

Disentangling the Overlap Between Employee Engagement and Passion

Gaja Zager Kocjan

University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Abstract

With the emergence of positive psychology and the subsequent positive organizational behavior movement, focusing on the employee experience and factors of positive psychological states in employees has come to the forefront. In recent years, several studies have emphasized the practical value of employee engagement and passion (the dualistic model of passion; Vallerand et al., 2003) in predicting various positive individual and organizational outcomes (e.g., performance, well-being). Although engagement and passion seem relatively easy to spot at first glance, they are rather difficult to define and distinguish one from another. Therefore, the aim of the present article is to provide a comprehensive discussion on the shared aspects and conceptual differences between these two constructs within the work environment. The most noticeable overlap is proposed to exist between engagement and harmonious passion. It concerns the common underlying development mechanism, a very strong motivational force to engage in one's work, strong identification with work, and similar relationships with various antecedents and consequences. It is suggested that broader scope theories (such as the self-determination theory) should be taken into consideration in order to unify common findings from both theoretical backgrounds and overcome redundancy and the risk of multiplication of concepts in positive psychology.

Keywords: engagement, passion, motivation, overlap, employees

Introduction

With the development of positive psychology, psychologists have shifted their attention away from pathology, stress, and ill-being towards the positive aspects of

✉ Gaja Zager Kocjan, Regentova 3, 6280 Ankaran, Slovenija. E-mail: gajazkocjan@gmail.com.

The article was written during a doctoral study, which was partly funded by the European Union through the European Social Fund. Co-financing is part of the Operational Programme for Human Resources Development for the period 2007-2013, Priority axis 1 "Promoting entrepreneurship and adaptability" and preferred orientations 1.3. "Scholarship Scheme".

well-being, such as optimism, positive emotions, creativity, meaning, personal growth, etc. (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). In recent years, principles of positive psychology have become increasingly ubiquitous also in work settings. Employee experience and factors of positive psychological states in employees have gained prevalence in the literature (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008).

The emergence of positive psychology and the subsequent positive organizational behavior movement (Luthans, 2003) coincided with changes in the world of work. Around the turn of the century, several consulting firms became interested in employee engagement. Schaufeli (2013) speculates that this interest stems from the ongoing transition from traditional to modern organizations, who strive to produce more output with less employee input. The concept was soon adopted by several academic researchers who attempted to clarify the definition of engagement and develop suitable measuring instruments. Another concept that bears a strong resemblance to employee engagement is passion (Vallerand et al., 2003). Contrary to engagement, passion has not evolved in the business world but was developed by academic researchers in the field of social psychology.

Employee engagement or passion is relatively easy to notice and recognize at first glance, yet rather difficult to define and distinguish one from the other. In recent years, several studies have emphasized the positive correlations of both engagement and passion with differing outcomes, such as performance (e.g., Salanova, Schaufeli, Xanthopoulou, & Bakker, 2010; Vallerand et al., 2008) and well-being (e.g., Mäkikangas, Bakker, Aunola, & Demerouti, 2010; Vallerand & Houliort, 2003). Despite their similarity, researchers have not yet focused specifically on a potential overlap between engagement and passion in the context of the work environment. The aim of the present article is to discuss the conceptual similarities and differences between employee engagement and passion taking into account various aspects of their potential convergence or divergence, such the relationship with various antecedents and consequences, a strong motivational foundation and identification with one's work.

Evolution and Conceptualizations of Employee Engagement

Due to the bottom-up manner in which the concept of engagement has evolved in the business world (Schaufeli, 2013), a variety of engagement definitions have emerged, yet none of them has gained widespread acceptance. The Gallup Organization was the first to espouse the concept of engagement. Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002) used a huge database from a study held at the Gallup Organization and found that engagement was positively correlated with important business outcomes. They defined engagement as "the individual's involvement and satisfaction with, as well as enthusiasm for work" (p. 269). Although it was criticized for its ambiguous conceptualization and overlap with other well-known

constructs (e.g., job involvement, job satisfaction), their approach led to an increased interest in engagement research and highlighted the need for an exact academic conceptualization of engagement (Jeung, 2011).

Kahn (1990) is considered the first scholar who applied the concept of engagement to the workplace context. He defined engagement as "the simultaneous employment and expression of a person's 'preferred self' in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional) and active, full performances" (p. 700). According to Kahn (1992), engagement reflects the simultaneous investment of an individual's physical, cognitive, and emotional energy into work performance. Although widely cited as the theoretical foundation, Kahn's conceptualization of engagement was seldom used in research (Shuck, 2011). Recently, some empirical studies have emerged using his conceptualization as a theoretical framework (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004; Rich, LePine, & Crawford, 2010), though they are few.

Kahn's work was followed by several attempts to refine and further clarify engagement conceptualization. Based on Kahn's perspective, Rothbard (2001) defined engagement as "one's psychological presence in or focus on role activities" (p. 656), and proposed two components of role engagement - attention and absorption. Saks (2006) extended Kahn's definition by decomposing the concept into job engagement (performing the work role) and organizational engagement (performing the role as a member of the organization). Macey and Schneider (2008) further expanded Saks's (2006) model and conceptualized trait, state, and behavioral engagement as separate, but related constructs. Their work, however, has been subject to some criticism (e.g., Griffin, Parker, & Neal, 2008; Hirschfeld & Thomas, 2008; Newman & Harrison, 2008; Saks, 2008) mainly in terms of the reconceptualization of engagement as "old wine in new bottles".

Researchers in the field of occupational health psychology suggested the view of job engagement as the positive antipode of burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). They considered burnout as a three-dimensional construct consisting of components of exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy. As a positive antithesis of burnout, job engagement was suggested to represent a positive affective-motivational state of fulfilment characterized by high energy, involvement, and efficacy (Maslach & Leiter, 1997; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, and Bakker (2002) further developed the definition by Maslach and Leiter (1997). They defined work engagement as a "positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption" (p. 74). They considered it a permanent, stable, and general affective-cognitive state. Although Schaufeli et al. (2002) agree that engagement represents a positive antipode of burn out, they argue that the measurement of both concepts as well as their structures should differ.

According to Schaufeli et al. (2002), the first dimension of work engagement, vigor (physical-energetic component), represents energy and mental resilience in

the workplace and willingness to invest effort and persevere when problems arise. Dedication (emotional component) is the second dimension and refers to enthusiasm and inspiration at work and to the perception of significance, pride, and challenges. The third dimension, absorption (cognitive component) refers to the complete focus on work and to the feelings of engrossment in one's work (Schaufeli et al., 2002). This dimension is very close to the experience of flow, as defined by Csikszentmihalyi (1975, 1997). However, Schaufeli et al. (2002) argue that flow represents a more complex concept that refers to a particular, short-term peak experience instead of a more pervasive and persistent state of mind.

In recent years, research on engagement has flourished. Researchers mostly adopted Schaufeli et al.'s (2002) conceptualization of engagement upon which probably the best quality measuring instrument for engagement was developed (Utrecht work engagement scale). Nevertheless, the concept of engagement has also been exposed to criticism and controversy (e.g., Newman & Harrison, 2008; Rich et al., 2010; Saks, 2008). Various scholars questioned the utility of the construct. They pointed to inconsistencies among different conceptualizations of engagement and highlighted the problem of repackaging other related constructs, such as job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, into the new concept of engagement. Especially the difference between job involvement and employee engagement seems to be the most confusing one. As a cognitive construct (a cognition regarding one's psychological identification with his or her job; Kanungo, 1982) job involvement is often considered to be an antecedent to engagement or as its inherent facet (for a more detailed discussion on this difference see section "Identification with One's Work: A Key Difference between Engagement and Passion?"). Notwithstanding, research has also provided some empirical evidence for the differentiation between engagement and related constructs. For example, in a study by Christian et al. (2011) engagement showed both discriminant validity as well as criterion-related validity over job attitudes in predicting job performance. Moreover, Rich et al. (2010) found that job involvement, job satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation failed to exceed engagement in predicting job performance. In addition to inconsistencies in conceptualizations, some scholars have also criticized engagement for the lack of a common framework to explain the development of the concept as well as its antecedents and consequences (e.g., Meyer & Gagne, 2008; Zigarmi, Nimon, Houson, Witt, & Diehl, 2009).

The Two Faces of Passion for Activities

Unlike several theories on employee engagement, as of yet, only few conceptualizations of passion for activities exist. The most established and supported by the largest body of research is the dualistic model of passion (Vallerand et al., 2003). A couple of other less established passion theories

(Cardon, Wincent, Sing, & Drnovsek, 2009; Pertulla, 2010) have also been proposed, however, they were followed by considerably less empirical research and are thus less validated.

Vallerand et al. (2003) define passion as a strong inclination towards an activity that people like, that they find important, and into which they invest their time and energy. Activities that individuals like and engage in on a regular basis can become central features of their identities. Two types of passion are proposed, harmonious and obsessive passion (the dualistic model of passion), which differ depending on the way an individual internalizes passion for an activity into his or her identity. In the field of work psychology, passion is considered as a strong inclination someone has towards his or her work. An individual likes doing the work, finds it very important, and invests a lot of time and energy into it (Vallerand & Houliort, 2003).

Harmonious passion results from the autonomous internalization of an activity into one's identity. A person willingly the activity as important for them, placing no contingencies upon it. This leads to a motivational force to engage in that activity, accompanied by a sense of self-determination. A passionate activity captures a significant but not dominant space in one's identity and is thus in harmony with other aspects of his or her life. Individuals with harmonious passion are able to focus fully on their passionate activity, leading to higher positive and lower negative affect during and after engaging in that activity. Their engagement is more flexible and accompanied by a sense of control over the activity. They like their passionate activity and are likely to engage in it for longer periods of time. However, they are also able to cease engaging in that activity, if it becomes a negative factor in their lives (Vallerand, 2008; Vallerand et al., 2003).

On the other hand, obsessive passion results from a controlled internalization of an activity into one's identity. Such internalization is related to certain contingencies attached to the activity (e.g., feelings of social acceptance, self-esteem) leading to intra- and/or interpersonal pressures to engage in that activity. Although individuals with obsessive passion like their passionate activity, their passion controls them, so they feel compelled to engage in that activity. This activity ultimately occupies a disproportionately large amount of space in their identities and conflicts with other activities in their lives. Because of controlled internalization, which creates an inner compulsion, engagement in a passionate activity is more rigid, preventing an individual from being fully focused on that activity and from experiencing positive emotions. The individual engages in the passionate activity even when he or she should not and experiences negative emotions after engaging in that activity or when prevented from engaging in it. Due to the internal pressure, the individual may be unable to completely cease thinking about their passionate activity (Vallerand, 2008; Vallerand et al., 2003).

Employee Engagement and (Harmonious) Passion: Two Sides of the Same Coin?

The motivational perspectives of employee engagement and passion theories shed light on the mechanisms through which time and energy investment in work influences people's affect, cognition, and behavior. In terms of their content and conceptualization, these theories share several similarities. Moreover, research shows that measures of engagement and passion are associated with various antecedents and consequences in the workplace in a similar manner. The most noticeable overlap seems to exist between engagement and harmonious passion. Nevertheless, studies on engagement and passion are usually carried out independently, resulting from different research areas and often neglect each other's findings. Some scholars, therefore, highlight the need for integrated research and a refined conceptualization of these constructs (e.g., Schaufeli, 2012). Accordingly, our aim is to provide a comprehensive discussion on the shared aspects and conceptual differences between employee engagement and passion.

Firstly, some basic differences between the conceptualization of employee engagement and passion will be highlighted. These differences concern the dimensionality and the context to which both concepts are applied. Vallerand et al. (2003) describe passion as an overall unidimensional concept (either harmonious or obsessive) that can be related to any kind of activity. On the contrary, engagement is mostly considered as a multidimensional concept, usually related to one's work or job (Kahn, 1990; Maslach & Leiter, 1997; Rothbard, 2001; Schaufeli et al., 2002).

Another important difference between employee engagement and passion concerns the relative emphasis that scholars put on different aspects of the definitions they propose. In the conceptualization of passion, Vallerand et al. (2003) are primarily focused on the relationship between passionate activity and other activities in an individual's life (whether they are in harmony or not) and on the process of the internalization of a certain activity into one's identity. Depending on this process two conceptually distinct types of passion (harmonious or obsessive) arise. On the other hand, most engagement conceptualizations put greater emphasis on exploring dimensions underlying the relationship between the employee and his or her task (e.g., Maslach & Leiter, 1997; Rothbard, 2001; Schaufeli et al., 2002) and on identifying psychological or environmental conditions that foster engagement in general (e.g., Kahn, 1990; Maslach et al., 2001; Saks, 2006; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

Despite the differences in dimensionality, contextual framework, and specific foci of the definitions, employee engagement and passion share several similarities. The most evident concerns a very strong motivational force leading an employee to engage in his or her work.

The Motivational Basis of Work Behavior

Both engagement and passion represent a high motivational force to engage in work. For example, Kahn (1992) suggested that employee engagement stems from individual's psychological presence at work, which goes beyond simple motivation and reflects authenticity, an expression of an employee's experienced feelings, thoughts, and beliefs. Drawing from Kahn's work, Rich et al. (2010) particularly emphasized the motivational aspect of engagement, defining it as a "multidimensional motivational concept" (p. 619). Further, Rothbard (2001) suggested that both engagement dimensions (attention and absorption) bear a motivational force. While attention is a motivational construct based on resources, absorption represents an intrinsic motivation-based construct.

Likewise, in occupational health psychology, engagement is seen as a motivational concept, similar to intrinsic motivation. The motivational aspect of engagement is mainly conveyed in the dimensions of energy (Maslach et al., 2001) and vigor (Schaufelli et al., 2002), which refer to high activation that is reflected in mental resilience in the workplace and a willingness to invest effort and persevere even when faced with difficult situations (Schaufelli et al., 2002). Similarly, as indicated by Rothbard (2001), the absorption dimension purveys a motivational tone. It is characterized by a deep immersion in one's work which is typically coupled with high levels of energy [Schaufelli et al. (2002) report a correlation of .70 between vigor and absorption for the observed variables and .90 for the latent variables].

The concept of passion is also closely related to the motivational aspect (Vallerand et al., 2003), although it seems to exhibit a somewhat less energetic tone than engagement (e.g., the dimension of vigor; Schaufelli et al., 2002). Despite this, Lafrenière, Jowett, Vallerand, Donahue, and Lorimer (2008) argue that passion differs significantly from both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Specifically, intrinsically motivated activities are not seen as internalized into one's identity, as is the case with passionate activities that have a self-defining nature. On the other hand, extrinsic motivation is characterized by the lack of enjoyment in the activity (Deci & Ryan, 2000), whereas liking the activity is typical for the passionate activities (Vallerand et al., 2003). In addition, a study by Vallerand et al. (2003, Study 2) showed that passion predicted changes in positive and negative affect over and above intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

Nevertheless, in a pioneering article on passion, Vallerand et al. (2003) explain the development of passion through a similar mechanism which specifies the form of an individual's motivation (Self-determination theory – SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000). People are purported to engage in various activities in order to satisfy their basic psychological needs. Activities that are enjoyable and very essential for the satisfaction of basic needs eventually become internalized in their identities. If they are internalized in an autonomous fashion, harmonious passion

should develop (Vallerand, 2008). Similarly, satisfaction of the needs for autonomy and competence combined with free engagement in an activity out of interest are essential for the development of intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Hence, the development of harmonious passion stems from the mechanism of satisfying basic psychological needs and therefore closely resembles the concept of intrinsic motivation. Promoting the satisfaction of basic needs can be purported to help an individual progress toward both high intrinsic motivation (autonomous regulation) and high harmonious passion. This is in line with previous research, suggesting a strong and positive relationship between harmonious passion and basic needs satisfaction (Forest, Mageau, Sarrazin, & Morin, 2011; Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003).

As for obsessive passion, it is characterized by a more controlled motivation and thus less adaptive engagement as compared to harmonious passion. Research mostly shows low relation between obsessive passion (controlled internalization) and basic needs satisfaction (Forest et al., 2011; Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003). This is not surprising, given that controlled internalization of an activity into one's identity results in lower coherence with one's core values and sense of self (Sheldon & Kasser, 1995).

Mechanisms proposed within the SDT were also adopted by Meyer and Gagne (2008; Meyer, Gagne, & Parfyonova, 2010) in their attempt to enhance the understanding of employee activity engagement¹. In their opinion, in order to understand engagement properly, long standing and well-tested theories, such as the SDT, should be taken into consideration. Hence, the SDT is proposed to provide a broader explanatory mechanism through which engagement may be better understood (Meyer et al., 2010). According to the SDT, the satisfaction of basic psychological needs leads to autonomous regulation, which is in turn related to higher levels of performance, adaptation to change, and employee well-being (cf. Meyer et al., 2010). Moreover, satisfying one's needs represents a mediator variable in the relationship between environmental resources and autonomous regulation (Gagne & Deci, 2005). Accordingly, Meyer and Gagne (2008; Meyer et al., 2010) suggest that the SDT may explain an underlying mechanism from which employee activity engagement develops.

In the model of activity engagement embedded within the framework of the SDT (Meyer et al., 2010), a distinction is made between disengagement, contingent engagement, and full engagement. Whereas *disengaged* employees lack motivation (they are not motivated), *fully engaged* employees experience autonomous regulation. When employees enjoy their work, autonomous regulation takes the form of

¹ Meyer et al. (2010) distinguish between activity engagement and organizational engagement using Deci and Ryan's (1985) SDT theory and Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of commitment, respectively, to explain their nature, development, and consequences. In the present work, we focus on activity engagement because it corresponds closely to the concept of harmonious passion (Vallerand et al., 2003).

intrinsic motivation. When they find meaning in their work but do not enjoy in it, it takes the form of identified or integrated regulation. *Contingent engagement* represents the middle pole on the engagement continuum. It is characterized by the sense of controlled regulation and can take forms of external regulation or introjected regulation. The work itself is not meaningful or enjoyable for these employees. Rather, it represents the means to an end - the attainment of secondary goals (e.g., continued employment, compensation, benefits). Employees can progress towards full engagement through the satisfaction of their basic psychological needs (Meyer et al., 2010).

In summary, both engagement and passion are clearly motivational constructs. Whereas obsessive passion is led by an inner drive compelling an individual to do the work, engagement and harmonious passion are characterized by the enjoyment one gets from the work (intrinsic motivation). The mechanism of basic psychological needs satisfaction proposed within the SDT can be assumed to foster the development of both harmonious passion and engagement. Therefore, SDT may represent a broader framework of a long-standing theory, through which the common motivational perspectives of engagement and harmonious passion can be brought together.

Identification with One's Work: A Key Difference Between Engagement and Passion?

According to Vallerand et al. (2003), activities that people like and regularly engage in become self-defining characteristics and thus part of their identities. Individuals that perceive their work as part of their identity are proposed to develop a more passionate attitude towards it. Identification with one's work is thus seen as an important characteristic of passion as well as a process that precedes the development of passion. Forest et al. (2012) argue that the aspect of identification represents the main difference between harmonious passion and engagement as conceptualized by occupational health psychologists. They propose that harmonious passion is a self-defining characteristic (an individual identifies with his or her passionate activity), whereas work engagement is a state of mind (feeling in relation to one's work; Schaufeli et al., 2002). However, according to Schaufeli et al. (2002; Maslach et al., 2001), work engagement dimension dedication is defined as a very strong involvement in one's work that goes *even beyond* the usual level of identification (typical for the concept of job involvement; Kanungo, 1982), as it refers not only to a particular cognitive state but includes an affective dimension as well. In fact, dedication is considered as the opposite pole of cynicism, one of the dimensions of burnout. The continuum between cynicism and dedication is labelled directly as *identification* – thus high work engagement (Schaufeli et al., 2002) is indeed characterized by strong identification with one's work (González-Romá, Schaufeli, Bakker, & Lloret, 2006).

Furthermore, the definition of work engagement as an enduring affective-cognitive state of mind "refers to how employees feel in relation to their work in general, over a long periods of time" (Xanthopoulou & Bakker, 2013, p. 27). Although a self-defining element is not central to this conceptualization, it cannot be completely excluded, since identification with one's work is very closely related to how he or she feels about that work (in a cognitive and affective sense). Moreover, passion is hypothesised to *result from* an internalization of the activity into one's identity, which then leads to a motivational force to *engage in* that activity and invest time and energy into it (Vallerand et al., 2003). Therefore, the definition of passion does not exclude the engaged state of mind either, though it puts a much greater emphasis on identification with the passionate activity.

Nevertheless, some engagement researchers view the aspect of psychological identification with one's work as a separate element, usually inherent in the definition of job involvement. Kanungo (1982) defines job involvement as a cognition regarding one's psychological identification with his or her job. May et al. (2004) suggest that engagement is an antecedent to job involvement in a sense that a deep engagement in a role should lead to identification with one's job. Conversely, job involvement may also be an antecedent to engagement, as greater psychological identification with a role may boost attention and absorption in regards to one's performance (Rothbard, 2001; Rothbard & Patil, 2011). Drawing on Kahn's (1990) work on engagement, which emphasizes the involvement of self in the work role, Rich et al. (2010) suggest that the simultaneous investment of cognitive, affective, and physical energies into performance represent something more fundamental and holistic, differentiating engagement from a mere aggregate of job involvement (cognitive energy), job satisfaction (affective energy), and intrinsic motivation (physical energy). Shuck, Ghosh, Zigarmi, and Nimon (2013) further articulate that job involvement represents a facet of engagement. They suggest that engagement "measures psychological states of energy directed towards a task or specific work role", whereas job involvement "measures a cognitive judgement about the work or the job itself and has no known behavioral implication" (p. 20). While engagement is simultaneously made up of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral facets, job involvement consists of only a cognitive dimension.

On the other hand, employee engagement and job involvement are also seen as occupying the same conceptual space. For example, Harter et al.'s (2002) definition of engagement comprises both a state of satisfaction and job involvement. Further, Macey and Schneider (2008) propose a definition of state engagement encompassing several other concepts, such as job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (these concepts are suggested to represent facets of engagement). Not surprisingly, due to an ambiguous conceptualization and clear overlap with other concepts this definition has triggered some criticism. The theory has been criticised on the supposition that engagement

represents nothing but an "old wine in a new bottle" (e.g., Newman & Harrison, 2008).

In summary, various definitions of engagement propose different relations between engagement and identification with one's work. They suggest that identification (often referred to in the context of job involvement) either represents an inherent element/facet of engagement (Harter et al., 2002; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Maslach et al., 2001; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Shuck et al., 2013), an antecedent (Rothbard, 2001; Rothbard & Patil, 2011) or a consequence of engagement (May et al., 2004). Although identification does not play a central role in the conceptualizations of engagement (as it does for passion), a close relationship between them clearly exists. The nature of this relationship, however, remains unknown. Drawing parallels with the passion theory, identification with one's work may be seen as an antecedent leading to the development of engagement, as well as its inherent element/facet.

Comparing Antecedents and Consequences of Engagement and Passion

Various studies have investigated the relationship that employee engagement and passion have with different antecedents and consequences. Firstly, studies have shown that job resources promote both engagement and harmonious passion. For instance, engagement was found to depend on performance feedback, social/organizational support, the quality of relationship with the supervisor, and supervisory coaching (Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006; Koyuncu, Burke, & Fiksenbaum, 2006; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). The beneficial role of job resources for employee engagement was also confirmed in longitudinal studies (de Lange, De Witte, & Notelaers, 2008; Hakanen, Schaufeli, & Ahola, 2008; Mauno, Kinnunen, & Ruokolainen, 2007; Schaufeli, Taris, & Van Rhenen, 2008). Regarding passion, research has shown that the autonomous internalization (typical for harmonious passion) depends on the extent to which autonomy is promoted in one's social environment (Mageau et al., 2009). Moreover, in a recent study, job demands were negatively correlated with harmonious passion, and job resources were positively correlated with it. Conversely, obsessive passion was negatively correlated to job resources and positively to job demands (Trépanier, Fernet, Austin, Forest, & Vallerand, 2013).

Secondly, harmonious passion and engagement both lead to a permanent increase in well-being. People that have developed a harmonious passion for their work are more likely to feel positive emotions before, during, and after work (e.g., Vallerand, 2012; Vallerand et al., 2003). The same applies to engaged employees that experience high energy and positive emotions in their work (e.g., Bakker, 2009). In addition, harmonious passion and engagement are positively related to several other indicators of well-being, such as low ill-health, high life satisfaction, and vitality (Hakanen & Schaufeli, 2012; Philippe, Vallerand, & Lavigne, 2009b;

Rousseau & Vallerand, 2003; Shimazu & Schaufeli, 2009; Shimazu, Schaufeli, Kubota, & Kawakami, 2012; Vallerand et al., 2007, 2008). Moreover, research has shown that harmoniously passionate and engaged employees usually experience better health (Demerouti, Bakker, De Jonge, Janssen, & Schaufeli, 2001; Hakanen et al., 2006; Rousseau & Vallerand, 2003; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). The opposite applies to obsessive passion, which seems to undermine well-being over time (e.g., Lafreniere, St-Louis, Vallerand, & Donahue, 2012; Philippe et al., 2009b).

Third, both harmonious passion and engagement, can affect employee performance. Results from a meta-analysis revealed that levels of engagement are positively related to business-unit performance (Harter et al., 2002). Moreover, engaged employees were found to deliver superior service quality, report less errors, have less injuries and accidents, show more innovativeness, and get better scores in effectiveness and job performance (Halbesleben, 2010; Rich et al., 2010; Salanova, Agut, & Peiro, 2005). Likewise, harmonious passion was found to be related to better performance in music (Bonneville-Roussy, Lavigne, & Vallerand, 2011), sports (Vallerand et al., 2008, Study 1), and the dramatic arts (Vallerand et al., 2007, Study 1), whereas obsessive passion was less reliably correlated to performance attainment. However, no study has investigated outright the relationship between passion for work and work performance.

In conclusion, research shows that engagement and harmonious passion are related to various antecedents and consequences in a similar manner. While job demands hinder harmonious passion and engagement, job resources foster them. Furthermore, both concepts have positive consequences for a person's health and well-being as well as promoting better job performance. Obsessive passion, on the other hand, shows a different, less adaptive pattern of relations with various antecedents and consequences.

The Role of Employee Engagement and Passion in Flow Experience

Because of autonomous internalization, which leads to flexible engagement in a passionate activity and to more holistic experience of the task, flow is considered as a consequence of harmonious passion (Vallerand et al., 2003). Csikszentmihalyi (1975) defined flow as a state of intense involvement in an activity when nothing else seems to matter. Flow is likely to occur when the person's abilities are suited to the given challenges, when they have a clear and direct goal, and when they receive clear feedback. Studies examining the relationship between passion and flow showed that harmonious passion was positively correlated with various components of flow during activity engagement, whereas obsessive passion was unrelated to them (Carpentier, Mageau, & Vallerand, 2012; Mageau, Vallerand, Rousseau, Ratelle, & Provencher, 2005; Philippe, Vallerand, Andrianarisoa, & Brunel, 2009a, Study 1; Vallerand et al., 2003, Study 1).

According to some scholars, engagement also resembles flow. For example, Rothbard (2001) describes the absorption dimension of engagement as akin to the flow experience, in that people are intensely focused on the activity and perceive themselves as one with the activity (Csikszentmihaiyi, 1975). Moreover, absorption is one of the work engagement dimensions suggested by Schaufeli et al. (2002). However, Schaufeli et al. point out that absorption does not represent flow itself but a dimension of "a more pervasive and persistent state of mind" (p. 75). Thus absorption may be considered more as a proneness towards experiencing flow, and flow may be considered as a result of high absorption.

Kahn (1990) suggested that engagement is characterized by "the simultaneous employment and expression of a person's 'preferred self' in task behaviors" (p. 700). Self-employment (investing personal energies into physical, cognitive, and emotional labors) underlies concepts such as involvement, intrinsic motivation, and flow. Expounding on this notion, the flow would be expected to stem from high engagement, to represent its facet or a behavioral expression of it. Moreover, according to Kahn (1992) engagement is a manifestation of the psychological presence at work, which is composed of four dimensions, namely attentiveness, connection, integration, and focus. Kahn (1992) compares connection with one's work with the flow experience, in which people "lose themselves" and feel one with their work.

Finally, Macey and Schneider (2008) argue that trait engagement encompasses an autotelic personality, a characteristic of people who engage in activities for their own sake rather than for external rewards (Csikszentmihályi, 1975, 1990). An autotelic personality is proposed to represent one of the trait engagement facets, together with trait positive affectivity, conscientiousness, and proactive personality. However, it should be noted once again that Macey and Schneider's work has been subject to criticism on the grounds of offering "a particular blend of older, familiar constructs" (Newman & Harrison, 2008, p. 32) under the new label.

In conclusion, flow may be considered as a possible consequence of both harmonious passion for work as well as employee engagement. Both concepts are related to a greater personal proneness to experience flow, as they create conditions (e.g., intense and focused concentration, clear goals, intrinsic motivation) from which flow is more likely to result.

Engaged in but not Passionate?

Forest et al. (2012) argue that it is possible to be highly engaged in (e.g., Schaufeli et al., 2002) or autonomously motivated for work (Deci & Ryan, 2000) without having a passion for it, but only because one recognizes this work as important for oneself. However, the mechanisms through which autonomous motivation and harmonious passion develop were shown to be highly similar. Additionally, following from the previous discussion, in a conceptual sense,

harmonious passion and engagement significantly overlap. Both concepts are considered as dimensions, ranging from low to high passion or engagement, and thus from low to high presence of their main characteristics. Thus, in our opinion, the case is not that much about being passionate/engaged in or not (as for Forest et al., 2012), but about the level of passion or engagement one has. Taking into account the dimensionality of these two concepts, it is safe to assume, that both concepts are highly correlated.

Nevertheless, passion and engagement were rarely investigated simultaneously in empirical research. At this point, we will briefly present two recent studies that address this issue and show a significant relation between both concepts. Trépanier et al. (2013) hypothesized that harmonious passion represents a psychological process through which engagement is experienced (Schaufeli et al., 2002). They tested the hypothesized model in two large occupational samples (nurses and teachers). Passion was measured with a shortened version of the *Passion Scale* (Vallerand et al., 2003) and for engagement the vigor subscale of the short version of the *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale* (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006) was used. The results supported their hypothesis, showing that harmonious passion partially mediated the relationship between job demands and resources and engagement. On the other hand, Ho, Wong, and Lee (2011) conducted a research with approximately 500 employees from a large insurance firm. They proposed a model in which engagement, as conceptualized by Rothbard (2001), mediated the relationship between harmonious passion and work performance. Passion was measured with the *Passion Scale* (Vallerand et al., 2003), and cognitive engagement was measured with two scales (absorption and attention) developed by Rothbard (2001). The obtained results empirically supported the hypothesis and revealed that harmoniously passionate employees performed better. The relationship between harmonious passion and performance was mediated primarily by absorption. Consistent with our previous supposition, in both studies harmonious passion and engagement were significantly related and interdependent. Moreover, results indicated that harmonious passion includes certain aspects that may be considered as antecedents of engagement. In line with Trépanier et al. (2013), we propose that these aspects refer to the (autonomous) internalization of work into one's identity (which is also present though less central in engagement definitions) which further leads to a motivational force to engage in that activity (Vallerand et al., 2003). In Table 1. presents a summary of similarities and differences between employee engagement and harmonious passion.

Table 1. *A Summary of Similarities and Differences Between Employee Engagement and Harmonious Passion*

	Employee Engagement	Harmonious Passion
<i>Focus</i>	Feeling in relation to one's work, dimensions underlying the relationship between the employee and his or her work, conditions that foster engagement in general	Relationship between passionate activity and other activities in one's life and the process of internalization of the activity in one's identity
<i>Dimensionality and Context</i>	Mostly considered as a multidimensional concept related to work	Overall unidimensional concept related to any type of activity
<i>Antecedents</i>	+ Job resources (e.g., performance feedback, social/organizational support, autonomy) - Job demands	Activity selection and valuation, autonomy support HP for work: + Job resources, - Job demands
<i>Consequences</i>	Higher well-being, better health, better performance, etc.	Higher well-being, better health, better performance
<i>Motivational Basis</i>	High motivational force to engage in work; strong relation to intrinsic motivation	High motivational force to engage in a passionate activity; strong relation to intrinsic motivation
<i>Identification with the Activity/Work</i>	Depending on the conceptualization, identification either represents an inherent element/facet of engagement or its antecedent	Central aspect of the definition – passion is a self-defining characteristic
<i>Relationship with Flow Experience</i>	A consequence of high engagement; in some conceptualizations absorption is also considered to be a dimension of engagement	A consequence of harmonious passion

The Assessment of Employee Engagement and Passion

Another important issue in distinguishing employee engagement and passion concerns the differences and similarities in the operationalization of both constructs. Therefore, in the present section, measurement instrumentation on employee engagement and passion are discussed and compared. Based on various conceptualizations, a plethora of questionnaires on employee engagement has been composed (e.g. The Gallup Organization, 1992-1999; May et al., 2004; Rich et al., 2010; Rothbard, 2001; Saks, 2006; Schaufeli et al., 2002), though not all of them have been equally validated. On the other hand, to this date only one scale has been developed upon the dualistic model of passion for activities (Vallerand et al., 2003).

Instrumentation on Employee Engagement

Kahn's (1990) initial work on engagement, was followed by several efforts to develop a valid and reliable measure of employee engagement. Various instruments based on different conceptualizations of engagement have been proposed. First, we present a number of instruments that are based on Kahn's perspective on engagement, but have only occasionally been used in empirical research and are thus less validated (May et al., 2004; Rich et al., 2010; Rothbard, 2001; Saks, 2006).

In a study on depletion and enrichment in work and family roles, Rothbard (2001) developed a measurement for engagement in work and family. She defined engagement as one's psychological presence in or focus on role activities, and distinguished two components of engagement - attention and absorption. The scale has four items for attention (e.g., "I concentrate a lot on my work"; $\alpha=.78$) and five for absorption (e.g., "I often get carried away by what I am working on"; $\alpha=.78$) (Rothbard, 2001).

May et al. (2004) composed a 24-item scale with three subscales reflecting the cognitive (e.g., "Time passes quickly when I perform my job"), emotional (e.g., "My own feelings are affected by how well I perform my job"), and physical (e.g., "I stay until the job is done") (May et al., 2004) dimensions of engagement originally proposed by Kahn (1990). However, the results of the factor analysis did not support a three-factor solution. Therefore, an overall scale with 13 items was used in further data analyzes, which demonstrated acceptable reliability ($\alpha=.77$).

Also Rich et al. (2010) went back to Kahn's (1990) theorizing. In developing their measure of engagement with physical, emotional, and cognitive subscales they drew from measures of work intensity (Brown & Leigh, 1996), core affect (Russell & Barrett, 1999), and two dimensions of work engagement, attention and absorption (Rothbard, 2001). An 18-item questionnaire with six items per each subscale was developed. In line with expectations, the exploratory factor analysis yielded three factors. Internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .89 to .94 for the three subscales. Sample item for physical engagement is "I devote a lot of energy to my job", for emotional engagement "I feel positive about my job", and for cognitive engagement "At work, my mind is focused on my job" (Rich et al., 2010).

Finally, also based on the work of Kahn (1990), Saks (2006) distinguished between job engagement and organizational engagement and developed an 11-item questionnaire for measuring psychological presence in one's job (five items; e.g., "I really "throw" myself into my job") and organization (six items; e.g., "Being a member of this organization is very captivating"). Results of a principal component analysis showed two factors corresponding to job engagement and organizational engagement. Both scales demonstrated adequate internal consistency (job engagement: $\alpha=.82$; organizational engagement: $\alpha=.90$).

Two by far the most widely used engagement scales are the Gallup Q¹² (known also as the Gallup Workplace Audit – GWA; The Gallup Organization, 1992-1999) and *The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale* (UWES; Schaufeli et al., 2002). Q¹² was developed by the Gallup Organization and has been used especially by the consultancy firms. In the development of the scale, its practical usefulness was considered. Q¹² includes 12 items that measure work-level processes that are under the influence of the manager. The scale has been administered to large samples from various countries (e.g., Harter et al., 2002; Harter, Schmidt, Killham, & Asplund, 2006). However, apart from good reliability, no other psychometric data are available for Q¹². Despite its widespread use, Q¹² has also been exposed to criticism related to the considerable overlap of its items with constructs such as perceived organizational support, availability of technical resources, climate, and empowerment. In line with this, items from Q¹² were argued to reflect the antecedents of engagement rather than the experience of engagement itself (e.g., Britt, Dickinson, Green-Shortridge, & McKibben, 2007; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010).

The most widely used engagement instrument in the academic research is *The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale* (UWES; Schaufeli et al., 2002), which was developed in the field of occupational health psychology. The scale consists of 17 items – six items for vigor (e.g., "At my work, I feel bursting with energy"), five for dedication (e.g., "I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose"), and six for absorption (e.g., "Time flies when I'm working"). In addition to the original scale, a shortened version with 9 items is also available (Schaufeli et al., 2006). Several studies based on multicultural samples have confirmed the reliability and validity of UWES (for the review see Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). The hypothesized three-factor structure was shown to be superior to the one-factor model. Nevertheless, the reported correlations between three subscales are often very high, therefore the total UWES score can also be used as an indicator of work engagement (e.g., Sonnentag, 2003). Similarly as Q¹², UWES has also been subject to criticism primarily related to the overlap with items from well-known measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, positive affect, and organizational commitment (Newman & Harrison, 2008).

Instrumentation on Passion for Activities

Upon the dualistic model of passion, the *Passion scale* (PS; Vallerand et al., 2003) has been developed. The PS assesses two types of passion, which differ depending on the way an individual internalizes passion for activity in his or her identity. There are six items for the harmonious passion subscale (e.g., "This activity is in harmony with the other activities in my life") and six items for the obsessive passion subscale (e.g., "The urge is so strong. I can't help myself from doing this activity"). In various studies the two-factor structure of the PS has been confirmed (although the correlations between both subscales are usually high) and

acceptable levels of reliability for both subscales were reported (e.g., Carbonneau, Vallerand, Fernet, & Guay, 2008; Rousseau, Vallerand, Ratelle, Mageau, & Provencher, 2002; Vallerand & Houliort, 2003).

Comparing Employee Engagement and Passion Scales

In PS, the main attention is given to the differentiation between harmonious and obsessive passion. In particular, items from the harmonious passion subscale mainly refer to the full, comprehensive engagement (various, memorable experiences and new discoveries within the passionate activity), feelings of flow during the activity engagement, and harmony between the passionate activity and other activities in one's life. As regards the obsessive passion scale, the main focus is on uncontrollable, forcible engagement and significant effects that the activity has on one's emotions and life. Although identification with one's passionate activity is suggested to represent a central aspect of the passion concept and the key difference between harmonious passion and engagement as conceptualized by occupational health psychologists (Forest et al., 2012), items in PS are not clearly related to identification.

While in PS the main focus is on the type of passion one has for the specific activity, the way passionate individual interacts with that activity is not addressed in such detail as in most engagement scales that focus on various dimensions of employee-work/job relationship (e.g., cognitive, emotional, and physical component; vigor, attention, and absorption). This is in line with the central aspect of the dualistic model of passion that distinguishes two types of passion, but gives less attention to the elements of the interaction between an individual and his or her passionate activity. Although the general definition suggests that passion represents a strong inclination towards a specific activity (Vallerand et al., 2003), the dimensions of the relationship that an individual has with that activity (within harmonious or obsessive passion) are not further addressed and therefore not represented in the PS.

Nevertheless, according to Vallerand et al. (2003), passion is hypothesized to result in a motivational force to engage in the passionate activity and invest time and energy into it. In terms of the interaction with one's work, engagement stemming out of (harmonious) passion may resemble closely the physical, cognitive, and emotional elements of employee engagement. Consequently, despite different foci of PS and engagement measures, very high correlations between (harmonious) passion and engagement as well as possibility of a common underlying latent dimension.

Concluding Remarks

The main aim of the present article was to provide a comprehensive discussion on the conceptual similarities and differences between two increasingly popular constructs within positive psychology, namely, employee engagement and passion. Although research shows that these concepts have great practical value in predicting various positive individual and organizational outcomes (e.g., performance and well-being), from a theoretical perspective they seem difficult to distinguish one from the other. Despite the differences in operationalization, dimensionality, contextual framework, and specific foci of the definitions, these concepts share several similarities. The most noticeable is the overlap between engagement and harmonious passion and concerns their common underlying mechanism of development, a very strong motivational force to engage in one's work, strong identification with work, and similar relationships with various antecedents and consequences.

The considerable overlap between the conceptualizations of employee engagement and (harmonious) passion inevitably creates a sense of redundancy in the theoretical perspectives of both concepts, which further contributes to the risk of multiplication and fragmentation of concepts that positive psychology is facing today. The problem is intensified by the ever-increasing ease of access to and dissemination of new information, which contributes to the apparent theoretical differentiation, though generating sterile juxtapositions among scientists instead of fostering fruitful cooperation, which could lead to the appropriate unification of the two much related theories. Therefore, instead of having a number of theories that are differentiated by their focus on different aspects of conceptually similar constructs, we suggest that scholars should focus on broader scope theories by unifying common research findings from various backgrounds. In line with this, we suggest that the contribution of employee engagement and passion theories would be of a much greater use taking into account well-established and well-tested theories. One such theory may be SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000; Meyer et al., 2010), through which the common motivational perspectives of employee engagement and harmonious passion can be brought together.

Finally, we encourage scholars to empirically support theoretical discussions on similarities and differences between employee engagement and passion, as well as other conceptually related constructs. Future empirical research is needed to examine convergent and discriminant validity of the measurement instruments of these constructs. In addition, future research would benefit from the investigation and comparison of the relationships that passion and engagement have with some other relevant variables at the individual (e.g., basic personality dimensions, different aspects of employee well-being) and work environment level (e.g., different job demands and resources). This should lead to the development of a

model (nomological network) further clarifying the relationships between the constructs.

References

- Bakker, A.B. (2009). Building engagement in the workplace. In R.J. Burke & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *The peak performing organization* (pp. 50-72). Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Bakker, A.B., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2008). Positive organizational behavior: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29*, 147-154.
- Bonneville-Roussy, A., Lavigne, G.L., & Vallerand, R.J. (2011). When passion leads to excellence: The case of musicians. *Psychology of Music, 39*, 123-138.
- Britt, T.W., Dickinson, J.M., Green-Shortridge, T.M., & McKibben, E.S. (2007). Self engagement at work. In D.L. Nelson & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Positive organizational behavior* (pp. 143-158). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- 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.
- Carbonneau, N., Vallerand, R.J., Fernet, C., & Guay, F. (2008). The role of passion for teaching in intra and interpersonal outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*, 977-987.
- Cardon, M.S., Wincent, J., Sing, J., & Drnovsek, M. (2009). The nature and experience of entrepreneurial passion. *Academy of Management Review, 34*, 511-532.
- Carpentier, J., Mageau, G.A., & Vallerand, R.J. (2012). Ruminations and flow: Why do people with a more harmonious passion experience higher well-being? *Journal of Happiness Studies, 13*, 501-518.
- Christian, M.S., Garza, A.S., & Slaughter, J.E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology, 64*, 89-136.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). *Beyond boredom and anxiety*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). *Finding flow: The psychology of engagement with everyday life*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*, 227-268.
- de Lange, A.H., De Witte, H., & Notelaers, G. (2008). Should I stay or should I go? Examining longitudinal relations among job resources and work engagement for stayers versus movers. *Work & Stress, 22*, 201-223.

- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., De Jonge, J., Janssen, P.P.M., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). Burnout and engagement at work as a function of demands and control. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health*, 27, 279-286.
- Forest, J., Mageau, G.A., Crevier-Braud, L., Bergeron, É., Dubreuil, P., & Lavigne, G.L. (2012). Harmonious passion as an explanation of the relation between signature strengths' use and well-being at work: Test of an intervention program. *Human Relations*, 65, 1233-1252.
- Forest, J., Mageau, G.A., Sarrazin, C., & Morin, E.M. (2011). 'Work is my passion': The different affective, behavioural, and cognitive consequences of harmonious and obsessive passion toward work. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 28, 17-30.
- Gagne, M., & Deci, E.L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 331-362.
- González-Romá, V., Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., & Lloret, S. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: Independent factors or opposite poles? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62, 165-174.
- Griffin, M.A., Parker, S.K., & Neal, A. (2008). Is behavioral engagement a distinct and useful construct? Commentary on Macy & Schneider. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1, 48-51.
- Hakanen, J., Bakker, A.B., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43, 495-513.
- Hakanen, J., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2012). Do burnout and work engagement predict depressive symptoms and life satisfaction? A three-wave seven-year prospective study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 141, 415-424.
- Hakanen, J., Schaufeli, W.B., & Ahola, K. (2008). The job demands-resources model: A three-year cross-lagged study of burnout, depression, commitment, and work engagement. *Work and Stress*, 22, 224-241.
- Halbesleben, J.R.B. (2010). A meta-analysis of work engagement: Relationships with burnout, demands, resources, and consequences'. In A.B. Bakker & M.P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 102-117). New York: Psychology Press.
- Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., & Hayes, T.L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 268-279.
- Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., Killham, E.A., & Asplund, J.W. (2006). *Q¹² meta-analysis*. Princeton, NJ: The Gallup Organization.
- Hirschfeld, R.R., & Thomas, C.H. (2008). Representations of trait engagement: Integration, additions, and mechanisms. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 63-66.
- Ho, V.T., Wong, S., & Lee, C.H. (2011). A tale of passion: Linking job passion and cognitive engagement to employee work performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48, 26-47.

- Jeung, C.-W. (2011). The concept of employee engagement: A comprehensive review from a positive organizational behavior perspective. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 24, 49-69.
- Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692-724.
- Kahn, W.A. (1992). To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. *Human Relations*, 45, 321-349.
- Kanungo, R.N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 341-349.
- Koyuncu, M., Burke, R.J., & Fiksenbaum, L. (2006). Work engagement among women managers and professionals in a Turkish bank: Potential antecedents and consequences. *Equal Opportunities International*, 25, 299-310.
- Lafrenière, M.-A.K., Jowett, S., Vallerand, R.J., Donahue, E.G., & Lorimer, R. (2008). Passion in sport: On the quality of the coach-athlete relationship. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 30, 541-560.
- Lafrenière, M.-A.K., St-Louis, A.C., Vallerand, R.J., & Donahue, E.G. (2012). On the relation between performance and life satisfaction: The moderating role of passion. *Self and Identity*, 11, 516-530.
- Luthans, F. (2003). Positive organizational behavior (POB). In R.M. Steers, L.W. Porter, & G.A. Begley (Eds.), *Motivation and leadership at work* (pp. 187-195). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Macey, W.H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1, 3-30.
- Mageau, G.A., Vallerand, R.J., Charest, J., Salvy, S., Lacaille, N., Bouffard, T., & Koestner, R. (2009). On the development of harmonious and obsessive passion: The role of autonomy support, activity valuation, and identity processes. *Journal of Personality*, 77, 601-645.
- Mageau, G.A., Vallerand, R.J., Rousseau, F.L., Ratelle, C.F., & Provencher, P.J. (2005). Passion and gambling: Investigating the divergent affective and cognitive consequences of gambling. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35, 100-118.
- Mäkikangas, A., Bakker, A.B., Aunola, K., & Demerouti, E. (2010). Job resources and flow at work: Modeling the relationship via latent growth curve and mixture model methodology. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 795-814.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M.P. (1997). *The truth about burnout*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., & Ruokolainen, M. (2007). Job demands and resources as antecedents of work engagement: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70, 149-171.

- May, D.R., Gilson, R.L., & Harter, L.M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 77, 11-37.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- Meyer, J.P., & Gagné, M. (2008). Employee engagement from a self-determination theory perspective. *Industrial and Organizational Perspectives*, 1, 60-62.
- Meyer, J.P., Gagné, M., & Parfyonova, M. (2010). Toward an evidence-based model of engagement: What we can learn from motivation and commitment research. In S.L. Albrecht (Ed.), *Handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research and practice* (pp. 62-73). Cheltenham: Edwin Elgar Publishing.
- Newman, D., & Harrison, D. (2008). Been there, bottled that: Are state and behavioral work engagement new and useful construct 'wines'? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1, 31-35.
- Perttula, K. (2010). *Passion for work: Initial measurement and construct validation*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Philippe, F.L., Vallerand, R.J., Andrianarisoa, J., & Brunel, P. (2009a). Passion in referees: Examining their affective and cognitive experiences in sport situations. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 31, 77-96.
- Philippe, F.L., Vallerand, R.J., & Lavigne, G. (2009b). Passion does make a difference in people's lives: A look at well-being in passionate and non-passionate individuals. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 1, 3-22.
- Rich, B.L., LePine, J.A., & Crawford, E.R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 617-635.
- Rothbard, N.P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 655-684.
- Rothbard, N.P., & Patil, S.V. (2011). Being there: Work engagement and positive organizational scholarship. In K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 56-69). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Rousseau, F.L., & Vallerand, R.J. (2003). Le rôle de la passion dans le bien-être subjectif des aînés [The role of passion in the subjective well-being of the elderly]. *Revue Québécoise de Psychologie*, 24, 197-211.
- Rousseau, F.L., Vallerand, R.J., Ratelle, C.F., Mageau, G.A., & Provencher, P.J. (2002). Passion and gambling: Validation of the Gambling Passion Scale (GPS). *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 18, 45-66.
- Russell, J.A., & Barrett, L.F. (1999). Core affect, prototypical emotional episodes, and other things called emotion: Dissecting the elephant. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 805-819.
- Saks, A.M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 600-619.

- Saks, A.M. (2008). The meaning and bleeding of employee engagement: How muddy is the water? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 1*, 40-43.
- Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiró, J.M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 1217-1227.
- Salanova, M., Schaufeli, W.B., Xanthopoulou, D., & Bakker, A.B. (2010). Gain spirals of resources and work engagement. In A.B. Bakker & M.P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 118-131). New York: Psychology Press.
- Schaufeli, W.B. (2012). Work engagement. What do we know and where do we go? *Románian Journal of Applied Psychology, 14*, 3-10.
- Schaufeli, W.B. (2013). What is engagement? In C. Truss, K. Alfes, R. Delbridge, A. Shantz, & E. Soane (Eds.), *Employee engagement in theory and practice* (pp. 198-220). London: Routledge.
- 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., & Bakker, A.B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In A.B. Bakker & M.P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 10-24). New York: Psychology Press.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*, 701-706.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A.B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*, 71-92.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Taris, T.W., & Van Rhenen, W. (2008). Workaholism, burnout and engagement: Three of a kind or three different kinds of employee well-being. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 57*, 173-203.
- Seligman, M.E.P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*, 5-14.
- Sheldon, K.M., & Kasser, T. (1995). Coherence and congruence: Two aspects of personality integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 531-543.
- Shimazu, A., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2009). Is workaholism good or bad for employee well-being? The distinctiveness of workaholism and work engagement among Japanese employees. *Industrial Health, 47*, 495-502.
- Shimazu, A., Schaufeli, W.B., Kubota, K., & Kawakami, N. (2012). Do workaholism and work engagement predict employee well-being and performance in opposite directions? *Industrial Health, 50*, 316-321.

- Shuck, B. (2011). Integrative literature review: Four emerging perspectives of employee engagement. *Human Resources Development Review*, 10, 304-328.
- Shuck, B., Ghosh, R., Zigarmi, D., & Nimon, K. (2013). The jingle jangle of employee engagement: Further exploration of the emerging construct & implications for workplace learning and performance. *Human Resource Development Review*, 12, 11-35.
- Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: A new look at the interface between non-work and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 518-528.
- The Gallup Organization (1992-1999). *Gallup Workplace Audit*. Washington, DC: U.S. Copyright Office.
- Trépanier, S.G., Fernet, C., Austin, S., Forest, J., & Vallerand, R.J. (2013). Linking job demands and resources to burnout and work engagement: Does passion underlie these differential relationships? *Motivation and Emotion*, 38, 353-366.
- Vallerand, R.J. (2008). On the psychology of passion: In search of what makes people's lives most worth living. *Canadian Psychology*, 49, 1-13.
- Vallerand, R.J. (2012). The role of passion in sustainable psychological well-being. *Psychological Well-Being: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 2, 1-21.
- Vallerand, R.J., Blanchard, C., Mageau, G.A., Koestner, R., Ratelle, C.F., Léonard, M., Gagné, M., & Mersolais, J. (2003). Les passions de l'âme: On obsessive and harmonious passion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 756-767.
- Vallerand, R.J., & Houliort, N. (2003). Passion at work: Toward a new conceptualization. In S.W. Gilliland, D.D. Steiner, & D.P. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Emerging perspectives on values in organizations* (pp. 175-204). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Vallerand, R.J., Mageau, G.A., Elliot, A., Dumais, A., Demers, M.-A., & Rousseau, F.L. (2008). Passion and performance attainment in sport. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, 9, 373-392.
- Vallerand, R.J., Salvy, S.-J., Mageau, G.A., Elliot, A.J., Denis, P.L., Grouzet, F.M.E., & Blanchard, C.B. (2007). On the role of passion in performance. *Journal of Personality*, 75, 505-534.
- Xanthopoulou, D., & Bakker, A.B. (2013). State work engagement: The significance of within-person fluctuations. In A.B. Bakker & K. Daniels (Eds.), *A day in the life of a happy worker* (pp. 25-40). Hove Sussex: Psychology Press.
- Zigarmi, D., Nimon, K., Houson, D., Witt, D., & Diehl, J. (2009). Beyond engagement: Toward a framework and operational definition for employee work passion. *Human Resource Development Review*, 8, 300-326.

Angažman i strast prema poslu – zajednički aspekti i konceptualne razlike

Sažetak

Positivna psihologija i pokret pozitivnoga organizacijskog ponašanja, usredotočujući se na iskustva zaposlenika, stavljaju u prvi plan faktore pozitivnih psiholoških stanja zaposlenika. Posljednjih je godina nekoliko istraživanja naglasilo praktičnu važnost zaposlenikova angažmana i strasti prema poslu (dualni model strasti; Vallerand i sur., 2003) u predviđanju različitih pozitivnih osobnih i organizacijskih ishoda (npr. izvedba na zadacima, dobrobit). Iako se i angažman i strast čine relativno transparentnim konstruktima koji se mogu lako uočiti, njih je zapravo teško jasno definirati i međusobno razlikovati. Stoga je cilj ovog rada pružiti detaljan prikaz njihovih zajedničkih aspekata i konceptualnih razlika, u kontekstu radnog okruženja. Najveće preklapanje postoji između angažmana i tzv. skladne strasti, a ono se temelji na zajedničkom razvojnom mehanizmu koji se nalazi u podlozi obaju konstrukata, snažnoj motivaciji za bavljenjem poslom, snažnoj identifikaciji s poslom i sličnim odnosima s različitim faktorima koji prethode ili su posljedica razvoja ovih konstrukata. Smatra se da bi šira teorija (poput npr. samodeterminirajuće teorije) bila primjenjivija u objašnjavanju navedenih konstrukata te bi se na taj način ujednačila zajednička obilježja obaju konstrukata i time izbjeglo ponavljanje i rizik multipliciranja koncepata unutar pozitivne psihologije.

Ključne riječi: angažman, strast, motivacija, preklapanje, zaposlenici

El compromiso y la pasión por el trabajo – aspectos comunes y diferencias conceptuales

Resumen

La psicología positiva, tanto como el movimiento del comportamiento organizacional positivo, enfocándose en experiencias de los empleados, ponen en la vanguardia factores de estados psicológicos positivos de los empleados. En los últimos años varias investigaciones han acentuado la importancia práctica que tienen el compromiso del empleado y la pasión por el trabajo (modelo dualista de la pasión; Vallerand et al., 2003) para la predicción de diferentes resultados personales y organizativos positivos (p. ej. rendimiento, bienestar). Aunque tanto compromiso como pasión parecen ser constructos relativamente claros, fácil de notar, en realidad es muy difícil definirlos claramente y diferenciarlos entre sí. Por eso el objetivo de este estudio fue dar una imagen detallada de sus aspectos comunes y diferencias conceptuales en el contexto del entorno laboral. La mayor superposición existe entre el compromiso y así llamada pasión armoniosa. Se basa en el mecanismo común de desarrollo que se encuentra en la base de ambos constructos, una fuerte motivación para desempeñar un trabajo, una fuerte identificación con el trabajo y relaciones similares con diferentes factores que preceden o son consecuencia de estos constructos. Se considera que una teoría más amplia (como p. ej. la teoría autodeterminativa) sería más aplicable en la explicación de los constructos nombrados y de esta manera se igualarían los rasgos comunes de ambos constructos y se evitaría la repetición y el riesgo de multiplicación de conceptos en la psicología positiva.

Palabras claves: compromiso, pasión, motivación, superposición, empleados

Primljeno: 22.10.2014.