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# Introduction

Over the last decade, engagement has been extensively studied and that it is associated with beneficial organizational and personal outcomes is well understood (Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011). Practitioners have also often claimed that it impacts financial performance and that a large number of workers report active disengagement (e.g. Bates, 2004, Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes (2002)), Saks (2006) references a representative list of practitioner literature. To effectively compete in the dynamic environment, organizations must have employees that apply their full capabilities to work (Bakker & Leiter, 2010).

Has cognitive, emotional and behavioral components (Bakker et al., 2011; Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010; Saks, 2006)

Rich et al. (2010) have conceptualized engagement as a broader aspect of an employee's self as regards other attitudinal constructs such as job involvement, job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. The unique and wider contribution of engagement in predicting job performance has also been demonstrated (Christian, Garza, & Slaughter, 2011; Dalal, Baysinger, Brummel, & LeBreton, 2012; Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2008; Rich et al., 2010).

# Theory and Hypothesis

## Leader-member exchange

Kahn (1990) theorized that an employee's perception of his work context and his own individual makeup would contribute to the psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability, which would in turn result in engagement with work. The leader is the prime way of an employee to experience his work context (**???**)

## Core self-evaluations

Core self-evaluations have been previously linked to engagement (Rich et al., 2010) as an antecedent by virtue of their being able to influence psychological availability.

## P-O Fit

May et al. (2004) have also found that role fit is a predictor to engagement.

In a review of research on motivation Latham & Pinder (2005) suggests that the relationship between individual differences and outcomes is contingent upon organizational characteristics as well. Value congruence with the organization if one such fit model that has been conceptualized and used in research on fit (Kristof, 1996).

# Method

## Procedure and Participants

## Measures

### Work Engagement

Though Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006) has been criticized for including respondent perceptions of meaningfulness and challenge, we do not see this as a concern in our research as the predictors we use are all fairly distant.

Broad consensus on energy and identification as components of engagement (Bakker et al., 2011), both of which are reflected in the UWES.

### Leader-member exchange

### Core self-evaluations

### P-O Fit

### Control Variables

Conceivable that people with higher education would be more likely to engage in job crafting and thus be more engaged (Bakker et al., 2012)

# Results

***TODO: Need to include discussion of directions and strengths of correlations***

# Discussion

## Theoretical Contributions

***TODO: Possibility of variations due to sample characteristics***

High CSE individuals maybe immune to the situational strength (Meyer, Hecht, Gill, & Toplonytsky, 2010) of LMX.

High LMX would provide greater clarity on expectancies and appraisals.

Enactment of high CSE may lead to high engagement even in the absence of high LMX

Job crafting does not necessarily imply that the goals of the crafting would be inline with the organizational goals (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). LMX would generally permit only those iDEALs (Rousseau, 2005) that supported organizational goals, thus people with low P-O Fit would have less job crafting opportunities and would thus not be engaged?

## Practical Implications

Might be difficult for knowledge workers to distinguish between physical and cognitive energies (Rich et al., 2010)

Some discussion on state engagement (Sonnentag, 2011; Tims, Bakker, & Xanthopoulou, 2011). Could be the reason why it makes sense to measure all the constructs together, episodic engagement (Sonnentag, 2011)

## Limitations and Future work

Multi-item and high reliability scales might not have problems with common method bias (Spector, 1987)

Reason not to use job performance directly: Could be more difficult for employees to vary there levels of objective job performance as these are often evaluated and used for compensation or other administrative reasons (Saks, 2006)

Reciprocal relationship between LMX and work engagement using a job crafting approach (Bakker et al., 2012)

Call for how engagement fits into other motivational theories (Rich et al., 2010). Can fit into VEI as follows:

* Valence -> P-O Fit
* Expectancy -> LMX, + CSE
* Instrumentality -> CSE
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