

*Dominyak Vladislav, St. Petersburg State University,
Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Psychology,*

*Rodionova Elena, St. Petersburg State University,
Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Psychology,*

*Litvinova Sofia, St. Petersburg State University,
Master of Psychology, Department of Psychology*

Abstractness model of employee engagement

Statement of scientific problem

In recent years the surge in interest in an employee engagement both in scientific community, and among practitioners is observed. Employers realize importance of an employee engagement for efficiency of the organization, the importance of measurement of an employee engagement and forming of organizational conditions for its increase. This interest is caused by the fact that the engaged employees are more effective. It is confirmed, for example, by the researches Hewitt Associates which found connections of an employee engagement with growth of sales volumes a year later and also with indicators of an operating and gross profit of the companies (AON Hewitt, 2013).

Interest of business community in an employee engagement and need of clear controlling mechanisms an employee engagement urged on interest of scientists in content of this phenomenon. It has caused also emergence of the psychological model of an employee engagement offered below.

Problem Analysis Research

At the moment there are many models of an employee engagement. The model by William A. Kahn (1990) who understood an employee engagement as "the harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles" (Kahn, 1990, p. 694) is considered one of the first models of an employee engagement. Being engaged, employees involve and express themselves physically, emotionally and cognitively through performance of the working role. The engagement is defined by the working context mediated by perception of the person, experience of stay in which has to create three psychological conditions: meaningfulness, safety, and availability.

Much of the existing models of an engagement are concentrated on conditions (or drivers) which have to be present at a working context for providing an employee engagement. These are the Deloitte model (Bersin, 2015), "The Aon Hewitt Employee Engagement Model" (AON Hewitt, 2013), IES Engagement model (Robinson, Perryman, Hayday, 2004), ORC International Employee Lifecycle model (ORC International, 2015), etc.

From psychological aspect the engagement usually is considered from the point of view of the theory of traits as psychological state and as behavior (Macey, Schneider, 2008).

Gallup Inc. model includes consideration of four measurements of an employee engagement — satisfaction of basic needs, assessment of managements support, team work and possibilities of growth which are expressed in the questionnaire from 12 questions (Nink, Welte, 2011).

According to the theory of U. Schaufeli and his colleagues the engagement consists of three elements – vigor, dedication and absorption and is considered as the positive state connected with work. These elements correspond to three main measurements of professional burnout: exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy) (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, Bakker, 2002).

Thus, the engagement into the organization is characterized by such emotional and cognitive condition in case of which the employee puts the resources, such as time and energy in organizational processes. We have assumed that with conditionally constant quantity of these resources at the person, he can distribute them between the organization and other spheres (for example, a family, a hobby, friends, etc.) The more resources the employee puts in the organization, the more he is engaged, the it is less – the more he puts them somewhere else, "look aside" from the organization. From there was an assumption that the engagement into the organization can be presented as lack of an engagement into something else. Also we have assumed that distribution of resources of the worker between the organization and other spheres of life is mediated by his value judgment of a possibility of realization of motivators in the organization.

The purpose and objectives of the study

Research objective is preliminary studying of separate aspects of hypothetical model of formation of an employee engagement, check of her predictive opportunity.

Sample of the research – 92 employees of the commercial organizations of St. Petersburg (Russia), 46 women and 50 men aged from 22 up to 50 years. Middle age - 28 years.

Research hypothesis: the engagement into the organization depends on in what ratio the potential of an engagement goes to the organization and to other spheres of life, and this orientation is defined by in what degree of people sees possibilities of realization of motivators in the organization.

For check of a hypothesis we have chosen two models of an engagement and the corresponding instruments of measurement: model of Wilmar Schaufeli and his colleagues (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, Bakker, 2002) and UWES in adaptation by D. A. Kutuzova (2006) as belonging more to process of work and E. I. Kudryavtseva's (2015) questionnaire constructed on the basis of the Gallup model as belonging to the organization in general. As indicators of engagement's potential (the available resources) were chosen motivation to success and T. Elers's test (Raygorodsky, 2006) and curiosity (the questionnaire of assessment of curiosity developed on the basis of the Curiosity and Exploration Inventory model (Kashdan, Rose, Fincham, 2004). The questionnaire on the basis of a technique "The possibility for the realization of motivators" has been developed for assessment of the importance of motives and a possibility of their realization (Dominyak, 2006, Rodionova, 2013).

Research study results

Check of integrity and coherence of model of employee engagement took place by use of the multiple regression analysis in several stages.

At the first stage we have estimated communication of indicators of an engagement and potential of an engagement (motivation of achievement and curiosity). Potential of an engagement was capable to explain 25% of dispersion of vigor ($R=0,5$, $p<0,0001$), 14% - dedication ($R=0,38$, $p<0,01$) and 17% - absorption ($R=0,41$, $p<0,001$).

Further we have estimated relations of indicators of employee engagement and general assessment of a possibility of realization of motivators into the organizations which was capable to explain 18% of dispersion of vigor ($R=0,46$, $p<0,001$), 24% - dedication ($R=0,49$, $p<0,001$), 17% - absorption ($R=0,41$, $p<0,001$) and 22% - engagement into the organization ($R=0,46$, $p<0,004$). Inclusion in regression model of all fifteen considered motivators has allowed to explain 23% of

dispersion of vigor, 33% - dedication, 23% - absorption and 33% - engagement into the organization.

Thus, we have found a contribution to engagement indicators, both the engagement potential, and estimates of a possibility of realization of motivators, however this contribution isn't really big. According to our theoretical model the coefficient of a possibility of realization of motivators which serves as the intermediary in relation of potential of an engagement and engagement has been entered: $\text{Engagement} = \text{PE} * \text{PRM}$, where: PE – the potential of an engagement, PRM – coefficient of a possibility of realization of motivators.

Inclusion in regression model of all weighed indicators of potential of an engagement was capable to explain to 50% of dispersion of vigor, 52% - dedication, 51% - absorption and to 66% - engagement into the organization.

Thus, it is possible to observe essential increase in predictive ability of model due to use of estimates of a possibility of realization of motivators in the organization as intermediary between the potential of an engagement and employee engagement. It allows us to speak about getting of evidence for benefit of a validity of the offered model.

Conclusions and research perspectives

As a result of this research the model of employee engagement was developed and evidence for benefit of its validity are received. The presented model demands further studying and a validization. First of all, it is necessary to define the maintenance of potential of an engagement, its structure, perhaps, being guided by theories of traits and to develop (or to choose) the corresponding instruments of measurement. Use of the questionnaire of assessment of a possibility of realization of motivators in favor of use of «The Possibility for The Realization of Motivators» tool, already validized on the Russian sample, which shows more predictive abilities concerning an employee engagement, demands correction (Dominyak, Rodionova, 2016). Also adaptation and a validization of a technique and model in general in other cultures is of special interest.

We assume that the offered model can make a contribution to understanding of process of employee engagement to work and the organization, and also will find practical application.

References:

1. AON Hewitt (2013) 2013 Trends in Global Employee Engagement.
2. Bersin, J. Becoming irresistible. A new model for employee engagement. – Deloitte Review, 2015, issue 16, pp. 146-163.
3. Kahn, W.A. (1990) Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692–724.
4. Kashdan, T. B., Rose, P., & Fincham, F. D. (2004). Curiosity and exploration: Facilitating positive subjective experiences and personal growth opportunities. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 82, 291- 305.
5. Macey, W.H., Schneider, B. (2008) The Meaning of Employee Engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 1, pp. 3-30.
6. ORC International (2015) Measuring employee engagement – intuitive model, robust science.
7. Nink, M., Welte, K. (2011) Involving Employees in Change. *Business journal*, 6.12.11 Available at: <http://www.gallup.com/businessjournal/150932/involving-employees-change.aspx> [Accessed 23th Jan 2017].
8. Robinson, D., Perryman, S., Hayday, S. (2004) The Drivers of Employee Engagement. Report 408, Institute for Employment Studies. Available at: <http://www.employment-studies.co.uk/system/files/resources/files/408.pdf> [Accessed 22th Jan 2017].
9. 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*, 3, 71-92.
10. Dominyak, V.I. Organizatsionnaya loyal'nost': model' realizatsii ozhidaniy rabotnika ot svoey organizatsii. Diss. na soisk. uch. st. kand. psikh. n. - SPb.: St.Petersburg State University, 2006. - 281 p.
11. Dominyak, V.I., Rodionova, E.A. (2016) Motivatsionnyy aspekt uvlechenosti rabotoy // Anan'yevskiy chteniya – 2016. *Psikhologiya: vchera, segodnya, zavtra. Materialy mezhdunarodnoy nauchnoy konferentsii*, 25–29.10.2016 g. // otv. red. A.V. Shabol'tas i dr. T.2. — SPb.: ID "FARMindeks". - pp. 229-230.
12. Kudryavtseva, E.I. (2015) Otsenka i razvitiye upravlencheskogo potentsiala personala organizatsiy: metodologiya, teoriya, praktika. Diss. na soisk. uch. step. dokt. ekon. n. M., FGOU VPO “GUU”. – 472 p.

13. Kutuzova, D.A. (2006) Organizatsiya deyatel'nosti i stil' samoregulyatsii kak faktory professional'nogo vygoraniya pedagoga-psikhologa: Diss. na soisk. uch. st. kand. psikhol. nauk. M.
14. Raygorodskiy, D.YA. (2006) Prakticheskaya psikhodiagnostika. Metodiki i testy. — Izdatel'stvo Bakhrakh. — M. — 672 p.
15. Rodionova E.A. (2013) Psikhologiya stimulirovaniya personala. - Khar'kov: Gumanitarnyy tsentr. – 228 s.

Dominyak, V., Rodionova, E., Litvinova, S. Abstractness model of employee engagement // Proceedings of the XVIII International Academic Congress “History, Problems and Prospects of Development of Modern Civilization” (Japan, Tokyo, 25-27 January 2017). Volume XVIII. “Tokyo University Press”, 2017. – pp. 441-446.