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Abstract

This thesis examines the extent to which organizational identification modifies the relationship between some job demands and resources (workload, feedback, supervisory support and organizational support) and workforce engagement level. This study also explores the impact of organizational identification on the relationship between the same job demands and resources (workload, feedback, supervisory support and organizational support) and the workforce burnout level.

By examining these moderating factors, I clarify how factors other than the relationship between the employee and the job, employee and the supervisors, and employee and the organization influence workforce engagement and burnout levels. Thus, this research proposes an extended analysis to comprehend workforce engagement and burnout by presenting their definitions, how they are correlated and what are their antecedents (job demands and resources).

Furthermore, current research indicates that these moderator effects are appropriate. First, highly identified individuals tend to support institutions embodying those identities which may lead to high levels of dedication and absorption - two components of engagement. Second, highly identified individuals are knowledgeable of their membership and express emotional attachment to that membership, which can be
compared to three psychological conditions to evaluate engagement level: meaningfulness, safety and availability. Third, social identities and organizational identification are “relational and comparative” which may alter the impact of job demands on burnout, since employees may evaluate the demands as a source of differentiation.

A questionnaire was administered to employees in 3 different companies with different sizes (small, medium and large – total N = 122), different economic sectors (auto-parts, technology and communication and agriculture), and a five step hierarchical multiple regression analyses conducted to detect main interaction effects.

The results revealed that organizational identification modifies the relationship between all job demands and resources included in this model, and engagement. The engagement level of low identified employees is more sensitive to different levels of resources and demands. In contrast, employees with high levels of organizational identification demonstrated higher levels of workforce engagement even when the workload was high and feedback, supervisor support and organizational support were low. Interestingly, the engagement level of highly identified employees was lower when they were exposed to low workload, high feedback and high supervisor support.

Finally, the impact on burnout was present only in its relationship with workload. High levels of organizational identification minimized the impact of high levels of workload on burnout.
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Introduction

During the past three decades, many studies have shown that work context can have a profound impact on employee well-being, individual performance and organizational success. Past research revealed that job demands such as workload and role ambiguity may lead to exhaustion and impaired health (e.g. Doi, 2005; Halbesleben and Buckley, 2004), whereas job resources such as supervisor support, performance feedback, and organizational support may a motivational process leading to job-related learning and organizational commitment (Demerouti et al., 2001; Taris and Feij, 2004).

This research focuses on two constructs that are influenced by job resources and demands: workforce engagement and burnout (Schaufeli, 2002 and Salanova et al., 2005). However, due to their individual perceptive natures (Kahn, 1990; Maslach et al 2001), workforce engagement and burnout may be affected by an individual’s cognitive and evaluative skills that are beyond the scope of job resources and demands. For example, though engagement requires individual evaluations of the job resources available (Kahn, 1990), the individual may possess adequate job resources but may not perceive them as useful or sufficient. Thus, organizational identification, and its required sense of attachment, belongingness, and membership, has the potential to modify the relationship between job demands and resources, as well as workforce engagement and
burnout, since it will affect how individuals will internalize the perception of those job resources and demands.

The purpose of this study is to investigate how organizational identification modifies the relationship between some job demands and resources such as workload, feedback, supervisory support and organizational support, and workforce engagement level. Moreover, this study also explores the impact of organizational identification on the relationship between the same job demands and resources and workforce burnout level.

This thesis expanded previous research in the field in two ways. First, while previous research on organizational identification has focused primarily on identification definition and its impact on the organization performance (Tajfel, 1978; Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994; Elsbach, 1999; Corley et al., 2006; Cole & Bruch, 2006; Kreiner & Ashforth, 2004), this study focused on the moderator effect of organizational identification in particular. Second, previous engagement and burnout theory has focused on the relationship between the employee and the job, the employee and the supervisors, and the employee and the organization as antecedents of engagement and burnout (Kahn, 1990; Schaufeli, 2002). For example, Kahn (1990) evaluates how task characteristics, role characteristics, work interactions, interpersonal relationships group dynamics, management style and organizational norms affect engagement. This study took a different approach and focused on how organizational identification modifies the relationships between job resources and demands, and engagement and burnout.
Chapter 1: Engagement and Burnout

The key differentiator of competitive advantage in the new world economy is the organization’s employees (Minervini, Meyer & Rourke, 2003). However, employees have to cope with increasing demands from various and diverse roles and organizational stakeholders, often with limited resources (Minervini et al., 2003). Moreover, monitoring and improving employee effectiveness in coping with multiple new demands, stimulating their growth and enhancing their wellbeing as well as their organizational performance are current challenges of any organization. In this regard, engagement and burnout are specific research areas (Maslach et al., 2001).

The notion of employee engagement is relatively new (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Kahn (1990) was the pioneer in the field to first define the construct, however, after that, numerous different interpretations have been made, generating some misleading conclusions. At a minimum, the question remains as to whether engagement is a unique concept or merely a repackaging of other constructs (Lubinski, 2004). Thus, in order to avoid misinterpretations in this research while the engagement construct evolves, a clear definition is required.

Kahn (1990) stated that engaged people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances. His research premise
was twofold: first, that the psychological experience of work drives people's attitudes and behaviors (Hackman & Oldham, 1980); second, that individual, interpersonal, group, intergroup, and organizational factors simultaneously influence these experiences (Alderfer, 1985). He assumed that those work contexts, mediated by people's perceptions, created the conditions in which employees personally engage. Besides, he defined three psychological conditions to evaluate engagement level: meaningfulness, safety and availability. People vary their personal level of engagement according to their perceptions of the benefits - described as meaningfulness - and the guarantees - described as safety - they perceive in situations. Finally, engagement also varies according to the resources they perceive themselves to have - which Kahn (1990) termed availability.

More recent research performed by Schaufeli et al. (2002) describes engagement “as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption.” They further state that engagement is not a momentary or specific state, but rather, it is “a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior.” In order to further delineate the construct, Schaufeli et al. (2002) stated that vigor is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one's work, and persistence also in the face of difficulties. Dedication is characterized by a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge. Absorption is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work. In the present study, the Schaufeli et al (2002) engagement definition and proposed scale will be
used to measure different levels of workforce engagement however the subcategories (vigor, dedication and absorption) will not be evaluated independently.

Although burnout was originally conceptualized in the context of the helping professions (Rothmann, 2002), it has recently expanded to all types of professions and occupational groups. Burnout was studied as the individual’s relational transactions in the workplace. This interpersonal context focused attention on the individual’s emotions, and on the motives and values underlying his or her work with recipients (Maslach et al, 2001). Burnout is thought to be comprised of three interrelated components—emotional exhaustion, depersonalization (cynicism), and diminished personal accomplishments (professional efficacy) (e.g., Maslach and Jackson 1981).

The emotional exhaustion component of burnout occurs as a response to job-related demand stressors placed on employees, thus, it represents the basic individual stress dimension of burnout (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). Depersonalization (Bakker and Shaufeli, 2004) or cynicism, is a dysfunctional response to work-related stress resulting from the perception that important aspects of a job are random or uncontrollable. It represents the interpersonal context dimension of burnout. Diminished personal accomplishment (Bakker and Shaufeli, 2004) or professional inefficacy refers to a decline in an employee’s feelings of competence and successful achievement on the job. Representing the self-evaluation dimension of burnout, diminished personal accomplishment stems from factors suggesting one is ineffective or unappreciated.

According to Maslach et al. (2001), the study of work context should include the entire continuum of work-related experiences, ranging from negative (burnout) to
positive (work engagement). Therefore, this research will consider both constructs, although, I will measure them with different instruments given that they are independent constructs that are, indeed, moderately or strongly negatively related (Schaufeli, 2002).
Chapter 2: Antecedents of Engagement and Burnout

The workforce engagement and burnout researchers have already demonstrated that job resources and demands are relevant antecedents of engagement and burnout (Maslach, 1981; Schaufeli, 2002; Bakker, 2007; Cropanzano, 2005). Thus, generally speaking the work context of workforce engagement and burnout can be divided into two categories: job resource and job demand (Schaufeli, 2002). Job resources refer to those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that either/or (1) reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs; (2) are functional in achieving work goals; (3) stimulate personal growth, learning and development (Schaufeli, 2002). Bakker et al. (2001) found that job resources were predictors of engagement. Recently, Salanova and Schaufeli (2008) concluded that the absence of job resources fosters disengagement, whereas the presence of job resources stimulates personal development and increases work engagement.

Jones and Fletcher (1996, p. 34) define demands as "the degree to which the environment contains stimuli that peremptorily require attention and response. Demands are the 'things that have to be done.'" Clearly, in every job something has to be done. More specifically, I refer to job demands as those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or psychological (i.e.,
cognitive or emotional) effort and are therefore associated with certain physiological and/or psychological costs. Although job demands are not necessarily negative, they may turn into job stressors when meeting those demands requires high effort that elicits negative responses such as depression, anxiety, or burnout.

Since each level of the work context captures specific impacts on engagement and burnout (Kahn, 1990; Maslach, 1981; Schaufeli, 2002), the current model includes: task-level, interpersonal level and organizational level.

The task-level, in this thesis represented by workload, was introduced to capture the impact of work itself on the individual reaction. Schaufeli (2002) demonstrated that workload is related to low levels of engagement and high levels of burnout. However, I assume that some tasks, and their respective amount, can affect individuals differently based on the attachment that he/she has to the organization. Individuals with high levels of organizational identification may demonstrate different reactions to different levels of workload representing different levels of engagement and burnout.

Interpersonal level, measured here as feedback and supervisor support, represents the relational network inherent to the required psychological safety present in the engagement construct, and depersonalization - a characteristic of the burnout concept. Schaufeli (2002) demonstrated that feedback and supervisory support are predictors of the subcomponents of engagement and burnout which ultimately lead to different levels of engagement and burnout. My focus, however, is to evaluate if organizational identification moderates the relationship between such job resources and engagement and burnout.
The organizational level, represented in this thesis by organizational support, evaluates how the workforce perceives the organization as a unique entity composed of strong supportive relationships which facilitate internalization of organizational values. Sacks (2006) confirmed that organizational support is critical to high levels of engagement which is in accordance with Kahn’s (1990) findings. Both researchers demonstrated that organizational support was positively related to psychological safety, one of the subcategories of engagement (Kahn, 1990). Moreover, Maslach (2001) demonstrated that lack of organizational and social support is related to burnout. In this thesis, I verify if organizational identification modifies the impact of organizational support on engagement and burnout levels. Such theory support will be provided later.

Workload has been studied by many burnout researchers, and the findings support the general notion that burnout is a response to high levels of work demand (Maslach et al, 2001). Perrewe and Ganster (1989) defined high levels of workload as the amount of work that exceeds what an individual can accomplish in a given period of time. Workload that is overwhelming because it exceeds the skills, knowledge, and abilities of individuals is referred to as qualitative work overload. At the same time, if the workload negatively influences the quantity and quality of the work delivered, the employee can express feelings of exhaustion (Lee and Ashforth, 1996) which may lead to a complete burnout.

On the other hand, if the work in its composition and amount is consistent with the employee’s skill, knowledge, and abilities (Hobfoll, 2001), it will, most likely foster workforce engagement. Employees will become fully concentrated, inspired and
challenged because they cognitively or emotionally evaluate themselves as having the right physical, psychological, and emotional “tools” to perform the job.

Bakker and Demerouti (2007) found that proper feedback fosters learning, thereby increasing job competence, whereas decision latitude and social support satisfy the need for autonomy and the need to belong, respectively. Specifically, performance feedback which promotes objective information about individual performance fosters extra effort, persistence and resistance—characteristics described in the engagement construct as vigor, absorption and dedication. Moreover, proper feedback helps the employee understand what is expected, what should be learned and how to improve the current performance, which can lead to states of engagement (psychological meaningfulness), and social systems that create less threatening, predictable social situations in which to engage (psychological safety).

The lack of feedback may promote burnout by increasing the cynicism level and reinforcing feelings of ineffectiveness for the same reasons. Employees will face feelings of self-inefficacy because they may not understand what is required to improve the current performance which can create cynicism and detachment from the job. Finally, Maslach (2001) stated that lack of feedback is consistently related to all three dimensions of burnout.

Supervisor support can be defined as the degree to which supervisors value subordinate contributions and care about subordinate well-being (Kottke and Sharafinski 1988). Later, Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) stated that engagement and burnout are indicators of employee wellness. Moreover, Heijden (2001) stated that good supervisory
feedback enhances the opportunity for advancement in worker capabilities resulting in social recognition and growth potential. Finally, Dirk and Ferrin (2002) advocate that a high degree of supervisor support would elicit employee trust in supervisors, which might raise employee job satisfaction.

Such definitions may be compared to at least one of the engagement characteristics: psychological safety. According to Kahn (1990) people felt safe in situations in which they trusted that they would not suffer for their personal engagement. Thus, interpersonal relationships promoted psychological safety when they were supportive and trusting, and generated further career development (Kahn, 1990). According to Kahn, if an employee perceives positive supervisory support, he or she will invest more effort and persist when facing a difficult situation by releasing more energy and demonstrating vigor. On the other hand, when supervisors are abusive behavior, they damage the associability and trust level with the employees, eroding psychological safety and engagement.

Organizational support is defined as an employee’s perception of the concern an organization shows for his or her well-being. Research has shown that perceived organizational support is positively related to conscientiousness in carrying out job responsibilities, commitment and innovation (Eisenberger et al., 1990). A large body of evidence indicates that employees with high levels of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) judge their jobs more favorably—demonstrating increased job satisfaction, more positive mood and reduced stress. Employees with high levels of POS are more invested
in their organization in that they have increased affective organizational commitment, increased performance and reduced turnover (Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002).

Conscientiousness in carrying out job responsibilities is related to the vigor component of the engagement construct since vigor is described as energy, effort and persistence. Moreover, dedication and absorption can be related to the POS theory when employees perceived themselves as “more invested in their organization” demonstrating enthusiasm, inspiration, pride and happiness. Lack of organizational support can foster burnout by creating inadequate conditions to meet significant and ongoing demands confronted by the worker, which leads to a downward spiral in energy loss (Hobfoll, 1998).

In summary, different job resources and job demands may have distinct effects on workforce engagement and burnout. Moreover, the job contexts studied in this model (workload, feedback, supervisor support, and organizational support) represent different levels of the work relationship which is required to comprehend broadly how organizational identification influences the engagement and burnout levels.
Chapter 3: Organizational Identification

In order to better understand organizational identification, a brief review of social identity and identification may be required as the organizational identification construct derives from social identity and identification. Tajfel (1978: 63) defined social identity as “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his/her knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership.” Tajfel and Turner (1986: 16) added that social identities are “relational and comparative,” as group members gain both a descriptive sense of their identity (who are we?) and an evaluative sense (how good are we?) by contrasting the ingroup with a salient outgroup(s).

Individuals occupy multiple roles, and identity theory is concerned with how the social embeddedness of roles in valued relational networks increases their likelihood of being activated and performed well in a given situation (Ashforth et al, 2008). The more valued the relationship, the more important the role identity and the more likely the person will strive to affirm the identity (Burke & Reitzes, 1991). Finally, identity is the central, distinctive, and enduring characteristic of an organization: it is how the collective answers the question “who are we as an organization? (Albert & Whetten, 1985).
Organizations are composed of groups or teams with specific roles, and as society is built on the development of groups and subgroups with specific roles, social identity may be extrapolated to the analysis of organizations (Hogg et al., 2004). Thus, among all possible identities and for the purpose of this thesis, I will focus on the “organizational identity” and its consequential identification.

It is appropriate to mention that the more identity perceptions are widely shared and densely articulated by members of the collective or role, the stronger is the identity (Cole & Bruch, 2006; Kreiner & Ashforth, 2004) and, therefore, the stronger the potential for identification—and disidentification (i.e., “This is not me”; Elsbach, 1999). Tajfel (1982: 2) stated that in order to achieve the stage of “identification,” two components are necessary, and another one is frequently associated with them. The two necessary components are: cognitive, in the sense of awareness of membership; and evaluative, in the sense that this awareness is related to some value connotations. The third component consists of an emotional investment in the awareness and evaluations. In other words groups, as collections of people sharing the same social identity, compete with one another for evaluatively positive distinctiveness.

Organizational Identification incorporates the organizational “nuance” (“How good are we as an organization?”) and focuses on the perception of oneness or belongingness to some human aggregate “when a person’s self-concept contains the same attributes as those in the perceived organizational identity” (Dutton et al., 1994: 239). Organizational Identification is organizationally specific—for example, I am a member of Nike and this is important to me—meaning an individual’s identity and fate become
intertwined with those of the organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006). Thus, he or she becomes a microcosm of the organization, personally embodying its shared values and beliefs.
Chapter 4: The research model

Building upon previous work and the effect that organizational identification may have on workforce engagement and burnout, I assume that attachment to organizational membership and perceptions of belongingness may moderate the relationship between workload, feedback, supervisor support and organizational support, and workforce engagement and burnout.

Figure 1 – Research Model
According to the organizational identity theory, individuals look for ways to differentiate themselves from relative important ones (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Another relevant aspect is that individuals tend to choose activities congruent with salient aspects of their identities, and they support the institutions embodying those identities (Ashforth and Mael, 1989). Thus, identification refers to the extent that a person internalizes that organizational identity as a definition of self (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

The intensity of this organizational-employee relationship in the form of centrality, distinctiveness and belongingness, will modify how employees cognitively and emotionally perceive the job resources available and elicit different levels of engagement and burnout. This thought corroborates Kahn’s (1990) conclusion that “the work contexts, mediated by people's perceptions, create the conditions in which employees personally engage”. I assume that organization identification works as the “perception filter” which enhances or minimizes the impact of the available resources, in the form of feedback, supervisor support and organizational support, in workforce engagement. Based upon the intensity of this bond, which is the perception of oneness or belongingness to some human aggregate (Ashforth & Mael, 1989), employees will evaluate the available external resources (feedback, supervisor support, organizational support) differently, leading to distinct engagement levels. Thus, instead of mediating the relationship between work context and engagement/burnout, organizational identification will moderate them. Organizational identification may be described as an internal resource that is not affected by external resources and demands. It depends on the employee willingness to become a member of the organizational whole, and share values
and beliefs, thus it will modify the relationship between the external resources and demands, and engagement/burnout by being a perception filter that influences how the employee utilizes the external resources and demands to set the organization apart from its competition. This willingness to differentiate the organization from competitors and the sense of belongness will be combined with the external resource to generate different levels of workforce engagement and burnout. Thus, organizational identification is an internal resource that influences how the employee internalizes different levels of demands and resources to become engage and differentiate the company.

In this thesis, I propose that low levels of organizational identification may be overcome by higher investments on job resources and lower job demands. Indeed, the effects of job resources and demands on the workforce engagement and burnout level may be even more significant when organizational identification levels are low.
Chapter 5: Hypothesis

In this thesis I propose that the level of organizational identification is likely to modify the extent to which workload effects employee engagement and burnout levels. Mashach et al. (2001) has already demonstrated that burnout is a response to high levels of workload, mainly in the exhaustion dimension. The simple formula that too many demands exhaust an individual’s energy to the extent that recovery becomes impossible (Mashach et al. 2001) may be challenged by the level of organizational identification. It is known that identification is maintained in situations involving great loss or suffering (Brown, 1996), missed potential benefits (Tajfel, 1982), task failure (Turner, 1981), and even-expected failure (Gammons, 1986). Thus, employees may demonstrate high levels of membership and feelings of attachment that can mitigate the relationship between demands and burnout meaning employee engagement levels will be less influenced by different levels of workload when they have high levels of organizational identification. Conversely, employees with low levels of organizational identification will be more sensitive to different levels of workload which will result in a less stable engagement level. Employees with low organizational identification do not have other sources of energy to support and develop engagement. For example, as they are not emotionally
attached to and do not feel a member of the organization the impact of high workload will be evaluated as stressful instead of an opportunity to outperform the competition.

This hypothesis corroborates the research of Tajfel and Turner (1986) who stated that identities are “relational and comparative”. In other words, employees who internalize the organizational identity will demonstrate needs to distinguish ingroups from outgroups—in this case their organization from other organizations—which can incentivize employees to release more energy to make these differences more salient without expressing exhaustion, regardless the role workload required.

This discussion suggests the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1a** – Organizational identification will moderate the relationship between workload and engagement. Specifically, the impact of high levels of workload on engagement will be minimized when employees are highly identified with the organization. On the other hand, the employee engagement level of those who have low levels of organizational identification will be more susceptible to different levels of workload.

**Hypothesis 1b** – Organizational identification will moderate the relationship between workload and burnout. Specifically, the impact of high levels of workload on burnout will be minimized when employees are highly identified with the organization. In contrast, the burnout level of those who have low levels of organizational identification will be more susceptible to different levels of workload.

Feedback is a relevant antecedent of burnout and engagement that may likely be moderated by organizational identification. Feedback can provide employees with the
information necessary to understand different levels of performance which may instigate a motivational process leading to work engagement and organizational commitment (Salanova et al., 2005; Taris and Feij, 2004). At the same time, it has been proven that lack of feedback is consistently related to all three dimensions of burnout (Maslach, 2001). Strong organizational identification requires high levels of value and goal congruence between the employees and organization (Corley et al, 2006). Thus, employees who are strongly identified and share the same values of the organization may interpret different levels of feedback differently from weakly identified employees. This will result in a more stable engagement level among highly identified employees regardless the amount of feedback received.

On the other hand, low identified employees will have to depend on feedback to sustain high levels of engagement. Because they do not feel they belong to the organization, low levels of feedback may be perceived as managerial indifference and a careless behavior may emerge. Employee willingness to exert more energy will be diminished by a lack of attachment and information. When the organization provides more feedback to low identified employees, however, they evaluate it as a opportunity to outperform competitors by increasing their dedication, vigor and absorption levels.

I expect a similar effect on burnout; employees with low level of organizational identification will be more sensitive to feedback levels. Cynicism and exhaustion will prevail and feelings of detachment will be more present when organizational identity is low. However, high levels of feedback will have a stronger impact on the burnout level of low identified employees. On the other hand, high identified employees will have their
burnout level only moderately affected by feedback levels. This relationship is expected because employees will have more opportunities to avoid burnout symptoms (cynicism, exhaustion and lack of efficacy).

Given the preceding arguments, the following hypotheses are proposed:

**Hypothesis 2a** – Organizational identification will moderate the relationship between feedback and engagement. Specifically, the impact of low levels of feedback on engagement will be minimized when employees are highly identified with the organization. On the contrary, the employee engagement level of those who have low levels of organizational identification will be more susceptible to different levels of feedback.

**Hypothesis 2b** – Organizational identification will moderate the relationship between feedback and burnout. Specifically, the impact of low levels of feedback on burnout will be minimized when employees are highly identified with the organization. In contrast, the burnout level of those who have low levels of organizational identification will be more susceptible to different levels of feedback.

The relationship between supervisor support, engagement and burnout can also be modified by the organizational identification level. Subordinates with high levels of identification will evaluate supervisor support differently, which will have a dissimilar impact on engagement and burnout.

Psychological safety, one component of engagement, involves a sense of being able to show and employ the self without negative consequences (Kahn, 1992). An important aspect of safety stems from the amount of care and support employees’
perceive to be provided by their organization as well as their direct supervisor. In fact, Kahn (1990) found that supportive and trusting interpersonal relationships as well as supportive management promoted psychological safety, which leads to engagement. Organizational members felt safe in work environments that were characterized by openness and supportiveness and ones that allowed members to experiment and even fail without fear of the consequences (Kahn, 1990).

Social support is also one of the antecedents studied in the Maslach et al. (2001) burnout model. A lack of social support has also consistently been found to be related to burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). Furthermore, a study by Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) found that a measure of job resources that includes support from supervisors predicted engagement.

One way that the same level of supervisor support may lead to different levels of engagement or burnout is through organizational identification. In other words, employees who have stronger identification may become more engaged to their job due to the psychological safety resulting from the cognitive process of becoming a member of the organizational whole. Moreover, employees with high levels of organizational identification will be influenced by the sense of belonging and attachment which may minimize the importance of low social support. Thus, employees who are highly identified may not be strongly influenced by the level of organizational support.

On the other hand, employees with weaker identification will demonstrate higher levels of burnout with similar levels of supervisor support. As these employees do not have shared goals and values, and are not member of the “collective whole”, they will
cognitively evaluate supervisor support negatively. They will expect negative supervisor evaluations which will increase burnout (exhaustion and cynicism). However, they will be more sensitive to high supervisor support since they will not have other resources available to avoid burnout.

Hence, the following are proposed:

**Hypothesis 3a** – Organizational identification will moderate the relationship between supervisor support and engagement. Specifically, the impact of low levels of supervisor support on engagement will be minimized when employees are highly identified with the organization. On the other hand, the employee engagement level of those who have low levels of organizational identification will be more susceptible to different levels of supervisor support.

**Hypothesis 3b** – Organizational identification will moderate the relationship between supervisor support and burnout. Specifically, the impact of low levels of supervisor support on burnout will be minimized when employees are highly identified with the organization. Conversely, the burnout level of those who have low levels of organizational identification will be more susceptible to different levels of supervisor support.

Saks (2006) demonstrated that organizational support leads to engagement through the reciprocity norm of Social Exchange Theory (SET). According to Saks’s research, when employees believe their organization is concerned about them and cares about their well-being, they are likely to respond by attempting to fulfill their obligations to the organization by becoming more engaged. I propose, however, that this reciprocity
is moderated by organizational identity because engagement goes above and beyond repayment – the actions of one party lead to a response or actions by the other party. Engagement is not an attitude; it is the degree to which an individual is attentive and absorbed in the performance of his or her roles. Thus, organizational identification may influence the relationship between organizational support, and workforce engagement and burnout.

Ashforth (2008) stated that there is an essential human desire to expand the self-concept to include connections with others and to feel a sense of belonging with a larger group. As salient group identities emerge when group membership is built upon shared values, mutual respect, and internalized beliefs (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000), they moderate the relationship between organizational support and engagement. The identification creates a healthy environment in which the expanded employee self-concept will modify the perception of organizational support and its respective impact on engagement. As employees feel a sense of membership in the collective whole and internalize its values and goals, they might evaluate organizational support more positively to help the organization differentiate from the salient competitors. This extra effort results in higher levels of engagement and corroborates with Swann (1990) research that highly identified individuals systematically strive to promote the perception that they are worthwhile persons. Thus, employees with high levels of organizational identification will have their engagement and burnout level less affected by different levels of organizational support. In contrast, employees with low levels of organizational identification will be more
influenced by organizational support because they do not experience feelings of attachment and belonging.

On the basis of the above discussion, I propose the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 4a** – Organizational identification will moderate the relationship between organizational support and engagement. Specifically, the impact of low levels of organizational support on engagement will be minimized when employees are highly identified with the organization. Alternatively, the employee engagement level of those who have low levels of organizational identification will be more susceptible to different levels of organizational support.

**Hypothesis 4b** – Organizational identification will moderate the relationship between organizational support and burnout. Specifically, the impact of low levels of organizational support on burnout will be minimized when employees are highly identified with the organization. In opposition, the burnout level of those who have low levels of organizational identification will be more susceptible to different levels of organizational support.
Chapter 6: Design and Method

To test the underlying hypotheses, a questionnaire was administered to employees in three different companies. The companies have different sizes—small, medium and large—and are from different economic sectors: auto-parts, technology and communication and agriculture, in order to minimize the impact of a particular sector and possible industry bias. The sample consisted of 122 employees (response rate 40%) from all departments of the organizations, in which 57 (response rate 33%; 42 males, 15 females; average tenure was 11.22 years with a standard deviation of 8.34; mean age was 35.51 with a standard deviation of 8.75) were from organization one – an large international industrial organization in the auto-part sector, 35 (response rate 45%; 24 males, 11 females; average tenure was 4.11 years with a standard deviation of 3.88; mean age was 30.22 with a standard deviation of 7.34) from organization two – a small national service organization is the technology and communication sector, 30 (response rate 50%; 20 males, 10 females; average tenure was 9.43 years with a standard deviation of 5.36; mean age was 34.50 with a standard deviation of 8.88) from organization three – a medium international agricultural organization in the seed sector. The questionnaire was initially formulated in English and later translated into Portuguese by the researcher. A pilot questionnaire was administered to five persons randomly selected in the companies
to evaluate its translation accuracy. Finally, each participant received an email with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and a link to the survey. The sample contained 86 male and 36 female respondents, with an average tenure in the organizations of 8.80 years with a standard deviation of 7.2, and a mean age of 33.75 with a standard deviation of 8.11.

**Measurement**

Engagement was assessed with the UWES-9 - Utrecht Work Engagement Scale - (Schaufeli, et al., 2006). The items of the UWES are grouped into three subscales that reflect the underlying dimensions of engagement: vigor (3 items; e.g., “At my work, I feel bursting with energy”, Cronbach’ α = .82), dedication (3 items’ e.g., “My job inspires me”, Cronbach’ α = .85), and absorption (3 items; e.g., “I am immersed in my work”, Cronbach’ α = .76). The Cronbach’ α for the whole scale was 0.92. All items were scored on a 7-point frequency rating scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (always).

Burnout was assessed with the MBI–General Survey (MBI-GS; Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach,&Jackson, 1996). The MBI-GS includes three subscales: Exhaustion (5 items; e.g., “I feel emotionally drained from my work”, Cronbach’ α = .81), Cynicism (5 items; e.g., “I have become less interested in my work since I started this job”, Cronbach’ α = .55), and Professional Efficacy (6 items; e.g., “At my work, I feel confident that I am effective at getting things done”, Cronbach’ α = .84). The Cronbach’ α for the whole scale was .84. The burnout items are scored in a similar manner as the items of the UWES. However, all Professional Efficacy items are reversed scored so that high scores on Exhaustion, Cynicism, and low levels of Professional Efficacy (i.e., lack of
professional efficacy) are indicative of burnout. In order to avoid response bias, burnout and engagement items were randomly merged into a 25-item questionnaire.

Organizational identification with the organization was measured with a scale developed by Mael and Ashforth (1992). This scale is composed of 6 items; e.g., “When someone criticizes the organization, it feels like a personal insult” (Cronbach’ α = .92), and all items are scored on a 5-point frequency rating scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree).

Workload was assessed based on a questionnaire developed by Beehr et al. (1976). The scale includes three items that refer to quantitative, demanding aspects of the job (e.g., “It often seems like I have too much work for one person to do”). All items were mixed and scored on a five-point frequency scale, ranging from 1 (‘Strongly disagree’) to 5 (‘Strongly agree’). Cronbach’ α = .62

Organizational support was measured with a scale developed by Eisenberger et al (1986). This scale is composed by nine items which were scored in a five-point frequency scale, ranging from 1 (‘Strongly disagree’) to 5 (‘Strongly agree’). Cronbach’α = .91

Supervisory support was measured by a nine-item scale developed by Greenhaus et al. (1990) (e.g., “My supervisor takes the time to learn about my career goals and aspirations”). Participants indicated their response on a five-point Likert-type scale with anchors (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Cronbach’α was .78.

Lastly, performance feedback was measured by two items from the supervisor support questionnaire (Greenhaus et al, 1990) (e.g., “My supervisor gives me helpful feedback about my performance”) and two items from the organizational support scale.
(Eisenberger et al, 1986) (e.g., “Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice”). All items were scored on a five-point frequency scale, ranging from 1 (‘Strongly disagree) to 5 (‘Strongly agree’). Cronbach’s $\alpha = .77$

The control variables are job tenure, age, gender and company. Controlling for these variables allowed me to better isolate the role of organizational identification, job resources and job demands, and their impact on workforce engagement and burnout. Specifically, it is known that emotional exhaustion is related to the chronic drain of resources over time in the job (Leiter, 1993). Thus, I controlled for the number of years a worker had been doing this particular job for the organization to account for the different career stages each worker was in.

**Analysis**

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to detect main and interaction effects of some job resources and demands, and Organizational Identification on the dependent variables Workforce Engagement and Burnout.

The hierarchical regression constituted five successive steps. The first step entered the demographic variables to control. Then, in the second step, the independent variables—workload, feedback, supervisor support and organizational support-- were added.

However, because the primary interest of this research was the interaction of job resources, demands, and organizational identification, the third step necessarily controlled for the independent effects of Organizational Identification on the models. I
evaluated the organizational identification significance and how it improved the predictability of the model. The first three steps are demonstrated in tables 2 and 3.

The fourth step entered the cross-product term of two predictors in order to test the hypothesized interaction effects. This step represents the interaction effect in a model composed by the control variables, the dependent variable being analyzed and the moderator variable (organizational identification). Finally, the fifth step consists of the whole model in which the interaction effect is added in the model with all control and dependent variables. Given the complexity of the model, simplicity in the number of variables included in the interaction test is suggested (Jaccard & James, 2003). Therefore, I tested the moderator models separately as well as together. Steps 4 and 5 are represented by tables 4 and 5.
Chapter 7: Results

Table 1 contains the means, standard deviations, and zero order Pearson correlations of the study variables. These relationships ruled out problems of multicollinearity, as multicollinearity is not considered problematic until correlations reach approximately 0.75 (Ashford & Tsui, 1992).

Table 1 – Means, Standard Deviation and Correlations

<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</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Burnout</td>
<td>-.782**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Workload</td>
<td>-.532**</td>
<td>.476**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feedback</td>
<td>.541**</td>
<td>-.563**</td>
<td>-.246**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sup Support</td>
<td>.529**</td>
<td>-.517**</td>
<td>-.217**</td>
<td>.813**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Org Support</td>
<td>.672**</td>
<td>-.654**</td>
<td>-.355**</td>
<td>.767**</td>
<td>.709**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Org Ident.</td>
<td>.681**</td>
<td>-.594**</td>
<td>-.354**</td>
<td>.452**</td>
<td>.510**</td>
<td>.603**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Age</td>
<td>.191**</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.198**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tenure</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.182**</td>
<td>.577**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>8.112</td>
<td>7.236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). N = 122
Workforce engagement was negatively related to burnout ($r = -0.782, p < 0.01$) as well as to workload ($r = -0.532, p < 0.01$). That is, individuals who reported higher levels of engagement also reported being burned-out and having high levels of workload which is consistent with the Engagement and Burnout theory. Furthermore, feedback, supervisor support and organizational support were positively related to engagement and negatively related to burnout, which confirms the theory that engagement and burnout are moderated or strong related opposite constructs. These findings are in line with earlier research findings concerning the predictability of job resources and demands to engagement and burnout. Organizational identification was positively related to engagement ($r = 0.681, p < 0.01$) and negatively related to burnout ($r = 0.594, p < 0.01$). Thus, more engaged employees reported higher levels of organizational identification, whereas more burned out employees reported lower levels of organizational identification.

Finally, age and tenure had the lowest correlation and significance levels when compared to engagement and burnout. Such data allow me to conclude that engagement and burnout are not highly influenced by age and tenure. However, the correlations with organizational identification demonstrated to be significant - $r = 0.198$ and $0.182, p < 0.01$, respectively.
Table 2 – Hierarchical Regression Analyses – Dependent Variable: Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step (1) b</th>
<th>Step (2) b</th>
<th>Step (3) b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.161</td>
<td>4.607</td>
<td>3.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>-.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td></td>
<td>.090 (*)</td>
<td>-.388 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>.138 (*)</td>
<td>.399 (*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>.463 (*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R squared</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>17.752</td>
<td>20.644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.001

Table 2 reports the results of the hierarchical regression for the workforce engagement in which our moderator (organization identification) variable was added in the step 3. In the first model, I entered the control variables. In the second model the independent variables (workload, feedback, supervisor support and organizational support) were entered along with the control variables (age, gender (dummy), tenure, companies (dummy)) which yielded significant equation (F = 17.752, p < 0.001). This effect was due workload (b = .090, p < 0.001) and organizational support (b = 0.138, p < 0.001) in the sense that employees with low levels of workload and high levels of organizational support reported high levels of workforce engagement. All control variables were not significantly related to the model and some independent variables
associated to the employee/supervisor relationship (feedback and supervisor support) were also not significant.

In the third regression step, organizational identification was added to the model generating another significant equation \( F = 20.644, p < 0.001 \). This variable was significantly related to the workforce engagement level increasing the prediction power of the model by 6.4% \( (\Delta \text{R}^2 = 0.064) \). Moreover, the independent variables workload and organizational support remained significant \( (b = -0.388, p < 0.001; b = 0.399, p < 0.001, \text{respectively}) \). The inclusion of organizational identification suggested that identified employees will demonstrate higher levels of workforce engagement. Similarly, the set of control variables were not significantly related to this new model.

It’s interesting to notice that the workload signal changed from positive to negative from step two and three. Moreover, both equations resulted in significant values for workload. This apparent contradiction can be explained by looking at different workload levels. Employees’ evaluation of workload may vary from positive to negative depending on the amount of workload. Employees can see little amounts of workload influencing engagement negatively since they will not be challenged enough to express their energy. The same may occurs with high levels of workload; however, in this situation employees will not have the personal resources to overcome this excess demand. The contradiction may lie in between the extremes; employees with the “right” amount of workload, the ones that he can handle, may feel more engaged since they will be able to demonstrate their effort and dedication in the right amount to accomplish the
work. Thus, workload changes from negatively affecting to positively affecting engagement.

Table 3 - Hierarchical Regression Analyses – Dependent Variable: Burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step (1)</th>
<th>Step (2)</th>
<th>Step (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.293</td>
<td>4.142</td>
<td>4.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.442 (**)</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>.329 (*)</td>
<td>.282 (*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>-.512 (*)</td>
<td>-.380(**)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.279 (***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R squared</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>15.188</td>
<td>15.276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.001, ** p < 0.005, ***p < 0.006

Table 3 describes the results of the hierarchical regression for workforce burnout in which the moderator (organization identification) variable was added after the inclusion of our independent and control variables (step 3). In the first model, the control variables were entered, however none were significant. In the second model, the independent variables (workload, feedback, supervisor support and organizational support) and the control variables (age, gender (dummy), tenure, companies (dummy))
were inserted, which yielded significant equation \((F = 15.188, p < 0.001)\). Similarly to the engagement construct, the effect was due workload \((b = 0.329, p < 0.001)\) and organizational support \((b = -0.512, p < 0.001)\), however, as the b signals indicate, employees with high levels of workload and low levels of organizational support as expected to report high levels of workforce burnout. All control variables were not significant related to the model, except for employees from company 2 which represents the small company in the technology industry. Two independent variable associated to the employee/supervisor relationship (feedback and supervisor support) were also not significant.

In the third regression step, organizational identification was added to the model generating another significant equation \((F = 15.276, p < 0.001)\). This variable was significantly related to the workforce burnout level increasing the prediction power of the model by 2.9% \((\Delta R^2 = 0.029)\). Moreover, the independent variables workload and organizational support remained significant \((b = -0.282, p < 0.001; b = 0.380, p < 0.005\), respectively\), however their individual direct impact on the independent variable was decreased, which is verified by the b value. The inclusion of organizational identification demonstrated identified employees are expected to exhibit lower levels of workforce burnout \((b = -0.279, p < 0.006)\). Similarly to the engagement construct, the set of control variables were not significantly related to this new model.

Tables 4 and 5 contain the results of the models used to compare the interaction effects on workforce engagement and burnout. In step 4, I included the moderators and
the interaction of each compared pair. In step 5, I included all independent variables, control variables and the interaction effect of the each pair proposed by the hypotheses.

Following Aiken and West’s (1991) probing procedures for interaction terms, I regressed workforce engagement and burnout on each one of the independent variables (workload, feedback, supervisor support and organizational support) at high—one standard deviation above the mean and low—one standard deviation below the mean—values of organization identification.

Hypothesis 1a proposes that organizational identification will moderate the relationship between workload and workforce engagement, whereas hypothesis 1b posits that organizational identification will modify the relationship between overload and burnout. Thus, the negative effect of high levels of workload will be weaker for employees with high levels of identification and lower identified employees will be more sensible to different levels of workload. As shown in step five (workload) of tables 4 and 5, the interaction term of workload and identification was significant in both regression models (engagement: b = .554, p < 0.001 and burnout: b = -.254, p < .01). Following Jaccard and Turrisi (2003), the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that is accounted for uniquely by the interaction effect can be calculated by computing the difference in squared multiple correlations, therefore, the proportion of variance accounted for the interaction in the engagement and burnout models was 9.7% and 2.4% respectively (Δ R squared).
Table 4 - Interaction effects – Dependent Variable: Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Workload</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Supervisor Support</th>
<th>Organizational Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>-.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload x Ident.</td>
<td>-.459*</td>
<td>-2.620*</td>
<td>-.2549*</td>
<td>.1509**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.379*</td>
<td>1.509**</td>
<td>1.183**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Support</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.297*</td>
<td>1.517*</td>
<td>1.113*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Support</td>
<td>.433*</td>
<td>.454*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>.775*</td>
<td>-1.149**</td>
<td>-1.444*</td>
<td>.716*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload x Ident.</td>
<td>.553*</td>
<td>.554*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.001, ** p < 0.005, *** p < 0.010
Table 5- Interaction effects – Dependent Variable: Burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Workload</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Supervisor Support</th>
<th>Organizational Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without</td>
<td>With</td>
<td>Without</td>
<td>With</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.400***</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload x Ident.</td>
<td>.359*</td>
<td>1.359**</td>
<td>1.274*</td>
<td>.281*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback x Ident.</td>
<td>-.187</td>
<td>-.415*</td>
<td>-.473</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Support x Ident.</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.305*</td>
<td>-.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Support x Ident.</td>
<td>-.396**</td>
<td>-.383**</td>
<td>-.383**</td>
<td>-.395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*p < 0.001, **p < 0.005, ***p < 0.010
To advance further interpretations, these interactions are illustrated in Figure 2 in which the broken regression line (high levels of identification) has a more stable slope demonstrating that different levels of workload has less impact in the engagement and burnout levels. Moreover, there was a greater impact on both dependent variables when identification levels were low, as hypothesized. The results indicate that engagement and burnout levels of lower identified employees suffer a higher impact of workload. Hence, Hypotheses 1a and 1b were supported.
Figure 2 - Interactive effect of organization identification and workload on workforce engagement and burnout.

Hypotheses 2a and 2b propose interaction effects between feedback and organization identification on engagement and burnout respectively. Thus, these interactive relationships would intensify or mitigate the existing correlation between feedback, and engagement and burnout. Step 5 (feedback) of table 4 and 5 demonstrate these relationships. The interaction effect on engagement was significant ($b = -0.279$, $p <$
whereas the effect on burnout was not significant (b = .11, p > .10). Such finding states that burnout is not affected by the interaction of feedback and identification whereas engagement is. The proportion of variance explained by the inclusion of the interaction in the engagement model was 1.8% (Δ R squared). In addition, highly identified employees will face a negative impact on the engagement level when feedback increases above average which is demonstrated in Figure 3 by the negative slope of the equation. Interestingly, the opposite is true for low identified employees. Such employees will have their engagement increased when the feedback level increases. This pattern suggests that highly identified employees do not require high levels of feedback to become engage, however, after a specific point, the feedback damages the engagement level, whereas low identified employees requires more feedback to overcome low levels of identification which results in higher engagement. Such interpretation can be confirmed in figure 3. Thus, hypothesis 2a was supported, however hypothesis 2b was not.
Hypotheses 3a and 3b posit that identification modifies the relationship between supervisor support, and engagement and burnout respectively. Results in five (supervisor support) in tables 4 and 5 showed that the interaction effect was significant for workforce engagement ($b = -0.261, p < 0.005$) and not significant for burnout ($b = 0.087, p > 0.10$). The interaction effect on burnout demonstrated to be not relevant for the model, not modifying the relationship between supervisor support and burnout. However, the interaction affects the relationship between supervisor support and engagement. Hence, Hypothesis 3a was supported while hypothesis 3b was not. The proportion of variance explained by the inclusion of the interaction in the engagement model was 2.4% ($\Delta R^2$).
High levels of identification demonstrated to have a negative effect on engagement based on the supervisor support level. Such employees demonstrated a lower level of engagement when supervisor support increased. However, the engagement level of low identified employees was positively affected by higher levels of supervisor support. This pattern suggests that highly identified employees do not require high levels of supervisor support to become engaged, however, if “too much” supervisor support is provided their engagement level will suffer. On the other hand, low identified employees require more supervisor support to increase their engagement level. The interaction effect of identification and supervisor support on engagement is plotted in Figure 4.
Finally, table 4 and 5 in step 5 (organizational support) show that hypothesis 4a, identification modifies the relationship between organizational support and engagement, was supported by data ($b = -.445$, $p < .001$); however, hypothesis 4b, identification modifies the relationship between organizational support and burnout, was not significant, therefore supported by data ($b = .127$, $p > .10$). The interaction between organizational identification and burnout demonstrated to be not relevant for the model, on the other hand, the interaction revealed to be applicable to the new workforce engagement model. The proportion of variance explained by the inclusion of the interaction in the engagement model was 2.6% ($\Delta R^2$). Furthermore, high levels of identification demonstrated a determining and stable effect on engagement regardless of the organizational support level while low levels of identification reveled stronger
consequences on engagement based on the level of organizational support. Low identified employees require more organizational support to become engaged. This conclusion is similar to mine previous hypotheses 2a and 3a, but differs for highly identified employees, since there is no negative impact based on the level of the independent variable, organizational support. Figure 5 graphically depicts this interaction.

![Interaction: Engagement - Org. Supp. x Identification](image)

**Figure 5 -** Interactive effect of organization identification and organizational support on workforce engagement.
Chapter 8: Discussion

The primary aim of this study was to investigate how organizational identification modifies the relationship between some job demands—workload— and resources— feedback, supervisor support and organizational support --, and workforce engagement and burnout. The study investigated, for the first time, specific interactions between organizational identification and workload, feedback, supervisor support and organizational support and their impact on engagement and burnout. I hypothesized varying degrees of identification would result in differential impact on these relationships resulting in dissimilar levels of engagement and burnout. The recognition of these interactions contributes to the development of the engagement and burnout constructs in three ways.

First, significant interactions between organizational identification, and job demands and resources increase our inquisitiveness to explore other aspects in the work context that might impact engagement and burnout. Current engagement and burnout literature focuses primarily on the relationship between the individual and the job, individual and supervisors, and individual and organization as predictors of the constructs; however, other variables may modify the workforce engagement and burnout level significantly.
Second, I sought to contribute to what is currently known as positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), to a negative psychological state like burnout. Burnout is commonly researched in occupational health psychology, however engagement is a relatively new construct (Macy & Schneider, 2008) that requires more research to be better comprehended. By focusing on how organizational identification modifies the relationship between the work context and engagement, the study demonstrates that low identified individuals require more resources and less demands to become engaged. So far, the literature has not made distinction between different levels of moderations.

Third, workforce engagement has proven to be more susceptible to different levels of organizational identification than burnout as all proposed interaction effects were significant for engagement and only workload was significant for burnout. This confirms Schaufeli’s belief that engagement and burnout are two related but distinct constructs (2004). Thus, it becomes important to control for organizational identification when comparing both constructs in the future, because such conclusions about engagement and burnout levels may be highly influenced by different levels of organizational identification.

In order to reduce the risk of industry bias, a multi-sample approach was used that included three samples consisting of employees from industrial organizations (i.e., auto-parts) as well as from service and agricultural organizations. This approach allowed for better analysis because the results were not influenced by industry specificities.
The survey results supported the four workforce engagement hypotheses proposed in this thesis. I found significant interaction among all dependent variables and organizational identification and their impact on workforce engagement. In line with Mael’s (1988) research that identification may change how employees evaluate and perceive their workload to pursue distinctiveness among competitors, I found that different levels of identification modify the impact of workload on engagement. Specifically, the engagement level of low identified employees will be more susceptible to different levels of workload. Tajfel and Turner (1986) commented that employees who internalize the organizational identity demonstrate needs to distinguish ingroups from outgroups. Therefore, those employees who do not feel absorbed in or internalize the organization’s values will sense that more work represents only higher demands instead of an opportunity to differentiate the organization. Such an evaluation will lead to lower levels of energy and consequently lower levels of engagement.

The engagement levels of high identified employees will be less influenced by high levels of workload. In this way, high identification can mitigate the “negative consequences” of high levels of workload. Thus, the previous formula proposed by Maslach et al (2001) that too many demands exhaust an individual’s energy may be challenged.

The results suggest the impact of feedback on workforce engagement was also moderated by identification as well. The engagement level of employees with low identification was demonstrated to be more sensitive to feedback. In this case, the employee’s engagement level becomes more dependent on the feedback provided, as he
or she does not have other sources to find the psychological safety required to become engaged (Kahn, 1990). Thus, feedback will be fully utilized to generate more energy, absorption and dedication and the engagement level will become more dependable on feedback’s amount.

Employees with high levels of organizational identification demonstrated higher levels of engagement even when feedback levels were lower. Unlike low identified counterparts, however, higher levels of feedback damaged the engagement level of high identified employees. Employees who are highly identified demonstrated higher levels of engagement when feedback levels were lower. It is known that strong organizational identification requires high levels of value and goal congruence between the employees and organizations (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) and this aspect may overcome the need to constantly provide structural and formal feedback. It is important to point out that employees with high levels of identification may also absorb feedback in different ways because they constantly try to set the organization apart from competition (Tajfel and Turner, 1986). Such employees may use a lower amount of feedback in a more intense, positive way generating high levels of engagement. Moreover, as identification is the perception of oneness with or belonging to some human aggregate (Ashforth and Mael, 1989), employees with high levels of identification may feel obligated and committed to use low levels of feedback provided to improve their own job which will help the organization to execute its strategy and differentiate from other groups, whereas, such employees may evaluate “too much” feedback as a way to micromanage and interfere on
his or her job, which explains the decrease in the engagement level when high levels of feedback is provide.

Engagement was also significantly affected by the interaction of supervisor support and organizational identification. Employees with low levels of organization identification demonstrated the increased impact of supervisor support on engagement. Specifically, the more supervisor support low identified employees received, the higher their engagement level. Kahn (1990) concluded that psychological safety is necessary for one to become engaged, moreover, this psychological safety becomes a psychological substitute for low levels of oneness and belongingness to the organization. The employee feels attached to the supervisor which extrapolates to the engagement level. Thus, even though he or she is not “connected” to the organization, he or she becomes more engaged when the supervisor demonstrates personal care and respect.

Employees with high levels of identification demonstrated high levels of engagement in adverse supervisor support conditions. Kahn (1990) found that supportive and trusting interpersonal relationships as well as supportive management promoted psychological safety – component of workforce engagement, however, the results demonstrated that the emphasis that employees placed on supervisor support was mitigated by the level of organizational identification. The engagement level of highly identified employees was higher when supervisor support was lower. In this way, the cognitive process of becoming a member of the organization and internalizing the company’s values and goals contributes to promote engagement up to a certain amount. Thus, engagement through psychological safety may be the result of not only the
supervisor support alone, but also the interaction of organizational identification and supervisor support. Because of this, organizational identity becomes a relevant variable in the model. Furthermore, it is reasonable to expect that highly identified employees use low levels of supervisor support in a more constructive way to help the organization differentiate itself from competition.

The findings confirmed that the relationship between workforce engagement and organizational support is modified by organizational identification. Again, the most significant impact on engagement level occurs on low identified employees. Such employees demonstrate higher levels of engagement when they perceive high levels of organizational support, therefore, the need to internalize the organizational values and goals are enhanced by how the employee evaluates the company’s concern for his or her well-being. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) found that employees with high levels of perceived organizational support are more invested in their organization which overcomes the necessity to become a microcosm of the organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Thus, employees who are not identified will evaluate such personal concern as a source of psychological meaningfulness and safety which will lead to engagement.

Saks (2006) demonstrated that organizational support leads to engagement through the reciprocity norm of Social Exchange Theory (SET). However, our results demonstrated that the reciprocity is affected by the sense of membership and the internalization of values and goals. Ashforth (2008) stated that there is an essential human desire to expand the self-concept to include connections with others and to feel a sense of belonging with a larger group. As salient group identities emerge when group
memberships are built upon shared values, mutual respect, and internalized beliefs (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000), they moderate the relationship between organizational support and engagement. Thus, the engagement construct goes beyond reciprocity, it requires the combination of organizational support and identification to increase energy and effort, absorption and dedication levels of the workforce. When this bond is present, the impact of organizational support on the workforce engagement is considerably higher.

The research also indicated that organizational identification moderates the relationship between workload and burnout. Maslach et al. (2001) has already demonstrated that burnout is a response to workload mainly in the exhaustion dimension; however, the findings demonstrated that organization identification mitigates the impact of workload on burnout. The burnout level of low identified employees demonstrated a higher sensibility to different levels of workload. Specifically, higher levels of workload have a stronger impact on burnout for low identified employees. Such result may occur because employees with low levels of identification do not feel a member of the organization and evaluates the extra work only as more demand. He or she does not want to differentiate or to become a microcosm of the organization. Thus, more work leads to more demand and more stressful situations.

A second indication is that the burnout level of employees who are highly identified with the organization is not affected by different levels of workload. It is known that identification is maintained in situations involving great loss or suffering (Brown, 1996), missed potential benefits (Tajfel, 1982), task failure (Turner, 1981), and even expected failure (Gammons, 1986), and from a burnout perspective, this suggests
that organizational identification affects how employees evaluate different workload levels and how they internalize the effort required to perform the job. This personal resource helps employees not only to deal with high workloads, but also to internally justify the extra effort required to set the organization apart from the competitors. The emotional exhaustion which is the internal dimension of burnout is influenced by interpersonal and organizational relationships. In other words, being part of a highly identified group helps the individual deal with possible exhaustion generated by high levels of workload. By doing so, the employees minimize the impact of workload on burnout.

Although organizational identification moderated the relationship between workload and burnout, the research did not find support for interactions between feedback and organizational identification, supervisor support and organizational identification and organizational support and organizational identification on burnout. Interestingly, organizational identification was not perceived as an effective burnout reducing mechanism when the sources of burnout came from the relationship with supervisors (feedback and supervisor support) and the relationship with the organization (organizational support). Organizational identification was a successful burnout reducing mechanism only when the source of burnout came from the relationship between the individual and the job (workload).

If the amount of organizational identification arises from the internalization of the organizational values and goals, and if the relationship between feedback and burnout, supervisor support and burnout, and organizational support and burnout are not affected
by the level of organizational identification, we can assume that the causes of burnout are beyond the relationship between employee and organization and how they perceive such relationship. However, the present study indicates that further research may look for interaction between the components of burnout (exhaustion, cynicism, and self-efficacy) and organizational identification to verify the impact on each component. Besides, aspects such as employee/supervisor relationship and personality traits may be more relevant to influence burnout levels. I encourage future research on these areas to better understand the causes of burnout.

On a more general level, the study illustrates that low levels of organizational identification plays a more relevant role in the relationship between work context, and engagement and burnout levels. Specifically, special attention should be paid to job resources and demands when the workforce is not identified with the organization. Moreover, the study demonstrates that organizational identification plays a more important role in the positive psychological state (engagement) than in the negative psychological state (burnout). As engagement is a mediating component in the motivational process that is driven by available resources (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004) and burnout is a process driven by high job demands that might lead to health problems (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004), we can conclude that organizational identification performs a more significant role to increase organizational attachments (i.e. a low turnover tendency). Hence, including organizational identification and its moderator role in the engagement equation increases our understanding of employee functioning.
Chapter 9: Practical Implications

This study suggests that organizational identification significantly changes the relationship between some job demands and resources, and engagement. Thus, organizations that wish to improve employee engagement cannot overlook the importance of increasing organizational identification levels. Organizational programs that address employee’s identification will result in higher levels of overall engagement mainly when the workload level is high, and feedback, supervisor support and organizational support are low. Therefore, organizational identification has the power to improve engagement levels in a more demanding environment with low levels of resources. Organizational programs that address employees’ needs and concerns (e.g. surveys, focus groups, and suggestion programs) and demonstrate caring and support (e.g. flexible work arrangements) might cause employees to perceive job demands and resources differently, leading to higher levels of engagement.

In addition, the study showed that special attention is required to manage low identified employees. Such employees are more susceptible to different levels of resources and demands. In other words, the organizations need to provide more resources and/or less demand to have highly engaged employees with low identification.
Furthermore, the study demonstrated that engagement needs to be viewed as a broad organizational and cultural strategy that involves all levels of the organization (Frank et al., 2004), a series of actions and steps (Shaw, 2005) that require the input and involvement of organizational members (Robinson et al., 2004), and consistent, continuous, and clear communications (Kress, 2005).

Moreover, since job demands play a central role in the hypothesized energetic process that might lead to burnout (Schaufeli, 2004), but also to potential negative organizational outcomes such as the intention to leave the organization, reducing how the workforce perceives those demands seems to be warranted. The study showed that workload was influenced by different levels of organizational identification suggesting that managers need to pay attention to this interaction to preventively deal with burnout levels. Although implementing strategies to tackle high job demands, such as job redesign, flexible work schedules, and goal setting (for an overview see Quick, Quick, Nelson. & Hurreli. 1997; pp. 163-206) has positive effects on burnout levels, managers should also develop initiatives to increase organizational identification levels, which, finally, influence how the workforce internalizes those demands (perception filter).

Thus, companies must pay attention to Strategic Human Resources Management (SHRM) practices, such as socialization practices, communication initiatives, training and compensations policies, to develop the required internal alignment that sends a coherent signal to the workforce facilitating the internalization of the company’s values and goals which and helping the employees to set the organization apart in the
competitive environment. Such practices will positively influence the workforce engagement level and mitigate the effects of high levels of workload on burnout levels.
Chapter 10: Limitations and Future research

There are three important limitations of this study. First, all the data were self-reported, thus increasing the risk of common method variance. Despite this risk, perceptual measures, which are by definition self-reports, are in fact core to this theory. Although we tested our model in three independent samples that were drawn from different types of organizations, there is still an apparent need for replication in other samples using different types of indicators for organizational identification, job demands and job resources as well as for different types of individual and organizational outcomes.

Second, the study identified the interaction effect of organizational identification; however, as this is the first study in this area, there has been no theoretical grounding for any other causal relationship, even a reverse relationship. More research, including different job resources and demands such as work ambiguity and reward and recognition systems, would be valuable to establish the causal relationship between organizational identification, and workforce engagement and burnout.

Third, this model needs to be carried out in other industries—mainly in caregiving and service occupations to better evaluate the interaction component of organizational identification and burnout since burnout was first identified and studied in those work. Maslach et al (2001) stated that the relationship between provider and
recipient was the core aspect of burnout, thus, special attention should be paid to the interaction in these jobs.

The current study examined Brazilian workforce perceptions. However, future research should examine organizational identification levels and its moderating role in different cultures, since different cultures may evaluate organizational identification differently. For example, collectivistic cultures may place a stronger weight in organizational identification than individualistic cultures do.

It may be that culture expectations alter the impact of organizational identification on the relationship between the engagement and burnout antecedents and engagement and burnout themselves. Some cultures may weigh the importance of organizational identification differently than others as a result of the importance they place on private/work life balance. For instance, in some cultures that value private life more than work life, employees may feel much identified with the organization, however when the workload is high, the “positive impact” expected by this high level of identification may be minimized or even eliminated.

Another aspect future research should examine is the relationship between organizational identification and the components of workforce engagement and burnout. The impact of organizational identification may be different among the three components of engagement: vigor, absorption and dedication, and by knowing such relationship, researchers will be able to isolate the impacts on each component and develop initiatives to influence all of them individually. Another future research leads to the other identity levels such as career identification, team identification and job identification. Besides
organizational identification, the other identities may have a significant impact on workforce engagement and burnout. Another future research compares and contrasts the impact of each resource level (task-level, interpersonal level, and organizational level) on the engagement and burnout constructs. Researchers may focus on the degree of modification resulted from the interaction between each job resource and demand, and engagement and burnout, to focus on those which demonstrated higher impacts.

Researchers may also look at other moderators for the model. For example, how leadership styles modifies the relationship between work context and engagement/burnout. Leaders with different styles may have different impacts on how employees engage or get burned-out. Such different styles may facilitate or difficult the perception of resources availability and demands.

Another possible moderator may be personality traits. Some personality traits, such as, conscientiousness, may have a significant impact in this relationship since employees will deal with resources and demands in different ways. For example employees with high levels of conscientiousness demonstrated higher tolerance to deal with multiple tasks and multiple roles which may affect how they perceive resources and demands. Such research may also focus on the Conservation of Resource Theory (COR) (Hobfool, 1989). COR theory states that individuals will allocate their limited resource to activities that they value, thus employees with high levels of conscientiousness will be able to manage the release of energy and vigor in a more balanced way, facilitating high levels of work engagement.
Level of personal control over the outcome may also be a moderator and deserves future research. The amount of personal control over the resources and demands may influence how employee engages. If the employee has control over resources and demands, he/she will have higher accountability to the results which may influence the dedication and absorption levels affecting engagement.

Future research could also analyze the role of positive and negative feedback in engagement. The current research focused on significant feedback; however I did not distinguish positive from negative feedback. As highly identified employees demonstrate low engagement levels when they had high levels of feedback, researchers can investigate if the cause of this unexpected result is too much negative feedback.

Lastly, researchers can also add role conflict as an antecedent of engagement and burnout. Among many possible demands, role conflict may present a valid demand that is affected by organizational identification. As employees without a clear role definition may not know where to focus their energy, organizational identification may modify this relationship by providing a feeling of membership and belongness that will help them to keep engaged even without clear direction.
Conclusions

The literature on workforce engagement and burnout has come a long way since Kahn (1990) introduced the engagement construct, and Freudenberger (1975) and Maslach (1976) studied the burnout levels on care-giving and service occupations respectively. In 2002, Schaufeli defined engagement as vigor, absorption and dedication, and Maslach and Jackson (1981) described burnout as emotional exhaustion, depersonalization (cynicism), and diminished personal accomplishments (professional efficacy). Recently, Bakker et al. (2001), Bakker and Schaufeli (2004), and Salanova and Schaufeli (2008) found some antecedents of engagement and burnout. However, many unanswered questions remained. This study contributes to this literature by examining the interaction effect of organizational identification on the relationship of some work context variable (workload, feedback, supervisor support and organizational support) and workforce engagement and burnout. The results confirm that organizational identification modifies the all relationships between the job resources and demand on the model and workforce engagement. In fact, the engagement and burnout levels of low identified employees are more sensitive to different levels of job resources and demands. In addition, high organizational identification levels explain high levels of workforce engagement when employees have high levels of workload, low levels of feedback, low
levels of supervisor support and low levels of organizational support. The results also demonstrated that organizational identification modifies the relationship between workload and burnout which allows us to conclude that companies with highly identified workforce will preventively deal with the job stress and workforce cynicism would originate on the workload level. This study suggests that researchers need to broaden the analyses of job resources and demands and the impact of interaction effects on workforce engagement and burnout.


Appendix A: Scales

The following 25 statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, fill in “Never” in the space after the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you felt it by crossing the number that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never – A few times a year or less</th>
<th>Rarely – Once a month or less</th>
<th>Sometimes – A few times a month</th>
<th>Often – Once a week</th>
<th>Very Often – A few times a week</th>
<th>Always - Everyday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.</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>2. 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>3. 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>4. I get carried away when I am 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>5. 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>6. 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>7. My job inspires 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>8. 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I feel happy when I am working intensely</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>At my job, I feel strong and vigorous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I am enthusiastic about my job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I am proud of the work that I do.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I feel I'm 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>In my opinion, I am good at my</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following statements relate to different aspects of your organization and your thoughts and feelings about (Company’s name). Use the rating scale below to express the degree to which you agree or disagree with them (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree). Please, organization is the company you work for, not your division, department or team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When someone criticizes the organization, it feels like a personal insult.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am given enough time to do what is expected of me on the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The organization strongly considers my goals and values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My supervisor cares about whether or not I achieve my goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The performance standards on my job are too high.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am very interested in what others think about the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The organization cares about my opinions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My supervisor makes sure I get the credit when I accomplish something substantial on the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If a story in the media criticized the organization, I would feel embarrassed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My supervisor gives me helpful feedback about my performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The organization is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It often seems like I have too much work for one person to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor keeps me informed about different career opportunities for me in the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My supervisor gives me helpful advice about improving my performance when I need it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>My supervisor supports my attempts to acquire additional training or education to further my career</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The successes of the organization are my successes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Help is available from the organization when I have a problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>My supervisor takes the time to learn about my career goals and aspirations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>The organization really cares about my well-being</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>When someone praises the organization, it feels like a personal compliment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The organization care about my general satisfaction at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>When I talk about the organization, I usually say 'we' rather than 'they'.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>The organization shows very little concern for me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please provide some background information about yourself to aid in the analysis of the data

**Age:**

How old are you?

______ year old

**Gender:**

- Male
- Female

**Job Tenure:**

How long have you been working for (Company’s name)?

- Less than one year
- Between 1 and 2 years inclusive
- Between 2 and 5 years inclusive
- Between 5 and 10 years inclusive
- More than 10 years

**Job position:**

What is your current job position?

- Executive
- Manager
- Supervisor
- Analyst
- Assistant
- Sales Representative
- Technician
- Intern
- Other

Thank you for your time!!!!