International Academic Institute for Science and Technology

International Academic Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management
Vol. 2, No. 2, 2015, pp. 7-20.

ISSN 2454-2210

International Academic Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management

www.iaiest.com

Effects of Core Self-Evaluations and Psychological Climate on Work Engagement (Case Study: Hotel Employees Khuzestan.)

Razieh Safavi[a], Fereydoun omidi[b]

[a] *Department of Business Management, Persian Gulf International - Khorramshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Khorramshahr, Iran.*

[b] *Department of Business Management, Persian Gulf International - Khorramshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Khorramshahr, Iran.*

Abstract

Work engagement has received a great deal of attention in the last decade in the popular business press and among consulting firms and the practitioner community. As today's business strives for perfection in delivering products and services in an environment of immense competition and dynamic changes, work engagement has increasingly engaged the interest of both academics and practitioners. In particular, this study provided theory-based empirical evidence regarding whether employee evaluations of self (i.e., core self-evaluations) and perceptions of organizational environment (i.e., psychological climate) affect work engagement.

To test the hypotheses, data were collected from 394 hotel employees and managers in Khuzestan using a questionnaire. The proposed relationships were examined using hierarchical multiple regression.

Results of hypothesis testing showed that core self-evaluations and three components of psychological climate (managerial support for service, interdepartmental service, and information sharing and communication) positively influence work engagement. Given that work engagement is an important current issue for hospitality companies, the findings should provide the hotel industry with a more complete picture of how work engagement is associated with its antecedents. A discussion of managerial implications is included along with theoretical implications of the findings, an evaluation of research limitations, and directions for future research.

Keywords: Work engagement, Core self-evaluations, Psychological climate.

1. Introduction

Today, organizations are faced with an increasingly competitive and rapidly changing business environment. Globalization and rapid advances in communications and information technology emerging in the last twenty years have led to a substantial increase in competition among companies. Contemporary consumers have also changed consumption behaviors. They demand higher quality, reliability, variety, customization, speed, and convenience on the goods and services they purchase. They also push companies for new performance standards as they have more choices in goods and services and shrinking disposable income, and they change their needs and wants quickly. Always customer-focused organizational structure, customer recognition and diagnosis of customer needs is a top priority. Hospitality companies are concerned that the customer is a customer-focused organizations. customer-focused organizations are organization that work to look for win-win. This means that when one enters a hotel hotelier believes that it should be enough to pay the money that must be submitted to serve him. In the vortex of this hyper-aggressive business environment, new philosophies and new strategies have emerged to help organizations produce more with fewer resource. As today's business strives for perfection in delivering products and services in an environment of immense competition and dynamic changes, To this end, more and more prudent operators have realized that retaining intellectual capital has become an important source of competitive advantage as the vitality, sustainability, and profitability of organizations depend on essential employee qualities like competence, commitment, and contribution. Growing deficits and soaring costs due to the recent global economic downturn have also spurred today's organizations to compete by cutting prices and costs. Refining business processes, delayering management structures, and downsizing the number of employees have become common practices (Aburdene et al. 2005). hotel companies face increasing pressure to do more with fewer resources, necessitating innovative operational practices and strategies aligned with rapidly changing customer demands. The contemporary business environment requires more and more companies cut prices and costs by redesigning business processes, simplifying organization structures, and reducing the number of employees to try to do more with fewer resources. In the hospitality industry, providing quality products and services cannot be replaced by machines, so hospitality employees are the main actors in delivering service quality.Thus, employee attitudes and behaviors are critical to the quality of the product that hospitality firms sell to the customers, and accordingly, tremendously influence customer satisfaction. As a result, the concept of work engagement has gained a considerable recognition from many contemporary human resource and management professionals as one of the most prominent, critical drivers for business success today. Work engagement refers to the positive, affective psychological work-related state of mind that leads employees to actively invest themselves emotionally, cognitively, and physically in their work (Schaufeli et al., 2002).. Since the early 2000s, when the recent economic recession began, work engagement has become a critical driver for organizational success in a competitive business environment. Due to its possible links to an extensive range of individual and business outcomes like financial performance, productivity, retention, and even shareholder return, work engagement has gained a tremendous impetus among industry practitioners. According to research by the Corporate Executive Board (2004), for example, a 10% increase in work engagement can increase an employee's effort level by 6%, which may in turn increase an employee's performance by 2%. The research also showed that this 10% improvement in engagement can decrease an employee's probability of withdrawal by 9%; engaged employees are 87% less likely to leave a company. Engagement becomes a real concern for most organizations because surveys indicate that few employees, between 17 percent and 29 percent are highly engaged by their work. Caterpillar set out to increase work engagement and concluded that its initiative resulted in an 80 percent drop in grievances and a 34 percent increase in highly satisfied customers. Highly engaged employees have a passion for their work and feel a deep connection to their company; disengaged employees have essentially "checked out"-putting time but not energy or attention into their

work. Because of some of these promising findings, work engagement has attracted quite a following in many business organizations and management consulting firms. However, the concept is relatively new, While work engagement has become popular in practitioner research because of its positive association with many benefits, it is still an emerging concept in academic organizational behavior research (Karatepe and Demir, 2014). Core self-evaluations refers to fundamental assumptions that individuals hold about their worthiness, functionality, and capability (Judge et l.,1997).Psychological climate refers to an individual's own interpretations of organizational practices and procedure (James and Tetrick, 1986). Research indicates that these two concepts are positively associated with employee engagement. For example, employees with positive Core self-evaluations feel energetic and enthusiastic about their work (Karatepe et al.,2010). Also, positive Psychological climate motivates employees to enhance their willingness to dedicate themselves to their work. Given that being enthusiastic about work and investing in work roles are important components of work engagement, it seems intuitive that hospitality employees' Core self-evaluations and Psychological climate should be important drivers of work engagement. For example, in constant, demanding, high-level interactions with customers, positive self-appraisals of capability, effectiveness, and worthiness may be a critical source of service-oriented attitudes and behaviors. Thus, employee attitudes and behaviors are critical to the quality of the product that hospitality firms sell to the customers, and accordingly, tremendously influence customer satisfaction. Excellent service provided by engaged employees should help create a sustainable competitive advantage in the dynamic, service-oriented business environment of hospitality.
Given the foregoing, the main research question is raised: Are Core self-evaluations and Psychological climate among hotel employees has a positive effect on work engagement?

1. Literature review

1.1. Work Engagement

A review of literature indicates that work engagement has been conceptualized in three different ways. Kahn's conceptual work was the first to provide a foundation for the theoretical development of work engagement. According to Kahn (1990), personal engagement is "the harnessing of organization members" selves to their roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performance". Kahn (1990) further suggested that, "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 (physical, cognitive, and emotional), and active, full role performances". In contrast, Kahn (1990) defined disengagement as "the uncoupling of selves from work roles" and described a disengaged person as those who "withdraw and defend themselves physically, cognitively, or emotionally during role performances" (Kahn, 1990, p. 694). Thus, disengaged employees become physically uninvolved in their job, cognitively unvigilant, and emotionally detached from co-workers or managers. Taken together, engagement at work is the degree of physical, cognitive, and emotional involvement in a work role, how much a worker puts into a job and work interactions, and the personal connections with work and co-workers (Ferrer, 2005). Therefore, employees who exhibit engagement are physically involved in their tasks, are cognitively alert and attentive, and are emotionally connected to their work and to others in the workplace. Rothbard (2001) extended Kahn's (1990) work and provided an alternative view. Rothbard (2001) added two critical components to Kahn's conceptualization of engagement:attention and absorption. Attention refers to the "cognitive availability and the amount of time one spends thinking about a role" whereas absorption concerns "being engrossed in a role and refers to the intensity of one"s focus on a role" (Rothbard, 2001, p. 656). Consequently, work engagement was defined as psychological presence in a particular work role that involves attention and absorption . The second approach to the concept of engagement was led by burnout researchers, Maslach and Leiter (1997) and Maslach et al. (2001), who conceptualized engagement as the opposite of or the positive antithesis to the three burnout dimensions: exhaustion,

cynicism, and sense of inefficacy. Thus, burnout becomes "an erosion of engagement with the job, and engagement can be measured using scores on the burnout measurement scale called the Maslach Burnout Index (MBI). Low scores on exhaustion and cynicism and high scores on efficacy on the MBI indicate each of the three characteristics of job engagement: energy, involvement, and efficacy (Maslach et al., 2001).Thus, an engaged employee is energetic and positively connected with work activities and can handle the demands of the job .However, although burnout research developed an operational definition of engagement, assuming that burnout and engagement are situated on the opposite poles of a continuum may not be acceptable, and using a single instrument (i.e., the MBI) to cover the two opposite concepts has been questioned in other research (Schaufeli et al.,2004).Schaufeli et al., (2002) provided a third approach for work engagement, providing a different perspective to the engagement-burnout continuum theory. They defined engagement as a "positive, fulfilling, work related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. They also distinguished engagement from other employee-role-related constructs; engagement is a more "persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior", instead of a "momentary and specific state. Vigor, as the opposite concept of exhaustion in burnout, refers to "high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest efforts in one's work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties. Dedication involves "a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge" and thus is the opposite dimension of cynicism . Finally, absorption refers to "being fully concentrated and deeply engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work. Unlike vigor and dedication, absorption was newly identified as a distinct element of engagement and accordingly, should not be considered a contrasting concept of the burnout dimension of inefficacy . Therefore, Schaufeli et al. (2002) asserted that job engagement and burnout were independent states of mind inversely related to each other. This dissertation adopts Schaufeli, Taris, Le Blanc, Peeters, Bakker, & De Jonge's (2001) conceptualization as a definition of engagement for three reasons; (1) Kahn (1990) did not develop an operational definition of employee engagement even though he provided a conceptual basis for it; (2) burnout research uses an engagement-burnout continuum theory that implies a complementary relationship between engagement and burnout, not an independent relationship (e.g., Maslach et al., 1997); and (3) Schaufeli et al."s (2001) definition and measure of engagement (i.e., Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: UWES, Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) are cited and used most frequently in contemporary engagement literature and research (Bakker et al., 2008). Therefore, in this study, work engagement is defined as "a fulfilling work-related state of mind characterized by feelings of vigor, dedication, and absorption"; engagement includes persistent cognitive and affective states while working, high level of involvement and devotion to work, and immersion in work activities (Schaufeli et al.,2003).

1.2. Core Self-Evaluations

Core self-evaluation is defined as "basic conclusions or bottom-line evaluations that individuals hold about themselves" (Judge & Bono, 2001, p. 80). It is a basic, fundamental assumption that people hold about their worthiness, functionality, and capability as a person in their environment (Judge et al., 2004). Core self-evaluation is a higher order construct that comprises four specific traits: self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability/neuroticism .

1.3. Psychological Climate

Psychological climate is an individual's perceptions or interpretations of organizational environments including structures, processes, and events. It pertains to the degree to which an individual feels that the environment is psychologically meaningful and safe enough to influence motivational, affective, and attitudinal reactions.

In the organizational behavior literature, climate has been defined as a perceived set of attributes specific to a particular organization (Campbell et al., 1970). Based on this definition of climate, scholars have conceptualized definitions of climate in an organization in two ways: the collective perception approach and the individual perception approach. The former conceptualizes climate in an organization as *shared* perceptions among members of an organization about organizational environments including policies, procedures, and practices(Reichers et al., 1990); it is operationalized principally through aggregating individuals‟ perceptions of their work environment (e.g., Kozlowski & Klein, 2000; Parker, Baltes, Young, Huff, Altmann, 2003). Unlike the collective perception called organizational climate, others emphasize the individual perceptions of the work environment (e.g., Baltes et al., 2001). This individual perception approach has operationalized climate in an organization as *individual* perceptions about organizational environments that are psychologically significant or meaningful to oneself (Brown & Leigh, 1996). Thus, this type of climate, called the psychological climate. Psychological climate is an individual's perceptions or interpretations of organizational environments including structures, processes, and events. It pertains to the degree to which an individual feels that the environment is psychologically meaningful and safe enough to influence motivational, affective, and attitudinal reactions. Psychological climate is a multidimensional construct, and prior research has found various dimensions of the construct (James & James, 1989; Koys & DeCotiis, 1991). However, research still does not agree on the specific dimensions within the construct because not all dimensions of psychological climate are equally potent for different types and characteristics of job, role, work group, and/or organization (Martin, Jones, & Callan, 2005; Parker et al., 2003; Schneider, 1975). Even though psychological climate studies have included individual employees‟ perceptions of virtually every aspect of their work environment, a different organizational context changes particular dimensions (Manning et al., 2004). Given this, the present study used three dimensions from hospitality research to reflect hospitality work and organization. The dimensions of psychological climate included in this study were management's support for service, internal service, and information and communication (Amenumey & Lockwood, 2008).

2. Hypotheses

In study, 6 hypotheses were proposed which contains 3 main hypothesis and hypothesis 2 to 3 sub-hypothesis(a-c) divided.

3.1. The main hypothesis:

H1: Employees' core self-evaluations are positively effect to their engagement.
H2: Employees' psychological climate is positively related to their engagement.
H3: Employees' psychological climate moderates the relationship between core self-evaluations and work engagement.

3.2. Sub-hypothesis:

H2a: Employees' perception of the management's support for service is positively effect to their engagement.
H2b: Employees' perception of the other departments 'internal service provision is positively effect to their engagement.
H2c: Employees' perception of the information sharing and communication among departments is positively effect to their engagement.

3. Methodology

The population for this study was employees and managers from hotels in Khuzestan. However, using the Cochrans C test and After the pretest, and given limited accessibility to the population, as well as limited financial resources and time, this study used 394 hotel employees selected from a convenience sampling.

The sample of this study consisted of entry-level employees, supervisors, and managers from the four areas of hotel operations in Khuzestan: rooms (e.g., front office, housekeeping, reservations, and engineering), food and beverage (e.g., restaurants, room service, and convention and catering), sales and marketing, and administration (e.g., human resources and accounting). A total of 410 responses was collected, but 16 incomplete responses were removed for incomplete responses. Thus, 394 responses were used for analysis. The reliability of the construct items was evaluated using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. Cronbach's coefficient alpha of all the constructs in the study ranged from .82 to .96. All of the reliability exceeded the conventional recommended cut-off of .70 (Nunnally, 1978). Table 4.1 presents the results.

Table 4.1. Cronbach's coefficient alpha of all the constructs.

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha
work Engagement	.94
Core Self-Evaluations	.82
Psychological Climate	.93

Also, Of the 394 employees and managers who participated in the study, 64.4% (n = 250) were female. Approximately half (n = 196) of the respondents were between 20 and 29 years old, and
23.2% (n = 94) were between 30 and 39. More than half of the respondents had completed a 4-year college degree (55.1%, n = 213), followed by 2-year college graduates (22.6%, n = 90). For job tenure, 57.9% (n = 228) of the respondents had been working in the hospitality industry less than one year whereas 42.1% (n = 165) had been employed more than three years. Most respondents (86.1%, n = 336) were full time employees. Of the respondents, 66.1% worked in the front office (41.4%, n = 160), and food and beverage department (18.0%, n = 75), followed by sales (27.6%, n = 105), and the administrative departments (6.5%, n = 25). Line employees comprised 56.1% (n = 224) of respondents while the rest were managers (43.9%, n = 170). Table 4.2 summarizes the demographic profile of the survey respondents in this study.

Table 4.2. Demographic Profile of Survey Respondents.

Sample Characteristics	Frequency (n = 394)	Percent (%)
Gender		
Male	144	35.6
Female	250	64.4
Age		
20 or less	7	1.2
20 – 29	196	50.2
30 – 39	94	23.2
40 – 49	50	13.0
50 or older	47	12.4

Level of Education		
High school	71	18.3
2-year college	90	22.6
4-year college/university	213	55.1
Post graduate	20	4.0
Job Tenure		
1 year or less	94	23.8
1 – 3 years	134	34.1
3 – 5 years	74	18.9
5 years or more	91	23.2
Employment Status		
Full time	336	86.1
Part time	58	13.9
Department		
Front Office	160	41.4
F&B	75	18.0
Housekeeping	29	6.5
Sales	105	27.6
Administration	25	6.5
Position		
Line Employee/assistant manager	224	56.1
Manager	170	43.9

in the second step, principal components analysis (PCA), using SPSS 20, PCA, a procedure for analyzing interdependent correlations among a large number of items and then explaining these variables in terms of their common underlying dimensions or factors, was performed (1) to search for items that are highly correlated with one another, (2) to extract those items and classify them into several smaller sets of factors, and (3) to evaluate the accuracy of classification (Hair et al., 2010). The varimax orthogonal rotation approach was used to provide simple factor structure for each data set.Then, a series of confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) via AMOS 20 was performed to evaluate the psychometric properties of the measures for convergent and discriminant validity.a confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) was conducted for the construct of work engagement because, in previous research, the construct has been used as both a higher-order construct and multidimensional first-order construct. Accordingly, the goodness-of-fit of work engagement was tested compared with alternative models. Specifically, (1) a one-factor model of employee engagement with all items loading into one latent factor, (2) a first-order three-factor model comprising three latent variables (i.e., vigor, dedication, and absorption), (3) a second-order three-factor model comprising three latent variables were estimated for goodness-of-fit.
Table 4.3 reports the comparisons of overall fit indices for alternative measurement models of work engagement.

Table 4.3 Overall Fit Indices for Alternative Models of the Work Engagement Construct.

Model Element	First-order one-factor model	First-order three-factor model	Second-order three-factor mode
Model fit			
χ2	49.26	87.61	81.42
df	21	23	22
χ2/df	2.35	3.81	3.70
RMSEA	.06	.08	.08
CFI	.99	.98	.98
NFI	.98	.97	.97
TLI	.98	.96	.97

Note: *χ2* = chi-square; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; CFI= comparative fit index; NFI = normed fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index

Then, convergent and discriminant validity were examined among all variables via Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to assess the fit of our data to a measurement model. The results of Confirmatory factor analysis suggested a good fit of the proposed initial measurement model to the data based on the following fit statistics Statistics (RMSEA = .055, RMR = .130, CFI = .93, TLI = .92, $\chi 2$ (500) = 979.19,$p < .001$, $\chi 2/df = 1.96$).

However, the modification indices reported that two measurement items of Core Self-Evaluations showed relatively low standardized factor loading (<.50) and significant cross-loading; thus, the two Core Self-Evaluations (CSE) items were deleted. By dropping those items, the final measurement model test presented a substantially improved goodness of fit with the data (RMSEA = .053, RMR = .090, CFI = .96,TLI = .94, $\chi 2$ (326) = 612.82, $p < .001$, $\chi 2/df = 1.89$). The measurement items showed significant loadings at the alpha level of .001, indicating that the observable indicators loaded significantly on their respective latent variables. These results provided evidence of convergent validity (Anderson et al., 1988).Table 4.4 reports the standardized loadings of manifest variables.

Composite reliability and Cronbach's ¸ of each constructs ranged from .84 to .93 and from .82 to .94, respectively, exceeding the conventional cut-off value of .70 (Bagozzi et al., 1988). Thus, the measures in this study all consistently indicated its internal consistency. The average variance extracted estimates should be greater than the squared correlation estimates to show discriminant validity. The assessment showed that the condition was met demonstrating each construct in this study is distinct from the other constructs.

The average variance extracted(AVE) estimates of all constructs were higher than the suggested value of .50, demonstrating more than half of variances in constructs are explained by their corresponding measures (Fornell et al., 1981). Discriminant validity was assessed by comparing the average variance

extracted (AVE) values for two constructs with the square of the correlation estimate between the paired constructs .

Table 4.5 presents the descriptive statistics, reliabilities, correlations, squared correlations, and average variance extracted for all the constructs in this study.

Table 4.4.Confirmatory factor analysis: Items and standardized factor loadings.

Construct and scale items	Standardized loading
Work Engagement	
At my work, I feel energetic.	.782
At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.	.761
When I get up in the morning, I look forward to going to work.	.885
My job inspires me.	.883
I am enthusiastic about my job.	.897
I am proud of the work that I do.	.792
I feel happy when I am working intensely.	.644
I am engrossed in my work.	.725
Time flies when I am working.	.678
Core Self-Evaluations	
I am confident I get the success I deserve in life.	.720
Sometimes I feel depressed. (Ra)	-.860
When I try, I generally succeed.	.800
I complete tasks successfully.	.890
Overall, I am satisfied with myself.	.910
I am filled with doubts about my competence. (Ra)	-.820
I determine what will happen in my life.	.580
I do not feel in control of my success in my career. (Ra)	-.660
I am capable of coping with most of my problems.	.700
There are times when things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me. (Ra)	-.590
Psychological Climate: Customer Orientation of the Management	
My organization does a good job keeping customers informed of changes that affect them.	.730
Top management in my organization commits resources to maintaining and improving the quality of our work.	.920
Top management in my organization has a plan to improve the quality of our work and service.	.950
Psychological Climate: Managerial Support	
Managers in my organization are very committed to improving the quality of my work.	.900
Managers in my organization recognize and appreciate high quality work and service.	.820
Managers in my organization remove obstacles which prevent me from producing high quality work and service.	.790
Psychological Climate: Internal Service	
Other departments provide quality service to your unit.	.930
Other departments provide speedy service to your unit.	.940

Other departments keep commitment they make.	.840
Psychological Climate: Information and Communication	
People in my work unit/team/department are adequately trained to handle the introduction of new products and services.	.731
I have access to strategic information I need to do my job well.	.840
I understand management's vision of the organization.	.840
My work unit/team/department asks our customers to evaluate the quality of our work and service.	.830

Note: All factor loadings were significant at $p < .001$.
[a] Reverse coded.

Table 4.5. Descriptive statistics, reliabilities, correlations, squared correlations, Cronbach's Alpha, composite reliabilities, and AVEs of all variables.

	Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.	Gender	1.00	-.06[a]	−.06	−.04	-.09	.01	-.13	−.09	−.02	-.05	−.02	.00	−.06
2.	Age		1.00	−.08	.37**	.30**	-.23**	.35**	.23**	.13*	.05	-.06	−.01	.08
3.	Education			1.00	.16**	.09	-.21**	.28**	−.09	.01	-.20	-.06	−.04	.00
4.	Industry tenure				1.00	.49**	-.27**	.38**	.09	.07	-.03	-.12	-.08	−.04
5.	Organizational tenure					1.00	-.21**	.27**	.04	-.06	.05	−.05	−.14	.03
6.	Employment status						1.00	-.36**	.07	-.06	.06	-.13*	.09	.03
7.	Job position							1.00	.15*	.04	-.03	-.05	.05	-.04
8.	ENG								1.00	.46**	.53**	.57**	.47**	.09
9.	CSE								.22[b]	1.00	.42**	.40**	.31**	.57**
10.	PSC−CO								.28	.16	1.00	.82**	.54**	.47**
11.	PSC-MS								.33	.16	.68	1.00	.61**	.67**
12.	PSC-IS								.21	.09	.29	.36	1.00	.67**
13.	PSC-IC								.34	.22	.44	.45	.29	.54**
Mean		1.67	2.86	3.46	4.93	3.36	1.16	2.48	5.56	5.32	5.31	5.23	5.12	1.00
Standard Deviation		.49	1.06	.85	1.61	1.92	.36	1.26	.94	.73	1.37	1.39	1.24	1.06
Cronbach's Alpha									.94	.82	.89	.87	.93	.74
Composite reliability									.92	.93	.88	.87	.93	.84
AVE									.57	.58	.72	.69	.82	.64

Note: Age, education, and job position were measured using 5-point scales. Industry tenure and organizational tenure were measured via 6-point scales. Gender was coded as a binary variable (1 = male and 2 = female). Employment status was also coded as a binary variable (1 = full time and 2 = part time).

ENG = work engagement; CSE = core self-evaluations; PSC-CO = psychological climate (customer orientation of the management); PSC-MS = psychological climate (man-agerial support); PSC-IS = psychological climate (internal service); PSC-IC = psychological climate information and communication); AVE = average variance extracted.

*** $p < .001$.

*$p < .05$.

**$p < .01$

[a] Correlation estimates among constructs are above the diagonal.

[b] Squared correlations are below the diagonal.

4. Major Findings

In study investigated predictors of employee engagement, more specifically, how employees‟ perceptions of the self and work environment affect their engagement in the job.

In study, 6 hypotheses were proposed which contains 3 main hypothesis and hypothesis 2 to 3 sub-hypothesis(a-c) divided. To test the hypothesized relationships, hierarchical multiple regression was conducted.

Results of hierarchical regression analyses showed that core self-evaluations were found to have a significant relationship with employee engagement. All three psychological dimensions (i.e., managerial support for service, interdepartmental service, and team communication) were found significantly, positively associated with work engagement.

However, none of the interaction terms between core self-evaluations and psychological dimensions was found to have significant interaction effect with core self-evaluations on work engagement. Table 5.1 summarizes the results of hypothesis test in Study.

Table 5.1 summarizes the results of hypothesis test in Study.

	Hypothesis	Result
H1	Employees‟ core self-evaluations are positively effect to their engagement.	Significant
H2	Psychological climate is positively effect to their engagement.	Significant
H2a	Employees' perception of the management's support for service is positively effect to their engagement.	Significant
H2b	Employees' perception of the other departments 'internal service provision is positively effect to their engagement.	Significant
H2c	Employees' perception of the information sharing and communication among departments is positively effect to their engagement.	Significant
H3	Employees‟ psychological climate moderates the relationship between core self-evaluations and work engagement.	Non-significant

5. Conclusions

5.1. Relationship between Core Self-Evaluations and work Engagement

Core self-evaluation was significantly associated with work engagement. This finding supports Kahn's (1991) three psychological condition theory, which posits that employees show engagement when they are assured of psychological meaningfulness, safety, and availability in performing their jobs or roles.

5.2. Relationship between Psychological Climate and work Engagement

Employee psychological climate is an also significant predictor of engagement. In particular, employee perceptions of managerial support for service, interdepartmental service, and team communication had a positive influence on engagement. This finding supports the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, which posits that favorable organizational work environment may function as a job resource that mitigates job demands and motivates employees, enhancing their willingness to dedicate themselves to their job (Demerouti, et al., 2001).Therefore, hotel employees who believe their management is committed to providing customers with quality service or provides good support for employees performing service are more likely to become engaged in their jobs. Hotel employees are also likely to engage in their jobs and roles when they have smooth, systematic delivery of internal service and harmonious communication among employees in and across teams and departments.

5.3. Interaction Effect of Core Self-Evaluations and Psychological Climate on Work Engagement

Because the interaction effects of core self-evaluations and psychological climate had no significant effect on work engagement, positive perceptions of work environment may not necessarily increase core self-evaluation and thus the level of engagement even if employees with positive core self-evaluation work in a favorable work environment. This study examined especially the direct effects and interaction effects of core self-evaluations and psychological climate on work engagement. Several findings emerged from this theory-based empirical investigation. First, core self-evaluation is significantly associated with work engagement. This finding is consistent with prior studies in the hospitality setting, finding that hospitality employees with high core self-evaluation are likely to engage in their jobs and roles at work. This result supports Kahn's (1991) three psychological condition theory, which posits that employees show engagement when they are assured of psychological meaningfulness, safety, and availability in performing their jobs or roles. That is, people engage in their job when they believe that completing the job is worthwhile and meaningful, are provided a reliable work environment, and have enough psychological resources to complete their job. Therefore, since core self-evaluations pertain to all three psychological conditions, employees with these core self-evaluation traits are likely to engage in their job. Employees who possess positive self-regard (i.e., the self-esteem aspect of core self-evaluations) may set their work goals high, find the accomplishment of the goals worthwhile, and accordingly engage in their job, seeking meaningfulness from job accomplishments. Also, employees who consider themselves optimistic or confident (i.e., internal locus of control and generalized self-efficacy) are less likely to see their jobs demanding and more likely to interpret job and environment both challenging and enjoyable with high anticipation of success; these individuals are more willing to invest themselves in their work. Secondly, employee psychological climate is a significant predictor of engagement. In particular, employee perceptions of managerial support for service, interdepartmental service, and team communication have a positive influence on engagement. This finding is in line with previous studies on the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model. As the Job Demands-Resources theory suggests, a favorable organizational work environment, as perceived by employees, may function as a job resource that mitigates job demands and motivates employees, enhancing their willingness to dedicate themselves to their job. Therefore, we can infer that hotel employees who believe that management has strong

commitment to providing quality service to customers or that provides employees with good support for service excellence are likely to engage in their job. The results also indicate that hotel employees are likely to become engaged when they see smooth, systematic delivery of internal service to help them get their jobs done successfully and when they see harmonious communication among employees in and across teams and departments. In addition to the direct effects, the present study also proposed that core self-evaluations and psychological climate interact to increase employee engagement. Using the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model and the conservation of resources (COR) theory in combination, this study expected that employees‟ perceptions of the availability of organizational resources (i.e., psychological climate) should activate, reinforce, and/or facilitate what employees believe about their abilities (i.e., core self-evaluations), and this, in turn, should result in employee engagement. However, contrary to the researcher's expectation, the interaction effects of the two antecedent variables on employee engagement were not significant. Failure to find compelling support for this interaction effect suggests that positive perceptions of the work environment may not necessarily heighten core self-evaluation levels for higher levels of engagement even if employees with positive core self-evaluation work under a favorable work environment. On the other hand, the dimensions of internal service, team communication, and support for service quality, as stated in this study do not seem to relate to increasing core self-evaluations. Rather, these three dimensions are more instrumental in increasing service itself, not in influencing employee self-evaluations like efficacy or self-regard. They may not affect the individual subconscious, fundamental evaluations of ability or worthiness.

References

Aburdene, P. (2005). *Megatrends 2010: The rise of conscious capitalism*. Charlottesville: Hampton Roads Publishing Company.

Amenumey, E. K., & Lockwood, A. (2008). Psychological climate and psychological empowerment: An exploration in a luxury UK hotel group. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 8,* 265-281.

Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*, 411-423.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16, 74-94.

Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress, 22,* 187-200.

Brown, S. P., & Leigh, T. W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 358-368.

Campbell, J., Dunnette, M., Lawler, E., & Weick, K. (1970). Managerial behavior, performance, and effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 499-512.

Ferrer, J. (2005). Employee engagement: Is it organizational commitment renamed? Unpublished working paper, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved from http://eprints.vu.edu.au/123/1/wp8_2005_ferrer.pdf.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of Marketing Research, 18, 39-50.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspectives.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

James, L. A., & James, L. R. (1989). Integrating work environment perceptions: Explorations into the measurement of meaning. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 739-751.

James, L. R., & Tetrick, L. E. (1986). Confirmatory analytic tests of three causal models relating job perceptions to job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 77-82.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits - self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability - with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 80–92.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: a core evaluations approach. Research in Organizational Behavior, 19, 151-188.

Judge, T. A., Van Vianen, A., & De Pater, I. (2004). Emotional stability, core self-evaluations, and job outcomes: A review of the evidence and an agenda for future research. *Human Performance, 17,* 325-346.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33, 692-724.

Karatepe, O.M., Demir, E., 2014. Linking core self-evaluations and work engagementto work–family facilitation. Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag. 26, 307–323.

Karatepe, O.M., Keshavarz, S., Nejati, S., 2010. Do core self-evaluations mediate theeffect of coworker support on work engagement? A study of hotel employees inIran. J. Hosp. Tour. Manag. 17, 62–71.

Koys, D. J., & DeCotiis, T. A. (1991). Inductive measures of psychological climate. *Human Relations, 44,* 265-285.

Manning, M. L., Davidson, M. C. G., & Manning, R. L. (2004). Toward a shortened measure of organizational climate in tourism and hospitality. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, 28*, 444-482..

Martin, A. J., Jones, E. S., & Callan, V. J. (2005). The role of psychological climate in facilitating employee adjustment during organizational change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational psychology, 14*, 263-289.

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. Annual Review of Psychology, 52, 397-422.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Parker, C. P., Baltes, B. B., Young, S. A., Huff, J. W., Altmann, R. A., Lacost, H., & Roberts, J. E. (2003). Relationships between psychological climate perceptions and work outcomes: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*, 389-416.

Rentsch, J. R. (1990). Climate and culture: interaction and qualitative differences in organizational meanings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 668-681.

Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. Administrative Science Quarterly, 46, 655-684.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). *UWES – Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Test Manual*. Utrecht University, Department of Psychology. Retrieved from http://www.schaufeli.com.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25, 293-315.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two simple confirmatory factor analytic approach. Journal of Happiness Studies, 3, 71-92.

Schneider, B. J. (1975). Organizational climate: Individual preferences and organizational realities revisited. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 459-465.