

Empirical Evidence of Active Engagement and Active Disengagement in an Organizational Setting

Joseph Dawsey, Piedmont College
Edward Taylor, Piedmont College

This study provides empirical evidence supporting the notion that a continuum of behaviors range from one end point named active disengagement to another end point named active engagement. We utilized a previously analyzed data set and found support for the existence of the engagement continuum and in addition, we found support for the idea that the analytical lens of this continuum improves our understanding of the relationships between commonly used measures of citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, and psychological bonding. One final result of this analysis is the decoupling of the model from references to OCBs and extra-role behavior as articulated in the OCB research stream by recognizing that the theoretical grounding of the engagement model and the original OCB model was Katz and Kahn (1978).

Disengagement in an Organizational Setting

Interest in the phenomenon of employee engagement has gained in both attention and awareness since it was first introduced into the scholarly literature more than twenty years ago (e.g., Kahn, 1990; 1992). What does it mean to be engaged or even fully engaged at work? What is employee engagement? Over the years, researchers have produced a myriad of definitions and approaches (e.g., Macey & Schneider, 2008; Pfeffer, 2007), and seemingly these definitions have only been matched in variety and intensity in the works of practitioners and the popular press (Baron, 2005; Gallup, 2001; Krueger & Killham, 2005, 2006). In many ways, it is perhaps the popularity of the concept of employee engagement that has contributed to its somewhat inconsistent lineage. The search for a definition of employee engagement might be likened to encountering a chimera for the first time. At once we are fascinated by the multifaceted and idiosyncratic nature of the constituent components of the beast, and yet, we are equally horrified, and perhaps underwhelmed, with the loosely configured overall result. Instinctively, almost all managers know that they want to achieve a certain level of engagement with all employees but frequently find themselves baffled by inconsistent results.

Building upon this awareness, recent articles in the human resource development (HRD) literature have generated equally increasing interest in the concept of employee engagement in the workplace (e.g., Fairlie, 2011; Shuck, 2011; Shuck & Herd, 2012; Shuck & Wollard, 2010). At the same time, this burgeoning interest has also seemingly generated as many questions about employee engagement has have been answered in the scholarly literature. As a construct, employee engagement appears to have loosely coalesced from observations originating from practitioner articles (e.g., Gallup, 2001) and the popular press with some growing interest among academic researchers. These parallel discussions have also created what might be thought of as two lines of thought about employee engagement. The popular discussion, based primarily on anecdotal observations, has focused on the economic effects of having engaged employees in the workplace. Alongside the popular discussion, the academic literature has concentrated on aspects of what it means to be either engaged or disengaged. One of the most notable early efforts at conceptualizing employee engagement was Kahn's (1990) article describing personal engagement and personal disengagement. Kahn's (1990) definition of personal engagement highlighted the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral aspects of engagement as "the simultaneous employment and expression of a person's 'preferred self' in task behaviors that promote connections to others personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional), and active full role performances" (p. 700). This definition is interesting because it incorporates the full extent of personal presence, (including physical, cognitive, and emotional qualities) along with the notion of full roll performance. The nature of role performance and role characteristics is not a new discussion in either the organizational behavior or the HRD literatures; the manner in which workers assume and perform various roles in the workplace has been explored for some time (e.g., Blauner, 1964; Graen, 1976; Kahn, 1990, 1992; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Merton, 1968). By incorporating role performance into his definition of personal engagement, Kahn (1990) was attempting to address what he perceived to be a lack of contextual considerations (e.g., Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997) surrounding the discussions of employee engagement.

A variety of research efforts have examined similar constructs including the motivational factors surrounding job involvement (Hackman, 1969; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Maslow, 1950; Vroom, 1995), the

psychological elements (Kahn, 1990, 1992; Katz & Kahn, 1978), the emotional elements (Hochschild, 1979, 2003/1983; Maslach, 2003; Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001) and the extended or SRB elements (Dalal, 2005; Grant, 2007; Lee & Allen, 2000; Organ, 1988; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983). Macey and Schneider (2008), in one of the major conceptual reviews of emotional labor identified the general types of engagement that lead to the development of employee engagement: trait engagement; state engagement; and behavioral engagement. All of this points toward something of an evolving, yet still very unclear positioning of employee engagement. This lack of clarity is further highlighted in Shuck and Wollard's (2010) summary of employee engagement definitions (p. 101):

- “Personal engagement is the simultaneous employment and expression of a person's ‘preferred self’ in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence, and active full role performances” (Kahn, 1990, p. 700).
- “A persistent, positive affective-motivational state of fulfillment in employees that is characterized by high levels of activation and pleasure” (Maslach et al., 2001, p. 417).
- “Employee engagement refers to the individual's involvement and satisfaction with as well as enthusiasm for work” (Harter et al., 2002, p. 269).
- “A distinct and unique construct that consists of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components that is associated with individual role performance” (Saks, 2006, p. 602).
- “[Engaged] employees are mentally and emotionally invested in their work and in contributing to their employer's success” (Czarnowsky, 2008, p. 6).
- Trait engagement is defined as the “inclination or orientation to experience the work from a particular vantage point” (Macey & Schneider, 2008, p. 5). Psychological state engagement is defined as an antecedent to behavioral engagement (encompassing the constructs of satisfaction, involvement, commitment, and empowerment; pp. 5-6). Behavioral engagement is “define[d] in terms of discretionary effort” (p. 6).

Even though conversations addressing employee engagement have now been around for over twenty years, there has remained a persistent problem in the academic literature in terms of agreement as to what exactly constitutes employee engagement. What is employee engagement? What does it mean to be engaged at work? Is engagement a behavioral element or a psychological state? These and many similar questions have been explored over the years, but the conceptual picture of what engagement might look like has yet to be fully realized and/or measured through empirical research.

In addressing these questions of employee engagement, Dawsey and Taylor (2011) introduced a model of worker engagement built around an engagement continuum ranging from Active Disengagement to Active Engagement (AE - ADE). It addresses articles in the popular press (e.g., Gallup, 2001) and gaps in the twenty-plus-year-old scholarly research stream (e.g., Kahn, 1990; Macey & Schneider, 2008). One of the most cited definitions of engagement is drawn from Kahn's (1990) descriptions of personal engagement and personal disengagement (Shuck & Rieo, 2011). Kahn (1990) defined personal engagement as “the simultaneous employment and expression of a person's ‘preferred self’ in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional), and active full role performances” (p. 700). Kahn (1990) further defined personal disengagement as the “simultaneous withdrawal and defense of a person's preferred self in behaviors that promote a lack of connections, physical, cognitive, and emotional absence, and passive, incomplete role performance” (p. 701). Dawsey and Taylor's (2011) model builds on Kahn's definitions of personal engagement, but contrary to previous theory, the new model no longer views disengagement as simply the absence of engagement; instead Dawsey and Taylor's (2011) research found observable behaviors all along an engagement continuum. The AE - ADE continuum (Dawsey & Taylor, 2011) describes workers who perform supra-role behaviors (SRBs) (Katz & Kahn, 1978) and who are committed to their organizations as actively engaged; and workers who undermine their fellow workers and are not committed to the organization as actively disengaged. It is the behavioral element when coupled with the cognitive and emotional elements that accounts for the active forms of engagement and disengagement. Figure 1 illustrates the four points along the engagement continuum that constitutes the general conceptual framework of the model: Active Engagement, Engagement, Disengagement, and Active Disengagement.

Dawsey and Taylor (2011) defined active engagement as a psychological state of being bonded with the organization, and a cognitive state of expressed commitment to the organization (e.g., not planning to leave the organization); a further behavioral element of this psychological state (or attitude) would be consistent with behaviors typically associated with the early organizational citizenship behavior literature (e.g., Organ, 1988) which we now term SRBs given Organ's (1997) decoupling of OCBs from SRB behavior. In summary, actively engaged

employees are bonded with the organization and self-directed in their work, making psychological measures more important than cognitive and with a distinct pro-organizational behavioral element.

Dawsey and Taylor (2011) did not assert that general engagement (or what is often referred to in the literature as employee engagement) lacks a behavioral element, instead they asserted that general engagement and general disengagement are both attitudes that contain psychological and cognitive components but when the behavioral element manifests itself, it will be through supra-role behavior (Katz & Kahn, 1978) rather than through IRB behaviors (IRBs) (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Macey and Schneider (2008) also noted engagement concepts encompassing psychological states, traits, and behaviors, including elements of higher than normal effort and involvement.

The current study applies Dawsey and Taylor's model to an existing data set of supervisor and subordinate dyads with measures of IRBs and SRBs, perceptions, and performance. The purpose of the study is to see if behaviors and attitudes consistent with the engagement model shown below in Figure 1 can be found in this existing dataset.

Figure 1: Engagement Continuum

Active Engagement (AE) (21 items)	Engagement (E) (34 items)	Compliance (203 items)	Disengagement (DE) (33 items)	Active Disengagement (ADE) (23 items)
High IRB	High IRB		Low IRB	Low IRB
Higher SRB Lower (AOB) (Higher pos. SRB)	Outreaches to coworkers		Withdrawal from coworkers	Lower SRB Higher (AOB) (Higher Neg. SRB)
No intent to quit (cognitive commitment)	(Higher cognitive commitment)	Compliance	(Lower cognitive commitment)	Intends to quit (No cognitive commitment)
High psychological commitment - (Bonded)				Low psychological commitment (Not bonded)

Method

This study utilized a data set that initially was designed and deployed for a study published by Tepper and Taylor (2003) containing measures of mentorship, organizational citizenship behavior, justice, and other known covariates. The data set contains 314 dyads drawn from a survey of over 2,000 supervisors and their subordinates from 78 national guardsmen units in a Midwestern state. Tepper and Taylor's (2003) research demonstrated that supervisory mentoring enhanced subordinate perceptions of organizational justice which in turn led to increased levels of OCB performance in their subordinates as predicted by a trickle-down model of organizational justice (Masterson, 2001).

Measures

In most research projects the following discussion would be found in the literature review but in this case, where an existing data set, created for another purpose is assessed for its usefulness as a study of Dawsey and Taylor's (2011) engagement continuum, this problem has arisen in the measures section of the study. The original data set included a measure of OCBs as envisioned by Organ (1988) and attacked by Morrison (1994). The original presentation of the engagement continuum (Dawsey & Taylor, 2011) was explained using terminology commonly associated with OCBs (e.g., in-role and extra-role behavior). It now appears that any model conforming to Katz & Kahn's (1978) theory of roles must use terminology that is not a part of the in-role / extra-role debate surrounding OCBs and contextual performance and therefore, we have adopted IRB to designate in-role behavior as envisioned by Katz & Kahn (1978) and SRB to designate supra-role behavior described in the theory of roles (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

The 20-item survey measure of organizational citizenship behavior (Organ 1988) was successfully challenged by Morrison (1994) when she demonstrated that a majority of respondents to a survey containing the 20-item OCB measures viewed 18 of the 20 items as in-role behavior and Morrison therefore concluded that OCBs did not exist if respondents were engaging in in-role behaviors. Organ (1997) noted that this was a weakness of the measure and not of the construct; but he then removed the requirement that citizenship behaviors must be extra-role behavior and invoked Motowidlo and Van Scotter's (1994) contextual performance. Organ's elimination of the extra-role requirement for OCBs effectively decoupled OCB from its theoretical roots (i.e., one of Katz and Kahn's (1978) theory of roles - supra-role behavior which the extant literature now calls extra-role behavior and/or OCBs). Dawsey and Taylor's engagement model rests directly on the theory of roles as articulated by Katz and Kahn (1978) and therefore tests of the engagement model requires measures of psychological commitment and the three

behavioral roles in Katz and Kahn's (1978) theory of roles (i.e., in-role behavior (IRB), supra-role behavior (SRB), and commitment).

The original 20-item OCB measure, with its significant variance as to whether the survey items were IRB or SRB (Morrison, 1994) in the eyes of the worker, was found to be very useful for the planned analysis because it measured both IRB and SRB behavior and because the dataset also contained measures of IRB / SRB perception for both the supervisor and the subordinate for each of the 20 survey items. A further benefit of the measure is that it addresses the three forms of work conceptualized in today's labor market: the physical tasks of a wall paper factory, plus emotional labor (Hochschild, 2003/1983), and knowledge work (Davenport & Prusak, 1998; Davenport, 2005). In other words, had Morrison (1994) taken the tact that Organ (1988) had an operationalization problem because the original OCB construct assumed that IRBs were physical tasks and assumed that SRBs were emotional labor and knowledge work then the debate over whether OCBs were necessarily SRB behaviors would necessarily have taken a different course since Morrison's (1994) study of nurses in a hospital setting involved workers whose principle duties involved knowledge work and emotional labor. This could be explained in part by noting that the extant vocabulary of the day did not include emotional labor as a concept (i.e., Hochschild gave us emotional labor in 1983, Smith, Organ, and Near gave us OCBs in 1983). It is also worth noting that it was an objective of F. W. Taylor's classical scientific management was the division of labor in such a way that the physical task became the work of the subordinate and the knowledge work became the purview of the supervisor.

Contextual performance (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994) likewise is inadequate when applied to this analysis because contextual performance simply identifies whether or not a task is an IRB thereby creating a dichotomy of "in-role" and "not in-role," effectively ignoring the SRBs of the theory of roles (e.g., Not in-role isn't the conceptual equivalent of supra-role).

Katz & Kahn (1978) correctly assert that there are roles assumed by organization members that enhance the likelihood of organizational success or reduce the likelihood of organizational failure which are simply in- or supra- simply because of role perceptions. There are roles that remain supra-role even if the role incumbent declares it to be in-role. You cannot order a soldier to run in front of a machine gun, yet when one does, and saves lives, the leader of the organization will be glad that the soldier saw it as part of his job to do what the leader couldn't actually order the soldier to do. Or when school teachers run in front of a machine gun to save lives, we're glad that the teacher saw it as part of their job when asked about what they did and why. Brave souls perform heroic deeds (supra-role behavior), and those same brave souls will later explain, "I was just doing my job," – this is supra-role behavior and not simply a matter of role perception.

Nine survey items were selected as the focus for analysis as a way to link this operationalization of OCBs to the extant research in the field (Dierdorff, Rubin, & Bachrach, 2012) and concurrently account for a labor market economy where most jobs include more knowledge work and emotional labor than physical tasks. Three survey items were used to construct a sub-scale termed helping coworkers (e.g., shares ideas with co-workers); these three items also focus on knowledge work. Three additional survey items were selected that tapped into the subscale conscientious compliance or a quality focus (e.g., beats work deadlines); these items also address things surrounding the performance of physical tasks. The third set of survey items constitutes pro-organizational behavior or organizational dedication (e.g., welcomes newcomers to the organization); and concurrently focused on things typically thought of as emotional labor. These behaviors were reported by the supervisor of the worker performing the behavior by using a standard 5 point Likert scale, with scale scores ranging from 1 – strongly disagree to 5 – strongly agree. The items were selected in a manner that addressed the nature of work in the modern economy by including tasks that address emotional labor, knowledge work, and physical tasks.

Anti-organizational behavior, the theoretical opposite of OCB, was measured with the following two item scale: "hinders the efforts of coworkers to be successful" and "gives misleading information to coworkers." These behaviors were reported by the supervisor using a 5-point Likert scale with scores ranging from 1 - strongly disagree to 5 - strongly agree.

Psychological bond is the mean score of 5 items, taken from a 10 item psychological contract scale (Millward and Hopkins, 1998; Raja, Johns, & Ntalianis, 2004; Rousseau, 1989). The Likert type scale ranges from 1 to 5 where 1 represented the lowest level of bonding and 5 the highest. The five survey items were: "I feel a personal connection with this organization," "Being in this organization is a significant part of who I am as a person," "I feel a strong emotional bond with the organization," "I would experience significant regret if I stop being associated with the organization," and "My role in the organization affects many aspects of my life."

Organizational commitment, conceptualized by Katz and Kahn (1978) as a willingness of the individual to remain with the organization, was measured with three survey items that asked the respondents about their intention to quit the organization. A Likert type scale was utilized where 1 reflected no intention to quit and 5 represented someone who fully intended to quit.

The engagement index is the product of the psychological bond and organizational commitment variables after reverse recoding commitment so that a 5 reflects a high degree of intent to remain with the organization. Since commitment and psychological bond each have scale scores ranging from 1 to 5, then the range of values for this index is 1 to 25. After calculating the engagement index we sorted the 314 records in the data set on the engagement index.

The engagement category was the last variable created. Five engagement categories were created as originally presented in Dawsey and Taylor's (2011) model (see Figure 1). Each item in the data set was assigned to one of the 5 categories based upon the engagement index score. Those data records were placed, within plus or minus one standard deviation of the mean (11.75, SD = 6.97), into the compliant category. This turned out to be 65% of the observations or roughly two thirds of the data records and not inconsistent with a normal distribution. The remaining one third of the file was split in half with one sixth (55 records) representing the two engagement categories of the model, and the other sixth (56 records) representing the two disengagement categories. The values in the engagement index provided very natural break points - as 21 items were assigned to the active engagement category and the remaining 34, with lower index scores, were assigned to the engagement category. Similar break points were found within the disengagement items with the result that 23 items were assigned to the active disengagement category and the remaining 33 were assigned to the disengagement category. Figure 1 includes a summary of the number of records placed in each category.

Alphas for all measures were well above Nunnally's (1978) .7 guideline; alpha scores are shown on the diagonal of the correlation matrix in Table 1.

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations, and Coefficient Alphas

Variable	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Psychological Bond	3.43	1.01	(.88)						
2. Intent to Quit (commitment)	3.27	1.56	.58 **	(.88)					
3. Engagement Index	11.75	6.97	.84 **	.84 **	(na)				
4. Helping Coworkers	3.61	.82	.23 **	.17 **	.23 **	(.88)			
5. Quality of work	3.63	.80	.21 **	.16 **	.22 **	.87 **	(.90)		
6. Pro-organizational Behavior	3.59	.81	.27 **	.20 **	.27 **	.89 **	.84 **	(.89)	
7. Anti-organizational behavior	2.26	.97	-.11	.02	-.08	-.31	-.25 **	-.31 **	(.92)

Notes: * P<.05, ** P<.01. N = 314. Coefficient alphas are shown on the diagonal in parenthesis

Findings

On an item by item basis, each OCB survey item was classified according to whether the supervisor indicated a particular task as IRB ("an integral part of the job") or SRB ("above and beyond the scope of the job") and whether the subordinate indicated the task as IRB or SRB. Each of the nine survey items are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Leader and Subordinate In-role Behavior/Supra-role Behavior Perceptions with Performance Levels

TASK	Leader says IRB				Leader says SRB			
	Subordinate Says IRB	Subordinate Says SRB	Subordinate Says IRB	Subordinate Says SRB	Subordinate Says IRB	Subordinate Says SRB	Subordinate Says IRB	Subordinate Says SRB
Coworker helping								
Share ideas – w/coworkers	3.60	50%	3.70	26%	3.60	16%	3.60	8%
Treats coworkers courteously	3.60	56%	3.90	24%	3.60	12%	3.80	8%
Encourages coworker innovations	3.50	46%	3.70	29%	3.20	15%	3.50	10%
Average	3.57	51%	3.77	26%	3.47	14%	3.63	9%
Quality of work								
Works carefully	3.00	55%	3.60	25%	3.50	12%	4.00	8%
Works Error free	3.70	57%	3.80	27%	3.50	12%	4.00	4%
Beats deadlines on work	3.55	41%	3.63	36%	3.30	16%	3.56	8%
Average	3.42	51%	3.68	29%	3.43	13%	3.84	7%
Pro-Org-Behavior								
Welcomes newcomers to the organization (5)	3.60	56%	3.90	21%	3.50	12%	3.70	11%
Takes pride in the organization when talking about it (12)	3.55	48%	3.71	25%	3.48	16%	3.70	11%
Tells outsiders this is a good place to work (16)	3.56	35%	3.63	30%	3.20	16%	3.57	17%
Average	3.50	50%	3.69	25%	3.42	15%	3.69	10%

Note: N = 314 dyads.

Our initial observation is inconsistent with the cross-sectional studies in the OCB literature. In every case, more of the task behavior was performed when the task was viewed as SRB by the subordinate without regard to the supervisors' perceptions. This is contrary to the Morrison's (1994) criticism that OCBs are simply an artifact of occasions when the subordinate views a task as IRB and performs the task as part of the job; while at the same time the supervisor views it as SRB (e.g., simply a difference of opinion). This is also contrary to the conventional bureaucratic wisdom that if you want a specific task to be performed, you should incorporate it into an employee's job description (e.g., make it IRB). This also suggests that management attempts to enhance performance by redefining SRB tasks as IRB results in the just the opposite. Finally, this initial analysis suggests that the important role perception is the perception of the individual performing the task and not the perception to the supervisor.

The previously mentioned analysis was repeated by selecting only the actively engaged and the actively disengaged and comparing the mean scores for each group with the results in Tables 3, 4, and 5. As shown in Table 3 the actively engaged performed more of these behaviors than did those who were actively disengaged without regard to role perception. The results of those nine one-way ANOVAs support the ability of the engagement model cited to explain significant differences in behavior.

In Table 4, a series of one-way ANOVAs comparing the subordinates who reported an IRB role-perception¹ for each of the nine survey items are reported. Although actively engaged workers performed more in each of the nine areas, only about half of the differences were significant. In Table 5, a series of one-way ANOVAs comparing the subordinates who reported an SRB role-perception for each of the nine survey items are reported. Although actively engaged workers performed more of it in each of the nine areas, only about half of the differences were significant. One little notable oddity is that if the difference is significant in Table 4 it isn't in Table 5 and vice versa.

Table 3: One Way ANOVAs

Behavior	AE Mean (SD)	ADE Mean (SD)	Degrees of Freedom	F statistic	p-value
Coworker helping					
Sharing ideas with coworkers	4.33(.66)	3.17(.98)	(1, 42)	20.6	.000**
Treating coworkers courteously	4.19(.68)	3.13(.87)	(1, 42)	20.0	.000**
Encourages coworker innovations	4.14(.99)	3.04(.88)	(1, 42)	21.8	.000**
Conscientious compliance					
Works carefully	4.24(.77)	3.13(.87)	(1, 42)	19.9	.000**
Works error free	4.24(.70)	3.09(.90)	(1, 42)	22.0	.000**
Beats deadlines	4.10(.70)	2.96(.77)	(1, 42)	26.3	.000**
Organizational dedication					
Takes pride in the organization when talking about it	4.14(.66)	3.26(.75)	(1, 42)	17.1	.000**
Tells outsiders this is a good place to work	4.00(.78)	3.35(.65)	(1, 42)	9.2	.004**
Welcomes newcomers to the organization	4.10(.78)	3.22(.85)	(1, 42)	13.8	.001**

** p < .05.

Table 4: One Way ANOVAs Comparing IRBs

Behavior	Mean	SD	Degrees of Freedom	F statistic	p-value
Coworker helping					
Sharing ideas with coworkers (AE)	3.77	1.17	(1, 21)	.37	.55
(ADE)	3.50	.85			
Treating coworkers courteously (AE)	4.06	1.03	(1, 29)	9.52	.00**
(ADE)	2.93	.99			
Encourages coworker innovations (AE)	3.60	1.27	(1, 16)	2.58	.12
(ADE)	2.75	.89			
Conscientious compliance					
Works carefully (AE)	3.88	1.17	(1, 30)	5.51	.03**
(ADE)	3.00	.93			
Works error free (AE)	3.75	1.13	(1, 28)	4.36	.046**
(ADE)	3.00	.78			
Beats deadlines (AE)	3.60	1.27	(1, 17)	1.77	.20
(ADE)	3.00	.50			
Organizational dedication					
Takes pride in the organization when talking about it (AE)	3.79	1.05	(1, 24)	1.1	.31
(ADE)	3.42	.67			
Tells outsiders that this is a good place to work (AE)	3.73	1.03	(1, 19)	.71	.41
(ADE)	3.33	.82			
Welcomes newcomers to the organization (AE)	3.81	1.11	(1, 27)	1.96	.17
(ADE)	3.31	.75			

* p < .1, ** p < .05.

Table 5: One Way ANOVAs comparing SRBs

Behavior	Mean	SD	Degrees of Freedom	F statistic	p-value
Coworker helping					
Sharing ideas with coworkers (AE)	4.36	.81	(1, 19)	11.82	.00**
(ADE)	3.10	.88			
Treating coworkers courteously (AE)	3.71	.76	(1, 11)	.33	.58
(ADE)	3.50	.55			
Encourages coworker innovations (AE)	4.07	.73	(1, 24)	6.75	.02**
(ADE)	3.42	.52			
Conscientious compliance					
Works carefully (AE)	4.14	.90	(1, 10)	1.42	.26
(ADE)	3.60	.55			
Works error free (AE)	4.38	.74	(1, 12)	3.96	.07*
(ADE)	3.67	.52			
Beats deadlines (AE)	4.00	.78	(1, 23)	10.12	.00**
(ADE)	3.00	.78			
Organizational dedication					
Takes pride in the organization when talking about it (AE)	4.10	.74	(1, 16)	8.03	.01**
(ADE)	3.25	.46			
Tells outsiders that this is a good place to work (AE)	3.89	.93	(1, 21)	5.66	.03**
(ADE)	3.21	.43			
Welcomes newcomers to the organization (AE)	3.88	.84	(1, 13)	2.03	.18
(ADE)	3.29	.76			

* p < .1, ** p < .05.

Conclusion

This analysis found the existence of behaviors consistent with the model described in Figure 1 thereby providing evidence supporting the model as articulated. Further study can exclude the complexity of determining whether the supervisor views a task as an in- or extra- role behavior; all that seems to matter is the perception of the person performing the task as to in- or SRB perception. It further appears that the engagement construct can have significant explanatory power with respect to IRB and SRB task performance in the workplace. Finally, the nature of work (i.e., physical tasks, knowledge work, and emotional labor) will necessarily become part of any analysis of role performance in future studies.

REFERENCES

- Baron, A. 2005. Measuring for the right reasons. *Strategic Communication Management*, 9(5), 13.
- Blauner, R. 1964. *Alienation and freedom: The factory worker and his industry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brief, A., & Motowidlo, S. 1986. Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 710-725.
- Czarnowsky, M. 2008. *Learning's role in employee engagement: An ASTD research study*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.
- Dalal, R. 2005. A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241-1255.
- Dawsey, J., & Taylor, E. 2011. Active engagement to active disengagement: A proposed model. *Business Studies Journal*, 33(1), 29-41.
- Davenport, T. 2005. *Thinking for a Living: How to get better performance and results from knowledge workers*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Davenport, T., & Prusak, L. 1998. *Working knowledge*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Dierdorff, E., Rubin, R., & Bachrach, D. 2012. Role expectations as antecedents of citizenship and the moderating effects of work context. *Journal of Management*, 38(2), 573-598.
- Fairlie, P. 2011. Meaningful work, employee engagement, and other key employee outcomes: Implication for human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), 508-525.

- Gallup. (2001, March 19). **Gallup study indicates actively disengaged workers cost U.S. hundreds of billions each year.** Gallup Management Journal. Retrieved January 6, 2008 from <http://gmj.gallup.com/content/466/gallup-study-indicates-actively-disengaged-workers-cost-us-hundreds.aspx>.
- Graen, G. 1976. Role making processes within complex interactions. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), **Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology**, 1201-1245. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Grant, A. 2007. Relational job design and the motivation to make a pro-social difference. **Academy of Management Review**, 32(2), 393-417.
- Hackman, R. 1969. Nature of the task as a determiner of job behavior. **Personnel Psychology**, 22(4), 435-444.
- Harter, J., Schmidt, F., & Hayes, T. 2002. Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 87(2), 268-279.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. 1959. **The motivation to work**. New York: Wiley.
- Hochschild, A. 1979. Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. **American Journal of Sociology**, 85(3), 551-575.
- Hochschild, A. 2003. **The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling: Twentieth anniversary edition**. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Kahn, W. 1990. Psychological conditions of personal engagement at work. **Academy of Management Journal**, 33(4), 692-724.
- Kahn, W. 1992. To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. **Human Relations**, 45(4), 321-349.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. 1978. **The social psychology of organizations**. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Krueger, J., & Killham, E. (2005, December 8). **At work, feeling good matters: Happy employees are better equipped to handle workplace relationships, stress, and change, according to the latest GMJ survey.** Gallup Management Journal.
- Krueger, J., & Killham, E. (2006, March 9). **Why Dilbert is right: Uncomfortable work environments make for disgruntled employees - just like the cartoon says.** Gallup Management Journal.
- Lee, K., Carswell, J., & Allen, N. 2000. A meta-analytic review of occupational commitment: Relations with person- and work-related variables. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 85(5), 799-811.
- Macey, W., & Schneider, B. 2008. The meaning of employee engagement. **Industrial & Organizational Psychology**, 1(1), 3-30.
- Maslach, C. (2003). **Burnout: The cost of caring**. Cambridge, MA: Malor Books.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W., & Leiter, M. 2001. Job burnout. **Annual Review of Psychology**, 52, 397-422.
- Maslow, A. 1950. A theory of human motivation. **Psychological review**, 50(4), 370-396.
- Masterson, S. 2001. A trickle-down model of organizational justice: Relating employees' and customers' perceptions of and reactions to fairness. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 86(4), 594 – 604.
- Merton, R. 1968. **Social theory and social structure**. New York: Free Press.
- Millward, L., & Hopkins, L. 1998. Psychological contracts, organizational and job commitment. **Journal of Applied Social Psychology**, 28(16), 1530-556.
- Morrison, E. 1994. Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. **Academy of Management Journal**, 37(6), 1543-1657.
- Motowidlo, S., Borman, W., & Schmit, M. 1997. A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. **Human Performance**, 10(2), 71-83.

- Motowidlo, S., & Van Scotter, J. 1994. Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 79(4), 475-480.
- Nunnally, J. 1978. **Psychometric theory**. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Organ, D. 1988. **Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome**. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Organ, D. 1997. Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. **Human Performance**, 10(2), 85-97.
- Pfeffer, J. 2007. Human resources from an organizational behavior perspective: Some paradoxes explained. **Journal of Economic Perspectives**, 21(4), 115-134.
- Raja, U., Johns, G., & Ntalianis, F. 2004. The impact of personality of psychological contracts. **Academy of Management Journal**, 47(3), 350-367.
- Rousseau, D. 1989. Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. **Employee Responsibility Rights Journal**, 2(2), 121-139.
- Saks, A. 2006. Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. **Journal of Managerial Psychology**, 21(7), 600-519.
- Shuck, B. 2011. Integrative literature review: Four emerging perspectives of employee engagement: An integrative literature review. **Human Resource Development Review**, 10(3), 304-328.
- Shuck, B., & Herd, A. 2012. Employee engagement and leadership: Exploring the convergence of two frameworks and implications for leadership development in HRD. **Human Resource Development Review**, 11(2), 156-181.
- Shuck, B., & Reio, T. 2011. The employee engagement landscape and HRD: How do we link theory and scholarship to current practice? **Advances in Developing Human Resource Development**, 13(4), 419-428.
- Shuck, B. & Wollard, K. 2010. Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. **Human Resource Development Review**, 9(1), 89-110.
- Smith, A., Organ, D., & Near, J. 1983. Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 68(4), 653-663.
- Swanson, R., & Holton, E. 2009. **Foundations of human resource development**. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Tepper, B., & Taylor, E. 2003. Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. **Academy of Management Journal**, 46(1), 97-105.
- Vroom, V. 1995. **Work and motivation**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Joseph Dawsey is the instruction, outreach and assessment librarian at Piedmont College. He is a Ph.D. candidate in adult education and human resource and organizational development at University of Georgia. His current research interests include employee engagement and disengagement, emotional labor, and emotions in the workplace. He has published in Business Studies Journal.

Edward Taylor is associate dean at Walker School of Business and professor of strategic management and leadership at Piedmont College. He received his Ph.D. in management from University of Kentucky. His research interests include managerial citizenship behaviors, workplace and classroom engagement, competitive advantage status assessment, and the integration of quality management systems with the strategic management process. He has published in Academy of Management Journal, Academy of Management Review, Journal of Business Research, International Journal of Conflict Management, and Business Studies Journal.