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ABSTRACT

POB (Positive Organizational Behaviour) emphasizes the need for more focused theory building, research, and effective application of positive traits, states, and behaviors of employees in organizations. We argue that in order to make a substantive contribution to organizational science, POB will need to show the added value of the positive over and above the negative. In addition, the emerging concept of employee engagement is briefly introduced. The papers in the special issue describe exciting positive organizational behavior studies that each tap into an interesting direction in which POB research might go.


INTRODUCTION

More than ever before, managers would agree that employees make a critical difference when it comes to innovation, organizational performance, competitiveness, and thus ultimately business success. What can organizations do to attract and keep creative, dedicated, and thriving employees who make organizations flourish? Which working conditions inspire employees to be engaged, give their best, go the extra mile, and persist in the face of difficulties? Instead of traditional organizational structures that heavily rely on management control and economic principles of cost reduction, efficiency, and cash flow, the focus in modern organizations is on the management of human capital. Currently, organizations expect their employees to be
proactive and show initiative, collaborate smoothly with others, take responsibility for their own professional development, and to be committed to high quality performance standards. Thus employees are needed who feel energetic and dedicated, and who are absorbed by their work. In other words, organizations need engaged workers.

This is illustrated by Ulrich (1997), who writes in his seminal book “Human Resources Champions”: “Employee contribution becomes a critical business issue because in trying to produce more output with less employee input, companies have no choice but to try to engage not only the body but the mind and soul of every employee” (p. 125). Obviously, this objective is not achieved with the prevailing four D’s approach (damage, disease, disorder, and dysfunction) that focuses on preventing poor performance, low motivation, unwell-being, ill-health, and disengagement. Something more is needed—a radical shift, away from the four D’s, and this is where positive organizational behavior (POB) comes in. This special issue includes five POB articles that focus on a wide range of positive behaviors of engaged employees in flourishing organizations.

POSITIVE ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR AND SCHOLARSHIP

The field of POB has emerged from the recently proposed positive psychology approach. Psychology has been criticized as primarily dedicated to addressing mental illness rather than mental “wellness”—the four D’s approach. This prevailing negative bias of psychology is illustrated by the fact that the amount of publications on negative states outnumbers that on positive states by a ratio of 14:1 (Myers, 2000). The purpose of Positive Psychology “…is to begin to catalyze a change in the focus of psychology from pre-occupation only with repairing the worst things in life to also building positive qualities” (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000, p. 5). Thus, positive psychology studies the strengths and virtues that enable individuals and communities to thrive.

Like positive psychology, POB does not proclaim to represent some new discovery of the importance of positivity, but rather emphasizes the need for more focused theory building, research, and effective application of positive traits, states, and behaviors of employees in organizations (Luthans & Youssef, 2007). That a more positive approach is needed not only in psychology, but also in management and business is illustrated by Walsh, Weber, and Margolis (2003) who reported that in the business press over the last 17 years, compared to positive terms (e.g., compassion, virtue) negatively biased words (e.g., beat, win) have increased four-fold during the same period.

According to Luthans (2002), POB is interested in “the study and application of positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace” (p. 59). Luthans has argued that inclusion criteria for POB are being theory and research based, measurable, developmental, and manageable for performance impact in the workplace. Wright (2003) counterbalanced this utilitarian and management-driven view by arguing that the mission of POB must also include the pursuit of employee happiness and health as viable goals in themselves. We would like to add that, as argued by Zwetsloot and Pot (2004), employee health
and well-being is becoming a business value of strategic importance. For instance, instead of ‘‘costs,’’ occupational health and well-being measures are increasingly considered sound ‘‘investments’’ in employees who yield direct economic benefits to the company. Seen from this perspective, the organization-centered view of Luthans (2002) and the employee-centered view of Wright (2003) can be integrated into a positive business value model of employee health and well-being. An approach that has been labeled ‘‘Integral Health Management’’ (Zwetsloot & Pot, 2004) that constitutes a win–win situation for both the organization and its employees.

Typically, POB studies individual positive psychological conditions and human resource strengths that are—in one way or the other—related to employee well-being or performance improvement. This may involve, for instance, the predictive validity of general mental ability and emotional intelligence for sales performance. Research may also focus on the cognitive capacities of creativity and wisdom, and the affective capacities of work engagement and humor. POB studies also examine the role of states like self-efficacy, optimism, hope, resilience, and other personal resources in coping with organizational demands or in fostering performance. Further, POB-researchers are interested in peak performance in organizations and examine the conditions under which employees thrive.

Researchers who simultaneously started the positive organizational scholarship (POS) movement have provided a conceptual framework for organizing and integrating their research on positive organizations (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003). POS is defined as ‘‘the study of that which is positive, flourishing, and life-giving in organizations. Positive refers to the elevating processes and outcomes in organizations. Organizational refers to the interpersonal and structural dynamics activated in and through organizations, specifically taking into account the context in which positive phenomena occur. Scholarship refers to the scientific, theoretically derived, and rigorous investigation of that which is positive in organizational settings’’ (Cameron & Caza, 2004, p. 731). Similar to POB, but different from positive psychology, the primary emphasis of POS is on the workplace and on the accomplishment of work-related outcomes. Although partly overlapping, POS is primarily concerned with individual psychological states and human strengths that influence employee performance (Luthans, 2002), whereas POS is primarily concerned with the positive aspects of the organizational context that influence employee’s thriving (Cameron, 2005). In a way, this special issue builds a bridge between POB and POS because in most of its contributions a positive individual perspective (POB) is combined with a positive organization perspective (POS).

Before introducing the five articles that are included in this special issue, two illustrations are provided of the viability of a positive approach to organizational behavior: the added value of POB and processes over and above negative behaviors and processes, and the emergence of employee engagement.

THE ADDED VALUE OF POSITIVE ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

Failing to recognize the positive aspects of work is inappropriate and as Turner, Barling, and Zacharatos (2002, p. 715) have argued ‘‘. . .it is time to extend our research focus and explore more fully the positive sides, so as to gain full understanding of the meaning and effects of working.’’ However, in order to make a substantive contribution to organizational science,
POB will need to show the added value of the positive over and above the negative. For instance, if work engagement would be the perfect opposite of burnout, there is little to be gained from engagement research beyond what is already known from burnout research (see below). Moreover, we agree with Tetrick (2002), who convincingly argued that it is very unlikely that the same mechanisms that underlie employee ill-health and malfunctioning constitute employee health and optimal functioning. Hence, POB may contribute by supplementing the traditional negative model with a distinct wellness model that focuses on POB. By not exclusively focusing on the positive side but by taking a more comprehensive perspective that includes positive as well as negative aspects, criticisms of POB’s one-sided positivity bias and its separating positive from negative experiences and emotions are counteracted (Fineman, 2006).

Meanwhile, several recent POB studies have convincingly shown that positive organizational phenomena can make a unique contribution to explaining variance in organizational outcomes over and above negative ones. A ground-breaking study making this point is Fredrickson and Losada’s (2005) study among business teams. They empirically validated that positive communication and expressions of support among team members clearly distinguished flourishing teams over languishing teams. Specifically, in their observational research with 60 management teams, the authors identified 15 teams that clearly produced better results (as indicated by profitability, customer satisfaction, and 360 degree evaluations by superiors, peers, and subordinates) based upon their speech acts. Positive speech was coded for encouragement, support, and appreciation, while negative speech was coded for disapproval, cynicism, and sarcasm. Sixteen teams with mixed verbal interactions had average performance, while nineteen teams with negative verbal interactions showed inferior performance. Moreover, results showed that the successful teams exhibited verbalization of more positive effect and a wider range of ideas and initiatives, while teams with average or no success were more constrained in the range of effect and ideas. The poorest performing teams were tightly bounded, uncreative, and generally negative in outlook.

Other examples of recent POB studies investigated how the combination of stressful and motivating job characteristics influences negative and positive aspects of well-being. According to the job demands—resources (JD-R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) working conditions can be classified in two general categories (i.e., job demands and job resources) that are applicable to virtually all occupations. Basically, job demands require effort and are therefore related with physiological and psychological costs, such as fatigue, whereas job resources foster personal growth, learning, and development, and have motivational qualities. Bakker, Demerouti, and Euwema (2005), in their study among about 1000 Dutch college teachers, hypothesized and found that job resources buffered the impact of job demands on burnout (exhaustion and cynicism). Specifically, they found that job demands such as work overload, emotional demands, physical demands, and work–home interference did not result in high levels of burnout if employees experienced job resources, such as autonomy, performance feedback, social support, or coaching from their supervisor. Psychologically speaking, different processes may have been responsible for these interaction effects. That is, autonomy may have helped in coping with job demands because employees had discretion on when and how to respond to their demands. In a similar vein, social support and coaching from the supervisor may have buffered the impact of job demands on levels of burnout because employees received
instrumental help and emotional support. Finally, feedback may have been beneficial because it provided employees with the information necessary to maintain their performance.

Two other studies using the JD-R model have shown that job resources are particularly salient when job demands are high. Hakanen, Bakker, and Demerouti (2005) in their study among Finnish dentists hypothesized and found that job resources (e.g., skill variety, peer contacts) were most beneficial in maintaining work engagement under conditions of high job demands (e.g., workload, poor physical environment). Similar findings have been reported for Finnish teachers working in elementary, secondary, and vocational schools (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007). It was found that job resources buffer the negative relationship between pupil’s misbehavior and teacher’s work engagement. In addition, it was observed that job resources particularly influence work engagement when teachers are confronted with high levels of pupil’s misconduct. For example, supervisor support, an innovation culture, appreciation by colleagues, and a positive organizational climate were important job resources for teachers that helped them cope with demanding interactions with pupils.

In conclusion, studies using the broaden-and-build theory and the JD-R model illustrate how POB can outweigh negative behavior. Such theoretical approaches and empirical findings clearly add to our overall knowledge regarding organizational behavior and its outcomes.

THE EMERGENCE OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

As noted above, today’s organizations are in need of engaged employees. This is not only illustrated by best-selling books that convincingly make this case (Covey, 2004; Gratton, 2000), but also by the fact the keyword “employee engagement” yields far over 2 million hits on the World Wide Web. Moreover, virtually all major consultancy firms offer “assessment tools” that identify “drivers” and subsequent programs “to boost employee engagement”. In contrast, entering the keywords “employee engagement” and “work engagement” in Psych Info yields only 61 scientific articles and chapters. Obviously, there is a large discrepancy between corporate interest in employee engagement and academic research and writing. This is yet another reason why this special issue is timely.

Three approaches to employee engagement exist. First, it is conceived as a set of motivating resources such as support and recognition from colleagues and supervisors, performance feedback, opportunities for learning and development, and opportunities for skill use. The so-called “Gallup-12” questionnaire operationalizes employee engagement in this way. A meta-analysis of studies using this measure in almost 8000 business units of 36 companies (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002), showed that levels of employee engagement were positively related to business-unit performance (i.e., customer satisfaction and loyalty, profitability, productivity, turnover, and safety). The authors conclude that engagement is “... related to meaningful business outcomes at a magnitude that is important to many organizations” (Harter et al., 2002, p. 276).

Secondly, employee engagement is conceived in terms of commitment and extra-role behavior, for instance, as “a psychological state where employees feel a vested interest in the company’s success...
and perform to a high standard that may exceed the stated requirements of the job” (www.mercerhr.com),
or as “personal satisfaction and a sense of inspiration and affirmation they get from work and being a part
of the organization” (www.towersperrin.com). Clearly, this seems like putting old commitment wine in
new engagement bottles.

The third approach defines engagement independently from job resources and positive
organizational outcomes—such as commitment—as a positive, fulfilling, affective-motivational state of
work-related well-being that is the antipode of job burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Based
on this conceptualization, a brief work engagement questionnaire has been developed that consists of
three interrelated dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006).
Theoretically speaking, both engagement as well as burnout can be integrated in an overarching
comprehensive framework: the JD-R model (see above). This model assumes two processes (Schaufeli &
Bakker, 2004): (1) a health impairment process in which burnout mediates the relationship between job
demands and poor resources on the one hand, and negative health outcomes on the other hand; (2) a
motivational process in which engagement mediates the relationship between job resources on the one
hand, and positive organizational outcomes—such as organizational commitment—on the other hand.

The JD-R model nicely illustrates the point made by Tetrick (2002) that different mechanisms
underlie employee ill-health and malfunctioning (the health impairment process) as compared to
employee health and optimal functioning (the motivational process). In addition, various studies have
demonstrated associations of employee engagement with meaningful organizational outcomes such as in-
and extra role behavior (Schaufeli, Taris, & Bakker, 2006), intention to leave and organizational
commitment (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), financial turnover at the end of the work shift (Xanthopoulou,
Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007), academic performance (Schaufeli, Martinez, Marques Pinto,
Salanova, & Bakker, 2002), and service quality as rated by customers (Salanova, Agut, & Piero’, 2005).

In conclusion, studies on employee engagement add to our understanding of positive
organizational processes in organizations—also vis-à-vis negative processes—and show the relevance of
the concept for organizational outcomes. As such employee engagement is a promising new avenue for
future POB research.

CONCLUSION

Employee engagement emphasizes the importance of employee communication on the
success of a business. An organization should realize the importance of employees, more than
any other variable, as the most powerful contributor to an organization’s competitive position.
Organizations and employees share a symbiotic relation, where both are dependent on each other
to satisfy their needs and goal. Keeping this fact in mind the employers must identify the best
way to utilize their talent. Surveys and researches reveal that employees could be best engaged if
their unique needs could be fulfilled. It is very essential to realize what they are best at and
engage their talents in the best possible way. Therefore employee engagement should not be a
onetime exercise, but a continuous process of learning, improvement and action. As it is rightly
said, “An empty mind is a Devil’s workshop” and hence the need to engage employees in the
most productive way, and gain competitive advantage.
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