likely to be. Larger, more abstract groups make it more difficult to acquire social resources (Brewer, 1991). One explanation for this
difficulty is that the personal connections necessary to gather social resources such as support, information exchange, and recognition are favoured when the group is tangible rather than notional (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). This line of argument is consistent with the findings of this study. Work group identification directly explained social well-being represented by pro-social citizenship behaviours, whereas organisation identification did not directly explain social well-being. One of the more prominent distinctions between work group and organisation identification is the level of close interactions. While organisation identification may entail a clearly defined and salient set of behaviours, values, and goals, pivotal in the identification processes (Turner et al., 1987), the degree of social interaction capable of fostering optimal functioning and flourishing is likely lower compared to work group identification. Indeed, positive interpersonal interactions, most likely at the level of work group, would seem vitally important for organisational effectiveness, and therefore flourishing.

The findings from this study not only indicate the value of work group identification in terms of effectiveness through flourishing, they also suggest work group identification enhances sustainable practice through furthering employee health. Although the amount of variance explained for employee health appeared to be small (17% and 12%), the health of employees is both highly desirable and potent in terms of organisation effectiveness. Organisations with an option to advance the health of their workforce by a margin of 12-17% would hardly reject such outcomes, particularly when the benefit is facilitated through a more effective workforce via flourishing. An improvement in employee health is likely to have direct benefits to an organisation in terms of a reduction in absenteeism brought about by illness and also provide gains in productivity due to benefits related to physical and mental
capacities (Sparks, Faragher, & Cooper, 2001). As is the case for workforce flourishing, work group identification appears to contribute more to employee health than organisation identification, nevertheless, both of these identification targets are supportive of sustainable approaches to organisation effectiveness.

Ryff (2013) suggested that flourishing generates better, more successful outcomes compared to circumstances in which flourishing is absent. Ryff goes on to claim that positive outcomes related to flourishing are, in turn, likely to contribute to better health. This study assessed two variants of a model of flourishing and the results are consistent with Ryff’s assertion. Flourishing, as determined by job satisfaction (hedonic well-being), organisational commitment (psychological well-being), and citizenship behaviours (social well-being), are all indicative of positive work related outcomes that associate with better employee health according to the findings of the current study. Functionality, in terms of flourishing, represented by the well-being dimensions featured in this study, would seem to benefit organisations directly through effective work behaviours and attitudes, as well as indirectly through better employee health. Identification is a key component in determining positive functioning in terms of flourishing in the workforce and therefore, implores consideration for organisations wishing to address effectiveness in a sustainable manner.

Furthermore, consistent with Keyes and Simoes (2012), the combination of hedonic, psychological, and social well-being in this study was associated with better health outcomes than compared to the organisational identification model variant in which the three sources of well-being did not interact together. The implication for organisational practice is that identification in the workplace provides an effective means by which functioning in a workforce is positively
promoted through flourishing. Furthermore, the benefits of identification in the workplace are sustainable because they profit employee health as a consequence of the functionality inherent in a flourishing workforce. This suggests that organisational initiatives that promote identification may have tremendous value to organisations. However, before further consideration of the consequences of these findings towards identification are considered, the theoretical implications of the findings will be discussed.

4.6.1. Theoretical Implication for Identification, Flourishing, and Health

The relationship of different identity targets in the workplace to workforce flourishing had not been investigated prior to this study. Brewer’s (1991, 2009) optimal distinctiveness theory predicted that groups that best support competing needs for individuality and belonging would enable members of that group to function more effectively through the accumulation of personal and social resources. The results of this study are consistent with Brewer’s theory and related assertions. Work group identification, inclusive of more personal, interactive work activity, demonstrated a greater capacity to produce favourable outcomes in the form of flourishing and employee health. In response to van Knippenberg and van Schie (2000) speculation as to which identities hold importance over others, the results of this study would suggest that the work group is more influential in terms of flourishing and employee health. However, both work group identification and organisation identification demonstrated positive contributions to workforce flourishing and employee health.

In the current study, work group identification had an association with all three well-being dimensions of flourishing, adding further support for Brewer’s (1991, 2009) theory. Work groups, compared to the organisation as an identification target,
facilitate interpersonal interactions more often in line with arguments related to the inherent level of abstraction of each identity (Brewer, 2009), and also the greater frequency with which work groups are contextually relevant in the workplace (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). Both organisation and work group identification were able to directly explain hedonic and psychological well-being. However the third dimension of flourishing, social well-being, was directly related to flourishing when predicted by work group identification, but not when predicted by organisation identification.

The interpersonal capacity of work group identification appears to help facilitate greater workforce flourishing and employee health compared to organisation identification. In Brewer’s (1991, 2009) optimal distinctiveness theory, the claim is made that some groups have a greater capacity to enable positive outcomes and this seems to appropriate to apply to flourishing workforces. Consistent with the claims made by Brewer (2009), Bakker et al. (2011), and Bakker and Demeritou (2008), stating that work group identification has a greater capacity than organisational identification to build important social resources that enable positive outcomes such as employee health to emerge. A healthier, better functioning workforce is a highly sought after outcome for organisations. Organisational strategies aimed at improving effectiveness in a sustainable manner would benefit through attention to identification of their employees, and in particular, identification with small interactive groups such as the work group. When activity within the work group encourages identification with the group, employees are more likely to function optimally (flourish) and be more healthy.

The results of the current study are also informative in terms of theory related to both flourishing and health. For instance, Keyes’ (2007) and Keyes and Annas’
(2009) tri-dimensional construct of flourishing consisting of hedonic, psychological, and social well-being was supported by the results of the current study. When all three aspects of well-being were represented in workforce flourishing, the outcomes in terms of employee health were of a greater magnitude, compared to the organisation identification model variant. In the organisation identification variant of the model, only hedonic and psychological well-being directly loaded onto workforce flourishing. All three dimensions of flourishing appear to offer a unique contribution to the construct of flourishing that suggests greater potential for explanatory capacity, contrasted with previous research that predominantly focussed on hedonic or satisfaction approaches to well-being (see Keyes et al., 2002; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Waterman, 2008).

An example of a hedonic approach is the happy-productive worker thesis that arose from the Hawthorn study (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939) and has been revisited by Thomas Wright, Russell Cropanzano, and colleagues in recent times (e.g., Wright & Cropanzano, 1997; Cropanzano & Wright, 1999; Wright, Cropanzano, Dennly, & Moline, 2002). The happy-productive worker thesis initially drew attention to satisfaction and hedonic well-being as a factor linked to effective and productive employees. Wright, Cropanzano, and colleagues questioned the link to satisfaction per se, suggesting that functionality and construct specificity for satisfaction may be more related to effective and productive work outcomes. The approach used here and the accompanying findings are consistent with this assertion.

Two forms of functionality, psychological and social well-being, were incorporated in this study as well as the inclusion of hedonia, with measurement of the functional well-being constructs aligned specifically to the work context. Studies that seek to explore the role of well-being in the workplace, especially in terms of
organisational effectiveness, would be more capable of yielding information when using a broader conceptualisation of well-being such as the use of flourishing adopted in this study. The functional elements of psychological and social well-being are argued here to add additional explanatory capacity above that of hedonic approaches alone. Future studies may also reveal whether a synergistic effect occurs when hedonic, psychological, and social well-being are present in unison (see Keyes & Simoes, 2012), in contrast to an additive association between these dimensions of well-being and flourishing, as this was not within the scope of this thesis.

Keyes and Simoes (2012) and Ryff (2013) theorised that flourishing, by way of enhanced functional capacity, should give rise to better health. The results of this study are consistent with such a relationship. Functioning well in a workplace would logically increase the frequency and magnitude of benefit such as the health of employees, but also other benefits related to organisational effectiveness through improved functioning. Functional well-being enables resources to be gained (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Dutton et al., 2011) that Hobfoll’s (1989, 2001) COR theory predicts should result in better health. Furthermore, resource gains are likely to facilitate further resource gains that are hallmarks of a sustainable cycle or upward spiral (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014; Hobfoll, 2011; Salanova et al., 2010).

The current findings are consistent with the premise that flourishing results in better health and that it is likely that social resources are involved in this positive relationship. The contrast between work group and organisational identification in predicting flourishing and health in the current study was associated with differences between model variants that involved the relationship with social well-being. Work group identification demonstrated a more direct association with social well-being than organisation identification. As such, the dynamics of work group identification
involving social resource gains offers a salient explanation that accounts for the greater amount of variance in employee health found in the work group identification model variant. Workforce flourishing and employee health are best promoted through small group identification such as identification with a work group as there is a greater likelihood of a more direct relationship with social functioning and well-being.

4.6.2. Study Limitations

Some limitations can be identified in this study that should be considered in relation to the current findings. The measures used to represent the construct of flourishing were derived from scales that were designed for purposes other than their use in this study. Items were selected based on face validity according to their relevance to flourishing as a first step, then statistically assessed for their contribution and formation of scales fit for the purpose of this study. As a consequence, there is a possibility of some imprecision inherent in the measures as representative of existing theory. However, there were two reasons to proceed with the adaption of existing measures to the construct of flourishing. Firstly, the items and scales used were consistent with the three dimensional structure of workforce flourishing described in this thesis. These items also referred directly to work contexts providing important and necessary specificity to enable an examination of flourishing within organisation contexts. Secondly, there was not the scope within this thesis to design a unique measure, as doing so would have impacted on the ability to meet the principle aim of investigating sustainable relationships between organisation’s and their employees that enhance effectiveness and employee health. However, it is certainly acknowledged, particularly in light of the findings of this first study, that development of a context specific measure of flourishing that refines
and expands on the three well-being dimensions is decidedly warranted beyond this thesis. Until this study, the adoption of a context specific approach to the measurement of flourishing had not been undertaken. The results of this study should encourage future research to adopt a similar approach to advance understanding of how flourishing may benefit organisations and employees alike.

Further limitations relate to the size of the sample in this study. Although the sample size was sufficient for the number of parameters estimated in the structural equation model, a larger sample size offers greater confidence in the statistical relationships shown in the analysis. Another limitation related to the sample is that the findings relate to one organisation only and therefore, may be unique to the particular set of circumstances related to that organisation and the accompanying data set. The issue of generalisability will be addressed later in the thesis to some extent when the relationship between identification, flourishing, and health is tested again using a different organisation from a different sector. Future studies that examine these same constructs using different types of organisations will also help to answer questions of generalisability of the relationships found in this research.

4.7. Conclusion

This study sought to explore the relationship between identification and workforce flourishing, while also assessing issues of sustainability through the potential benefit to employee health. The findings of the current study clearly demonstrate that employee identification within the work context has an effect on functioning through workforce flourishing, and that the relationship is made more sustainable because it also has a positive effect on employee health. The relationship of identification to workforce flourishing and employee health was found most prominently in relation to work group identification compared to organisational
identification. Clearly, different targets of identification in the workplace hold different relationships with flourishing and health, although strong identification in general seems to positively contribute to both of these important outcomes.

Therefore, for organisations wishing to become more effective in terms of functioning through a flourishing workforce, and to sustain such benefit by simultaneously contributing to employee health, research should turn towards the circumstances in which positive identification is nurtured. For this purpose, the next study in this thesis focused attention on the antecedents that are likely to promote positive and strong identification with an organisation or work group. After this relationship was explored, the thesis returned attention to workforce flourishing and explored how the antecedents of identification contribute to flourishing via work related identification in subsequent chapters.
Chapter 5

Study Two: Employee Engagement and the Construct of Engagement Climate

The previous chapter found that identification at work is associated with workforce flourishing and employee health. The findings of that study demonstrated that two different targets of identification each made unique contributions to workforce flourishing and employee health, although in general the two targets made strong contributions to these outcomes. The suggestion put forth in relation to these findings was that the circumstances in which identification can be fostered within an organisation is an important field of inquiry to better understand how workforce flourishing and employee health might be promoted. Therefore, before continuing the exploration of workforce flourishing, this chapter will examine in more detail employees relationship with their work.

Social identification research has provided insights into the mechanisms that promote identification; however, much of this research has adopted the paradigm of inter-group conflict and competition as the primary mechanism for strengthening identification (e.g., Haslam et al., 1996; Randel, 2002). This emphasis has been largely driven by the theoretical understanding of categorisation that suggests targets of identification becomes salient when similarities of in-group members and differences with out-group members are highlighted in a given context (Haslam, 2014; Turner et al., 1987; Oakes, Turner, & Haslam, 1991). The process of categorisation may also evoke an exaggeration of similarities and differences to strengthen identification with a valued group (Hogg & Terry, 2000). While not all social identification research has focussed on intergroup conflict and competition as
the main mechanism to increase identification (e.g. Haslam et al., 2003), research into engagement has provided a more positive insight into circumstances that connect people to their work (e.g. Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011). Therefore, this chapter will explore the circumstances that are likely to promote identification in a positive manner by drawing on research in the field of engagement. A brief review of the literature addressing engagement and the characteristics of the work climate that promote engagement follows. The propositions to emerge from this review in relation to how the work climate effects engagement will be assessed qualitatively to confirm which characteristics or constructs might have the potential to increase identification. Following this, a factorial and validity assessment of these constructs will be undertaken so that a measure of the climate for engagement can be tested in relation to identification, workforce flourishing, and employee health later in this thesis.

5.1. Employee Engagement

Kahn (1990) was among the first to use the term employee engagement, defining it as the harnessing of employee’s selves to their work roles. Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) defined engagement as a positive, fulfilling, work related state of mind that is characterised by vigour, dedication, and absorption. Macey and Schneider (2008) described engagement as a positive relationship with one’s work where one has a sense of meaning, competence, and impact from one’s work. There is a consistent theme among these descriptions of engagement in that like identification, there are physical, cognitive, and emotional dimensions to engagement. Kahn’s (1990) physical properties of engagement are in keeping with descriptions of vigor and impact. Vigor is indicative of energy for work (Bakker et al., 2007). Cognitive aspects of engagement also fit with absorption and meaning.
Emotional properties of engagement are aligned with dedication and a sense of competence. In addition, the behaviour, emotions, and thoughts associated with engagement also help to determine an employee’s relationship to their work and others in an organisation (Ashforth et al., 2008; Bakker et al., 2007). The physical, cognitive, and emotional properties, that are the basis on which people relate more closely to their work, are important to engagement, as they are to identification. Therefore, in keeping with Kahn, employee engagement is defined here as the harnessing of employees’ selves to their work roles so that the actions, emotions, and thoughts of employees contribute to their relationship with work and also the between the employee and their organisation and their colleagues. In this regard, engagement not only has physical, cognitive, and emotional domains, it is also largely social in nature.

Researchers Howe (2003), Luthans and Peterson (2001), Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002), Crabtree (2005), and Gubman (2004) have expressed employee engagement as an employee’s connection or involvement with their work. However, their descriptions of engagement offered in these studies do not move beyond the tautological description of what it is to be engaged in one’s work. For example, Howe (2003) suggested that engaged employees will say more positive things about their work, are more likely to stay with their organisation, and are likely to strive for organisation success. There is a lack of insight into what the seeds of engagement might entail; rather, most studies only address what it is to be engaged.

Instead, recent theoretical development in relation to employee engagement, that closely link engagement to the accumulation of resources (Alarcon & Lyons, 2011; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2014; Salanova et al., 2010), may have something to offer in terms of antecedents of engagement. For instance, Hobfoll (2001, 2011)
suggested that the resources that support engagement are linked to positive work ecologies or environments. Specifically, Salanova et al. (2010) found that positive emotions were associated with resource gain that helped to promote employee engagement. Furthermore, employee engagement was accompanied by positive emotional responses that helped to encourage further resource gain. Employee engagement in these terms is indicative of a sustainable, self-generating process that captures positive aspects of employees experience at work through resources gain.

By drawing attention to engagement in terms of work ecologies, or as Bakker et al. (2011) called it, a climate for engagement; a clear articulation of the conditions that help promote the harnessing of an employee’s self to their work can be made. Consistent with this approach, Bakker et al. (2011) explained that engagement is an important mediating variable that helps explain how the work environment might influence identification. Scrutiny of the characteristics within a climate that encourage engagement and connection to work might therefore provide insight into the circumstances that promote organisation and work group identification. This framework seems useful in moving towards a more ecological based understanding of how workforce flourishing and employee health can be enhanced through increased identification and done so sustainably. Recent developments around engagement that have linked the accumulation of resources to higher levels of engagement (e.g., Schaufeli, Bakker, & van Rhenen, 2009; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, & Fischbach, 2013) offer a means by which the antecedents of engagement and, by extension, identification may be understood and subsequently applied.

Bakker and Demerouti (2007, 2014) stated that job resources are generally grouped as physical, social, or organisational features of the work climate. To be considered a resource, these physical, social, or organisational aspects of the work
environment should help reduce job demands, achieve work goals, or stimulate personal growth. As such, these aspects of the work climate may help support the physical, emotional, and cognitive characteristics of engagement described by Kahn (1990) and create a closer bond between an employee and their work, contributing to identification.

Evidence has been found that supports a resource based approach to engagement that also links resources to the work climate. For example, van den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, Witte, and Lens (2008) and Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, and Schaufeli (2009) found that characteristics of the working environment, indicative of job resources, had an impact on employee engagement through meeting, to some extent, employees’ need for autonomy, belonging, and competency (efficacy). Autonomy, belonging, and competency are psychological needs that have a positive effect on motivation (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991; Ryan & Deci, 2001). Xanthopoulou et al., (2009) argued that the resources that help meet such motivational needs are likely to compliments further resources gain, engagement, and therefore motivation at work. In another study Bakker et al. (2007) found that job resources such as job control, supervisor support, information, organisation climate (support), innovation, and appreciation (recognition) all contribute in some way to employee engagement and buffer the negative effects of job demands. As such, job resources act as both facilitators of engagement and buffers against the negative effects of work demands. Further, the work environment appears pivotal in determining the availability of resources that help promote engagement.

However, just as work climates may promote resources that encourage engagement, work climates may also erode resources leading to disengagement and
poor functionality of workers (Xanthopoulou et al., 2013). Kahn (1990) defined disengagement of employees as the uncoupling of selves from work roles resulting in defensive responses towards their work. Defensive responses include withdrawal of authentic views or feelings about their work when interacting with work colleagues. Defensive responses may also involve limits to creative expression, and withholding personal connection with others. Maslach, Jackson, and Leiter (1996) described this process of withdrawal from others and one’s work as the consequences of burnout. Disengaged or burnt-out employees are more likely to be found where the work climate acts counter to establishing meaningful connections or relationships between employees, fellow workers, and the organisation (Jaffe, 1995).

In summarising the argument so far, the characteristics of the work climate that connect employees to their work, the organisation, and fellow workers are likely to facilitate higher levels of identification. These characteristics are likely to have a notable capacity to promote resources for employees to help meet demands, achieve goals, and enhance personnel development. In other words, these characteristics enable employees to function effectively and to flourish. Therefore, consideration of the work climate would contribute to a better understanding of factors that promote identification, and in turn, how to improve workforce flourishing. Furthermore, as suggested by Bakker et al. (2011), a focussed approach that explored engagement climate rather than the more generalised construct of work climate might add further to our knowledge of engagement and conditions that support positive identification, flourishing, and health. A construct such as engagement climate represents the specific work conditions that might contribute to engagement and therefore identification and workforce flourishing.
5.2. Work Climate and Defining Engagement Climate

The climate belonging to work refers to the meaning employees associate with their work environment (James & Jones, 1974). The term work climate has been used so far in this thesis, however, the term psychological climate that is commonly found in the literature (e.g., James et al., 2008) is considered interchangeable for the purpose of this thesis. As such, the construct of work climate, similar to that of psychological climate, is based on the subjective evaluations by individuals in relation to their work environment. Employees are likely to evaluate their work environment against a set of values that are integral to individual employees but also shaped by the workplace (James et al., 2008). As our understanding of work climates grows, so too does our understanding of the processes that effect employee motivation and behaviour (Zhang & Lui, 2010). In this regard, the evaluative processes involved in work climate are of importance here.

Work climate is a term used to describe a wide range of environmental characteristics (Thumin & Thumin, 2011). O’Neill and Arendt (2008) proposed that the work environment is representative of the structures, processes, and events that occur in an organisation, which combined provide an employee’s perception of the climate. Using Locke’s (1976) latent variable structure for personal, work related values, James and James (1989) proposed there were four climate domains. The four domains were: role stress and lack of harmony, job challenge and autonomy, leadership facilitation and support, and work group cooperation. James et al. (2008) summarised these domains as roles, jobs, leaders, and work groups. These domains are subjective in that they are determined by the evaluation of an employee’s values in relation to the work climate characteristics. In terms of examining the climate conducive to engagement, and therefore identification, all domains may contribute;
however, the domains of roles and work group would appear stronger candidates on face value.

There in an ongoing debate about the usefulness of generalised concepts of climate as opposed to specifically targeted constructs that capture particular characteristics of the work environment (Bakker et al., 2011). Schneider (1990) made the distinction between the global, generalised climate on the one hand, and specific, targeted characteristics of climate corresponding to particular areas of inquiry on the other. For example, DeConinck (2011) used ethical climate specifically to explore influences on salespersons’ organisation identification, trust, commitment, and turnover intentions. Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke (2010) found that procedural justice climate and service climate partially mediated the relationship between servant leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour. Servant leadership represents prioritising the welfare and benefit of others over a leader’s self-interest. Consistent with a specified climate approach, Bakker et al. (2011) called for future engagement related research to begin the process of establishing the important characteristics that constitute an “engagement climate”. Rather than the generalised approach used for work climate, a more specific, targeted approach will be used in the present study. Engagement climate, defined as employees’ perceptions about workplace environmental factors that support engagement and work identification, will be the focus of discussion and analysis in this chapter. Employees roles and relationships with work group seems to be a good starting point to establish an understanding of the important factors associated with promoting engagement. The aim was to establish a set of engagement specific climate characteristics that impact on identification, and therefore, workforce flourishing and health.
5.3. Engagement Climate Characteristics

5.3.1. Participation in Decision Making and Recognition/Feedback

Features of engagement climate that are good candidates to facilitate employee engagement and therefore identification are likely to be characterised by their relationship building and role defining capacity (DeConinck, 2011; Gubman, 2004; Luthans & Peterson, 2004; May et al., 2004; Miles, 2001; Walumbwa et al., 2010). Two characteristics of the work environment that have the potential to foster positive relationships and knowledge about roles are participation in decision making and feedback/recognition of contributions towards work objectives. Work environments that facilitate the expression of employees’ competencies (Bakker et al., 2007; Walumbwa et al., 2010) and a sense of shared direction in relation to goals or objectives through participation are known to engage employees (Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2008; Howe, 2003; van den Broeck et al., 2008; Walumbwa et al., 2011). In addition to fostering a sense of shared direction (May et al., 2004), participation allows a sense of influence in the workplace that conveys a message of being valued by management and the organisation as a whole (Kahn, 1990). Participation also helps to gain a sense of control over work demands and clarifies role expectations (Maslach & Leiter, 2008).

Recognition of work performed can be both intrinsic through acknowledgement (Vezina & St Arnaud, 1995) and extrinsic via rewards (Davis, 1999) and there is also a strong socialisation orientation or purpose associated (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). The social orientation aspect of feedback/recognition would enable and employee to connect their sense of self to their work, a central process in engagement (Kahn, 1990). Likewise, feedback serves a social integrative purpose through conveying feelings of being valued.
Rec­og­ni­tion and feed­back, as repre­sen­ta­tive of integ­ra­tive social­i­sation prac­tices in re­sponse to em­ploy­ees’ work, are re­f­erred to jointly for the pur­pose of this thesis. Af­ford­ing em­ploy­ees digne­ty and re­spect through rec­og­ni­tion that their con­tri­bu­tions are val­u­able is like­ly to gen­er­ate mean­ing­ful re­la­tion­ships be­tween em­ploy­ees and their work and work groups such as the or­gan­i­sa­tion (May et al., 2004; van den Broeck et al., 2008). Sim­i­larly, feed­back/recog­ni­tion of work per­formed and ob­sta­cles over­come can help fos­ter feel­ings of be­ing val­u­ed (Maslach & Leiter, 2008).

It is ar­gued here that feed­back/recog­ni­tion and par­ti­ci­pa­tion in deci­sion mak­ing are likely to in­crease en­gag­ment through pro­mo­tion of em­ploy­ees’ feel­ings that they are mak­ing a val­u­ed con­tri­bu­tion to the or­gan­i­sa­tion. In es­sence, rec­og­ni­tion and par­ti­ci­pa­tion build re­la­tion­ships be­tween em­ploy­ees and the or­gan­i­sa­tion by fos­ter­ing a shared sense of di­rec­tion (com­mon de­n­si­ty) and in­her­ently con­vey­ing that an em­ploy­ees’ work makes a val­u­ed con­tri­bu­tion to mu­tal goals. In ef­fect, feed­back/recog­ni­tion and par­ti­ci­pa­tion are cre­ating con­di­tions like­ly to fa­cil­i­tate en­gag­ment and iden­ti­fi­ca­tion. In turn, en­gag­ment and iden­ti­fi­ca­tion are like­ly to re­sult in pos­i­tive func­tion­ing of em­ploy­ees con­sistent with the con­cept of work­force flour­ish­ing (Dutton et al., 2010).

5.3.2. Open Com­mu­ni­ca­tion

Em­ploy­ee en­gag­ment is more like­ly to oc­cur where an or­gan­i­sa­tion’s lead­ers or man­age­ment com­mu­ni­cate more fre­quent­ly and more open­ly to en­courage un­der­stand­ing and own­ship of or­gan­i­sational ob­jec­tives (Bakker et al., 2011; Howe, 2003). Open, two way com­mu­ni­ca­tion is rec­og­nis­ed as one of the more im­port­ant fac­tors in de­vel­op­ing pro­duc­tive re­la­tion­ships in the work­place (Bakker et al., 2011; Crab­tree, 2005), as it con­trib­utes to greater ac­cu­racy in per­ceived
explanations for managerial actions (May et al., 2004; Miles, 2001). Communication that is free flowing and more open also conveys an implicit message that the organisation respects and values their employees as members of the organisation. As such, feeling valued helps enhance engagement (Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2013). When communication in the organisation is poor, employees may not be clear about what is expected of them and how their role relates to organisational objectives (Greenfield, 2004) or the means by which they might contribute to such objective (Maslach et al., 1996). Therefore, open communication in the workplace is one aspect of the engagement climate that can enhance decision making capacity, a sense of being valued, and congruency between employee and organisational expectations. Congruency between employees and organisation expectations also helps to align values and objective, creating an overall climate that facilitates engagement and flourishing.

5.3.3. Organisation Support

Similar to open communication, organisation support is another indicator of employees’ perceptions of the extent to which an organisation values their contribution to the organisation (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Eisenberger et al. defined organisation support as an employee’s perception of the extent to which the organisation values their contributions and cares about their well-being. Perceptions in this regard may emerge based on the organisation’s behaviour towards the employee, including respect for employee-held values (Jones, Flynn, & Kelloway, 1995). A supportive organisation is likely to be evaluated positively, and as discussed by James et al. (2008) and Thumin and Thumin (2011), engagement is an evaluative process. This suggests that organisation support
indicates how favourably resources that facilitate engagement are assessed by employees.

Therefore, organisation support can be added to open communication, participation, and feedback/recognition as characteristic of a positive engagement climate. The capacity of organisation support to enhance an employees’ sense that their work is valued suggests that this aspect of engagement climate is likely to contribute to employee engagement (see Bakker & Demerouti, 2014). When there is a lack of faith in the organisational processes to remedy wrongs, employees may respond with increasing negative reactions to their work leading to disengagement (Maslach and Leiter, 2008; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Organisation support is therefore important in a climate of engagement.

5.4. Qualitative Study: Refining the Characteristics of Engagement Climate

Four characteristics of an engagement climate were identified in the preceding discussion that are likely to influence work identification and therefore, workforce flourishing. These characteristics are participation in decision making, feedback/recognition, open communication, and perceived organisation support. In order to support the theoretical arguments presented here for the inclusion of participation in decision making, feedback/recognition, open communication, and organisation support as typifying engagement climate, a qualitative study was conducted. The aim of the qualitative study was to explore employee insights into factors that contribute to employee’s sense of belonging (identification) and the practices organisations adopt that enable employees to be more effective and optimally functional (be engaged) at work. Following a qualitative assessment of the factors that contribute to engagement climate, the factors to emerge were tested
quantitatively to confirm factor structures and contributions in relation to the
construct of engagement climate.

The objective in the qualitative assessment was to freely capture employee’s
perspectives relating to the factors that contribute to engagement or identification at
work. When the range of participant perspectives had been collected and
categorised, comparison was made with theoretical perspectives to confirm
predictions about variables relating to engagement climate. The set of variables were
then factor analysed to arrive at a measure of engagement climate for use
empirically within a model of engagement climate, work identification, and
workforce flourishing. It was proposed that the four characteristics of engagement
climate discussed would be represented clearly by the qualitative assessment of
employee’s views on improving functionality and fit within an organisation.

5.5. Method

An outline of the method used for data collection and categorisation is
provided for the purpose of assessing the reliability and transparency of the
interpretations made of the data.

5.5.1. Participants

Participants in this study were self-selected from the same population of local
government (council) employees recruited for the first study in this thesis (see
Chapter 4). Two hundred and twenty four employees completed a questionnaire in
study one, either in paper based or electronic format. Demographic information for
the complete sample for study one can be found in Chapter 4. A total of 138
participants responded to the question regarding individual and group functionality
(peoplewise), which was 62% of those completing the questionnaire for the first
study. Table 5.1 displays demographic averages for those responding to the functionality question. A total of 117 participants completed the question related to their sense of belonging (belong) or fit with the organisation, which was 52% of the total number of respondents to the questionnaire from study one. Thirty-two respondents answered only the “peoplewise” question, eleven answered only the “belong” question, and 106 answered both questions. Table 5.1 displays the demographic averages for those responding to the second qualitative question.

Table 5.1.
Demographic Characteristics for Respondents answering each of Two Qualitative Questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>'peoplewise' n = 138 (SD)</th>
<th>'belong' n = 117 (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>42.6 (11.6)</td>
<td>42.37 (11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female 66.9%</td>
<td>Female 68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in role (ave yrs)</td>
<td>5.9 (6.6)</td>
<td>5.9 (6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in organisation (ave yrs)</td>
<td>7.7 (7.1)</td>
<td>7.9 (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Uni or TAFE</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Uni</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Grad Uni</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 – 0.7% missing
2 – 0.7% missing
3 – 2.2% other
4 – 2.2% missing
5 – 1.6% other
6 – 0.9% missing
5.5.2. Procedure

Questionnaires were made available to employees by contacting team leaders and managers to arrange for the distribution of the questionnaires at the next convenient team meeting. Questionnaires were subsequently handed out to members of the team for completion. A small number of questionnaires were completed online (17). Please see study one (Chapter 4 of this thesis) for more details regarding data collection.

5.5.3. Materials

Two qualitative questions were proposed to participants. Both questions were presented to participants at the end of the quantitative questionnaire that provided data for study one in this thesis. The format of the questionnaire was predominantly paper based with a small number of participants completing the questionnaire online. Space was provided for both questions in the paper based and electronic versions of the questionnaire for participants to write one or two short paragraphs.

The first question was designed to explore employee perceptions of what engagement climate variables might make a contribution to the positive interactions among staff to support functionality. Participants were asked the following question:

“What could be done peoplewise to make your organisation run more smoothly?”

The second question was designed to examine employee perceptions of engagement climate variables that contribute to their sense of belonging or identification with an organisation. Participants were asked the following:

“What could/does your organisation do that would make you feel as if you belonged more?”
5.5.4. Analysis of the statements

Independent t-tests were performed to assess if those respondents completing each of the two qualitative questions differed in some way to those who did not complete these questions. Comparisons were made on a range of demographic variables including age, gender, average number of children, years in role, years in organisation and two identification targets (organisation and work group identification – see study one for detailed description). In all tests, for both sets of respondents corresponding to the qualitative questions, there was no significant difference in any demographic or identification measures. Therefore, the people responding to the qualitative questions were representative of the larger sample obtained in study one of this thesis.

Participant responses to the two questions were recorded and arranged in separate tables, one table for each of the two questions. Within each table, responses were coded according to the following categories derived from the literature presented in the introduction of this chapter.

0 = No category (leave blank)
1 = Communication (open exchange of information)
2 = Recognition/feedback (e.g., thank you, understanding the work they do)
3 = Participation in decision making (Involvement in planning, design, strategies, management)
4 = Support (supervisor, manager, organisation)

A pilot coding exercise was undertaken with representative variations, or manufactured examples of the actual data collected. The thesis author was one of the coders; the other was an academic specialising in organisational behaviour and holding a Ph.D. in the field of Business Studies. Each coder received 10 examples, which were coded and then compared between coders. Coders then negotiated and
explained their coding rationale to help raise the level of consistency for categorisation decisions made when the main data sets were categorised. The two researchers undertook the task of coding the main data independent of each other to establish inter-rater reliability measures for data categorisations. The following instructions were used by each coder to achieve a consistent approach to the categorisation of the data.

*Please place the following statements, sentences, or phrases into one or more of the categories above. A brief description of the categories is provided but you are to use your best judgment independently to assign the data to categories.*

*Because many of the statements might contain references to more than one category, each case may have more than one category assigned but not for the same section of text. Once one part of the text is classified it cannot be given another classification. As a coder, you have to decide which category best fits the information provided by respondents, but only choose one category for each section of text. Do not refer to a category more than once for each case.*

*If statements cannot be categorised, leave them blank or assign ‘0’ as a classification.*

### 5.6. Results

#### 5.6.1. Peoplewise Question: Positive Functionality

A total of 188 classifications were made from 138 responses to the question “what could be done peoplewise to make your organisation run more smoothly?” The level of agreement between coders for the “peoplewise” question was 83% (κ = .78). The highest number of categorisations for a single category agreed by coders for “peoplewise” was 45 (24%) for the category of communication. Table 5.2 displays contingency categorisations for data coding related to the “peoplewise” question.
Table 5.2.
Inter-rater Reliability Contingency Coding for the "Peoplewise" Question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater A</th>
<th>Rater B</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = No category</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45 (24%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Recognition/feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30 (16%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Participation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28 (15%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43 (23%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One hundred and eighty eight classifications obtained from 138 cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of all responses received in response to the question “what could be done peoplewise…” 24% of respondents referred to communication, 23% referred to managerial/supervisor support, 16% referred to recognition/feedback, and 15% referred to participation in decision making. Across all statements made in reference to the “peoplewise” question, 22% of these statements could either not be coded into one of the four engagement climate categories, or coders did not concur with their judgement about the classification of these statements. The results suggest that a large proportion of the statements made in reference to “what could be done peoplewise…” fit with at least one of the four engagement climate categories.

5.6.2. Belonging Question: Identification with the Organisation

There were 162 classifications made from 117 cases for the question “what could/does your organisation do that would make you feel as if you belonged more?” The level of inter-rater agreement for the “belong” question was 88% (κ =
The highest number of agreed categorisations for a single category for the “belong” question was 42 (26%) for the category of support. Table 5.3 displays contingency categorisations for data coding related to the “belonging” question.

Table 5.3.
Inter-rater Reliability Contingency Coding for the “Belong” Question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rater B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = No category</td>
<td>8 0 3 5 0 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Communication</td>
<td>1 24 (15%) 0 1 0 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Recognition/feedback</td>
<td>3 0 26 (16%) 1 0 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Participation</td>
<td>0 0 0 37 (23%) 1 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Support</td>
<td>4 0 2 4 42 (26%) 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One hundred and sixty two classifications obtained from 117 cases

In reference to the question about “belonging more…” respondents raised issues related to managerial/supervisor support in 26% of instances, participation in decision making in 23% of instances, recognition/feedback in 16% of classifications, and communication in 15% of rater classifications. Over all classifications made for this question, 20% of the classifications were either not agreed between raters or they were classified as not fitting one of the four engagement climate categories. Similar to the “peoplewise” question, respondents to the “belonging” question made statements in a majority of instances that are highly consistent with the four engagement climate categories posed by this study.
For both qualitative questions, it is notable that the greatest difficulty for raters to reach agreement centred on the “0 = no category” classification. This is indicated by the high figures for disagreement found within these sections of Tables 5.2 and 5.3. It is expected that interpretations between raters will differ mostly at the edges of interpretation. That is, where an example may not be overtly identifiable with the central tenets guiding interpretations. Therefore, it is expected that the “no category” might attract the highest proportion of disagreement. As such, the pattern of classifications and the high level of equivocality found for the “no category” are deemed acceptable and are not viewed as problematic.

5.7. Qualitative Study Discussion

The construct of engagement climate is relatively new in terms of research and discussion centred on the characteristics of a work environment that supports engagement (Bakker et al., 2011). The qualitative study examined engagement climate by asking respondents about the interactive (peoplewise) and associative (belonging) characteristics that are argued to contribute to engagement. An examination of the qualitative data collected revealed that all four nominated engagement climate categories featured prominently in responses to the two qualitative questions presented to study participants.

Although the four characteristics of engagement climate taken collectively captured a similar percentage of mentions when the statements were considered for both the “peoplewise” (78%), and “belong” (80%) questions, the distribution of references for single engagement climate characteristics did vary between the two questions. For the “peoplewise” question, communication was referred to most frequently of the four engagement climate factors. In contrast, communication was the least mentioned of the four engagement climate characteristics in relation to the
“belonging” question. The different results for the two questions suggest people may view communication as a very important attribute enabling people to work well together. However, in terms of what might encourage a sense of belonging, it would appear that communication has a reduced level of importance in comparison with the other engagement climate characteristics explored here in this study.

The pattern of results found for the “belonging” question suggest that support such as from managers and supervisors is a priority compared to the other three engagement climate characteristics. Participation in decision making was also referred to often with regard to a sense of belonging. For the question related to functioning “peoplewise”, participation was ranked highest out of the four engagement climate characteristics. However, support had a similar frequency of references made in relation to both the “belonging” and “peoplewise” question. Taken together, these outcomes suggest that participation and a sense of managerial support are important to generating a sense of belonging. In contrast, communication and support are most applicable to people working together effectively (peoplewise). It is important to note however, that communication, recognition/feedback, participation, and organisation support provide a comprehensive insight into the constituents of engagement climate.

Theoretically, the results found in this study support Kahn’s (1990) claim that engagement depicts the harnessing of an organisation member’s self to their work role and others within the organisation. The qualitative questions presented to participants were specifically designed to capture employees’ impressions of the sorts of things that promote a sense of belonging and effective interaction with others. The strong representation of the four engagement climate characteristics in the qualitative data suggest that all four characteristics are likely to facilitate
employees’ relationship with their work (belonging) and their effectiveness or functionality in relation to each other (peoplewise). Furthermore, while there are differences in the contribution of some of the engagement climate characteristics, all four were strongly represented in responses to both of the qualitative questions and this suggests all four are important contributors towards connecting people to their work and enabling better functionality within the workplace.

The four engagement climate characteristics may be understood in terms of job demand/resource theories of engagement (e.g., Alarcon & Lyons, 2011; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2014; Salanova et al., 2010) when highlighting the potential of these characteristics to become resources that drive positive gain cycles. As levels of communication, feedback/recognition, participation, and organisation support rise, so too does the level of engagement, which is likely to lead to further enhancement of the engagement climate (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2014; Salanova et al., 2010). As such, these engagement climate characteristics would appear to offer a sustainable approach to creating opportunities for employees to have a closer relationship with their work and to function more effectively with others in the organisation.

The findings are also consistent with Bakker et al.’s (2011) argument for specific and contextualised work climate approaches to research. The rationale being that a specific approach would be more theoretically revealing than applying contextually generic constructs, despite the level of consistency with broad based work climate offered. The strong representation of all four engagement climate characteristics seems to provide evidence that there is value in taking Bakker et al.’s approach.
There are some limitations to this qualitative study, primarily concerning the range of engagement climate characteristics used to code the qualitative data. It may be argued that allowing engagement climate categories to freely emerge from an analysis of the data would lead to a richer, more varied range of engagement climate characteristics (see Stemler, 2001). However, the circumstances here were more suited to an a priori coding given that there existed some research and considered discussion on the topic of engagement climate, albeit from relatively recent and emerging explorations. This study embraced the opportunity to gather some preliminary data on speculative characteristics of engagement climate that were drawn from the existing literature but had not yet been empirically tested. As a first step toward empirical evaluation, qualitatively exploring the likelihood that communication, feedback/recognition, participation, and support would make meaningful contributions to the measurement of engagement climate was deemed a prudent step to take. To follow on from this, the construct of engagement climate was tested empirically and results are reported in the following sections of this chapter.

5.8. Quantitative Study: Further Examination of the Construct of Engagement Climate

Consistent with the evolving model approach to model development used in this thesis, the structure of the engagement climate construct found in the preceding qualitative study will be tested quantitatively. It was found previously in this study that engagement climate can be represented by employees’ perceived level of participation in decision making (Harter et al., 2002; Howe, 2003), assessments of open communication (dialogue) within the workplace (Howe, 2003), feedback/recognition regarding work performance (Maslach et al., 1996), and beliefs about the level of organisational support extended to them (Armeli, Eisenberger, &
To continue to develop the construct of engagement climate, these four characteristics of engagement climate were tested empirically. The four characteristics were measured and their contribution to the higher order factor of engagement climate assessed. A set of measures capturing engagement climate allows this construct to be incorporated into the model of workforce flourishing established earlier in this thesis.

The following hypotheses were tested:

**Hypothesis 1a**: The four factor structure for engagement climate consisting of communication, participation, feedback/recognition, and perceived organisational support found in the preceding qualitative study would be consistent with the factorial outcome of confirmatory factor analysis.

**Hypothesis 1b**: The four factors representing engagement climate would demonstrate convergent validity with measures of burnout.

### 5.9. Method

#### 5.9.1. Participants

An employment service organisation with the central office located in Melbourne, Australia was invited to participate in this study. The number of staff at the employment agency totalled 320 and emails were sent from the Human Resources Division to each of these staff members inviting participation through a link to the web page hosting the survey. The survey and data repository were located on Deakin University’s main computer drive. A total of 128 questionnaires were lodged electronically, with a response rate of 40%. A total of 84 were female (66.7%) and 41 were male (32.5%) with one respondent not indicating gender (0.8%). Ages ranged from 18 to 67 ($M = 40.11$, $SD = 10.46$).
The number of children reported by participants ranged from zero to six, with 64 people (51.6%) indicating one or more children and 23 (19.1%) reporting more than two children (one case had missing data, 0.8%). Average length of time with the employment agency was 2.74 years ($SD = 2.43$). Fifteen point one per cent were secondary school educated, 29.4% were educated to certificate level, 16.7% had done some university study, 23.8% had completed an undergraduate university degree, and 13.8% had completed a post graduate university qualification. Two people (1.6%) did not respond to the question relating to educational level achieved.

5.9.2. Procedure and Design

A detailed overview of the study, study aims, and potential benefits to the organisation that might stem from the information gathered were presented to management of the employment agency. A number of telephone conversations and meetings were held with the Director of Human Resources at this employment agency to explain the research. Following this, a formal presentation was held with management representatives to gather support for the research and to work out the practicalities of making the survey available to all staff members. The agency agreed to the study with the request that a measure of burnout be included as they were interested in gaining some insight into levels of burnout among their staff.

The employment service agency helps disadvantaged and unemployed people find work, and they have twenty nine offices located throughout the states of Victoria, New South Wales, and Tasmania. Offices are spread throughout each of these states in order to provide services in locations that are close to clients’ residencies. It was decided that because many of the agency staff may be involved with a client consultation at any one time, the most prudent method of distributing
the survey was to do so online and invite participation via an email containing a link to the survey.

A cross sectional design was used in the study to measure staff in terms of engagement climate. The engagement climate variable included measures of communication satisfaction, quality and occurrence of feedback/recognition, participation in decision making, and perceptions of organisational support.

5.9.3. Materials

A questionnaire was provided to participants to complete online or in paper format. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix B. The questionnaire contained measures to capture the four characteristics of engagement climate, namely; communication, participation, feedback/recognition, and organisation support. Sub-scale measures of burnout were used as convergent validity measures.

Communication Effectiveness, a subscale of the job satisfaction survey (Spector, 1985) that assesses employee satisfaction with organisational communication was used. The sub-scale consists of four items measured on a seven point Likert scale ranging from 0 = do not agree to 6 = totally agree. An example of the questions asked is “the goals of this organisation are not clear to me” (reversed scored). Reported Cronbach’s alpha for the original scale was .71. Centrality of item means, item variance, and contribution to scale were assessed to evaluate scale reliability. In the current study, all four items were retained with Cronbach’s alpha .79.

Feedback/Recognition was measured using Sims, Szilagyi, and Keller’s (1976) feedback subscale from the job characteristics inventory. The feedback sub-scale consists of five items and was measured using a five point Likert scale ranging
from 0 = poor to 4 = excellent. The subscale items ask participants to rate a number of statements for example, “the feedback from my supervisor on how well I am doing”. Assessment of scale reliability statistics found that item two was accounting for large amounts of variance, essentially rendering the other items redundant. The decision was made to remove this item. Conducting CFA analysis using structural equation modelling is made difficult if a factor is represented by only one manifest item (Blunch, 2013). Cronbach’s alpha for the four items remaining in the present study was .94.

**Participation in Decision Making** was measured using Vroom’s (1959) psychological participation scale. The scale consists of four items scored on a five point Likert scale ranging from 0 = none to 4 = a great deal. Test-retest reliability over a seven month period was .63. An example question is “in general, how much say or influence do you have on what goes on at work”? Response ranges from 0 = never to 6 = all the time. Higher scores represent greater levels of participation. All four items were retained for this study after scale reliability assessment was completed. Cronbach’s alpha in the present study was .88.

**Organisational Support** was measured using ten items from the Survey of Perceived Organisational Support (SPOS) (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Factor analysis of SPOS items revealed only one factor (Armeli et al., 1998; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Hutchison, 1997) with high internal reliability (Cronbach’s alpha = .97). For the present study, and consistent with other studies using this scale (see, Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), ten items were selected from the 36 items on the basis of their higher factor loadings as reported in the Eisenberger et al. (1986) study. Items were scored on a seven point Likert scale ranging from 0 = not at all to 6 = always. Higher scores on the SPOS items reflect greater levels of organisational support.
The 10 items were subjected to reliability assessment and two items were removed for reasons of low SMC’s or low SD’s. Cronbach’s alpha for the eight items used in the current study was .94.

**Exhaustion** and **Cynicism** subscales from the Maslach Burnout Inventory General Survey (MBI-GS) (Maslach et al., 1996) were used for the purpose of convergent validity assessment for engagement climate. The third sub-scale, professional efficacy, was not used on the basis that the authors reported this sub-scale had lower correlations with the exhaustion and cynicism sub-scales. Tests with exhaustion and cynicism separately would provide adequate information about the convergent validity for engagement climate. An example of a question from the exhaustion sub-scale is “I feel emotionally drained from my work”. An example of a question from the cynicism sub-scale is “I have become less enthusiastic about my work”. Both the exhaustion and cynicism sub-scales have five items each and were scored on a seven point Likert scale ranging from 0 = *never* to 6 = *every day*. Respondents were asked to indicate the frequency of occurrence for the situation featured in each of the questions. Reliability assessment of the two sub scales resulted in a reduction of items for both exhaustion and cynicism. The remaining items used from the MBI-GS for exhaustion was 1, 2, and 3. While the remaining items used for cynicism were 8, 9, and 14. Cronbach’s alpha for the three items used for exhaustion was .86, and for the three items for cynicism was .83.

**5.9.4. Data Preparation**

Questionnaire data were screened using SPSS (v21.0) statistical software. Inspection of the data file revealed one case with only the responses to the demographic questions recorded, all other questions (including complete scales) were left blank and therefore, this case was deleted. Another case had only a portion
of the demographic data presented as well as less than half of the questionnaire scales. This case was removed leaving a total of 126 cases in the data set. A scan for missing data using SPSS revealed one item that had three missing values across all cases (2.4%) which was the highest rate of missing data found. Other instances of scale items with missing data were limited to only one or two cases. The rates for missing data were low in terms of the percentage of cases and were therefore considered random. Missing values were replaced using the SPSS regression method.

The data was screened for outliers by checking upper and lower range for items against ± 3.29 multiplied by the standard deviation for each item. Higher numbers than this figure were deemed outliers. No outliers were present in the measures used in this study. No instances of skewness or kurtosis were found.

5.9.5. Analysis

The development of the construct of engagement climate through CFA builds on earlier research reported in this chapter. AMOS (v21.0) was used to assess CFA of constructs developed for this study. AMOS was also used to assess convergent validity for the construct of engagement climate.

The first step in analysis was to assess the factorial structure of the construct of engagement climate, and also establish convergent validity for this new construct. The purpose of developing the construct of engagement climate in this thesis was to develop an understanding of circumstances or practices that may be adopted to promote identification in a positive way within a work environment. As such, the construct was explored here for the purpose of including it in the model of workforce flourishing later in this thesis.
5.10. Results

5.10.1. Factor Analysis: The Latent Structure of Engagement Climate

Measures contributing to the latent construct of engagement climate were informed by theoretical sources such as Bakker and colleagues (Bakker et al., 2007; Bakker et al., 2011, & Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010) and refined through qualitative investigation featured earlier in this chapter. Scales were matched to the four domains of communication, feedback/recognition, participation, and organisational support that emerged from the theoretical and qualitative examination. Before the CFA of engagement climate was undertaken, each measure representing one of the four characteristics of engagement climate were scrutinised for variance captured, distribution around the scale midpoint, and item and scale reliability (see Blunch, 2013). Items remaining formed measures for the four domains that combined, represent the latent factor of engagement climate. Therefore, to assess the contribution of the four scales to engagement climate, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed (see Figure 5.1).

Results revealed a poor fit for the data, $\chi^2 (164) = 350.13, p < .000$ (see table 5.4), however eigenvalues indicated there were four factors in the solution to the data. A series of model re-specifications were required to achieve a fit to the data and form a solution that expressed the four factors to emerge from earlier qualitative and theoretical exploration. Each step of the re-specification of the model is summarised in tables 5.4 and 5.5. Table 5.5 lists the rational for each iteration of re-specification in the factor analysis of the construct of engagement climate. After the eighth iteration of re-specification acceptable model fit was found, $\chi^2 (59) = 76.56, p < .062$. Factor analysis in SPSS (v21.0) of the remaining items for the constructs of engagement climate revealed Kaiser-Meyer-Olin sampling adequacy was excellent.
(0.894), and Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant, \( p = 0.000 \). However, the
eigenvalue for the fourth factor was just below the standardised level of one with the
three other factors above the eigenvalues of one accounting for 72.78% of the
variance in the data. Scree plot examination indicated a single factor might better
explain the data, which was interpreted as the potential presence of the higher order
factor of engagement climate. Therefore, a test of the higher order factor structure
for engagement climate was conducted, and results indicated there was no
improvement of the factorial model of engagement climate (see table 5.4).

### Table 5.4.
Fit Indices for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) with Re-specification Iterations for the
Latent Factor of Engagement Climate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( \chi^2/df )</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>350.132</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.135</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>290.114</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1.987</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>251.988</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.953</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>188.795</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.671</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>152.039</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>121.079</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>101.889</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.435</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>76.564</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Higher**

| Order | 84.876     | 61 | 1.391        | .056  | .914| .980| .974| .911| .932|

### Table 5.5.
Engagement Climate CFA Re-specification Iterations, Changes Made, and Change
Justification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Changes made before next step</th>
<th>Justification for changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item 7 for organisational support removed</td>
<td>High SRC and MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Item 1 for organisational support removed</td>
<td>High SRC and MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Item 4 for feedback/recognition removed</td>
<td>High MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Item 4 for participation removed</td>
<td>High MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Item 10 for organisational support removed</td>
<td>High MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Item 2 for organisational support removed</td>
<td>High MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Item 4 for communication removed</td>
<td>High MI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The four factor structure of engagement climate was retained for further analysis in this study based on the theoretical and qualitative support for the four components. While the data suggests that a three factor solution may improve the factor model, examination of correlations in the components matrix in SPSS did not provide an articulate arrangement consistent with a three factor solution. These results are based on a small sample size, which may present some difficulty in parcelling out variance to form a clear factorial structure for engagement climate. The three factor solution is somewhat equivocal and therefore, the four factor solution will be applied. The next step in analysis was to test the convergent validity of engagement climate in relation to measures consistent with engagement.
Exhaustion and cynicism from the MBI-GS (Maslach et al., 1996) were selected as suitable measures for this purpose.

5.10.2. Engagement Climate Convergent Validity

To test the convergent validity of the engagement climate structure two CFAs were conducted, one with the MBI-GS subscale of exhaustion, and the other with the sub-scale cynicism, also from the MBI-GS. The two sub-scales are measures of burnout, which is a condition that negatively effects peoples’ capacity to perform at their work and is interpreted as the opposite of engagement (Maslach et al., 1996). Engagement climate should demonstrate a negative relationship to both exhaustion and cynicism for evidence of convergent validity.

The CFAs for each of the comparison constructs were conducted separately to help overcome the limitation of small sample size when analysis using SEM techniques. The fit for the CFA model of engagement climate and exhaustion was good, $\chi^2 (13) = 23.11, p < .040$. The fit for the CFA model of engagement climate and cynicism was moderate but acceptable, $\chi^2 (13) = 28.01, p < .009$. Table 5.6 displays the fit indices for both CFA models and figures 5.2 and 5.3 display manifest factor loadings and latent factor correlations demonstrating convergent validity of the construct of engagement climate. Convergent validity was found to be of a reasonable magnitude for exhaustion and in the expected negative direction ($r = -.61$). Convergent validity for cynicism was also good and in the expected direction ($r = -.67$). For the engagement climate and cynicism CFA, modification indices were showing that item 14 of the cynicism scale was cross loading with the manifest variables of organisational support and communication. Item 14 relates to cynicism about whether an employee perceives that their work contributes to anything.
Adjustment was not made to the CFA model as the purpose was foremost to assess the convergent validity of the engagement climate construct.

**Table 5.6.**
Fit Indices for the CFA Models Involving Exhaustion and Cynicism for Convergent Validity of Engagement Climate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFA Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td>23.109</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.778</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>28.008</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.154</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.2.** Convergent Validity Assessment using CFA of Engagement Climate and Exhaustion.
5.11. Quantitative Study Discussion

The hypothesis stating that the four factor structure of engagement climate consisting of communication, participation, feedback/recognition, and perceived organisational support will be consistent with results of CFA analysis was supported by the data. The hypothesis that the four factors representing engagement climate will demonstrate convergent validity with measures of burnout was also supported. The results of this study indicate that engagement climate demonstrates very good construct traits. The results of the CFA and convergent validity analysis also confirm the conclusions and forecasts drawn from the qualitative study reported earlier in this chapter. These findings in relation to the tested hypotheses will be discussed in detail within the general discussion that follows along with theoretical implications in the domain of psychological climate.
5.12. General Discussion

The four factor structure for engagement climate that was informed by the qualitative study early in this chapter was supported by the data after sequenced re-specification was performed. Most of the re-specification required to attain a good factor model fit to the data involved items from Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) perceived organisational support (POS) scale. A common theme in the four remaining items that represented organisational support was that the organisation cared about or helped employees in their work. Items containing inferences about appreciation, consideration, and disregard did not fit well with the construct of organisational support in the context of engagement climate.

Schaufeli and Bakker (2010) distinguished engagement from the similar construct of job involvement by suggesting the former involved behavioural and emotional expressions while the later was a cognitive judgement. The items that comprised organisational support in the current study referred to either help, or caring, or both, and are consistent with Schaufeli and Bakker’s (2010) description of behavioural or emotional elements of engagement. Furthermore, the items removed during CFA re-specification that referred to appreciation, consideration, and disregard appear to align with cognitive judgments about work, which may explain their poor fit with the CFA. The theme of cognitive judgement in the items that were removed suggest that engagement climate is best represented by behavioural and emotional aspects of work. Indeed, the CFA results demonstrated that along with the behavioural and emotional items in organisational support, the constructs of participation, feedback/recognition, and communication, represent workplace behaviours and appear to combine well as a representation of engagement climate.
The factor structure for engagement climate found in the current study was consistent with the theoretical arguments and qualitative results reported earlier in this chapter. The correlations between the four contributing variables of communication, feedback/recognition, organisational support, and participation suggest a cohesive construct of engagement climate exists that describes conditions within a work environment argued to promote engagement. None of the correlations were found to be below $r = .51$ (communication and participation the lowest), which is indicative of a robust relationship between the constructs examined here. Furthermore, none of the correlations exceeded $r = .72$ (communication and organisational support), which is not of a magnitude to warrant concerns about redundancy between constructs. There was also good support found for convergent validity, when comparisons were made with the constructs of exhaustion and cynicism from the Maslach et al. (1996) burnout inventory. Therefore, the construct of engagement climate appears to be captured well by the four components of commitment, feedback/recognition, organisational support, and participation and provides grounds for future consideration in research.

The four factor structure of engagement climate provides a framework that may also benefit interventions that aim to enhance organisational effectiveness and harness the potential of employees. These proposals were further advanced further in the next chapter when engagement climate was tested for its relationship with organisation and work group identification and also the contribution made to work force flourishing.

5.12.1. Theoretical implications

The findings of this study have implications for theory related to psychological climate (e.g., James & Jones, 1974). Researchers such as Bakker et al., (2011) have
argued that generalised conceptualisations of psychological work climate may have limited usefulness, proposing instead that targeted approaches may yield more useful information. Specific approaches to psychological work climate have been used to explore ethics (DeConinck, 2011) and procedural justice and service climates (Walumbwa et al., 2010). This study now adds engagement climate to those studies exploring targeted aspects of psychological climate. In the first part of this chapter, four characteristics of engagement climate were proposed, and later, support for the four components were found using qualitative and quantitative analysis. The findings of this study have contributed to understanding of the structural characteristics of engagement climate through qualitative analysis, CFA, and convergent validity testing. The factorial structure found in this study was consistent with the hypothesised structure derived from the qualitative analysis and all factorial indicators suggest a robust structure for engagement climate was found.

5.12.2. Study Limitations

A number of limitations to the current study have been identified in relation to the findings. Notably, the fixed array of engagement climate characteristics used as coding categories in the qualitative study in this chapter. This matter was discussed earlier at the end of the qualitative study and will not be discuss gain here. However, the four categories used were able to account for a large percentage of the qualitative data collected.

Further limitations relate to the size of the sample for CFA analysis. However, obtaining a larger sample was not possible with the organisation involved on this occasion. Importantly in this instance, the relationships implicated by theory and qualitative analysis were effectively explored in the CFA and validity assessment involving the smaller sample. A related limitation was that the sample used in this
study for CFA and convergent validity analysis was representative of one organisation. Therefore, in relation to findings involving the quantitative assessment of engagement climate in particular, further research would enhance generalizability of the CFA findings. Interestingly, the qualitative study and the CFA were conducted with separate samples, from different organisations, with strong support from the CFA study for the earlier qualitative findings. This helps in some way to support generalizability. The evidence from two different organisational populations, one from local government, and the other from an employment services organisation supports claims about the robustness of the construct of engagement climate without being conclusive.

5.13. Conclusion

This study sought to examine and develop a measureable construct of engagement climate beginning with the qualitative analysis. The four component structure of engagement climate featuring communication, participation, feedback/recognition, and organisational support was found to provide a good fit for the data in this study. The construct of engagement climate also demonstrated excellent convergent validity with the burnout subscales of exhaustion and cynicism (see Maslach et al. 1996). Taken together, the results featured in this chapter support the theoretical arguments for engagement climate and the factorial structure speculated from the literature. Application of the construct of engagement climate in further research was therefore a justified step to take next.

The advantage of engagement climate in organisational research is that it provides direct insight into the strategic application of such a construct for improvement of effective practice and interventions. In terms of furthering research in this area, engagement climate presents a straight forward approach to enhancing
employee identification in a way that promotes organisational effectiveness through workforce flourishing. Therefore, the next chapter re-visited the model of workforce flourishing established earlier in this thesis and continued the evolution of this model by integrating the construct of engagement climate.
Chapter 6

Study 3: The Relationship between Engagement Climate, Identification, and Workforce Flourishing

6.1. Introduction

Employee engagement is expressed in terms of an employee’s relationship with their work role (Kahn, 1990). A closely related construct, engagement climate, relates to employee perceptions of the working environment that foster the relationship with work roles (Bakker et al., 2011). The approach adopted in this thesis is to evolve a model of workforce flourishing that includes employees’ relationship with their work. Therefore, the structure of engagement climate found in the preceding study will be assessed in relation to work group and organisation identification, as well as workforce flourishing.

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was applied in the previous chapter to help define the attributes of engagement climate that exist within the work environment. Evaluating the relationship between engagement climate and workforce flourishing by controlling for the effects of identification will help to reveal if positive work conditions lead to positive functioning in the workplace. Furthermore, this study will assess the importance of the need for employees to connect personally with their work, and how this facilitates a relationship between work environments and flourishing.

In contrast to disengaged employees, engaged employees are an asset to an organisation as they have an increased likelihood of contributing to organisational goals (Howe, 2003; Langford, 2009; May et al., 2004; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010).
Engaged employees also develop positive relationships with co-workers and supervisors within the organisation (Luthan & Peterson, 2001; Robertson & Cooper, 2010). Engaged employees also have more positive attitudes and behaviours that contribute to organisational effectiveness (Howe, 2003; Kahn, 1990; Langford, 2009; Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2010). Engaged employees would appear to function in a positive manner in the course of their work consistent with the concept of flourishing (Dutton et al., 2011). Engaged employees would also be more likely to have high levels of identification as a consequence of positive relationships with co-workers and supervisors (Dutton et al., 2010). Positive relationships are underscored by positive attitudes and behavioural displays, or in other words, they would be more likely to flourish (e.g., Keyes, 2007; Seligman, 2011).

However, in the current study, engagement climate is a more expedient construct to adopt compared to employee engagement per se, because the later has strong similarity with the construct of identification and could therefore confound relationships between the constructs. Engagement climate helps shift focus from exploring the connection between an employee and their work environment, to the conditions that may facilitate a connection such as this. Engagement climate consisting of participation in decision making, communication, feedback/recognition, and perceived organisational support is distinct from the construct of identification.

Identification refers to incorporation of group values, beliefs, and goals as one’s own (Haslam, 2014; Turner et al., 1987), whereas engagement climate is an antecedent, a pre-condition, which promotes identification. According to Bakker et al. (2011), employee perceptions specific to aspects of their work environment are important for promotion of close psychological relationships with their work.
Therefore, employee perceptions play an important role in linking an employee with their work, considered to be the foundations of engagement climate. As such, engagement climate involves an assessment of condition at work with the potential to increase identification with work related groups as a consequence, including work groups and the organisation as a whole. To assess the relationship of employees to their work and the effects of the work environment on these relationships, the association of engagement climate to work group and organisation identification will be explored.

Brewer’s (1991, 2008) optimal distinctiveness theory, and the findings from the first study in this thesis, suggest that engagement climate may have a different impact on identification according to the degree of abstraction of the target group. In the first study of this thesis, it was found that work group identification predicted workforce flourishing and employee health to a greater degree than organisation identification. The difference was attributed to the capacity of work group identification to foster more frequent and more personalised interaction with other workers compared to organisation identification. It was therefore argued that work group identification has a greater relationship with social well-being, which results in enhanced workforce flourishing.

Positive interactions associated with identification may occur according to conditions present within an engagement climate (see Dutton et al., 2010). According to van Knippenberg and van Schie (2000), work group identification, rather than organisation identification, is the more likely circumstance in which employee interactions occur. Therefore, engagement climate, inclusive of activities such as participation in decision making, communication, and feedback/recognition are more likely to occur at the level of work group rather than the organisation
Organisational support, the fourth component of engagement climate, is likely to be evenly perceived at both work group and organisation identification levels. Therefore, there is unlikely to be differences in organisational support for each target of identification.

In terms of organisational support, the lack of predicted preference in the relationship between either work group or organisation identification is attributed to how these identification targets relate to the interaction between employees’ and their supervisor/manager. According to Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, and Rhoades (2002), the supervisor/manager represents an organisation more so than most others within that organisation. However, the supervisor/manager is also representative of the work group that they lead. Therefore, predicting which of the two targets of identification might be influenced through perceptions of organisational support is complex and provincial. Nevertheless, participation in decision making, communication, and feedback/recognition all appear to have a clear association with interpersonal interaction and, as such, are predicted to associate with work group identification more so than organisation identification. Consistent with this premise, work group identification was predicted to have superior explanatory capacity regarding the effect of engagement climate on flourishing, compared to organisation identification.

**Hypothesis 1:** Engagement climate will have a significant positive relationship with work group and organisation identification. However, work group rather than organisation identification will demonstrate a greater relationship with engagement climate based on the greater likelihood of positive social interaction with work group identification.
Hypothesis 2a: Similar to study one in Chapter 3 of this thesis, identification will be positively associated with workforce flourishing. Work group identification compared to organisation identification will demonstrate a greater relationship with workforce flourishing.

Hypothesis 2b: Engagement climate will have a positive association with workforce flourishing.

Hypothesis 2c: The effect of engagement climate on flourishing will be explained by identification. Therefore, when the effects of identification are controlled, engagement climate will not significantly contribute to workforce flourishing beyond the effects of identification. The effect of engagement climate on workforce flourishing is more likely to be explained by work group rather than organisation identification.

6.2. Method

6.2.1. Participants

Participants and the organisation involved in this study were the same as the quantitative study in the previous chapter. Details about participants and the organisation can be found there.

6.2.2. Procedure and Design

Procedure details are the same as the quantitative study in the previous chapter. Details about procedures can be found there. The following is a description of the design for the current study.

A cross sectional design was used in the study to measure staff in terms of engagement climate, identification, and flourishing. The dependant variables at
different stages in the analysis were work group and organisation identification and workforce flourishing. Workforce flourishing contained measures of psychological well-being, social well-being, and hedonic well-being. Independent variables at different stages of the analysis included engagement climate, work group identification, and organisation identification. The engagement climate variable included measures of communication satisfaction, quality and occurrence of feedback/recognition, participation in decision making, and perceptions of organisational support.

6.2.3. Materials

A questionnaire was provided to participants to complete online or in paper format. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix B.

Engagement Climate

Details about the measures used for engagement climate can be found in the quantitative study in the previous chapter. A brief summary of each measure is provided here for convenience.

Communication Effectiveness, a subscale of the job satisfaction survey (Spector, 1985) that assesses employee satisfaction with organisational communication was used.

Feedback/Recognition was measured using Sims et al.’s (1976) feedback subscale from the job characteristics inventory.

Participation in Decision Making was measured using Vroom’s (1959) psychological participation scale.
Organisational Support was measured using ten items from the Survey of Perceived Organisational Support (SPOS) (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Identification

Work group and Organisation Identification were measured using van Dick et al.’s (2004) dimensional measure of identification. The scale was designed to explore different foci of identification on four dimensions including cognitive, affective, evaluative, and behavioural. Although the dimensions of identification was not of interest in the current study, the clear distinction of identification targets for respondents and the range of items for each target of identification was assessed as desirable above that of the single item measure used in the first study of this thesis. The scale consists of seven items for each foci of identification and was scored using a Likert response style ranging from 0 = low identification to 6 = high identification.

The scale is presented to participants in the form of a table or grid with the first column representing each of the questions, then subsequent columns for each of the identification foci with space underneath to enter scores for the seven questions running in rows across the table. Participants were asked to enter a score for how true each question or statement was with respect to each of the identification target groups. An example of a question is “Being a member of my [team/work group] reflects my personality well”. Cronbach’s alpha in the van Dick et al. (2004) study ranged from .80 to .84. Both work group and organisation identification measures were assessed for reliability separately. For the work group identification measure, items four through to seven were removed on account of their poor contribution to the scale. Cronbach’s alpha for the remaining three item measure of work group identification was .86. For the organisation identification measure, reliability
assessment resulted in the removal of the same items as per the work group identification measure (i.e., 4, 5, 6, & 7). Cronbach’s alpha for the remaining three item measure of organisation identification was .84.

Workforce Flourishing Measures

**Hedonic well-being** - Job satisfaction: Warr et al.’s (1979) 15 item global job satisfaction scale formed the starting point towards deriving a measure of hedonic well-being. Repeating the same procedure used in the first study of this thesis the scale was assessed, and items selected, based on face validity relative to construct of hedonic well-being. Therefore, items 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, and 12 that were determined in study one of this thesis also formed the starting point for scale assessment in the current study. Secondly, the selected items then underwent reliability analysis to assess contributions and cohesiveness of the group of items (see Chapter 4 for a more detailed description of item selection priorities). In the current study items 1, 2, and 6 were removed because of comparatively poor contribution to the scale compared to the other items. The items remaining included item 4, 10, 11, and 12 used in study one of this thesis and also items 8 and 14. However, to maintain consistency with the first study, and for reasons of parsimony, only items 4, 10, 11, and 12 were retained for analysis. Items were answered using a 7 point Likert scale ranging from 0 = *not satisfied* to 6 = *completely satisfied*. The four items used are listed in Chapter 4. Cronbach’s alpha for remaining four items used in this study was .90. The items representing hedonic well-being were linked by common inference to the value, or satisfaction, with organisational or management actions that arguably promote effectiveness in the organisation.

**Psychological well-being** – In the absence of the organisational commitment scale by Allen and Meyer (1990) used in the first study of this thesis, the cynicism
sub-scale form the Maslach Burnout Inventory General Survey (MBI – GS) (Maslach et al., 1996) was used. As the sub-scale of cynicism was used to assess the convergent validity of engagement climate in the previous chapter, scale reliability had already been performed. Three items were retained from the original five. Remaining items were 8, 9, and 14 of the MBI-GS and are listed below. The three items used in this study are consistent with aspects reported to associate with positive psychological functioning (see, Keyes, 2007; Ryff, 2013; Seligman, 2011).

According to the authors of this scale, cynicism reflects indifference or distant attitudes towards work. This scale therefore captures the negative end of the spectrum of psychological well-being reflecting psychological states of mind that impact on functioning at work such as interest, enthusiasm, and cynicism. Responses to questions were scored on a seven point Likert scale ranging from 0 = never to 6 = every day. Respondents were asked to indicate the level of frequency of occurrence for each of the questions. Scores for items were reversed to maintain consistency with the positive orientation of other measures of workforce flourishing as well as the premise that flourishing is measured in positive terms. The items remaining are listed below and Cronbach’s alpha was .83 for the three items.

- I have become less interested in my work since I started this job (item 8 - reversed).
- I have become less enthusiastic about my work (item 9 – reversed).
- I have become more cynical about whether my work contributes anything (item 14 – reversed)

**Social well-being** was measured using items from Smith et al.’s (1983) Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) scale, following the same procedure for selecting items as that was used for hedonic and psychological well-being measures. Based on face validity of items as representing positive social interaction,
or social well-being, items 1, 3, 5, 7, and 13 were selected for further consideration, as was done for the first study in this thesis. Assessment of scale reliability showed that all items had similar variances and means. However, item five was removed to maintain consistency with the items used in the first study representing social well-being. Items representing social well-being were 1, 3, 7, and 13 and are listed in Chapter 4. Respondents were asked to think of an employee who worked or had worked with them and to rate how characteristic each item was of that employee. Scores are based on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from $1 = \text{not characteristic}$ to $5 = \text{totally characteristic}$. Cronbach’s alpha in the current study was .81. Each item shared a common theme of positive social functioning.

6.2.4. Data Preparation

A description of data preparation for this data set was reported in the previous chapter in the quantitative study. A brief overview is provided here for convenience. Questionnaire data were screened using SPSS (v21.0) statistical software. Two cases were removed due to large amounts of missing data leaving a total of 126 cases. Other missing data were at low rates (below 2.5%) and considered random. Missing data was replaced using the SPSS regression method. No outliers were present in the measures used in this study. No instances of skewness or kurtosis were found.

6.2.5. Analysis

The aim of developing the construct of engagement climate in this thesis was to advance understanding of circumstances or practices that promote identification in a positive way within a work environment. Often efforts to promote identification involve direct competition and result in conflict and negativity towards out-groups (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Therefore, within an organisation,
competition therefore has the potential for undesirable side effects (Hogg & Terry, 2000).

The next step in analysis was to test the construct of engagement climate in relation to each of two identification targets - work group and organisation identification. The final aspect of analysis undertaken was to assess the relationship between engagement climate, identification, and workforce flourishing by exploring the mediating properties of identification.

6.3. Results

6.3.1. Structural Model Analysis: Engagement Climate’s relationship with Work group and Organisation Identification

The aim of the structural model analysis was to explore the potential effect of engagement climate on two different identification targets; the work group and the organisation. Increasing levels of identification is often approached in ways that evoke inter-group rivalry and competition (see, Hogg & Terry, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; van Dick et al., 2004; van Knippenberg & Ellemers, 1993).

Engagement climate represents an approach to identification that is sustainable and without the negative side-effects of rivalry and competition.

Using AMOS (v21.0), the model of engagement climate and work group identification was the model examined first. An excellent fit to the data was found, $\chi^2 (13) = 16.304, p < .233$, and fit indices added further support for the model’s good fit (see table 6.1). Loadings for latent variables, correlations, and explained variance for the model are displayed in Figure 6.1 and correlations, means, and standard deviations are displayed in Table 6.2.
The model of engagement climate and organisation identification was run next, also using AMOS (v21.0). The model was not supported by the data, $\chi^2 (13) = 40.990, p < .000$, although some fit indices indicated a marginal degree of fit (see table 6.1). Inspection of standardised residual covariances and modification indices suggested that the manifest variable of participation in decision making was cross loading with item one of organisation identification. This item asks if people think it is true that they identify with the organisation. Participation in decision making was also cross loading with feedback/recognition in the same latent construct of engagement climate. It would seem that in terms of organisation identification, participation is closely intertwined with a state of identification and also the feedback/recognition one gets at work. This may account for the high degree of shared variance between these variables. To achieve model fit the manifest variable of participation was removed from the construct of engagement climate and the model re-run. The re-specified model of engagement climate and organisation identification was a good fit to the data, $\chi^2 (8) = 16.066, p < .041$, and fit indices added further support (see table 6.1). Loadings for latent variables, correlations, and explained variance for the model are displayed in Figure 6.2 and correlation, means, and standard deviations are displayed in Table 6.3. Despite the model of engagement climate and organisation identification displaying moderate fit after re-specification, the model of engagement climate and work group identification demonstrates superior fit to data in this study.
Table 6.1.
Structural Model Fit Indices for Engagement Climate in Relations to Two Identification Targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work group</td>
<td>16.304</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation - Step 1</td>
<td>40.990</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.153</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation - Step 2</td>
<td>16.066</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.008</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.1. Structural Model for the Relationship between Engagement Climate and Work Group Identification.

Figure 6.2. Structural Model for the Relationship between Engagement Climate and Organisation Identification after Re-specification of the Model.
Table 6.2.
Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations, and Alphas for the Model of Engagement Climate and Work Group Identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>1. Engagement Climate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work group Identification</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feedback/Recognition</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participation</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organisational Support</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. W-Group ID Item 1</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. W-Group ID Item 2</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M | 4.71 2.47 3.32 3.83 3.36 4.78 4.45 4.90
SD | 1.14 1.04 1.26 1.40 1.67 1.28 1.38 1.19
α | .86 .93 .83 .75 .93

Table 6.3.
Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations, and Alphas for the Model of Engagement Climate and Organisation Identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Engagement Climate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organisation Identification</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feedback/Recognition</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communication</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organisational Support</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organisation ID Item 1</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Organisation ID Item 2</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organisation ID Item 3</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M | 4.33 2.47 3.83 3.36 4.32 4.03 4.65
SD | 1.20 1.04 1.40 1.67 1.35 1.44 1.35
α | .84 .93 .75 .93

6.3.2. Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Effects of Engagement Climate on Flourishing after controlling for Identification.

The final process in analysis for this study was to examine the relationship between engagement climate and flourishing while controlling for the effects of identification. The two targets of identification were of interest here to assess how
each might interact with engagement climate and affect the relationship with flourishing. Hierarchical multiple regression was used in this instance because the small sample total was not compatible with a structural equation approach given the number of parameters involved. The number of parameters that would be freely estimated in such a model compared to the number of cases was below the 10:1 ratio recommended by Blunch (2013). Tabachnick and Fiddel (2014) recommend a formula for regression analysis that calculates sample size according to the number of independent variables used in the equation. The sample of 128 in the current study exceeds the forecast number of 90 obtained by applying the Tabachnick and Fiddel equation.

However, before the regression analysis was conducted, a CFA of the construct of workforce flourishing was conducted in order to justify the calculation of a composite mean score for the construct and apply this in regression analysis. Because the measure of psychological well-being in this study was different to the measure used in the first study (Chapter 4), a CFA analysis was important in order to assess the validity of the new combination of measures.

The next step involved was to run separate hierarchical regression equations, one each for work group and organisation identification. The identification measure was entered into the equation in the first step. For the second step, the four components of engagement climate; participation, communication, feedback/recognition, and organisational support were entered into the analysis. Results of the hierarchical regression for each target of identification are reported below.
CFA of Workforce Flourishing

The measures of emotional (hedonic) well-being and social well-being used in study one of this thesis were found to combine well and contribute to the construct of workforce flourishing. The measure of emotional (hedonic) well-being was drawn from Warr et al.’s (1979) global satisfaction scale. The measure of social well-being was drawn from Smith et al.’s (1983) measure of organisational citizenship behaviour. The same set of items used in study one for these two measures were used again in this study to provide manifest variables of their respective constructs comprising workforce flourishing. The third measure, psychosocial well-being, was measured using items from the cynicism sub-scale of Maslach et al.’s (1996) MBI-GS. Three items formed the manifest indicators of the psychological well-being component of workforce flourishing; scores for these items were reversed to reflect a positive contribution to workforce flourishing.

To assess the contributions of the three scales to workforce flourishing, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed (see Figure 6.3). Results revealed a good fit for the data, $\chi^2 (41) = 55.134, p < .069$ (see table 6.4), with eigenvalues confirming a three factor solution to the data. Inspection of standardised residual covariances and modification indices revealed that the model might benefit from re-specification, particularly in relation to item four of the job satisfaction scale; however, for reasons of maintaining consistency with the factor model found in study one of this thesis, no further changes were made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.4.</th>
<th>Fit Indices for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Construct of Workforce Flourishing with a Second Sample.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>$df$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.134</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two hierarchical multiple regressions with workforce flourishing as the dependent variable were the next steps undertaken in analysis. The regression analyses involving organisation identification, engagement climate, and workforce flourishing was conducted first. Organisation identification was entered at the first step of the regression to control for the effects of identification in the relationship between engagement climate and workforce flourishing. At stage two the variables communication, feedback/recognition, participation, and organisational support were entered as representative of engagement climate. Correlations between the regression variables are reported in Table 6.5. Regression statistics are displayed in

\[ \text{Figure 6.3. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the Latent Construct of Workforce Flourishing.} \]
Table 6.6. The results of the hierarchical regression for organisation identification, engagement climate, and workforce flourishing showed that organisation identification explained a significant amount of variance in workforce flourishing $F(1, 124) = 44.190, p < .000$. Organisation identification explained 26.3% of the variance in workforce flourishing. Introducing the engagement climate set of variables in stage two of the regression analysis explained an additional 41.0% of the variance in workforce flourishing $F(4, 120) = 37.538, p < .000$. When organisation identification and the four engagement climate variables were included in the regression model only participation, communication, and feedback/recognition remained significant predictors of workforce flourishing. Altogether, the five variables accounted for 67.3% of the variance in workforce flourishing.

Table 6.5.  
Correlations for Multiple Regression Analysis of Engagement Climate on Workforce Flourishing, Controlling for Organisation Identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Workforce Flourishing</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organisation Identification</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feedback/Recognition</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communication</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participation</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organisational Support</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.6.
Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Organisation Identification, Workforce Flourishing, and Engagement Climate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( sr^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Identification</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>6.65*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Identification</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>1.41NS</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>3.35*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Support</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>1.87NS</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>3.99*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback/recognition</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 126, *p < .001, NS = Not significant

The hierarchical regression for work group identification, engagement climate, and workforce flourishing was conducted next. Work group identification was entered at the first step of the regression to control for the effects of this target of identification in the relationship between engagement climate and workforce flourishing. At stage two, the variables communication, feedback/recognition, participation, and organisational support were entered as representative of engagement climate. Correlations between the regression variables are reported in Table 6.7. Regression statistics are displayed in Table 6.8. The results of the hierarchical regression for work group identification, engagement climate, and workforce flourishing showed that work group identification explained a significant 31.4% of the variance in workforce flourishing, \( F(1, 124) = 56.696, p < .000 \).

Introducing the engagement climate set of variables in stage two of the regression analysis explained an additional 37.8% of the variance in workforce flourishing \( F(4, 120) = 36.850, p < .000 \). When work group identification and the four
engagement climate variables were included in the regression model all variables made a significant contribution to workforce flourishing. Altogether, 69.2% of the variance in workforce flourishing was explained by work group identification and the four engagement climate variables.

**Table 6.7.**
Correlations for Multiple Regression Analysis of Engagement Climate on Workforce Flourishing, Controlling for Work Group Identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Workforce Flourishing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work group Identification</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feedback/Recognition</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communication</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participation</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organisational Support</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.8.**
Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Work Group Identification, Workforce Flourishing, and Engagement Climate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sr²</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Identification</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>7.53*</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Identification</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>3.12*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>3.43*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Support</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>2.03b</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>4.14*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback/recognition</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>3.05a</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 126, *p < .001, * p < .005, b p < .05
6.4. Discussion

The prediction in hypothesis one that engagement climate would have a significant positive relationship with work group and organisation identification was supported by the data. Results also supported the prediction that engagement climate would have a stronger relationship with work group identification rather than organisation identification. The structural model for engagement climate and work group identification fit the data well without the need for modification. Whereas the model featuring engagement climate and organisation identification required some re-specification before adequate fit could be found and fit indices were uniformly lower than the model featuring work group identification. A greater amount of variance was explained when organisation identification was considered compared to work group identification. However, work group identification as a dependent variable was a better fit to the data.

Results for hypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2c that employed hierarchical regression analysis were generally as predicted with hypothesis 2c the exception. Work group identification had higher regression weights and percentage of variance explained for workforce flourishing than organisation identification indicating hypothesis 2a was supported. Hypothesis 2b predicting engagement climate would have a positive effect on workforce flourishing was also supported in hierarchical regression analysis. However, hypothesis 2c predicting that the positive effects of engagement climate on workforce flourishing would be explained by identification were not supported for either work group or organisation identification.

Once engagement climate was entered into the hierarchical regression, organisation identification became a non-significant contributor to workforce flourishing. In contrast, work group identification remained significant after the
Consider the results of the hypotheses tested, engagement climate relates highly with identification as well as explaining additional variance in workforce flourishing to that of work group identification. The results support forecasts made at the conclusion of Chapter 5 suggesting engagement climate is an important contributor to both identification and workforce flourishing. These findings in relation to the tested hypotheses will be discussed in detail below along with implications for engagement, identification, and flourishing (well-being) theories.

### 6.4.1. Engagement Climate

Engagement climate was found to have a positive relationship with both work group and organisation identification and provides insight into the potential agency of engagement climate in terms of organisational interventions. The four components of engagement climate examined here provide excellent reference for the formulation of strategies to promote identification within an environment such as an organisation. In terms of work group identification, all four elements of engagement climate related to this identification target explaining a significant proportion of the variance in work group identification. Similarly, engagement climate explained a large amount of variance in organisation identification; however, this was only after participation in decision making was removed to obtain acceptable fit to the data.
Two issues are raised by these results. The first involves an explanation of the difference in variance explained by the two targets of identification. The second highlights the difference in the array of constructs representing engagement climate that were necessary to find a fit with the data. Both issues have a relationship to the formulation of strategies designed to enhance employee identification with their work, and the subsequent benefits that increased identification offers such as workforce flourishing.

These two issues are likely to have a common origin in that the configuration of engagement climate constructs differs according to the target of identification, and therefore, one might expect differences in variance explained. The greater amount of variance explained in organisation identification compared to work group identification can be attributed to differences in the way these identification targets are related to the work environment. Evidence for this argument is found by examining each of the engagement climate factor configurations predicting their respective identification targets. Organisation identification was predicted by three of the four components of engagement climate; communication, feedback/recognition, and organisational support. In contrast, work group identification was predicted by all four components of engagement climate, including participation. Putting aside the differences in configuration of engagement climate for the moment, the components of engagement climate that were found in common may not effect different identification targets in the same way. The different effects may therefore result in different amount of variance being explained for each target. Communication, feedback/recognition, and organisational support may have more in common with organisation level identification and facilitate this relationship more so than work group identification.
This line of argument would appear to contradict arguments by Brewer (2008), and van Knippenberg and van Schie (2000), that interactions such as communication, feedback/recognition, and organisational support are more effective at promoting work group rather than organisation identification. However, it is possible that the nature or subject matter that is the focus of such interactions is more consistent with organisation identification than work group identification. This may be particularly evident for the organisation under examination here. For example, if the content of communication is centred on organisational issues more so than issues pertaining to the work group, aspects important to identification such as meaning are more likely to be forged at the organisational level (Macy & Schneider, 2008). In other words, expressions of engagement are likely to be consistent with the meaning and significance generated during work activity (see Kahn, 1990). This line of argument runs counter to Brewer’s (2008) and van Knippenberg and Schie’s (2000) claim that the ability to interact and share knowledge determines effectiveness, and therefore, work groups are likely to be prominent in terms of effectiveness. Instead, the combination of opportunities to interact, such as through communication and feedback, in addition to the focus or nature of those interactions and the meaning they generate also appears to be important to identification and effectiveness through flourishing.

The difference between the configurations of engagement climate that explain each of the two targets of identification for the model variations is the other issue raised by the findings. Work group identification was predicted by engagement climate, inclusive of communication, feedback/recognition, organisation support, and participation. In contrast, organisation identification was predicted by three of the four components of engagement climate, but not by participation. Consistent
with the preceding argument, the nature of the relationship between variables may offer an explanation for the findings. For example, participation in decision making might only relate to work group identification if the nature of the decision being made is directed predominantly at the work group activities and not at organisational levels. There may arguably be a necessity to match actions undertaken through engagement climate with the activity normally occurring within a particular identification group.

Greenfield (2004) suggested that participation in decision making raises awareness and knowledge about the values that underpin decisions being made. Knowledge and awareness of values is also an important aspect of identification and is specific to the target of identification (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner et al., 1987). If participation in decision making is practiced in relation to decisions about the work group, then work group values are likely to become more salient and promote work group identification as a result. This explanation is compatible with the findings of the research presented here. It appears that engagement climate helps enhance the level of identification experienced; however, the nature of the interactions occurring within the climate of engagement also helps to determine the target of identification that is most likely to be most affected.

6.4.2. Workforce Flourishing

Reflecting the factor structure for workforce flourishing that was found in Chapter 4 of this thesis; a similar three factor structure was found for workforce flourishing in this study. Correlation patterns between the factors were also consistent with those found in Chapter 3 with hedonic well-being and psychological well-being demonstrating the highest correlation level. These two variables were also found to have the highest correlation between variables in the study reported in
Chapter 4. The lowest correlation was between social well-being and psychological well-being and this was also consistent with earlier findings. Fit indices of the CFA model in this study and the study in Chapter 3 were also of similar magnitude. However, the model in the current study showed slightly reduced levels of fit across the spectrum of indices compared to the earlier study, although differences were marginal.

Comparison of the CFA results for workforce flourishing in this study and the study in Chapter 4 suggest the factorial consistency for the construct demonstrates stability across the two different samples. Furthermore, the replacement of items of organisational commitment used earlier with items of cynicism from Maslach et al.’s (1996) burnout inventory in this study appears not to have modified the factorial structure of workforce flourishing. The construct of workforce flourishing is argued to be reliably represented by hedonic, social, and psychological well-being and presents a context specific approach to the investigation of flourishing.

The relationship of work group and organisation identification to workforce flourishing was tested in the current study; with current results reiterating the relationship found between these two variables in study one of this thesis. Extending the model, engagement climate was included to provide insight into the relationship between work environments (engagement climate), employee characteristics (identification), and effectiveness through functionality (workforce flourishing).

A hierarchical regression analysis was chosen in preference to structural equation modelling (SEM) on the basis that the sample size in the current study may have generated unstable parameter estimates by using SEM given the number of variables of interest (see Blunch, 2013). Hierarchical regression analysis showed
that for step one, organisation identification explained a significant proportion of the variance in workforce flourishing. The amount of variance explained was lower than that found in Chapter 4 of this thesis. In relation to work group identification, the hierarchical regression analysis showed that at the first step a significant amount of variance was also explained in workforce flourishing. However, this was also lower than the amount of variance found in Chapter 4. For the organisational population represented in this study, identification appears to account for a notable portion of the variance in workforce flourishing, albeit of reduced magnitude, compared to the earlier study in this thesis. The pattern of relationships found here is consistent with the earlier study in Chapter 4 of this thesis. In addition, the current study found that when organisation identification and work group identification were controlled, the inclusion of engagement climate explained additional variance in workforce flourishing.

In terms of organisation identification, the addition of engagement climate into the regression equation resulted in organisation identification no longer contributing significantly to workforce flourishing. Instead, participation, communication and feedback/recognition were the only significant contributions to workforce flourishing after all variables were entered. In contrast, when all variables had been entered into the hierarchical regression equation involving work group identification, all four components of engagement climate were found to be significant contributors to workforce flourishing. Furthermore, work group identification remained a significant contributor to workforce flourishing after all variables had entered the regression equation. These findings demonstrate that for this sample the relationship between engagement climate and workforce flourishing
involves a broader composition of factors when work group identification is concerned compared to organisation identification.

Taken together, the results of the two regression analyses suggest that the social environment is instrumental in contributing to the functional capacity of a workforce and organisation in the form of workforce flourishing. Communication, participation, and recognition seem particularly important to workforce flourishing regardless of the focus of identification. However, strong work group identification appears to contribute additional predictive capacity for flourishing beyond that of engagement climate alone. In addition, work group identification appears to affect perceptions of organisational support in a way that helps link such support with flourishing that was not evident when organisation identification was considered.

Work group identification involves a greater degree of social interaction compared to organisation identification (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). However, further research is required in order to support the claim that social interaction is responsible for promoting a broader array of engagement climate factors that facilitate workforce flourishing. The results presented here are nevertheless consistent with idea that the added interactional opportunities associated with work group identification contribute to workforce flourishing. In conclusion, the relationship of engagement climate to workforce flourishing that included work group identification accounted for a richer array of work related factors and was a better fit to the data than the relationship involving organisation identification. For the organisation represented in this study, work group identification provides a focal point that better represents links between the environment (engagement climate) and the potential effectiveness of the organisation through workforce flourishing.
6.4.3. Theoretical implications

The findings of this study have implications for theory related to psychological climate (e.g., James & Jones, 1974). Researchers such as Bakker et al., (2011) have argued that generalised conceptualisations of psychological work climate may have limited usefulness, proposing instead that targeted approaches may yield more information. Specific approaches to psychological work climate have been used to explore ethics (DeConinck, 2011) and procedural justice and service climates (Walumbwa et al., 2010). This study now adds engagement climate to those studies exploring targeted, specific aspects of psychological climate that relate to engagement. In Chapter 5 of this thesis, four components related to engagement climate were proposed, and later, support for the four components was found using qualitative analysis and CFA. The current study has advanced both the understanding and utility of engagement climate through SEM and regression analysis.

Evidence was found in this study linking engagement climate to both work group and organisation identification. Results such as these demonstrate the potential of the engagement climate construct in helping to understand and influence work related behaviour and organisational effectiveness. Assessment of engagement climate revealed that all four components of engagement climate helped explain a significant amount of variance in work group identification. In comparison, only communication, feedback/recognition, and organisational support of the engagement climate construct made a significant contribution to organisation identification. Given that organisation identification and work group identification have demonstrated differences in their relationship with employee effectiveness (flourishing), knowledge about the engagement climate factors that facilitate these
different identification targets has both utility and value. More generally, insights such as these demonstrate the advantages of investigating specific aspects of the psychological climate, that can then be compared to outcomes such as identification and flourishing.

Social identification theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) also provides a framework with which to assess the relationship between engagement climate and both work group and organisation identification. According to social identity theory, identification with a group suggests that people become active in maintaining their group’s distinctiveness in relation to other groups (e.g., Haslam, 2014; Haslam et al., 2003). As a consequence, competition (Oakes, 1996), and underrating and devaluing the worth of other groups (Haslam, 2014; Haslam et al., 2003) can become the default pathway or strategy for increasing levels of identification within a group. The results of this study provide evidence that less destructive means are available to enhance identification in the workplace. Engagement climate that includes communication, participation, feedback/recognition, and organisational support does not target outside groups in negative ways for the purpose of enhancing identification. Instead, engagement climate provides a positive contribution to identification and workforce flourishing that does not undermine the capacity of rival groups to function well also.

Brewer’s (1991, 2008) optimal distinctiveness theory also received some support by the findings of the current study. Optimal distinctiveness theory posits that identification with a group that balances the need for distinctiveness and the competing need to belong will be more likely to strengthen identification. In terms of work related identification, the work group rather than organisation is most likely to balance these competing needs. The work group therefore, is more likely to
become the predominant target of identification and associate more naturally with the work environment. In the current study, it was found that engagement climate and work group identification was a better fit to the data than engagement climate and organisation identification. Although the percentage of variance explained for organisation identification was greater than that for work group identification, fewer components of engagement climate contributed to explaining organisation identification. The model found to fit the data for organisation identification is certainly a more parsimonious solution compared to work group identification. However, it is unlikely that the need for identification can be reduced to that which is most simple to achieve. The contrast between model configurations also highlights potential differences in antecedents for each target of identification. Further study would be required to determine if this pattern of associations is generalizable beyond the organisation in this study.

Hierarchical regression analysis demonstrated that work group identification remained a significant contributor to workforce flourishing after engagement climate was entered into the second step of the analysis. In contrast, organisation identification did not continue to contribute significantly to workforce flourishing after engagement climate was entered into the regression equation. Furthermore, after controlling for work group identification, all four components of engagement climate remained significant contributors to workforce flourishing. In other words, in addition to work group identification, the engagement climate components of communication, feedback/ recognition, participation, and organisational support all made significant contributions to workforce flourishing.

Compared to organisation identification, when engagement climate was added to the equation, in this instance only communication, feedback/ recognition, and
participation remained significant predictors of workforce flourishing. Comparing these different outcomes suggests that work group identification provides a sense making perspective that draws more broadly on environmental aspects of work to promote effective functioning (workforce flourishing). This result is not surprising given that there is a greater potential for social interaction at the level of work group identification than organisational identification (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000).

Only for work group identification did organisational support and the target of identification itself remain significant contributors to workforce flourishing after entering engagement climate into the regression equation. Brewer (2009) stated that people are motivated within a given context to adopt a target of identification that enables the need to belong to be balanced with the need for distinctiveness. Work group identification appears to enable this balance to be reached more so than organisation identification. The effect of achieving such balance may be that the target of identification becomes associated with flourishing directly by demonstrating a relationship with flourishing beyond that explained by engagement climate.

Furthermore, work group identification evokes a relationship between perceptions of support (organisational support) and workforce flourishing (well-being) that was overshadowed by other engagement climate variables when organisation identification was the focus. To return to an earlier point, this is one instance where parsimony is less desirable than the alternative diversity in social environment determinants. Work group identification accounts for the complexity in engagement climate, better than organisation identification. According to Brewer (2009) in circumstances where identification leads to a balance between belonging
and distinctiveness needs, perceptions of trust and security are more likely, facilitating pro-social interactions. In this study, work group identification, rather than organisation identification may help in the sense making capacity of employees to help reach an understanding of their environment and respond more effectively, including balancing the needs for belonging and distinctiveness. Greater effectiveness in such circumstances may foster more pro-social actions that together help explain workforce flourishing as it occurs in natural settings.

Additional theoretical implication of the current study relate to the emerging field of research into flourishing and functional well-being (Keyes, 2007; Ryff & Singer, 2008; Seligman, 2011). Keyes (2007) approach to flourishing involved a number of measures, however, they were categorised into three basic forms of well-being; hedonic (or emotional) well-being, psychological well-being, and social well-being. The factor structure found in the current study provides confirmation of the association between these three sources of well-being. Furthermore, the three factor structure of workforce flourishing found in this study replicated the same factorial and correlational relationships that were found from CFA reported in Chapter 4. These results endorse workforce flourishing as a construct with promising consistency in its structure. Workforce flourishing has also been found to relate as theorised to identification in both the current study and the previous study found in Chapter 4. These findings that include confirmation of the three component structure of flourishing and the predicted relationship of flourishing with identification and engagement climate support further exploration of the flourishing construct.

Previous studies with a focus on identification and flourishing in the workplace have been mostly speculative (e.g., Dutton et al., 2010, 2011). Some studies, such as van Dick et al. (2008) have examined the relationship between job
satisfaction (Hedonic well-being) and identification finding correlations of \( r = .34 \) and \( r = .31 \) for work group identification and \( r = .43 \) and \( r = .22 \) for organisation identification. Correlations with workforce flourishing found in this study were \( r = .51 \) for organisation identification, and \( r = .56 \) for work group identification.

Following on from the Dick et al. (2008) study, the addition of functional well-being to that of hedonic well-being, consistent with the approach in this study, appears to offer additional explanatory potential, particularly in relation to identification in the workplace. Flourishing is both theoretically and pragmatically important to understanding and promoting organisation effectiveness.

### 6.4.4. Study Limitations

A number of limitations to the current study have been identified in relation to the findings. Similar to the study in Chapter 3 of this thesis, the measures used to represent the latent construct of flourishing were adopted based on their availability rather than developed as new measures. Constructing new measures was beyond the scope of this study given the primary concern was to investigate engagement climate in relation to identification and workforce flourishing. The items used to represent hedonic, psychological, and social well-being as factors of workforce flourishing were obtained from measures of job satisfaction, cynicism, and citizenship behaviours and performed similarly to the measures and selected items used in the Chapter 4 study. Certainly, the relationships that were found in this study involving work group and organisation identification support the use of the measures adopted to represent the three components of workforce flourishing used here. However, future research might endeavour to explore alternative measures to improve explanatory capacities for workforce flourishing.
Further limitations relate to the size of the sample. More elaborate analysis between the variables of interest in this study may have been possible with a larger sample size. However, this was not possible with the organisation involved on this occasion. Importantly, the relationships implicated by theory and the presented arguments underpinning this study were all explored. Furthermore, the analyses undertaken were within the recommended parameters for sample size suggested by Blunch (2013).

A related limitation was that the sample in this study was representative of one organisation, and in relation to findings involving engagement climate in particular, further research would enhance generalizability of the findings. The structure of engagement climate that was supported by the data derived from qualitative analysis of statements from employees in a local government organisation. The structure was confirmed with data from a different organisation, associated with the employment sector, and this goes in some way to support generalizability of findings for engagement climate. In addition, the structural form of workforce flourishing found in this study, was consistent with the structure found in an earlier study of this thesis and reported in Chapter 4. Two different organisational populations, one from local government, the other from an employment services organisation, were very similar in terms of the structure found for the construct of workforce flourishing and this also goes some way towards assessing generalizability of the findings for this construct also.

6.5. Conclusion

This study sought to introduce and explore the relationship of engagement climate with identification and workforce flourishing, of which the last two constructs were examined earlier in this thesis. When engagement climate was tested
in two separate SEMs; as a predictor of work group identification in one, and as a predictor of organisation identification in the other - engagement climate explained significant amounts of variance in both targets of identification. The results endorse the agency of the construct of engagement climate in promoting the personal integration (identification) and optimal functioning (flourishing) within a work environment.

The advantage of engagement climate in organisational research is that it provides direct insight into strategic application that might stem from knowing how other constructs are affected. For example, with respect to the current study and thesis, engagement climate presents a straight forward approach to enhancing employee identification in a way that promotes organisational effectiveness through workforce flourishing. Furthermore, the results in this study, in relation to the structure and relationships associated with workforce flourishing, were found to be consistent with findings reported earlier in this thesis related to a sample of employees from a local government organisation. These findings underscore the importance of flourishing in organisational contexts and point towards future research opportunities that will make an additional contribution to understanding organisational and employee effectiveness through the lens of flourishing and well-being.
Chapter 7

Thesis Conclusion

This thesis has involved construct testing and model development. The aim has been to examine workforce functioning in relation to sustainable organisation effectiveness, with the underlying intention to contribute to better organisational practices. Theoretical contributions from this thesis are highlighted by the introduction of a new construct in engagement climate and a variation on another construct from flourishing to workforce flourishing. This thesis makes a further theoretical contribution by demonstrating that social identification can be promoted in positive, non-competitive ways to the mutual benefit of both group and individual. Theoretical contributions were also made to the field of study centred on flourishing and eudaimonia by demonstrating the explanatory advantages of the eudaimonic-hedonic approach to flourishing and the application of a context specific approach to flourishing in workforce flourishing. The context specific approach is a departure from the mainstream that has taken a more holistic approach to flourishing, conceptualised as a general state not tethered to the particulars of a context. In addition, this thesis presented evidence for improved organisational and leadership practices that produce sustainable and positive outcomes, notably in relation to employee identification and engagement climate. The theoretical value of the findings reported in this thesis and the main practical implications that are drawn from the results are presented in this chapter.

As a means of exploring employee functionality, the construct of flourishing was developed and tested. Consequently, a new variation of the construct in terms of workforce flourishing was selected for this thesis to represent the dynamics of
functionality within the workforce. In early development of this thesis, the construct of organisational health was adopted as a framework to examine employee functioning. However, organisational health as an applied construct had a number of limiting features, namely, the difficulty obtaining a consistent and manageable definition. For example, organisational health may suggest employee health is at optimum levels (Jaffe, 1995), or alternatively, it may indicate the functional capacity of an organisation’s structures and governing practices (DeJoy et al., 2010). Considerable contrasts between how the term organisational health is understood render the use of the term problematic. Selecting one interpretation of organisational health will rightly attract criticism that important elements have been ignored, and with such variation in the way in which organisational health has been defined, pursuit of this construct can become a cul de sac of semantics.

This thesis scrutinised the role of the workforce in relation to organisation effectiveness and therefore, application of organisational health as a theoretical framework was too expansive for such a purpose. Alternatively, flourishing, and specifically, workforce flourishing is a construct that can be assigned to groups and individuals, expressing effectiveness and functionality (Seligman, 2011). For the purpose of this thesis, theory related to flourishing provided an informative framework with which to better understand how a workforce might contribute to organisation effectiveness and do so in a sustainable manner through a positive association with employee health.

Flourishing encapsulates hedonic and eudaimonic well-being in which both the emotional and functional come together to enable a healthy, effective, and sustainable state of being (Huppert & So, 2013). In terms of functional well-being, the distinction is made between psychological and social functioning (Dutton et al.,
2011; Ryan & Deci, 2001) which together equate to eudaimonia (Keyes, 2007; Ryan & Deci, 2001). The blend of both hedonia and eudaimonia seem necessary to achieve optimal functioning (Keyes & Simoes, 2012), and this was demonstrated in the model developed in this thesis. These starting principles provided some initial structure to the examination of workforce functioning in this thesis. Not only was it shown that hedonic, psychological, and social elements of flourishing combine well to articulate a well-functioning workforce; all three in combination were superior when predicting health outcomes and support the instalment of flourishing as an important organisational objective.

7.1. Summary of Theoretical Implications

Workforce flourishing, as explored in this thesis across two separate samples, demonstrated promising consistency with theorised structure (e.g., Dutton et al., 2011; Keyes, 2005). The three factor structure consisting of hedonic, psychological, and social well-being was also shown to have a greater impact on employee health when all three elements contributed significantly. However, the value of the construct of workforce flourishing is not just inherent in its ability to draw together hedonic, psychological, and social factors to explain outcomes. The greater value of the construct of workforce flourishing, and flourishing in general, is the explanatory framework it offers to describe positive gains that result in outcomes exceeding the sum of parts (see Keyes & Simoes, 2012). The positive gain cycle is an example, in which outcomes such as healthier employees result in an increased capacity to function more effectively, contributing to further health benefits. Flourishing allows growth in the very same attributes, behaviours, or habits that in turn, allow further gains in flourishing.
In research by Keyes and Simoes (2012), they found that only when hedonic, psychological, and social well-being were considered in combination, rather than separately, was a significant relationship with mortality found. Similarly, in the research undertaken here, when all three aspects of workforce flourishing were involved, better employee health outcomes were reported. For some time, theory and research has endeavoured to understand how positive circumstances or environments contribute to human enterprise. Theoretically, workforce flourishing explains how positive circumstances can become self-sustaining as well as how hedonic, psychological, and social elements come together to facilitate positive outcomes and optimal functioning. Workforce flourishing may represent a new perspective on the familiar dilemma of the happy - productive worker and help explain optimal effectiveness in the workplace.

Considerable and sustained interest in the conditions that drive human productivity and effectiveness emanated from the Hawthorn studies conducted in the 1920’s (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). Essentially, the Hawthorn studies highlighted that employees’ interpretations of their surrounds has an impact on their effectiveness. From the debates initiated through these studies, a movement emerged advocating the importance of social relationships, satisfaction, and self-actualization as means to organisation effectiveness (Ledford, 1999). However, much of the research conducted was less about the social and developmental aspects of work, and more about employee emotion (Ryan & Deci, 2001). The concept of the happy-productive worker is an example, describing the role of happiness or satisfaction of employees as arguably leading to more productive and engaged activity (Staw, 1986). Workforce flourishing and the findings presented in this thesis would tend to suggest there is more to productivity than employee happiness.
Around a decade ago, Russell Cropanzano, Thomas Wright, and colleagues (Wright & Cropanzano, 1997; Wright et al., 2002) argued that the accumulated research findings for the happy-productive worker theory were somewhat equivocal, suggesting also that the conceptualisation of happiness as satisfaction (usually job satisfaction) was responsible for the mixed support for the link with productivity. Wright and Cropanzano (2004) and Wright et al. (2002) proposed instead that hedonia (psychological well-being as they described it) was more consistent with the theory that happiness leads to performance. However, more recently Straume and Vittersø (2012) have argued and found evidence that eudaimonic (functional) well-being may be the foundations for heightened hedonic well-being. Therefore, psychological and social well-being (eudaimonia) may be the necessary ingredient for effectiveness that is heightened further in the presence of hedonia. Straume and Vittersø found that meaning, interest, and social efficacy, all aspects of eudaimonia, lead to higher levels of satisfaction when goals are achieved or positive outcomes attained. In other words, strong eudaimonic links to activity results in richer rewards in terms of hedonia (e.g., satisfaction, pleasure, happiness). Findings such as these, along with the findings presented in this thesis, make an important contribution to understanding the conditions that sustain employee effectiveness. Given the findings reported here, rather than a happy-productive paradigm for organisational effectiveness, a flourishing-productive agenda may be more accurate and worthy of future exploration. Happiness per se is not the dominant driver of productive work. Functional well-being or eudaimonia, when contributing to positive emotional states consistent with hedonia (e.g., happiness), is likely to be more reliably associated with productive work than when hedonia is absent.
The extent to which the work environment might impact on the capacity of a workforce to flourish was implied by the findings in study one that demonstrated a strong link between identification and workforce flourishing. Identification with a group such as those typically found within a workplace involves interpretive processes that help an employee to understand their surroundings such that they are able to respond effectively within that environment (Turner & Reynolds, 2011). Once a link between identification and flourishing was found, it was deemed both relevant and potentially valuable to explore the conditions that promote identification within a workplace. Employee engagement and work climate literature implied that certain practices and perceptions present in the workplace may help promote high levels of identification (see Chapter 5). The conditions reported in this thesis that impact on identification at work included participating in decision making, feedback/recognition, open communication, and organisational support. These findings have implications toward the way social identification theories are understood. Firstly, on the basis that identification has a potentially beneficial effect on well-being and health. Secondly, because engagement climate represents a framework for encouraging identification without the need to solicit intergroup competition and the negative side effects that might follow.

In relation to identification and health, the literature that contributed both directly and indirectly to this thesis contained little empirical examination of the health and well-being outcomes arising from work identification. Dutton et al.’s (2010, 2011) papers come close but are not empirically based, although they offer considered argument for the link between identification and well-being. Findings from this thesis offer empirical evidence for contemporary understanding about how an employee’s relationship with their work impacts on their health and well-being.
Identification represents an important and potentially powerful resource at work that unlocks the capacity of the workforce to be highly productive in terms of flourishing. Furthermore, identification and flourishing are sustained by enhanced employee health. Theoretically, identification might now be conceptualised beyond an explanation of certain behaviours centred on conformity. Identification, and the way employees’ relate to their work, can now be understood as an asset to organisational enterprise through the mutual investment in the development of both employee and organisation.

As an organisation moves towards holding employee development and flourishing as a high priority, in turn an employee is more likely to hold the interests of the organisation as their priority based on the consequences of higher levels of identification. Identification, as a target or objective to achieve workforce flourishing, represents a powerful combination that lays the foundations for a sustainable ecology within the organisation. Sustainability arises in the sense that identification linked to flourishing has a positive relationship with employee health. Enhanced employee health, as an outcome of flourishing, adds further to the capacity of a workforce to function well. Essentially, it is a positive gain spiral that provides its own momentum for sustaining and enhancing positive outcomes for the organisation and employees. Comparisons can be made to a healthy ecology where activities and outcomes are beneficial and balanced so that the system is self-supporting and sustainable.

Rabinovich et al. (2012) claimed that the content of identification (e.g., norms, values, goals) is understood in reference to comparisons with other groups or out-groups. However, the findings presented in this thesis in relation to engagement climate suggest that non-comparative means are available from which to construct
an understanding of identification in terms of norms, values, and goals. Social
identification theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and self-categorisation theory (Turner
et al., 1987) may now generate fresh interest and new application in partnership with
positive psychology, explaining non-competitive forms of identification that are
based on resource building, flourishing, and self-actualisation. The reported findings
in this thesis related to engagement climate demonstrate non-competitive approaches
to enhancing identification, which circumvents the potential negative consequences
of competition between groups within an organisation. As will be discussed in the
following sections of this chapter, the factors explored and found to contribute to
engagement climate represent effective organisational and leadership strategies that
would improve identification and facilitate positive outcomes such as flourishing
and health.

Theoretically however, engagement climate and the literature on engagement
(e.g., Bakker & Demerouti, 2008, 2014; and Hobfoll’s COR theory; Hobfoll, 1989,
1998, 2011) can be applied to the field of social identification and group dynamics
in the workplace. In particular, the concept of resources and resource caravans
(positive gain spirals) (Hobfoll, 2011) can be overlayed with the outcomes of
engagement climate featured in this thesis. Engagement climate, as a setting for
generating resources, helps to promote identification through the acquisition of those
resources. Additional contributions towards building a better understanding of group
functioning in the workplace is likely if future research is directed towards applying
these theoretical frameworks to issues of organisational effectiveness. Engagement
climate contributes in this regard and opens up a conversation that is likely to
advance our applied knowledge for dealing with issues of workforce effectiveness.
7.2. Workforce Flourishing through Work Identification

Full and effective functioning is a core characteristic of flourishing (Huta & Waterman, 2013) and suggests that organisations would benefit through the pursuit of a flourishing workforce. Identification in the workplace helps members of a workforce make sense of their surrounds and respond effectively (Ashforth et al., 2008). Therefore, identification and flourishing have a common orientation towards functionality. Identification was found in this thesis to relate strongly to workforce flourishing, and represents an excellent candidate for organisational strategies that aim to promote flourishing within their workforce. The link between identification and workforce flourishing suggests that when employees’ find a degree of fit between personal and organisational held norms, values, and goals, positive outcomes such as flourishing are more likely. The benefits are more pronounced when high levels of identification are associated with a work group, team, or unit as opposed to a super-ordinate group such as the organisation.

Identification enables an environment to be more predictable (Millward & Haslam, 2013), become a source of personal endorsement (Dutton et al., 2010; Hogg, Hains, & Mason, 1998), and a source of social support (Amiot & Sansfaçon, 2011). These benefits contribute to the ability of workers to function effectively in their environment and enable workforce flourishing. Focussing organisation strategies towards increasing predictability, self-development and actualisation, and social support therefore, has value for organisations through supporting greater workforce flourishing. Findings from this thesis provide direction towards how this can be achieved.

Studies undertaken in this thesis demonstrated that both work-group and organisation identification relate well to workforce flourishing. However, work
group identification has a greater effect on the social aspects of flourishing. Therefore, while organisations may invest in activities that promote identification at the organisation level (e.g., highlighting company success, community work, company logos or icons), promoting identification at the work group level is warranted in order to address social well-being and more fully realise the workforces’ potential to flourish.

One of the keys to work group identification is leadership and associated leadership practices. For example, Cottrill, Lopez, and Hoffman (2014) found that authentic leadership style is associated with inclusive environments, which increased the likelihood of stronger identification (Leroy et al., 2012). A leader who also meets the expectations of the work group in terms of demonstrating behaviours to which the work group is also expected to conform, will also enhance identification within that group (Hogg et al., 1998). To meet expectations, it is argued here that effective forms of communication and involvement in shaping group activity are required to form accurate perceptions of group expectations. According to Leroy et al. (2012), authentic leadership embodies behavioural integrity and would therefore seem to be a style of leadership that would enhance work group identification and impact positively on flourishing.

Prottas (2013) argued that a leader’s behavioural integrity relates to a member’s engagement in their work, and that several leadership styles foster behavioural integrity along with authentic leadership. Servant and transformative leadership are examples of the leadership styles synonymous with behavioural integrity but also with the notion that such behaviours should lead to positive outcomes for employees. Workforce flourishing and employee health were found to relate to identification in this thesis, results that are entirely consistent with the
positive outcomes for employees that are a trademark of inclusive and engaging leadership styles. In light of the potential for outcomes such as flourishing and employee health, effective leadership skills at all levels within and organisation should be a priority. This is particularly relevant to leadership at middle and lower levels of an organisation as identification at work group level has a stronger association with the positive outcome of flourishing. A general message to take from the findings within this thesis is that leadership at the work group level attuned to inclusive and supportive practices will have a greater impact on workforce flourishing and health than the same leadership activities conducted at the organisation level. Therefore, leadership styles are a priority for all levels of organisational activity because of the positive impact on employee effectiveness through identification and flourishing. In particular, there are advantages for leadership at the work group level that embodies the skills and competencies capable of facilitating employee identification with their work.

The inability of an organisation to develop leadership qualities that promote employee identification and flourishing at all levels of operations is likely to be costly to that organisation in terms of their workforce performance. Alternatively, organisations that value the development of their leaders’ capabilities stand to prosper from enhanced workforce performance. This is particularly impelling when leadership development has a reach extending throughout the ranks of the organisation and is oriented towards fostering integrity and inclusiveness. In today’s competitive global environment, harnessing the full capabilities of the work force in a manner that contributes positively to employee health and well-being represents a strategy that is difficult to ignore. Leadership that embraces the types of practices that enable identification is what organisations require if they are to perform
optimally and sustainably. To this end, engagement climate, and the practices it encapsulates, makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of what effective leadership practices might be. Therefore, a discussion follows on the capacity of engagement climate to shape leadership and organisational strategies in the pursuit of increasing workforce effectiveness through flourishing and health.

7.3. Engagement Climate as Effective Organisation Practice

The construct of engagement climate stemmed from the literature on work engagement. The developed construct was verified through a qualitative study and factor analysis undertaken in this thesis. Four characteristics or factors of engagement climate were proposed and subsequently found to combine well as engagement climate. Participation in decision making, feedback/recognition of work performance, communication, and organisational support were four factors found to characterise the construct of engagement climate. Following this, it was found that engagement climate related strongly with both organisation and work group identification. Engagement climate, and the four factors found to represent the construct provide a basis by which leadership and organisational practices can be understood in terms of facilitating greater levels of employee identification, workforce flourishing, and employee health.

Feedback/recognition, communication, and organisational support are effective in encouraging organisation and work group identification. Participation in decision making seems more effective in supporting work group identification than organisation identification. As organisations seek to compete effectively given the demands of their day to day circumstances, enabling the workforce to function at their best through a positive engagement climate is both highly desirable and valuable. Practices such as feedback/recognition, participation, communication, and
organisation support are not optional for an organisation seeking optimal functioning. They are argued here to be central to effective organisation and leadership practice that support high level functioning.

Engagement climate impacts on identification in two notable ways. The first is the social, interactive nature of the factors underlying engagement climate. Work groups are more likely to facilitate social interactions compared to organisation groups (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000), as such, engagement climate has greater impact on work group identification than it does organisation identification. The second pathway occurs through knowledge sharing associated with factors such as feedback/recognition, participation, and communication. Information exchange within a work context is likely to be more applicable to an organisation’s norms, behaviours, and goals than it would apply to the work group. A reason for this is that the central purpose for activity within the organisation is to fulfil the needs of the organisation first, with units or work group performing particular functions as a contribution to such organisational needs. This would explain why the information exchange factors of engagement climate associate more strongly with organisation identification than work group identification.

To make a contrast, albeit a highly exaggerated one, social interactions facilitate work group identification and informational exchanges support organisation identification - although these mechanisms are not exclusively associated with these particular identification foci. However, awareness of these differences, even though subtle, enables leaders and organisations to target identification with specific strategies to meet their particular needs. Adopting either social or informational strategies would have a positive effect on work group or organisation identification respectively but not exclusively. Knowing how certain
engagement practices influence different targets of identification can help achieve
greater levels of flourishing and health within the workforce, benefiting
organisational effectiveness. For example, it was demonstrated in this thesis that the
social factors associated with engagement climate are more likely to promote
workforce flourishing through work group identification, more so than organisation
identification. In comparison, informational factors were found to have a stronger
association to flourishing in the context of organisation identification. A considered
engagement climate strategy should aim for a comprehensive approach so that
flourishing is achieved through different targets of identification.

Leadership practices that embrace engagement climate strategies would appear
to gain agency through the effect towards employees’ relationship with their work,
namely, identification. Furthermore, interventions or strategies that address
engagement climate are likely to be sustainable approaches for organisational
effectiveness because they contribute to employee health (Study 1 & 3) and
workforce flourishing (Study 3). The benefit of such leadership practices would be
both self-perpetuating through sustainability and highly functional via a flourishing
workforce, not to forget employee-organisation concordance through identification.

Given the advantages stated, organisations stand to prosper through leadership and
organisation practices that encourage a climate of engagement and employee
identification with work groups and the organisation.

7.4. Final Comments
This thesis contributes towards understanding how work environments impact
effectiveness within an organisation through workforce flourishing. The constructs
of engagement climate and workforce flourishing are unique to this thesis but
importantly, they demonstrate strength in their capacity to explain how work
environments enable organisational effectiveness. The findings presented in this thesis further advance arguments for promoting well-being within an organisation, as they demonstrate that employee health is enhanced in the presence of flourishing. Improving employee health can be achieved simultaneously to raising workforce effectiveness through flourishing and strongly indicates that the pursuit of workforce flourishing is a sustainable and worthy course for organisations to pursue.

Practically, the research findings in this thesis demonstrate how strategies based upon engagement climate promise much in the way of effective and sustainable organisational practice. For example, the effectiveness of leaders would improve when practices consistent with fostering an engagement climate are adopted. A clear association between the work environment, employees’ interpretation of the environment, and manifest well-being and health was incrementally pursued and demonstrated in the studies undertaken in this thesis. As a starting point, engagement climate sets the conditions in which employees might connect their work environment to their sense of self through identification. Next, the degree of identification manifests as hedonic, psychological, and social well-being, or in other words, workforce flourishing. These relationships are then likely to be enriched and sustained by the positive contribution to employee health.

The health and well-being of employees is evidently associated with the nature of activity undertaken in the workplace, largely associated with the capacity to interpret or find practical meaning from such activity (identification and flourishing). As such, health and well-being are influenced by the way employees relate to themselves and each other, in addition to the activities they perform in fulfilling their work requirements. When engagement and belonging through identification are the guiding values determining the way employees work together,
these work climates enable employees to flourish. This thesis contributes to an understanding of organisational effectiveness that can be applied in the design of sustainable and well-functioning systems of work. A system of organisational practice, which captures the qualities of a sustainable, efficient, and balanced ecology, and supports employee growth and development without negative consequences, is surely an imperative for any organisation.

“I know that I know when I develop the capacity to create the results I really care about – when what you know allows you to create” – Peter Senge
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Appendix A

Study One Questionnaire

Please respond to the questions that follow by inserting an answer, or circling a number, as appropriate.

Please note that there are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in a range of responses for different people.

Your age: ________ (years)
Gender: Female / Male (circle)
Number of Children: _______
Number of hours worked per week on average: _______
Profession or trade: ________________________
Current role/position: _______________________
Number of years in current role/position: ______
Number of years with organisation: _______
Education level attained (please tick one):
- [ ] Secondary School/College
- [ ] TAFE/Certificate course
- [ ] Some University/TAFE
- [ ] Post Graduate University
- [ ] Undergraduate University
- [ ] Other ___________________

The following questions refer to your work and the groups to which you belong at your work. Please answer the questions while keeping in mind how much you identify with the groups mentioned.

Which work group or department do you work in? _______________________

What profession or trade is related to the work you do? ___________________
The following three questions relate to how much you identify with certain groups related to your work or employment. To answer these questions, imagine that one of the circles represents you and the other circle represents the work related group as indicated. The more the circles overlap, the more you identify with the group.

Place a cross or a tick in the box that best represents how much do you identify with your organisation?

Place a cross or a tick in the box that best represents how much do you identify with your work group or department.

Please circle your option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do not agree</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Sometimes agree</th>
<th>Agree on average</th>
<th>Mostly agree</th>
<th>Almost always agree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You would be very happy to spend the rest of your career with this organisation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You enjoy discussing your organisation with people outside it.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You really feel as if this organisation’s problems are your own.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You think that you could easily become as attached to another organisation as you are to this one.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Please circle your option.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You do not feel like part of the family at your organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You do not feel emotionally attached to this organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You do not feel a strong sense of belonging to your organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are not afraid of what might happen if you quit your job without having another one lined up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be very hard for you to leave your organisation right now, even if you wanted to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much in your life would be disrupted if you decided you wanted to leave your organization now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It wouldn’t be too costly for me to leave my organisation now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now, staying with your organisation is a matter of necessity as much as desire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feel that you have too few options to consider leaving this organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organisation would be the scarcity of available alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the major reasons you continue to work for this organisation is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice – another organisation may not match the overall benefits you have here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You think that people these days move from company to company too often.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please circle your option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do not agree</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Sometimes agree</th>
<th>Agree on average</th>
<th>Mostly agree</th>
<th>Almost always agree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You do not believe that a person must always be loyal to the organisation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumping from organisation to organisation does not seem at all unethical to you</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the major reasons you continue to work for this organisation is that you believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you got another offer for a better job elsewhere you would not feel it was right to leave your organisation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You were taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organisation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organisation for most of their careers.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You do not think that wanting to be a ‘company man’ or ‘company woman’ is sensible anymore.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much do the following comments generally describe the behaviours of those with whom you work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Characteristic</th>
<th>Slightly Characteristic</th>
<th>About Average</th>
<th>Very Characteristic</th>
<th>Totally Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping others who have been absent.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering for things that are not required.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How much do the following comments generally describe the behaviours of those with whom you work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Not Characteristic</th>
<th>Slightly Characteristic</th>
<th>About Average</th>
<th>Very Characteristic</th>
<th>Totally Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking undeserved breaks.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting new people even though it is not required.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at work is above norm.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping others who have heavy work loads.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coasting towards the end of the day.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving advanced notice if unable to come to work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great deal of time spent with personal phone conversations.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not take unnecessary time off work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting the supervisor with his or her work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making innovative suggestions to improve the department.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not take extra breaks.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend functions not required by that help company image.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not spend time in idle conversation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
<td>A Little Satisfied</td>
<td>Sometimes Satisfied</td>
<td>50% Satisfied</td>
<td>Often Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The physical work conditions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The freedom to choose your own method of working.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your fellow workers.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recognition you get for good work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your immediate boss.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of responsibility you are given.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your rate of pay.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your opportunity to use your abilities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial relations between management and workers in your firm.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your chance of promotion.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way your firm is managed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attention paid to suggestions you make.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your hours of work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of variety in your job</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your job security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the past month you have…….. | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Almost always | Always |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
Been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Felt nervous and stressed? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Dealt with irritating life hassles? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Felt that you were effectively coping with important changes that were occurring in your life? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Felt that things were going your way? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Found that you could not cope with all the things you had to do? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Been able to control irritations in your life? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Felt that you were on top of things? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Been angered because of things that happened that were outside of your control? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Found yourself thinking about things that you have to accomplish? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Been able to control the way you spend your time? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
On an average day at work, how frequently do you……….. | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Always |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
Resist expressing my true feelings? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Pretend to have emotions that you don’t really have? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Hide your true feelings about a situation? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Make an effort to actually feel the emotions that you need to display to others? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Try to actually experience the emotions that you must show? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Really try to feel the emotions you have to show as part of your job? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Over the past few weeks you have……….. | Not at all | A little | A lot | Very much |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
Been feeling perfectly well and in good health? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
Been feeling in need of a good tonic? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
Been feeling run down and out of sorts? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
Felt that you are ill? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
Been getting any pains in you head? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
Been getting a feeling of tightness or pressure in your head? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
Been having hot or cold spells? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
Lost much sleep over worry? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
Had difficulty in staying asleep once you are off? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
Felt constantly under strain? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
Been getting edgy and bad tempered? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
Been getting scared or panicky for no good reason? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
Found everything getting on top of you? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
Over the past few weeks you have........  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Been feeling nervous and strung up?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been managing to keep your self busy and occupied?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been taking longer over the things you do?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt on the whole you were doing things well?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been satisfied with the way you’ve carried out your tasks?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt that you are playing a useful part in things?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt capable of making decisions about things?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been able to enjoy you normal day to day activities?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What could be done *peoplewise* to make your organisation run more smoothly?

What could/does your organisation do that would make you feel as if you belonged more?
Appendix B

Study Three Questionnaire

Please respond to the questions that follow by inserting an answer, or circling a number, as appropriate. Please note that there are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in a range of responses for different people.

Your age: __________ (years)
Gender: Female / Male (circle)
Number of Children: ______
Number of hours worked per week on average: __________________________
Profession, trade or occupation: _________________________________
What division do you work in (please tick one):
  - [ ] Employment Services
  - [ ] Clean Force
  - [ ] Strategy & Alliance
  - [ ] ELS
  - [ ] Corporate Services
  - [ ] Other _______________
Name the site you work at: ______________________________________
Name the program you are working on: ______________________________
What level are you (please tick one):
  - [ ] Senior Management
  - [ ] Front Line Management
  - [ ] Staff
Job Title: _______________________________________________________
Number of years in current role/position: _______
Number of years with WISE: ___________
Education level attained (please tick one):
  - [ ] Secondary School/College
  - [ ] TAFE/Certificate course
Which best describes your previous employment or working background (please tick one):

- Private Sector
- Employment Services
- Community Sector
- Other ___________________
- Government (please specify) _____________________

Please indicate with numbers from 0 to 6 whether the statement is true for yourself.

0 = Not at all true
6 = Totally true

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Team/Work Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I identify myself as a career oriented person or as a member of the organisation or team/workgroup respectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being career oriented or a member of the organisation or team/workgroup reflects my personality well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to work for my career, organisation or team/work group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think reluctantly of my career, organisation or team/work group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I’d rather not say that I am career oriented or a member of the organisation or team/work group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My career, organisation or team/work group is positively judged by others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work for my career, organisation or team/work group above what is absolutely necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do not agree</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Sometimes agree</th>
<th>Agree on average</th>
<th>Mostly agree</th>
<th>Almost always agree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications seem good within this organisation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals of this organisation are not clear to me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organisation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work assignments are often not fully explained.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much do the following comments generally describe the behaviours of those with whom you work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Characteristic</th>
<th>Slightly Characteristic</th>
<th>About Average</th>
<th>Very Characteristic</th>
<th>Totally Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping others who have been absent.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering for things that are not required.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking undeserved breaks.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting new people even though it is not required.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at work is above norm.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping others who have heavy work loads.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coasting towards the end of the day.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving advanced notice if unable to come to work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great deal of time spent with personal phone conversations.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do the following comments generally describe the behaviours of those with whom you work</td>
<td>Not Characteristic</td>
<td>Slightly Characteristic</td>
<td>About Average</td>
<td>Very Characteristic</td>
<td>Totally Characteristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not take unnecessary time off work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting the supervisor with his or her work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making innovative suggestions to improve the department.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not take extra breaks.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend functions not required by that help company image.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not spend time in idle conversation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate how satisfied you are with the following.</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
<th>A Little Satisfied</th>
<th>Sometimes Satisfied</th>
<th>50% Satisfied</th>
<th>Often Satisfied</th>
<th>Mostly Satisfied</th>
<th>Completely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The physical work conditions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The freedom to choose your own method of working.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your fellow workers.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recognition you get for good work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your immediate boss.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of responsibility you are given.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your rate of pay.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your opportunity to use your abilities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate how satisfied you are with the following.</td>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
<td>A Little Satisfied</td>
<td>Sometimes Satisfied</td>
<td>50% Satisfied</td>
<td>Often Satisfied</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfied</td>
<td>Completely Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial relations between management and workers in your firm.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your chance of promotion.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way your firm is managed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attention paid to suggestions you make.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your hours of work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of variety in your job</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your job security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate the following.........</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The feedback from my supervisor on how well I’m doing.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity to find out how well I am doing on my job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing whether I am performing my job well or poorly.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consider the following questions and indicate the extent to which they occur in your workplace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you find out how well you are doing on the job?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you receive information from your supervisor on your job performance?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Hardly ever</th>
<th>Less than average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above average</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, how much say or influence do you have on what goes on at work?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel you can influence the decisions of your immediate supervisor regarding things about which you are concerned?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your immediate supervisor ask your opinion when a problem comes up which involves you work?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Impossible</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Not very easy</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Pretty easy</th>
<th>Hardly a problem</th>
<th>Never a problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you have a suggestion for improving the job or changing the setup in some way, how easy is it for you to get ideas across to your immediate supervisor?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation strongly considers my goals and values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation disregards my best interests when it makes decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation really cares about my well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation is willing to extend itself in order to help me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, the organisation would fail to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation cares about my general satisfaction at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation shows very little concern for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation cares about my opinions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the level of agreement with the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Do Not Agree</th>
<th>Agree a Little</th>
<th>Sometimes Agree</th>
<th>Agree on Average</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Almost Always Agree</th>
<th>Totally Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel attached to this organisation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be difficult for me to leave this</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate the level of agreement with the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do Not Agree</th>
<th>Agree a Little</th>
<th>Sometimes Agree</th>
<th>Agree on Average</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Almost Always Agree</th>
<th>Totally Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’m too caught up in this organisation to leave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel tied to this organisation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I simply could not leave the organisation that I work for</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be easy for me to leave this organisation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am tightly connected to this organisation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the level of agreement with the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>A few times a year or less</th>
<th>Once a month or less</th>
<th>A few times a month</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>A few times a week</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from my work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel used up at the end of the workday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working all day is really a strain for me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can effectively solve the problems that arise in my work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel burned out from my work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am making an effective contribution to what this organization does</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become less interested in my work since I started this job</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become less enthusiastic about my work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate the level of agreement with the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>A few times a year or less</th>
<th>Once a month or less</th>
<th>A few times a month</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>A few times a week</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion, I am good at my job</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel exhilarated when I accomplish something at work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just want to do my job and not be bothered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become more cynical about whether my work contributes anything</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I doubt the significance of my work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At my work, I feel confident that I am effective at getting things done</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>