

## **The Buzzword: Employee Engagement. Does Person-Organization Fit Contribute to Employee Engagement?**

**Zeynep Merve Ünal\*, Tülay Turgut**

*Department of Business Administration, Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey*

(Received: 11 July, 2014; Revised: 22 December, 2014; Accepted: 1 January, 2015)

### **Abstract**

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between person-organization value fit and employee engagement, as well as to develop a new scale for measuring organizational engagement. We considered person-organization fit with a degree of similarity between personal values and organizational values. These values were measured by the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP). We divided employee engagement into two dimensions. These were “work engagement” and “organizational engagement.” Work engagement was measured by the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES). To measure organizational engagement, we constructed a 15-item Organizational Engagement Scale. We achieved this by examining its definition and existing scales. In order to collect data, available employees provided us with the relevant information. A total of 285 employees answered the questionnaires of this study. These employees worked in organizations that function in the service sector in Istanbul. Our reliability and factor analyses revealed that the Organizational Engagement Scale has a high reliability and two sub dimensions. These were named “organizational vigour” and “organizational dedication”. Regression analyses confirmed our research hypotheses: we found person-organization positively contributed to both work engagement and organizational engagement. However, we found that the contribution of person-organization fit to organizational engagement was more powerful than to work engagement.

### **Keywords**

Employee engagement, Organizational engagement, Values, Person-organization fit, Work engagement.

---

\* Corresponding Author, Email: zeynepmerveunal@gmail.com

## Introduction

Engagement is a concept that is hard to define. However, it is easy to realize that concepts of love, trust and justice are crucial for people. In organizations, engagement has become a buzzword (Richman, 2006). It is used as a competitive advantage strategy by human resources of consulting firms (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Employee engagement has been defined in many different ways. Mostly, it has been defined as an “emotional and intellectual commitment to the organization” (Baumruk, 2004; Richman, 2006; Shaw, 2005) or “the amount of discretionary effort exhibited by employees in their jobs” (Frank *et al.*, 2004). Thus, the level of employee engagement has been determined by measuring well-known concepts such as organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour (Robinson *et al.*, 2004). From this point of view, the concept of employee engagement has been described as “an umbrella term for whatever one wants it to be” (Saks, 2008, p.40), a potential “repackaging of other constructs” (Macey & Schneider, 2008, p.4) and “in a state of disarray” (Dalal, *et al.*, 2008, p.52). In summary, whereas some believe that putting old wine in a new bottle improves the taste, others argue it is still the same fermented grape juice.

Saks (2006) was the first researcher to divide employee engagement into work engagement and organizational engagement. According to Saks (2006, p.602), employee engagement is a unique construct composed of cognitive, emotional and behavioural concepts which are related to “individual role performances.” This definition embraced previous studies of engagement and introduced the idea of employee engagement. Employee engagement was developed in terms of cognitive (Kahn, 1990; Maslach *et al.*, 2001; Maslow, 1970), emotional (Harter *et al.*, 2002; Kahn, 1990) and behavioural (Harter *et al.*, 2002; Maslach *et al.*, 2001) engagements in literature. In Saks’ (2006) employee engagement model, engagement was conceptualized as role related (Kahn, 1990; Rothbard, 2001). Here, the individual is psychologically present in a particular organizational role. The dominant roles of individuals in organizations are their work role and their role as a member of an organization. Thus, in the model of Saks, organizational and work engagement were handled separately.

Accordingly, in this paper, we analysed employee engagement under two sub-dimensions: work engagement and organizational engagement.

Our study followed the theoretical framework mentioned above. It was intended to further contribute to our understanding of the implications of person-organization value fit for work and organizational engagement. In previous studies, work engagement has been discussed in relation to jobs and individual resources (e.g., Halbesleben, 2010). Some studies have also examined organizational level resources. However, few studies have examined person-organization fit (e.g., Hamid & Yahya, 2011). With regard to organizational engagement, there are a number of findings that indicate organizational resources, such as organizational support and organizational justice, as predictors (e.g., Saks, 2006). However, once again, there are few studies that investigate the contribution of person-organization fit. Thus, in our study, we aimed to evaluate person-organization value fit in relation to both types of engagement based on two justifications. First, there is a knowledge gap regarding the relation of value fit to engagement. Second, as a matter of fact, both values and engagement are motivational constructs where value fit is expected to be a considerable predictor for higher levels of engagement.

This study additionally aimed to construct a new scale to measure organizational engagement. We found a large number studies that include measurements of employee engagement (e.g., May *et al.*, 2004; Saks, 2006; Schaufeli *et al.*, 2006). Despite the tremendous improvements in understanding how best to conceptualize, measure and manage engagement, recent research and reviews (e.g., Bakker *et al.*, 2011; Crawford *et al.*, 2010) have determined a number of matters in order to be agreed. For instance, matters regarding how to conceptualize and measure engagement have been undetermined.

In previous studies, the level of employee engagement has been determined by the measuring of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour (Robinson *et al.*, 2004). Bakker *et al.* (2011) argued that engagement is nothing more than some “old wine-new bottle” conceptual cocktail consisting of commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviour and turnover

intentions. Sufficient theory (Inceoglu & Fleck, 2010) and research (e.g., Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006) showed that engagement is an important standalone motivational construct that is independent of other such constructs which, in the main, are better conceptualized as outcomes of engagement.

Indeed, the matters mentioned above mainly relate to the dimension of organizational engagement, rather than work engagement which has a more commonly accepted conceptual definition and measures. Thus, the focus of our study was on the construction of an Organizational Engagement Scale.

### **Work Engagement**

In academic literature, the definition of work engagement by Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma and Bakker (2002) has been commonly used. Schaufeli *et al.* (2002, p.74) defined engagement as a “positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigour, dedication and absorption. Vigour is characterized by high level of energy and mental resilience while working. Dedication refers to being strongly involved in one’s work and experiencing a sense of significance and pride. Finally, absorption is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one’s work” (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

Few meta-analyses have been published which identify the strongest and most reliable drivers of work engagement (Christian & Slaughter, 2007; Halbesleben, 2010; Simpson, 2008). Halbesleben’s (2010) meta-analysis, consistent with the Job-Demand Resource model (JD-R) (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), demonstrated that feedback, autonomy, social support and organizational climate are consistently associated with engagement and/or particular facets of engagement. Halbesleben’s meta-analysis also showed that personal resources (for example, self-efficacy and optimism) are strongly related to engagement.

### **Organizational Engagement**

Saks (2006) defined organizational engagement as a “sense of personal attachment to the company itself, independent of the

individual's professional role within the organization." According to Wellins and Concelman (2005), organizational engagement is "an amalgamation of commitment, loyalty, productivity and ownership that fosters an employee in order to reach high performance." As it can be understood from such definitions, organizational engagement concept is similar to organizational commitment. However, according to the definition of organizational engagement, the distinguishing features are a genuine willingness to contribute to organizational success, combined with feelings of energy, inspiration, strength and joy (Albrecht, 2010; Macey & Schneider, 2008), alignment with organizational goals and a willingness to exert discretionary effort (Schneider, Macey, Barbera & Martin, 2009; Vance, 2006). In this process, an organization is seen by employees as an inspiring place (Albrecht, 2010). Employees are attentive, connected, integrated and focused on situations of the workplace (Kahn, 1992). They show an effort to solve problems in their organization and feel excited about issues concerning their organization (Macey, Schneider, Barbera & Young, 2009). This results in a recognized contribution to their organization (Deci, 1975).

According to Pitt-Catsoupes and Matz-Costa (2008), the basic factor that distinguishes organization engagement from organization commitment is "energy." An individual who is engaged in his or her organization will be likely to reach self-actualization through channelling all of his/her energy to contribute to organizational success. Engaged employees perform beyond their capacity by energy, passion, aliveness and willingness. Thus, organizational engagement concept refers to "individual's passion, enthusiasm, high level of concentration and sense of energy towards their organizations and working there beyond the commitment."

According to Saks' (2006) findings, organizational engagement predicts organizational commitment. In other words, employees who feel strong in an organization make a recognizable contribution to that organization. They make an effort to engage in issues of the organization and enjoy being a member of it. They feel energetic in it and use their knowledge and skills to make contributions to organizational goals. Thus, they experience "organizational engagement". As a result of this, employees commit to their

organizations by speaking proudly of it to others, perceiving problems of the organization as their own problems and feeling happy at the prospect of working at their organization for the rest of their career life.

Saks (2006) suggested the antecedents of organizational engagement can be identified by the social exchange theory (SET). SET argues that obligations are generated through a series of interactions between parties who are in a state of reciprocal interdependence (Saks, 2006). Accordingly, when individuals receive economic and socio-emotional resources from their leaders, they feel obliged to respond and repay the organization. Individuals repay their organization through their level of engagement. That is, employees will choose to bring cognitive, emotional and physical resources to their organization in response to the resources they receive from their organizations. These resources are predictors of organizational engagement (Saks, 2006). Moreover, perceived organizational support, supportive management, confidential interpersonal relationships and perceived organizational justice have been identified as antecedents of organizational engagement (Saks, 2006).

In addition, scholars have used Relative Weight Analysis (RWA) to identify the key drivers of employee engagement (Johnson, 2000; Lundby & Johnson, 2006). Such analyses revealed that the top ten global drivers are: confidence in the organization's future, organization support work/life balance, excited about one's work, promising future for one's self, safety priority, corporate responsibility efforts which increase overall satisfaction, opportunity to improve one's skills, satisfied with recognition, confidence in the organization's senior leaders and co-workers give their best. Even though "excited about one's work" is about work engagement, it can be evaluated that engaged workers might also be engaged to their organization because of the perception of resources that come from their organizations.

### **Person-Organization Fit**

Person-organization fit has been defined as the congruence between the norms and values of organizations and the values of persons

(Chatman, 1989, 1991). According to Kristof (1996), person-organization fit is stated under two distinctions. One is the supplementary and complementary fit and the other is the needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit. Supplementary fit exists when there is a similarity of relevant characteristics between an organization and a person (Kristof, 1996). Complementary fit exists when there is a “congruence of individual and organizational values” (Kristof, 1996; Lopez, 1999; Sekiguchi, 2004). Cable and Edwards (2004) argued that complementary and supplementary fit are interrelated and that these two types of fit independently contribute to individual and organizational outcomes. Needs-supplies fit occurs when organizations satisfy the needs of their employees. In this context, individuals whose needs are met experience a higher rate of job satisfaction and seem more productive (Piasentin, 2007, p.15, 16). Demands-abilities fit occurs when there is a similarity between the requirements of work and the abilities of an individual.

In our study, we explored person-organization fit on the basis of “supplementary fit”. This is defined as a similarity between culture, climate, values, goals and norms of organization and personality, values, goals and attitudes of the individuals. In previous studies, “Organizational Culture Profile” (OCP) has been widely used. OCP was developed by O’Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell (1991) to determine the fit of individuals to an organization. It has seven value dimensions. These value dimensions are “innovation, stability, respect for people, outcome orientation, attention to detail, team orientation and aggressiveness” (O’Reilly *et al.*, 1991, p.494).

Person-organization fit positively contributes to a large number of organizational attitudes and behaviours (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006, p.391-392). With regard to behavioural results, person-organization fit is correlated with job performance, organizational citizenship behaviour and turnover rate (Kristof, 1996). When an individual perceives the similarity between his or her own values and the values of his or her organization, he/she will feel a sense of attachment to the organization (Cable, 1995; Finegan, 2000). Consequently, such an individual will experience a sense of job satisfaction and display organizational citizenship behaviour (McDonald, 1993; Vilela, Gonzalez & Ferrin, 2008).

## **The Contribution of Person-Organization Fit to Work Engagement and Organizational Engagement**

Studies on person-organization fit (Parkers *et al.*, 2001; Schneider, 2001) reveal that individuals have a tendency to work in organizations that they have parallel values with. This interaction influences their attitudes and behaviours towards their organizations. Although there are no studies on the relationship between person-organization fit and organizational engagement directly, there are several studies which explore the relationship between person-organization fit and positive job/organizational attitudes, as well as work engagement.

Previous studies (e.g., Bretz & Judge, 1994; Harris & Mossholder, 1996; Hoffman & Woehr 2006; Verquer *et al.*, 2003) argue that person-organization fit has a positive relationship with the following variables: work engagement, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour and job satisfaction. Besides, there are some findings and ideas that shed light on the relationship between fit and engagement. For instance, according to Albrecht (2010), the congruence between the demands of employees and the organizations' offered facilities contribute to engagement level in a positive way. In a similar vein, internalization of organizational values and goals are argued to contribute to employee engagement towards their organizations (Bindl & Parker, 2011). Bono and Judge (2003) focused on employees who were "engaged in their work". They suggested that employees who perceive their work as consistent with their personal values will be more engaged. Additionally, according to Bindl and Parker (2011), organizational applications that include values of the organization that are applied to employees leads to the engagement of employees. This contributes to the occurrence of a positive psychological state within the organization.

Other than the above arguments and suggestions, a theoretical rationale for the relationship between person-organization value fit and employee engagement can be found in the field theory (Lewin, 1952). The three main variables of field theory are behaviour, person and environment. Field theory emphasizes an individual's needs, personality and motivating forces. It argues that employee behaviour depends upon the state of the person and his or her environment. The



concrete behaviour is a result of the way he or she sees the environment. That is, the person shapes his or her behaviour based on the way s/he perceives his or her environment. When the person perceives the environment positively s/he tends to behave positively. Hence, employees who perceive fit between individual and organizational values, will be expected to behave in an engaged way towards both their work and organization. Besides, values and value systems play central roles in motivation (Rokeach, 1973). Furthermore, engagement itself is a motivational construct, as its definition states. With this in mind, individuals who perceive value congruence with their organizations will have an opportunity to act in accordance with their internalized values. In other words, their environments shape their grounds of motivation and their abilities to carry out work activities in an engaged way.

Taking the statements above into consideration, the hypotheses of this research are as follows:

**H1:** Person-organization fit contributes positively to organizational engagement

**H2:** Person-organization fit contributes positively to work engagement

## **Methods**

### **Participants**

A total of 285 employees from health, education and banking service sectors in Istanbul (Turkey) participated in this research. The age of participants ranged between 18 and 66 years, with the mean of 34. Their total tenure ranged between 1 and 40 years, with a mean of 10. The per cent of female participants was higher (53%; N = 151) than the per cent of male (47%; N= 134) participants. More than half of the participants were single (55.1%; N= 157) and the rest were married (44.9%; N= 128). Moreover, half of the participants had bachelor degrees (50.5%; N=144), 54 participants had associate degree (18.9%) and 84 participants had master or PhD degrees (29.5%).

### **Procedure**

Participants of this study were reached by convenience sampling and snowball sampling. Questionnaires were sent via e-mail to the

individuals who worked in different organizations that function in the service sector. After the first contacted people sent the questionnaires to their acquainted employees, the number of participants expanded by snowball sampling. As a result, the questionnaire was sent to a total of 400 employees. Within a two week period, 285 employees sent the completed questionnaire back. This represented a response rate of 71.25%. In order to properly apply factor analysis, the number of participants is seen as a crucial criterion and a recommended minimum subject to item ratio is at least 5:1 (Gorusch, 1983). With 39 items, the OCP had the maximum number of items among the three scales used in this research. Thus, the minimum number of participants to apply factor analysis was  $(39 \times 5)$  195. Hence, the sample size of 285 was regarded as correct to apply statistical analyses.

The front page of our questionnaire included information about the aim of our research, the completion time of the questionnaire and our privacy policy. Assurance of anonymity was specifically stressed in order to reduce the effects of the response bias and to increase participation (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000).

## **Measures**

### **Organizational Engagement Scale**

In order to measure organizational engagement, we constructed a 15-item Organizational Engagement Scale. In the process of constructing this scale, we examined definitions of organizational engagement and of the available scales. Thus, along with taking items from previously developed scales, new items were formed based on definitions in order to extensively represent organizational engagement. Four identical items were taken from Saks' (2006) six-itemed scale. Furthermore, one of Saks' (2006) items which had been negatively formed ("I am really not into the goings-on in this organization") was reversed into a positive form. With minor changes, two items of Esen's (2011) Organizational Engagement Scale were used. The remaining eight items were based on definitions of organizational engagement in academic literature.

For instance, the items "working in this organization is satisfying

for me” and “I defend this organization against injustices” were formed based on the definitions of Macey and Schneider (2008). Moreover, the items “I have genuine willingness to contribute to organizational success” and “I use my knowledge and abilities to contribute to goal actualization of this organization” were formed based on the definitions of Vance (2006) and Schneider *et al.* (2009).

Initially, the 15 items were presented to a group of 20 employees. This was to evaluate whether employees found the items meaningful in the work environment and to highlight awkward phrasing. Additionally, we considered evaluations from academics who had mastered engagement. Any required modifications were made accordingly. Subsequently, the 15-item scale was piloted on an additional sample of 30 respondents and a high reliability level for the scale was obtained ( $\alpha = .95$ ).

Response alternatives were given on a six-point rating scale where 1=never; 2=rarely; 3=sometimes; 4=often, 5=very often, 6=always.

### **Work Engagement Scale**

To measure work engagement, we used a shortened nine-item version (Schaufeli *et al.*, 2006) of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), developed by Schaufeli *et al.* (2002). UWES-9 is internally consistent (Schaufeli *et al.*, 2006) and has good construct validity (Seppälä *et al.*, 2009). Each dimension (vigour, dedication and absorption) was measured by 3 items. Items were rated on a six-point rating scale where 1=never; 2=rarely; 3=sometimes; 4=often, 5=very often, 6=always.

### **Person-Organization Fit Scale**

We used a shortened 40-item version (Cable & Judge, 1997) of Organizational Culture Profile (OCP), which was developed by O'Reilly *et al.* (1991). We used this to measure the congruence between individual values and organizational values. This short version of the instrument has been widely used in previous studies (Cable & Judge, 1997; Cable & Parsons, 2001; Judge & Cable, 1997). Such studies suggest that the OCP is internally consistent and reliable. Furthermore, it has discriminant validity and substantial predictive validity (Adkins & Caldwell, 2004; O'Reilly *et al.*, 1991). One of the items “enthusiasms for the job” was removed. This was due to the

similarity of meaning with the Work Engagement Scale item “I am enthusiastic about my job”. Thus, in this study, person-organization fit was measured by 39 items. Respondents rated each of 39 value items separately for their current organization and for their ideal organization. Items were rated on a six-point rating scale where 1= not at all; 2= a little bit; 3= moderately; 4= considerably, 5= quite, 6=a lot.

## Findings

The explanatory factor analyses of the Organizational Engagement Scale revealed two factors (KMO = 0.94; Barlett’s Test of Sphericity Chi Square: 4499.409; df: 105;  $P < 0.001$ ) explaining 76.71% of the total variance. The first factor was named “organizational vigour” and included eight items. This explained 43.07% of the total variance. The second factor was named as “organizational dedication” and included seven items. This explained 33.63% of the total variance. The alpha coefficients were 0.95 for the total scale, 0.96 for the first factor and 0.93 for the second factor. Table 1 shows factor loading of all items.

**Table 1. Results of factor analysis of organizational engagement**

ITEMS	Factor Loading	Factor Variance (%)
<b>F1.Organizational Vigor</b>		<b>43.075</b>
Being a member of this organization makes me come alive.	0.880	
Being a member of this organization is exhilarating for me.	0.868	
Being a member of this organization is very captivating.	0.864	
I find the organization inspiring to do my best.	0.856	
Working in this organization is satisfying for me.	0.846	
In my organization, I feel strong.	0.817	
In my organization, I feel that I am bursting with energy.	0.817	
One of the most exciting things for me is getting involved with things happening in this organization.	0.790	
<b>F2.Organizational Dedication</b>		<b>33.636</b>
I am really into the “goings-on” in this organization.	0.845	
I use my knowledge and abilities to contribute to goal actualization of this organization.	0.845	
I have genuine willingness to contribute to organizational success.	0.840	
I make recognizable contributions for this company.	0.818	
I have willingness to exert discretionary effort for success of this organization.	0.751	
I defend this company against injustices.	0.729	
I make an effort to solve the problems that might affect the success of this organization.	0.694	

The factor analyses of the Work Engagement Scale revealed two factors (KMO= 0.84; Barlett's Test of Sphericity Chi Square: 2199.160; df: 36; P< 0.001) which explained 76.54% of the total variance. The items measuring the dimensions of vigour and dedication were gathered under the first factor. This was named as "vigour & dedication" and explained 48.41% of the total variance. The three items representing "absorption" formed the second factor which explained 28.13% of the total variance (Table 2). The alpha coefficients were 0.92 for the total scale, 0.93 for the first factor and 0.79 for the second factor.

**Table 2. Results of factor analysis of work engagement**

ITEMS	Factor Loading	Factor Variance (%)
<b>F1. Vigor &amp; Dedication</b>		<b>48.412</b>
At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.	0.899	
My job inspires me.	0.892	
At my work, I feel bursting with energy.	0.869	
I am enthusiastic about my job.	0.817	
When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.	0.794	
I am proud of the work that I do.	0.608	
<b>F2. Absorption</b>		<b>28.137</b>
I am immersed in my work.	0.919	
I get carried away when I am working.	0.897	
I feel happy when I am working intensely.	0.520	

In the measurement of person-organization fit, 39 value items were used. These items were answered by the respondents for the values of organizations that they currently worked in and for their ideal organizational values. During the factor analysis of the responses given for the current organization values, 11 items were removed due to their low factor loadings (< 0.50). In the final analysis, 28 items loaded under three factors (KMO = 0.96; Barlett's Test of Sphericity Chi Square: 7033.219; df: 378; P < 0.001) which explained 66.54% of the total variance. Furthermore, 15 items formed the first factor named as "humanity" which explained 29.52% of the total variance. The second factor was formed by 10 items and was named "responsibility & innovation". This explained 22.64% of the total variance. The third factor was formed by three items, named "assertiveness". This explained 14.37% of the total variance (Table 3). The alpha coefficients were 0.97 for the total scale, 0.95 for the first factor, 0.94

for the second factor and 0.78 for the third factor. Assuming that the same 28 items of the three factors were valid for individual values, the absolute value of difference of individual and organization values were calculated to obtain the “person-organization fit” score. Hence, by including all 28 items, the general person-organization fit (POF) score was calculated. Additionally, the fit scores for each value dimensions as “humanity fit”, “responsibility & innovation fit” and “assertiveness fit” were calculated separately. Due to the calculation of the difference between respondents’ individual values (i.e., ideal organization values) and organizational values (i.e., current organization values), POF increased when the values were closer to 0 (zero). Similarly, POF decreases when the values were away from zero.

**Table 3. Results of factor analysis of organizational values**

ITEMS	Factor Loading	Factor Variance (%)
<b>F1. Humanity</b>		<b>29.520</b>
Fairness	0.819	
Being people oriented	0.780	
Tolerance	0.774	
Offers praise for good performance	0.739	
Being supportive	0.737	
Security of employment	0.677	
Being reflective	0.671	
Opportunities for professional growth	0.660	
High pay for good performance	0.634	
Being calm	0.603	
Confronting conflict directly	0.582	
Sharing information freely	0.581	
Decisiveness	0.573	
Being aggressive	0.517	
Developing friends at work	0.501	
<b>F2. Responsibility &amp; Innovation</b>		<b>22.645</b>
Being socially responsible	0.727	
Being highly organized	0.713	
Having good reputation	0.698	
Having a clear guiding philosophy	0.673	
Being innovative	0.657	
Adaptability	0.647	
Being distinctive from others	0.632	
Stability	0.605	
An emphasis on quality	0.590	
Being analytical	0.527	
<b>F3. Assertiveness</b>		<b>14.376</b>
Risk taking	0.795	
Autonomy	0.729	
Being quick to take advantage of opportunities	0.647	

Before testing our hypotheses, descriptive and correlational analyses were performed. Table 4 shows the mean values, standard deviations and correlations among the variables. The strongest correlation was between “organizational engagement” and “work engagement” ( $r = 0.685$ ;  $P < 0.01$ ). Moreover, “person-organization fit”, as expected, had significant and positive correlations with both work engagement ( $r = 0.206$ ;  $P < 0.01$ ) and organizational engagement ( $r = 0.459$ ;  $P < 0.01$ ).

**Table 4. Descriptive statistics and correlations between variables**

	Mean	Standard Deviation	1	2
1. Person-Organization Fit	1.32	1.10		
2. Work Engagement	4.08	1.08	0.206**	
3. Organizational Engagement	3.97	1.15	0.459***	0.685***

\* $P < 0.05$ , \*\* $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $P < 0.001$

Two separate simple regression analyses were performed to test the contributions of “person-organization fit” on work engagement and organizational engagement. These produced statistically significant regression models ( $F = 12.54$ ;  $P < 0.001$  for work engagement;  $F = 75.62$ ;  $P < 0.001$  for organizational engagement). Standardized regression coefficients indicated that person-organization fit has a significant positive contribution on the organizational engagement ( $\beta = 0.459$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ) and on the work engagement ( $\beta = 0.206$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ). Besides, the explanatory power of POF on organizational engagement was more powerful compared to that on work engagement (Table 5).

**Table 5. The Contribution of person-organization fit on work engagement and organizational engagement**

	Work Engagement	Organizational Engagement
	$\beta$	$\beta$
Person-Organization Fit	0.206***	0.459***
R	0.206	0.459
R <sup>2</sup>	0.042	0.211
F	12.543***	75.629***

\* $P < 0.05$ , \*\* $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $P < 0.001$

Moreover, in order to test the contribution of sub-dimensions of “person-organization fit” on sub-dimensions of work engagement and organizational engagement, we applied step wise regression analyses. The statistically significant results of regression analyses are shown at Table 6. The stepwise regression analyses indicated that the only sub-dimension of person-organization fit that has significant positive contribution on “organizational dedication” ( $F = 24.390$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ;  $\beta =$

0.28;  $P < 0.001$ ) and on “vigour & dedication” ( $F = 17.530$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ;  $\beta = 0.24$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ) was humanity fit. With regard to “organization vigour”, both humanity fit ( $\beta = 0.36$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ) and responsibility & innovation fit ( $\beta = 0.21$ ;  $P < 0.05$ ) had significant positive contributions ( $F = 60.149$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ). None of the person-organization fit sub-dimensions had significant contribution to “absorption”. Moreover, assertiveness fit did not have any significant contribution on any of the dependent variables.

**Table 6. The contribution of sub-dimensions of person-organization fit on sub-dimensions of work engagement and organizational engagement**

	OE-Organizational Dedication	OE-Organizational Vigour	WE-Vigour & Dedication
	$\beta$	$\beta$	$\beta$
POF-Humanity Fit	0.282***	0.360***	0.242***
POF-Responsibility &Innovation Fit	----	.208*	----
POF-Assertiveness Fit	----	----	----
R	0.282	0.547	0.242
R2	0.079	0.299	0.058
F	24.390***	60.149***	17.530***

\* $P < 0.05$ , \*\* $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $P < 0.001$

## Discussion and Conclusion

In literature, there are numerous studies that focus on employee engagement. However, there are few studies that include statistical findings on this issue. Our study aimed to contribute to engagement literature in this regard.

In this study, we constructed a new scale of organizational engagement which had illuminating results. Items included in the scale were: “in my organization, I feel strong”, “being a member of this organization make me come alive”, “I have genuine willingness to contribute to organizational success”, “I defend this company against injustices” and “I use my knowledge and abilities to contribute to goal actualization of this organization”. These were considered as parallels with respect to the definition of organizational engagement as “individuals who experience organizational engagement psychologically attach their organization, feel energetic and excited in the organization every day, know what is expected from themselves in the organization, work in order to contribute to the organization and have positive point of view” (Harter *et al.*, 2002).

Our factor analysis of organizational engagement revealed two sub



dimensions. Each factor's internal consistency turned out to be higher than .90. If we take into consideration the variance explanation power (76%) and the reliability level of each dimension, we conclude that our scale was successful. These two dimensions- named "organizational vigour" and "organizational dedication" - reflect concepts of "high levels of energy" and "willingness to exert discretionary effort for the success of organization" which have been argued in previous studies as the characteristics of organizational engagement. Moreover, it is remarkable to note that our obtained organizational engagement dimensions are consistent in content with the two dimensions (vigour and dedication) of work engagement. Thereby, the findings of our Organizational Engagement Scale suggest its reliability and validity. High internal consistencies emerged and dimensions of "organizational vigour" and "organizational dedication" were consistent with the organizational engagement definitions. These were parallel to the two dimensions of work engagement. Furthermore, our obtained positive and significant relationship between value fit and organizational engagement reinforce the scale's validity.

The results of our regression analyses support our hypotheses - that person-organization value fit has a positive contribution to organizational engagement, as well as work engagement. The positive contribution of value fit on engagement can be explained by Lewin's (1952) field theory, which argues that the interaction between the person and their environment determines their behaviour. In accordance with this, the congruity of individual and organizational values may encourage positive behaviour in a work and organizational context. Thus, employees may be willing to put in high levels of energy and be strongly involved in their work. At the same time, they may be willing to use their knowledge and abilities to contribute to the goal actualization of their organizations and to exert discretionary efforts to contribute to organizational success.

On the other hand, one interesting finding was that person-organization fit had a more explanatory power on organizational engagement ( $\beta = 0.459$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ) than on work engagement ( $\beta = 0.206$ ;  $P < 0.001$ ). This finding might be explained on the basis of resource level. Person-organization value fit seems more apt to be

perceived as an organizational level resource. Thus, it is reasonable to expect that an organizational level resource has a more powerful influence on the psychological states of individuals towards their organizations. With regard to work engagement, our findings shed light on the low prediction power of person-organization fit on work engagement. Albrecht (2012) found that job resources, such as role clarity, autonomy, supervisory coaching and career development, have a high level of association with work engagement. Additionally, organizational culture and climate, which are characterized as organizational resources, have a low level of association with work engagement. Accordingly, we can conclude that “person-organization value fit” can be characterized as an organizational resource which has more explanatory power on organizational engagement. Furthermore, that work engagement is more powerfully predicted by job resources.

Moreover, regression analyses conducted for sub-dimensions of variables revealed that humanity fit dimension has a more explanatory power on employee engagement. Humanity dimension includes values with respect to the importance of individual labour and the quality of interpersonal relations like tolerance, being people oriented, fairness, offering praise for good performance and being supportive. This finding can be explained in the frame of Kahn’s concept of psychological safety. According to Kahn (1990), employees experience psychological safety in organizations where supportive and trusting interpersonal relationships exist. In such organizations, employees are allowed to try new things and even fail without fear of the consequences. Thus, putting importance on values, such as tolerance, being people oriented and fairness, by both employees and the organization promotes psychological safety within the organization. This facilitates employees’ engagement to their work and organization. Similarly, Saks’ findings (2006) indicate that employees who experience high levels of organizational support are more likely to have greater levels of both work and organizational engagement. Moreover, according to Deci and Ryan (1987), employees view their relationship with their first line supervisors as an indicator of the company’s support. Thus, positive relationships with one’s supervisor also promotes safety perceptions and employee engagement.

## References

- Adkins, B. & Caldwell, D. (2004) "Firm or subgroup culture: Where does fitting in matter most?". *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 25, 969-978.
- Albrecht, S. L. (2010). *Handbook of Employee Engagement Perspectives, Issues Research and Practice*, School of Psychology and Psychiatry, Monash University, Australia.
- Albrecht, S. L. (2012). "The influence of job, team and organizational level resources on employee well-being, engagement, commitment and extra-role performance". *International Journal of Manpower*, 33(7), 840-853.
- Bakker, A. B. & Demerouti, E. (2007). "The job demands–resources model: State of the art". *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 309-28.
- Bakker, A. B.; Albrecht, S. L. & Leiter, M. P. (2011). "Key questions regarding work engagement". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(1), 4-28.
- Baumruk, R. (2004). "The missing link: The role of employee engagement in business success". *Workspan*, 47, 48-52.
- Bindl, U. K. & Parker, S. K. (2011). "Meaning regulation at work: How emotions impact on the future of organizations". Paper accepted for presentation at the *25th ANZAM Conference*, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Bono, J. D. & Judge, T. A. (2003). "Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders". *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 554-571.
- Bretz, R. D. & Judge, J. A. (1994). "Job search behavior of employed managers". *Personnel Psychology*, 7, 275-301.
- Cable, D. M. (1995). *The role of person-organization fit in organizational entry*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Cornell University.
- Cable, D. M. & Edwards, J. R. (2004). "Complementary and supplementary fit: A theoretical and empirical integration". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 822-834.
- Cable, D. M. & Parsons, C. K. (2001). "Socialization tactics and person-organization fit". *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 1-23.
- Cable, D. & Judge, T. (1997). "Interviewers' perceptions of person–organization fit and organizational selection decision". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 824, 546–561.
- Chatman, J. A. (1989). "Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit". *Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 333-349.
- Chatman, J. A. (1991). "Matching people and organizations: Selection and

- socialization in public accounting firms". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 459-484.
- Christian, M. S. & Slaughter, J. E. (2007). "Work engagement: A meta-analytic review and directions for research in an emerging area". Congress paper in *67th annual meeting of Academy of Management*, Philadelphia, PA, August.
- Crawford, E. R.; LePine, J. A. & Rich, B.L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 834-848.
- Dalal, R. S.; Brummel, B. J.; Wee, S. & Thomas, L. L. (2008). "Defining employee engagement for productive research and practice". *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 52-5.
- Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1987). "The support of autonomy and the control of behavior". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 1024-1037.
- Esen, E. (2011). "Employees organizational engagement". *Marmara Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi [Marmara University Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences]*, XXX (1), 377-390.
- Finegan, J. E. (2000). "The impact of person and organizational values on organizational commitment". *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(2), 149-169.
- Frank, F. D.; Finnegan, R. P. & Taylor, C.R. (2004). "The race for talent: Retaining and engaging workers in the 21st century". *Human Resource Planning*, 27(3), 12-25.
- Gorusch, R. L. (1983). *Factor Analysis*, 2nd ed, Hillsdale, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2010). *A meta-analysis of work engagement: Relationships with burnout, demands, resources and consequences*, in A. B. Bakker & M. P. Leiter (eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 102-117). New York: Psychology Press.
- Hallberg, U. E. & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). "'Same same' but different? Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment?" *The European Psychologist*, 11, 119-127.
- Hamid, S. N. A, & K. K. Yahya (2011). "Relationship between person-job fit and person-organization fit on employees' work engagement: A study among engineers in semiconductor companies in Malaysia". *Annual Conference on Innovations in Business & Management*, London, UK., <http://www.cibmp.org/Papers/Paper615.pdf>

- Harris, S. G. & Mossholder, K. W. (1996). "The affective implications of perceived congruence with culture dimensions during organizational transformation". *Journal of Management*, 22, 527-548.
- Harter, J. K.; Schmidt, F. L. & Hayes, T. L. (2002). "Business-unit level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 268-79.
- Hoffman, B. J. & Woehr, D. J. (2006). "A quantitative review of the relationship between person-organization fit and behavioral outcomes". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 389-399.
- Inceoglu, I. & Fleck, S. (2010). "Engagement as a motivational construct". In S. Albrecht (Ed.), *The handbook of employee engagement: Models, measures, and practices*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 74-86.
- Johnson, J. W. (2000). "A heuristic method for estimating the relative weight of predictor variables in multiple regression". *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 35, 119.
- Judge, T. A. & Cable, D. M. (1997). "Applicant personality, organizational culture, and organization attraction". *Personnel Psychology*, 50(2), 359-394.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). "Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work". *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692-724.
- Kahn, W. A. (1992). "To be full there: Psychological presence at work". *Human Relations*, 45, 321-49.
- Kerlinger, F. N. & Lee, H. B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research* (4th ed.). Holt, NY: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). "Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement and implications". *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1), 1-49.
- Lewin, K. (1952). *Field theory in social science: selected theoretical papers*. London: Tavistock.
- Lopez, T. B. (1999). "Person-organization fit: A market orientation customer orientation perspective". 1-3. <http://www.sbaer.uca.edu/research>.
- Lundby, K. M. & Johnson, J. W. (2006). "Relative weights of predictors: What is important when many forces are operating". in A. I. Kraut (ed.), *Getting Action for Organizational Surveys: New Concepts, Methods, and Applications*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass, pp. 326-51.
- Macey, W. H. & Schneider, B. (2008). "The meaning of employee engagement". *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 3-30.
- Macey, W. H.; Schneider, B.; Barbera, K.M. & Young, S.A. (2009).

- Employee engagement: Tools for analysis, practice, and competitive advantage*, Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Maslach, C.; Schaufeli, W.B. & Leiter, M. P. (2001). "Job burnout". *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- May, D. R.; Gilson, R.L. & Harter, L. (2004). "The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability, and the engagement of the human spirit at work". *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 11-37.
- McDonald, P. R. (1993). *Individual-organizational value congruence: Operationalization and consequents*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The University of Western Ontario, London.
- O'Reilly, C.; Chatman, J. & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). "People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit". *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 487-516.
- Parkers, L. P.; Bochner, S. & Schneider, S.K. (2001). "Person-organization fit across cultures: An empirical investigation of individualism". *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50(1), 81-108.
- Piasentin, K. A. (2007). *How do employees conceptualize fit? Development of a multi dimensional measure of subjective person-organization fit*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Calgary, Canada.
- Pitt-Catsoupes, M. & Matz-Costa, C. (2008). "The multi-generational workforce: Workplace flexibility and engagement". *Community, Work & Family*, 11(2), 215-229.
- Richman, A. (2006). "Everyone wants an engaged workforce how can you create it?". *Workspan*, 49, 36-9.
- Robinson, D.; Perryman, S. & Hayday, S. (2004). *The drivers of employee engagement*. Brighton: Institute for Employment Studies.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: The Free Press.
- Rothbard, N. P. (2001). "Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 655-84.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). "Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement". *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- Saks, A. M. (2008). "The meaning and bleeding of employee engagement: How muddy is the water?". *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 40-43.
- Schaufeli, W. B. & Bakker, A. B. (2004). "Job demands, job resources, and

- their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293-315.
- Schaufeli, W. B.; Bakker, A. B. & Salanova, M. (2006). "The measurement of work engagement with a brief questionnaire: A cross-national study". *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 701-716.
- Schaufeli, W. B.; Salanova, M.; Gonzalez- Roma, V. & Bakker, A. B. (2002). "The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach". *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92.
- Schneider, B. (2001). "Fits about fit". *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50(1), 141- 152.
- Schneider, B.; Macey, W. H.; Barbera, K. M. & Martin, N. (2009). "Driving customer satisfaction and financial success through employee engagement". *People & Strategy*, 32, 22-27.
- Sekiguchi, T. (2004). "Person-organization fit and person-job fit in employee selection: A review of the literature". *Osaka Keidai Ronshu*, 54(6), 179-196.
- Seppälä, P.; Mauno, S.; Feldt, T.; Hakanen, J.; Kinnunen, U. Schaufeli, W. & Tolvanen, A. (2009). "The construct validity of the Utrecht work engagement scale: Multisample and longitudinal evidence". *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10(4), 459-70.
- Shaw, K. (2005). "An engagement strategy process for communicators". *Strategic Communication Management*, 9(3), 26-9.
- Simpson, M. (2008). "Engagement at work: A review of the literature". *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 46, 1012-24.
- Vance, R. J. (2006). *Employee engagement and commitment: A guide to understanding, measuring and increasing engagement in your organization, effective practice guidelines*. Alexandria, VA: Society for Human Resource Management.
- Verquer, M. L.; Beehr, T.A. & Wagner, S. (2003). "A meta-analysis of relations between person-organization fit and work attitudes". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 473-489.
- Vilela, B. B.; Gonzalez, J.A. & Ferrin, V. P. F. (2008). "Person-organization fit, OCB and performance appraisal: Evidence from matched supervisor-salesperson data set in a Spanish context". *Industrial Marketing Management*, 37(8), 1005-1019.
- Wellins, R. & Concelman, J. (2005). "Creating a culture for engagement". *Workforce Performance Solutions* ([www.wpsmag.com](http://www.wpsmag.com)). Retrieved, October 2, 2008, from: [www.ddiworld.com/pdf/wps\\_engagement\\_ar.pdf](http://www.ddiworld.com/pdf/wps_engagement_ar.pdf).