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Executive Summary

The purpose of this study is to provide the Oklahoma Center for Nonprofits and its stakeholders with the results of a questionnaire designed to assess work engagement views and attitudes of non-profit employees (N = 98) in relation to their organizations. Frequency analyses were computed for all study variables. In regard to work engagement, on average, employees experienced vigorous at work often and dedication often to very often. In addition, respondents on average experienced absorption sometimes to often. Concerning burnout variables, on average respondents experienced exhaustion once a month or less to a few times a month. Respondents indicated that on average they experienced cynicism a few times a year or less to once a month or less. On average, respondents felt a sense of professional efficacy a few times a week. In regard to perceived organizational support, on average respondents agreed that they felt valued by their organization. In regard to areas of worklife (AWS), some employees indicated high levels of workload while others indicated lower levels. The majority of respondents agreed that they have control of their work, that they feel a sense of community with their coworkers, and that they have similar values with their organization. Findings were mixed regarding rewards and fairness with some favorable and some unfavorable responses. Finally, the majority of respondents agreed that they were satisfied with their job and intend to remain at their job. Correlation and regression analyses were also computed to examine the relationship between work engagement and AWS and between burnout and AWS. Both regression equations were statistically significant indicating that AWS is related to work engagement and burnout with differing variables making a significant contribution.
Introduction

The mission of the Oklahoma Center for Nonprofits is building better communities through effective nonprofits. Their chief purpose is to provide continued service in consulting and training throughout the state of Oklahoma (See http://www.oklahomacenterfornonprofits.org for more information).

The following paragraphs provide an overview of the work engagement literature, including a summary of the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model. Following is a presentation of the methodology, including procedures and participants, instruments, and design. Next, results of the frequency analyses, and correlation and regression analyses are discussed. Finally, conclusions about study findings are provided.

Work Engagement

Work engagement is defined as “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Romá, & Bakker, 2002, p. 74). Engaged individuals are energetic about their work, feel connected to their work, and are better able to deal with job demands (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007b). Vigor is characterized by energy, mental resilience, the willingness to invest one’s effort, and persistence (Schaufeli, Salanova et al., 2002). Dedication is characterized by “a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge” (Schaufeli, Salanova et al., 2002, p. 74). Absorption is characterized by being engrossed in one’s work, to the extent to which time passes quickly and it is difficult to detach oneself from work (Schaufeli, Salanova et al., 2002).
Interest in studying work engagement originated from research in job burnout, a frequently examined construct in the 1970s (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Burnout, defined as a state of exhaustion in which an individual is cynical about occupational values and doubtful about his or her performance abilities (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996), was a popular construct because it captured the realities of individuals’ experiences in the workplace (Maslach et al., 2001). The study of work engagement coincided with the emergence of positive psychology (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007). Rather than concentrate on the negative approach of burnout, which focuses on alleviating symptoms and problems, researchers shifted to a more positive approach of work engagement, which focuses on facilitating health and well-being (Lopez, Snyder, & Rasmussen, 2006).

Engaged employees are healthy and productive workers. A recent Gallup (2005) poll indicates that employees’ level of work engagement is related to their physical health and psychological well-being. In addition, engaged employees are generally more productive in the workplace. Unfortunately, 24.7 million (19%) workers in the United States are actively disengaged, defined as those who are fundamentally disconnected from their jobs; the economic cost of actively disengaged employees is between $292 billion and $355 billion a year in productivity loss (Gallup, 2001). Further, actively disengaged employees are less loyal, less personally satisfied, and more stressed than their counterparts. In addition, these employees miss 3.5 more days each year than their colleagues, accounting for 86.5 million days (Gallup, 2001). Due to the social and economic impacts of disengagement, the study of work engagement has become an area of prime focus in organizational and social psychology.
The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model has been the predominant avenue from which correlates of engagement have been examined. Working conditions can be grouped into two categories: job demands and job resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Bakker, Demerouti, de Boer, & Schaufeli, 2003; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). Health impairment (burnout) and motivation (engagement) are two psychological processes triggered by job demands and resources, respectively (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner et al., 2001; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). The health impairment process is an energy-depleting process by which employees’ energy resources are drained due to extreme job demands, whereas the availability of resources stimulates employee motivation (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). In the present study, potential correlates of work engagement and burnout that were examined include areas of worklife (workload, control, rewards, community, fairness, and values), perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and intent to remain.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this report is to provide the Oklahoma Center for Nonprofits and its stakeholders with the results of a questionnaire designed to assess work engagement views and attitudes of employees in relation to their organizations. Work-related variables were examined by means of frequency analyses, and correlation and regression analyses.

**Method**

**Procedure and Participants**

Employees from non-profit organizations were invited to participate in this study by reason of their association with the Oklahoma Center for Nonprofits. After approval from
the Oklahoma Center for Nonprofits, an email was sent to employees that described the purpose of the study and invited them to participate voluntarily. An electronic questionnaire that included demographic information and work-related questions was included in the email as a link. After accepting the informed consent, individuals were directed to a web-based questionnaire. Responses were collected electronically using ZIPSurvey, a secure web-based software. Completion of the questionnaire took approximately 30-40 minutes. The survey items and informed consent are included in Appendix A and B, respectively. The protocol for this study was approved by the university’s human subject review board. See Appendix C for the Institutional Review Board Approval.

A total of 98 individuals completed questionnaires. Demographic information was collected from participants including age, gender, marital status, race/ethnicity, education, and work status. Table 1 presents the demographic variables of participants. In addition, the mean age of employees was 47.18 years. The mean years worked for their organization and mean years worked in their present job was 3.51 years and 3.23 years, respectively.
Table 1

*Demographic Variables of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>86 (87.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>66 (67.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>12 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>3 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>15 (15.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>89 (90.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12\textsuperscript{th} grade</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS/GED</td>
<td>5 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>17 (17.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>33 (33.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>41 (41.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>86 (87.8%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>12 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N = 98**

**Instruments**

The instruments used in the first sample include a demographic questionnaire, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, the Maslach Burnout Inventory, the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support, Areas of Worklife Survey, and the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire. The following paragraphs describe each of the scales and presents psychometric properties of each of the scales (i.e. reliability and validity).

Reliability is defined as the extent to which a test *consistently* measures whatever it is measuring; therefore, the higher the reliability, the better (Gay & Airasian, 1992). Internal consistency reliability estimates ($\alpha$) are commonly used to measure reliability; while there is no set standard for an appropriate reliability, an estimate $\geq .70$ may be considered adequate for purposes of this study. Validity deals with the appropriateness of interpretations made from the test (Gay & Airasian, 1992); in other words, validity concerns extent to which the scale measures what it is *intended* to measure.

**Utrecht Work Engagement Scale**

Work engagement was assessed with the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). The 17-item self-report measure is grouped into three scales: 6
items measure vigor, 5 items measure dedication, and 6 items measure absorption. All items are presented in a 7-point Likert type response format ranging from 1-never to 7-always. Higher scores indicate stronger levels of engagement.

The UWES manual reported reliability estimates for vigor (α = .83), dedication, (α = .92) and absorption (α = .82) for a Dutch sample (N = 2,313) (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). The structural validity of UWES scores was evaluated by Schaufeli, Salanova et al. (2002) by means of confirmatory factor analysis. In a Spanish sample, results indicated that although subscales were correlated (mean r = .63. and .70), a three-factor structure fit the data well.

**Maslach Burnout Inventory**

The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996) is a 16-item instrument that measures the three dimensions of burnout including: exhaustion (5 items), cynicism (5 items), and professional efficacy (6 items). All items are presented in a 7-point Likert type response format ranging from 1-never to 7-everyday. Higher scores on exhaustion and cynicism and lower scores on professional efficacy indicate stronger levels of burnout.

Internal consistency reliability estimates for a sample of nurses ranged from .78 to .93 for subscales (Poghosyan, Aiken & Sloane, 2009). In addition, Poghosyan et al. found intercorrelations among subscales ranging from an absolute value of .25 to .60.

**Survey of Perceived Organizational Support**

The Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986) is an 8-item instrument which measures the extent to which their organization values their contributions and is concerned about their well-being. Items are
presented in a 7-point Likert type response format ranging from 1-\textit{strongly disagree} to 7-\textit{strongly agree}. Higher scores indicate higher levels of perceived organizational support.

Scores on the SPOS have been found to have an overall reliability of .93 with a mean item-total correlation of .75 (Worley, 2006)

\textit{Areas of Worklife Survey}

The Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS; Leiter & Maslach, 2004) is a 29-item instrument that measures six qualities including: workload (6 items), control (3 items), rewards (4 items), community (5 items), fairness (6 items), and values (5 items). Items are presented in a 5-point Likert type response format ranging from 1-\textit{strongly disagree} to 5-\textit{strongly agree}. Higher scores indicate higher levels of the particular quality.

Reliability estimates for UWES scores responses were reported with a normative sample (N = 8,609) of individuals from various occupations (i.e. public service/retail, post office, hospital, university, teachers). Internal consistency reliability estimates were .76 for workload, .69 for control, .82 for reward, .82 for community, .82 for fairness, and .72 for values (Centre for Organizational Research and Development, n.d. b).

\textit{Job Satisfaction and Intent to Remain}

Job satisfaction and intent to remain was measured with the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Kelshm, 1983). Three items are used to measure job satisfaction. Two items are used to measure intent to remain. Items are presented in a 5-point Likert type response format ranging from 1-\textit{strongly disagree} to 5-\textit{strongly agree}. Scores on the job satisfaction scale have been found to have an overall internal consistency reliability of .85 (Bowling & Hammond, 2008).
Design

The purpose of the present study was to examine levels of work engagement, burnout, perceived organizational support, areas of worklife, job satisfaction, and intent to remain among nonprofit employees. To begin, frequency analyses were computed to examine average responses of individuals for study variables. In addition, the relationship between work engagement and areas of worklife was investigated. Specifically, a forced-entry regression analysis was computed, regressing the work engagement total scale score on the six areas of worklife (workload, control, rewards, community, fairness, and values). Finally, the relationship between burnout and areas of worklife was examined. Again, a forced-entry regression analysis was computed, regressing the burnout total scale score on the six areas of worklife.

Results

Frequency Analyses

Frequency analyses and their interpretations are presented in Graphs 1-14.
Graph 1: Average Responses to Work Engagement Items

**Work Engagement - Vigor**

- Feel bursting with energy: 5.18
- Feel strong and vigorous: 5.09
- Feel like going to work: 5.3
- Can work for a long time: 5.78
- Very resilient, mentally: 5.37
- Always persevere: 5.8

Vigor is characterized by energy, mental resilience, the willingness to invest one’s effort, and persistence (Schaufeli, Salanova et al., 2002).

The preceding graph illustrates responses to vigor items on the work engagement scale. On average, employees *often* felt bursting with energy and strong and vigorous. Individuals also felt like going to work and could work for long periods of time *often*. Finally, employees responded on average that they persevere at work *often*.
**Graph 2: Average Responses to Work Engagement Items**

**Work Engagement - Dedication**

- Full of meaning and purpose: 5.68
- Enthusiastic about my job: 5.54
- My job inspires me: 5.28
- Proud of the work I do: 6.25
- My job is challenging: 5.42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Average Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 90
2009 Technical Report
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**Dedication** is characterized by “a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge” (Schaufeli, Salanova et al., 2002, p. 74).

The above graph illustrates average responses to **dedication** items on the work engagement scale. On average, employees felt that their work was full of meaning and purpose **often**.

Individuals were generally enthusiastic about their job and inspired by their job **often**.

Finally, employees responded on average that they were proud of the work they do **very often**.
Graph 3: Average Responses to Work Engagement Items

Work Engagement - Absoprtion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time flies when I'm working</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When working, I forget everything</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel happy when working intensely</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immerged in my work</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get carried away when working</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to detach from work</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absorption is characterized by being engrossed in one’s work, to the extent to which time passes quickly and it is difficult to detach oneself from work (Schaufeli, Salanova et al., 2002).

The above graph illustrates average responses to absorption items on the work engagement scale. On average, employees felt that time flies when they are working often. Individuals generally felt happy when they were working intensely often. Finally, employees responded on average that they get carried away when they were working sometimes.
Graph 4: Average Responses to Burnout Items

**Burnout - Exhaustion**

- *Feel emotionally drained from work*: Average response 3.9
- *Feel used up at end of day*: Average response 4.06
- *Feel tired when I get up*: Average response 3.6
- *Working all day is a strain*: Average response 2.99
- *Feel burned out from work*: Average response 3.11

**Exhaustion** is defined as being emotionally overextended and exhausted due to one’s work (Maslach et al., 1996).

The above graph illustrates average responses to exhaustion items on the burnout scale. On average, employees felt emotionally drained from their work once a month or less.

Individuals on average reported that they feel tired when they get up once a month or less.

Finally, employees responded on average that they feel burned out from work once a month or less.
Graph 5: Average Responses to Burnout Items

**Burnout - Cynicism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Become less interested in work</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become less enthusiastic about work</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to do job and not be bothered</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt the significance of work</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become more cynical about work</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 89  
2009 Technical Report  
Oklahoma Center for Nonprofits

**Cynicism** is defined as a distant or indifferent attitude toward one’s work (Maslach et al., 1996).

The above graph illustrates average responses to **cynicism** items on the burnout scale. On average, employees have become less interested and enthusiastic about their work *a few times a year or less*. Individuals on average reported that they just want to do their job and not be bothered *once a month or less*. Finally, employees responded on average that they doubt the significance of their work *a few times a year or less*. 
The above graph illustrates average responses to professional efficacy items on the burnout scale. On average, employees felt that they can effectively solve problems at work *a few times a week*. Individuals on average reported that they are good at their job and that they feel exhilarated when they accomplish something at work *a few times a week*. Finally, employees responded on average that they are effective at getting things done at work *a few times a week*.

**Professional Efficacy** is defined as feeling confident that one can be continually effective at work (Maslach et al., 1996).
The above graph illustrates average responses to perceived organizational support items. On average, employees *slightly agreed* that their organization cares about their well-being and considers their goals and values. In addition, respondents *slightly agreed* that help is available from their organization. Finally, employees responded on average that they *disagreed* that their organization would take advantage of them.

**Perceived Organizational Support** is when employees perceive that their organizations value their contributions and are concerned about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986).
Graph 8: Average Responses to Areas of Worklife Items

Areas of Worklife - Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Disagreed/Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>Hard to Decide</th>
<th>Agreed/Strongly Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't have time to do my work</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work intensely for long periods</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I come home tired from work</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have so much work to do</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have enough time to do what’s important</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave work behind when I go home</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Responding

N = 98
2009 Technical Report
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**Workload** is the amount of work an employee is expected to complete in a given time (Centre for Organizational Research and Development, n.d. a).

The above graph illustrates average responses to **workload** items on the areas of worklife scale. To begin, 33.7% employees disagreed and 52.8% employees agreed that they don’t have time to do their work. The majority (55.7%) of respondents agreed that they have enough times to do what’s important. Finally, 51.1% employees disagreed and 35.3% employees agreed that the leave work behind when they go home.
Graph 9: Average Responses to Areas of Worklife Items

**Areas of Worklife - Control**

- I have professional autonomy:
  - Disagreed/Strongly Disagreed: 9 (6.7%)
  - Hard to Decide: 10 (11.2%)
  - Agreed/Strongly Agreed: 84 (84.3%)

- I can influence management:
  - Disagreed/Strongly Disagreed: 10 (11.2%)
  - Hard to Decide: 1 (1.1%)
  - Agreed/Strongly Agreed: 78 (87.7%)

- I have control over how I do my work:
  - Disagreed/Strongly Disagreed: 10 (11.2%)
  - Hard to Decide: 1 (1.1%)
  - Agreed/Strongly Agreed: 81 (93.8%)

N = 89  
2009 Technical Report  
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*Control* is the opportunity to make decisions, solve problems, and fulfill responsibilities (Centre for Organizational Research and Development, n.d. a).

The above graph illustrates average responses to control items on the areas of worklife scale. Of all respondents, 84.3% agreed that they have professional autonomy. Also, 81.0% of employees agreed that they have control over how they do their work.
Graph 10: Average Responses to Areas of Worklife Items

**Areas of Worklife - Rewards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Worklife</th>
<th>Disagreed/Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>Hard to Decide</th>
<th>Agreed/Strongly Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receive recognition from others for work</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work is appreciated</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My efforts go unnoticed</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not get recognized for my contribution</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Responding

N = 88
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*Rewards* are the financial and social recognition for one’s contribution at work (Centre for Organizational Research and Development, n.d. a).

The above graph illustrates average responses to *reward* items on the areas of worklife scale. Of all employees who responded, 74.2% *agreed* that they receive recognition from other for their work. In addition, 66.3% *disagreed* that their efforts go unnoticed. Finally, 43.2% of respondents *disagreed* that they do not get recognized for their contribution while 20.4% indicated *hard to decide* and 36.4% indicated *agreement*. 
Graph 11: Average Responses to Areas of Worklife Items

**Areas of Worklife - Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagreed/Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>Hard to Decide</th>
<th>Agreed/Strongly Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People trust one another to fulfill their roles</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a member of a supportive work group</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of my work group cooperate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of my work group communicate</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t feel close to my colleagues</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.9 13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 87
2009 Technical Report
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*Community* is the quality of the social environment at work (Centre for Organizational Research and Development, n.d. a).

The above graph illustrates average responses to community items on the areas of worklife scale. To begin, 64% of respondents agreed that people trust one another to fulfill their roles. Also, 78.4% of employees responded agreed that members of their work group cooperate. Finally, 71.3% of respondents disagreed that they don’t feel close to their colleagues.
The above graph illustrates average responses to fairness items on the areas of worklife scale. Of all respondents, 60.2% agreed that resources are allocated fairly. In addition, 30.7% of employees indicated that they had a hard time deciding if there are effective appeal procedures while 44.3% agreed. Finally, 65.5% of respondents disagreed that it’s not what you know, but who you know while 19.6% had a hard time deciding and 14.9% agreed.
Graph 13: Average Responses to Areas of Worklife Items

Areas of Worklife - Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagreed/Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>Hard to Decide</th>
<th>Agreed/Strongly Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My values and the organization's are alike</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My personal career goals are consistent with organization's</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization is committed to equality</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working here forces me to compromise</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 87
2009 Technical Report
Oklahoma Center for Nonprofits

Values are those things that are important to organizations and their employees (Centre for Organizational Research and Development, n.d. a).

The above graph illustrates average responses to values items on the areas of worklife scale. To begin, 79.8% of respondents agreed that their values and the organization’s values are alike. Of all respondents, 86.2% disagreed that working at their organization forces them to compromise.
Graph 14: Average Responses to Areas of Job Satisfaction and Intent to Remain Items

**Job Satisfaction & Intent to Remain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagreed/Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>Hard to Decide</th>
<th>Agreed/Strongly Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like my job</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like working here</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will look for a new job in next year</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>15.9 21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often think about quitting</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 88  
2009 Technical Report  
Oklahoma Center for Nonprofits

**Job satisfaction** is the extent to which individuals enjoy their job. **Intent to remain** is the extent to which individuals expect to stay at their current job.

The above graph illustrates average responses to **job satisfaction** and **intent to remain** items. Of all respondents, 79.5% **agreed** that they are satisfied with their job. In addition, 87.5 of respondents **agreed** that they like working at their organization. Finally, 68.2% of respondents **disagreed** that they often think about quitting.
Regression Analyses

In addition, the relationships between work engagement, burnout, and the six areas of worklife were investigated. Bivariate relationships between work engagement, burnout, and areas of worklife were examined. Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and Pearson correlations of these study variables. Statistically significant correlations were present among work engagement and all areas of worklife variables except workload. In addition, correlations among burnout and areas of worklife were all statistically significant.

Table 2

Correlations of Work Engagement, Burnout, and Areas of Worklife Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Engagement</td>
<td>92.05</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Burnout</td>
<td>41.53</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>-.69**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Workload</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Control</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Rewards</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Community</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Fairness</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Values</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 84. *p < .05, **p < .01
A regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between areas of worklife and work engagement. Specifically, the work engagement total scale was regressed on the six areas of worklife including workload, control, rewards, community, fairness, and values (see Figure 1). The regression equation was significant \[ F(6, 71) = 9.894, p < .001 \] with the predictors accounting for 41% of variance in work engagement. Results indicate that workload (\( \beta = -.19; p < .05 \)), and values (\( \beta = .56; p < .001 \)) made a significant contribution.

Figure 1

*Diagram of the Areas of Worklife and Engagement Relationship*

*Note.* *p* < .05, **p** < .001
Essentially, this means that the areas of worklife, on the whole, were related to work engagement. And specifically, workload and values were the variables that made a statistically significant contribution. Workload was negatively related, meaning that lower levels of workload were present with higher levels of work engagement. Values was positively related to engagement, indicating that higher levels of each factor were found with higher levels of work engagement.

An additional regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between areas of worklife and burnout. Specifically, the burnout total scale was regressed on the six areas of worklife including workload, control, rewards, community, fairness, and values (see Figure 2). The regression equation was significant \[ F(6, 72) = 13.838, p < .001 \] with the predictors accounting for 49% of variance in work engagement. Results indicate that workload (\( \beta = -.22; p = .05 \)), control (\( \beta = -.23; p = .05 \)), and values (\( \beta = -.values; p < .01 \)) made a significant contribution.
In essence, this means that the areas of worklife, on the whole, were indeed related to burnout. And specifically, workload, control, and values were the variables that made a statistically significant contribution. All variables were negatively related to burnout. Thus, lower levels of each variable were present with higher levels of burnout.

Limitations

There are some study limitations that should be noted. The methodological design for the present study reflects a cross-sectional, nonrandom, survey design. Also, the sample
size was limited. It cannot be assumed that the 89 individuals who responded to the survey are representative of all employees associated with Oklahoma Center for Nonprofits. Finally, cause and effect conclusions cannot be made about the regression analyses.

Conclusions

Work engagement is an important construct as it relates to individuals’ well-being at the workplace. The current study provided descriptive information on the attitudes and beliefs of employees of Oklahoma Center for Nonprofits agencies in relation to their organizations. In regard to work engagement, frequency analyses indicate that on average, employees experienced **vigor at work** *often* and **dedication** *often* to *very often*. In addition, respondents on average experienced **absorption** *sometimes* to *often*. Concerning burnout variables, on average respondents experienced **exhaustion** *once a month or less* to *a few times a month*. Respondents indicated that on average they experienced **cynicism** *a few times a year or less* to *once a month or less*. On average, respondents felt a sense of **professional efficacy** *a few times a week*. In regard to **perceived organizational support**, on average respondents *agreed* that they felt valued by their organization.

On the subject of areas of worklife, each area will be addressed separately. To begin with **workload**, 33.7% disagreed and 52.8% agreed that they don’t have time to do their work. In addition, a similar percent also disagreed and agreed (44.9% and 38.2%) that they come home tired from work. Regarding **control**, most respondents agreed (78.7% to 843%) that they have control of their work. With **rewards**, most individuals (74.2% and 82%) agreed that they receive recognition and are appreciated for their work. Concerning **community**, a large majority (67.8% to 78.4%) agreed that their colleagues are supportive,
cooperative, and communicate well. Regarding **fairness**, the majority (60.2% and 57.5%) of respondents *agreed* that resources are allocated fairly, and that management treats all employees fairly. Interestingly, 28.4% of respondents found it *hard to decide* if opportunities are decided solely on merit. Finally, in regard to **values**, a large majority (70.5% to 79.8%) of respondents *agreed* that their values/goals are similar to the organizations.

Job satisfaction and intent to remain are the final descriptive variables of interest. On the topic of **job satisfaction**, a large majority (79.5% and 87.5%) of respondents *agreed* that they are satisfied with their job and like working in their organization. Concerning **intent to remain**, 68.2% of individuals *disagreed* that they often think about quitting.

In addition to descriptive information, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among work engagement and areas of worklife and among burnout and areas of worklife. Both regression equations were statistically significant. The variables that made a significant contribution to work engagement were workload and values. One can conclude that employees with higher levels of work engagement had lower levels of workload, and higher levels of values. In regard to burnout, the variables that made a significant contribution were workload, control and values. Thus, employees with higher levels of burnout had lower levels of workload, control and values.
References


Centre for Organizational Research and Development. (n.d. b). The areas of worklife survey: Measure description. Wolfville, NS, Canada: Acadia University.


burnout inventory: An analysis of data from large scale cross-sectional surveys of nurses from eight countries. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 46*, 894-902.


Appendix A

Survey Items
Work Engagement Survey for Non-Profit Organizations

The purpose of this survey is to assess views and attitudes related to your organization. The information provided will be used to improve the organization. All responses will remain anonymous. There is no obligation to answer any of the questions. Please read each item and select the best response that reflects your answer.

What is your gender?  ○ Female  ○ Male

What is your age? ________

What is your work status?  ○ Full-time  ○ Part-time

What is your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)
○ White  ○ Asian
○ Black/African American  ○ Hispanic/Latino
○ American Indian  ○ Other

What is your marital status?
○ Married  ○ Single
○ Divorced  ○ Widowed
○ Separated

What is your educational background?
○ Less than 12th grade  ○ Some College
○ HS/GED  ○ College Graduate
○ Vocational School  ○ Post Graduate

Utrecht Work Engagement Scale

The following 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, choose the "never" statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you felt it by choosing the statement that best describes how frequently you feel that way.
1 – Never
2 – Almost Never
3 – Rarely
4 – Sometimes
5 – Often
6 – Very Often
7 – Always

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.
2. I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose.
3. Time flies when I’m working.
4. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.
5. I am enthusiastic about my job.
6. When I am working, I forget everything else around me.
7. My job inspires me.
8. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.
9. I feel happy when I am working intensely.
10. I am proud of the work that I do.
11. I am immersed in my work.
12. I can continue working for very long periods at a time.
13. To me, my job is challenging.
14. I get carried away when I’m working.
15. At my job, I am very resilient, mentally.
16. It is difficult to detach myself from my job.
17. At my work, I always persevere, even when things do not go well.

Maslach Burnout Inventory

The following statements are about job-related feelings. Indicate the extent to which you have had this feeling by choosing the number that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

1 – Never
2 – A few times a year or less
3 – Once a month or less
4 – A few times a month
5 – Once a week
6 – A few times a week
7 – Everyday

1. I feel emotionally drained from my work.
2. I feel used up at the end of the workday.
3. I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
4. Working all day is really a strain for me.
5. I can effectively solve the problems that arise in my work.
6. I feel burned out from my work.
7. I feel I am making an effective contribution to what this organization does.
8. I have become less interested in my work since I started this job.
9. I have become less enthusiastic about my work.
10. In my opinion, I am good at my job.
11. I feel exhilarated when I accomplish something at work.
12. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.
13. I just want to do my job and not be bothered.
14. I have become more cynical about whether my work contributes anything.
15. I doubt the significance of my work.
16. At my work, I feel confident that I am effective at getting things done.

**Survey of Perceived Organizational Support**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements below.

1 – Strongly Disagree
2 – Moderately Disagree
3 – Slightly Disagree
4 – Neither Agree or Disagree
5 – Slightly Agree
6 – Moderately Agree
7 – Strongly Agree

1. My organization cares about my opinions.
2. My organization really cares about my well-being.
3. My organization strongly considers my goals and values.
4. Help is available from my organization when I have a problem.
5. My organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part.
6. If given the opportunity, my organization would take advantage of me.
7. My organization shows very little concern for me.
8. My organization is willing to help me if I need a special favor.

**Areas of Worklife**
Please use the following rating scale to indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

1 – Strongly Agree
2 – Disagree
3 – Hard to Decide
4 – Agree
5 – Strongly Agree

**Workload**
1. I do not have time to do the work that must be done.
2. I work intensely for prolonged periods of time.
3. After work I come home too tired to do the things I like to do.
4. I have so much work to do on the job that it takes me away from my personal interests.
5. I have enough time to do what’s important.
6. I leave my work behind when I go home at the end of the workday.

**Control**
1. I have control over how I do my work.
2. I can influence management to obtain the equipment and space I need for my work
3. I have professional autonomy/independence in my work.

**Rewards**
1. I receive recognition from others in my work.
2. My work is appreciated.
3. My efforts usually go unnoticed.
4. I do not get recognized for all the things I contribute.

**Community**
1. People trust one another to fulfill their roles.
2. I am a member of a supportive work group.
3. Members of my work group concentrate with one another.
4. Members of my work group communicate openly.
5. I don’t feel close to my colleagues.

**Fairness**
1. Resources are allocated fairly here.
2. Opportunities are decided solely on merit.
3. There are effective appeal procedures available when I question the fairness of a decision.
4. Management treats all employees fairly.
5. Favoritism determines how decisions are made at work.
6. It’s not what you know but who you know that determines a career here.
Values
1. My values and the organization’s values are alike.
2. The organization’s goals are consistent with the organization’s stated goals.
3. My personal career goals are consistent with the organization’s stated goals.
4. This organization is committed to quality.
5. Working here forces me to compromise my values.

Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire

Please use the following rating scale to indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

1 – Strongly Agree
2 – Disagree
3 – Hard to Decide
4 – Agree
5 – Strongly Agree

Job Satisfaction
1. All in all, I am satisfied with my job.
2. In general, I don’t like my job.
3. In general, I like working here.

Turnover Intention
1. I will probably look for a new job in the next year.
2. I often think about quitting.
Appendix B

Informed Consent
Work Engagement Survey for Non-Profits

My name is Evie Muilenburg-Trevino, and I am a research specialist in the Center of Applied Research for Non-Profit Organizations at the University of the Oklahoma, Tulsa; in addition, I am a graduate student at Oklahoma State University and this study is being conducted as part of my dissertation. I am requesting that you volunteer to participate in a research study titled Work Engagement: A Psychometric Study. You were selected as a possible participant because of your employment with a non-profit organization. Please read this information sheet and contact me to ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to take part in this study.

Purpose of the Research Study: The purpose of this study is to assess your views and attitudes related to your organization. The information provided will be used to improve your organization.

Procedures: You will be informed about the study and invited to participate. If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete an online survey which will require between 30-40 minutes of your time. Topics on the survey include a brief demographic section and attitudes about your organization.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study: There are no risks or benefits associated with participating in this study which are greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life.

Compensation: You will not be compensated for your time and participation in this study.

Voluntary Nature of the Study: Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not result in penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to participate, you are free not to answer any question or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Length of Participation: Completion of the questionnaire should require between 30-40 minutes.

Confidentiality: All information will be anonymous since no names or identifying information will be collected. The records of this study will be kept private and your supervisor will not have access to your responses. In published reports, there will be no information included that will make it possible to identify you as a research participant. Research records will be stored securely on a password protected computer. Resulting data will be kept for five years and stored in a locked area. Only approved researchers will have access to the records.

Contacts and Questions: If you have concerns or complaints about the research, contact Evie Muilenburg-Trevino at (918) 660-3473, emtrevino@ou.edu or Dale Fuqua, Ph.D. at 444 Willard Hall, OSU, (405) 744-9443, dr.fuqua@okstate.edu. In the event of a research-related injury, contact the researcher. You are encouraged to contact the researcher if you have any questions. If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about the research and wish to talk to someone other than the individuals on the research team, or if you cannot reach the research team, you may contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at (405) 325-8110 or irb@ou.edu or you may contact the Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board, Dr. Shelia Kennison, IRB Chair, 219 Cordell North, Stillwater, OK 74078, 405-744-1676 or irb@okstate.edu.

Please keep this information sheet for your records. By completing this questionnaire, I am agreeing to participate in this study.
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Institutional Review Board Approval
December 17, 2008

Eve Muilenburg-Trevino
Schusteran Center
4502 East 41st Street 1C10
Tulsa, OK 74135

Dear Ms. Muilenburg-Trevino:

RE: Work Engagement: A Psychometric Study

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I have reviewed the above-referenced research project and determined that it meets the criteria in 45 CFR 46, as amended, for exemption from IRB review. You may proceed with the research as proposed. Please note that any changes in the protocol will need to be submitted to the IRB for review as changes could affect this determination of exempt status. Also note that you should notify the IRB office when this project is completed, so we can remove it from our files.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to call the IRB office at (405) 325-8110 or send an email to irb@cu.edu.

Cordially,

Lynn Davenport, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board
Center of Applied Research
for Non-Profit Organizations