

Crossover of Work Engagement

Subjects: Psychology

Contributor: Konstantinos Chiotis, George Michaelides

Work engagement is related to a plethora of positive outcomes both at the individual and organizational level. This positive organizational state can cross over from one individual to another, and this process may depend on several factors, such as the work context or individual differences. Crossover is a form of emotional contagion, and a conscious procedure in which transference of emotions and affective states is facilitated by the empathic reactions of partners.

Keywords: work engagement ; crossover ; agreeableness

1. Introduction

Crossover is a form of emotional contagion, and a conscious procedure in which transference of emotions and affective states is facilitated by the empathic reactions of partners ^[1]. Simply put, when we spend time with others, and pay close attention to them, our affective states can cross over. Crossover processes can cause affective states, emotions, or well-being to be transmitted between colleagues ^{[2],[3]}, leaders and followers ^{[4],[5],[6],[7]}, and dual-earner couples ^{[8],[9],[10]}. Work engagement, in particular, has received extra attention within the crossover literature. Engaged employees are enthusiastic about their jobs ^[2] and can be a source of inspiration for others ^[3]. Research has shown that work engagement can be transmitted among working spouses ^{[11],[12]}, as well as from one employee to another in the workplace ^{[2],[3],[7]}. This is very important, considering the various positive outcomes of work engagement at the individual, team and organizational levels. For example, due to their dedication, engaged employees demonstrate better in role task performance ^[13], have better financial returns ^[3], and improved well-being ^[14]. In addition, engaged employees, due to their physical, cognitive, and emotional connection to their work roles ^[15] are more likely to be entrepreneurial ^[16] and exhibit proactive behaviors ^[17]. The fact that engagement can cross over from one employee to another, means that it can also emerge as a collective characteristic of work teams ^{[2],[18]}. Indeed, there are studies that have highlighted the positive association between team level work engagement and team performance ^{[19],[20]} as well as the positive relationship between work engagement and performance at the organizational level ^{[21],[22]}.

Past research has shown that the transmission of work engagement can be facilitated by various factors ^{[23],[24]}. These may include factors such as frequency of communication e.g., ^[3] or more individual characteristics, such as empathy ^{[25],[26]}. This brings into question whether broader personality traits, such as those measured by the Big-5, can also influence the extent to which engagement can be transmitted between individuals.

2. Work Engagement

Kahn ^[15] was the first that introduced the construct of personal engagement at work, defining it as a psychological, emotional and physical state transferring peoples' energy into their works. According to this view, an authentic expression of self occurs during situations of engagement, which in turn is beneficial for the individual. Regarding work engagement, there is a broad consensus among scholars about its core dimensions which are energy and involvement ^[27] and Kahn's ^[15] conceptualization of engagement suggests that it entails a behavioral-energetic, an emotional, and a cognitive component ^[28]. From this perspective, Schaufeli and Bakker ^[29] define work engagement as a positive, fulfilling, and work-related state of mind, characterized by vigor, dedication (emotional component) and absorption (cognitive component). Vigor refers to having high levels of energy and mental resilience while working (behavioral-energetic component). Dedication refers to a sense of enthusiasm, pride, and significance that someone feels due to his/her work (emotional component), and finally absorption refers to being highly concentrated to work or a specific task so that it can even become rather difficult for a person to detach himself/herself from work (cognitive component).

Work engagement has been found to relate to several positive organizational outcomes including organizational commitment and improved well-being ^{[14],[29]} job performance ^{[3],[30]} and lower turnover intention ^[31]. Engaged employees are quite energetic, self-efficacious ^[32], willing and happy to assist their colleagues ^[33], they tend to create their own

positive feedback, and despite committing a lot of effort and resources, they are still left with a state of fulfillment and satisfaction about what they have accomplished ^[27].

3. Crossover of Work Engagement

Crossover is defined as the process that occurs when psychological well-being experienced by a person affects the level of psychological well-being of another person in the same social environment ^[34]. Consequently, crossover is a dyadic inter-individual transmission of mental states or emotions among closely related individuals, which occurs within a particular domain of life such as family or workplace ^[35].

Westman and Vinokur ^[36] proposed three main mechanisms responsible for the crossover process. The first mechanism refers to a direct transmission of from one partner to another through empathetic reactions (direct empathetic crossover). They argue that well-being experienced by one partner produces an empathic reaction in the other, which in turn leads to an increase in his/her own level of strain. The second mechanism concerns an indirect transmission of well-being as a result of interpersonal transactions and behavioral interactions between partners (indirect crossover). Thus, experiencing some change in well-being by one person can trigger a change in their behaviors as well as the way they interact with others and consequently influence their well-being. As such, social undermining or conflicting interactions could be mediating the crossover of negative affective states, and social support can mediate the crossover for positive affect ^[42]. Finally, the third mechanism suggests that well-being experienced by partners is not actually due to any crossover effect, but to common stressors and shared contexts which affect both partners. These three mechanisms can either operate independently of one another or jointly ^[37], and findings of empirical studies ^[25], ^[38], ^[39], support all of these propositions.

Although Westman ^[34] initially placed the emphasis on negative forms of well-being, such as job stress, strain, and burnout, it is possible that positive experiences may also cross over from one partner to the other via the same mechanisms as the negative aspects ^[34]. Work engagement is one of the most widely researched positive aspects of individual well-being ^[40]. In terms of its position in the nomological network of well-being constructs, it is negatively related to job burnout ^[41], and positively with life satisfaction ^[42], ^[43], and happiness ^[44]. Moreover, when employees experience work engagement they also have high levels of intrinsic work motivation ^[45] which is to say that they tend to find enjoyment in the job itself regardless of whether there are any additional rewards or benefits associated with doing it ^[45].

Based on the research of emotional contagion in the workplace e.g., ^[46], ^[47], ^[48], ^[49], there is a considerable amount of studies that have focused on the crossover of work engagement among employees and have also attempted to uncover the factors and the conditions that moderate this process. For example, Wirtz et al. ^[7] study showed that work engagement can cross over from subordinates to their leaders over time, indicating this way that subordinates can shape their leaders' work experiences and affect their well-being. In their diary study, Bakker and Xanthopoulou ^[3] showed that daily work engagement crossed over from one employee to the other within a dyad, only on those days that these employees interacted more frequently than usual, indicating that frequency of communication played a moderating role in the transmission of work engagement. In another study, Bakker et al. ^[2] found that crossover of work engagement, and especially vigor, took place on days when colleagues interacted more frequently, and that expressiveness, built through frequent daily interaction, could increase the possibility for work engagement to cross over from one employee to another. Similarly, Tian et al. ^[50] showed that work engagement crossed over from one partner to another and communication quality had a significant moderating effect on this process. Finally, in their study, Chiotis and Michaelides ^[51], found that work engagement crossed over from one employee to another within a dyad and this effect was further intensified if either one or both employees in the dyad are characterized by high levels of agreeableness.

4. Conclusions

Given the higher levels of interdependence that employees may experience due to increased demands for working in teams or pairs ^[52], as well as the positive organizational or individual outcomes of work engagement, it is crucial to investigate under which conditions crossover of work engagement takes place or which factors may facilitate this process. As such, it is important to examine crossover effects in various work contexts, as well as in dual-earner couples. To understand the dynamic nature of work engagement, researchers should employ more daily diary studies. Such methodological approaches would allow a more nuanced representation of how and when crossover effects occur.

References

1. Mina Westman; Efrat Shadach; Giora Keinan; The crossover of positive and negative emotions: The role of state empathy.. *International Journal of Stress Management* **2013**, 20, 116-133, [10.1037/a0033205](#).
2. Arnold Bakker; Hetty Van Emmerik; Martin Euwema; Crossover of Burnout and Engagement in Work Teams. *Work and Occupations* **2006**, 33, 464-489, [10.1177/0730888406291310](#).
3. Arnold B. Bakker; Despoina Xanthopoulou; The crossover of daily work engagement: Test of an actor-partner interdependence model.. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **2009**, 94, 1562-1571, [10.1037/a0017525](#).
4. Christina Köppe; Jana Kammerhoff; Astrid Schütz; Leader-follower crossover: exhaustion predicts somatic complaints via StaffCare behavior. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* **2018**, 33, 297-310, [10.1108/jmp-10-2017-0367](#).
5. Annick Parent-Lamarche; Claude Fernet; The Role of Employee Self-Efficacy in Top-Down Burnout Crossover. *Journal of Occupational & Environmental Medicine* **2020**, 62, 803-809, [10.1097/jom.0000000000001924](#).
6. Yasin Rofcanin; Mireia Las Heras; Maria Jose Bosch; Geoffrey Wood; Farooq Mughal; A closer look at the positive crossover between supervisors and subordinates: The role of home and work engagement. *Human Relations* **2018**, 72, 1776-1804, [10.1177/0018726718812599](#).
7. Nina Wirtz; Thomas Rigotti; Kathleen Otto; Carina Loeb; What about the leader? Crossover of emotional exhaustion and work engagement from followers to leaders.. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* **2017**, 22, 86-97, [10.1037/ocp0000024](#).
8. Suzanne M. Booth-LeDoux; Russell A. Matthews; Julie Holliday Wayne; Testing a resource-based spillover-crossover-spillover model: Transmission of social support in dual-earner couples.. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **2020**, 105, 732-747, [10.1037/apl0000460](#).
9. Russell A. Matthews; Regan E. Del Priore; Linda K. Acitelli; Janet L. Barnes-Farrell; Work-to-relationship conflict: Crossover effects in dual-earner couples.. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* **2006**, 11, 228-240, [10.1037/1076-8998.11.3.228](#).
10. Xiaohong Xu; Yisheng Peng; Peng Zhao; Richard Hayes; William P. Jimenez; Fighting for time: Spillover and crossover effects of long work hours among dual-earner couples. *Stress and Health* **2019**, 35, 491-502, [10.1002/smi.2882](#).
11. Arnold B. Bakker; E Evangelia = Eva Demerouti; Wilmar Schaufeli; The crossover of burnout and work engagement among working couples. *Human Relations* **2005**, 58, 661-689, [10.1177/0018726705055967](#).
12. Mina Westman; Dalia Etzion; Shoshi Chen; Crossover of positive experiences from business travelers to their spouses. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* **2009**, 24, 269-284, [10.1108/02683940910939340](#).
13. Michael S. Christian; Adela S. Garza; Jerel E. Slaughter; WORK ENGAGEMENT: A QUANTITATIVE REVIEW AND TEST OF ITS RELATIONS WITH TASK AND CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE. *Personnel Psychology* **2011**, 64, 89-136, [10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x](#).
14. Jari J. Hakanen; Arnold B. Bakker; Wilmar B. Schaufeli; Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology* **2006**, 43, 495-513, [10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001](#).
15. William A. Kahn; PSYCHOLOGICAL CONDITIONS OF PERSONAL ENGAGEMENT AND DISENGAGEMENT AT WORK.. *Academy of Management Journal* **1990**, 33, 692-724, [10.2307/256287](#).
16. Jason C. Gawke; Marjan J. Gorgievski; Arnold B. Bakker; Employee intrapreneurship and work engagement: A latent change score approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* **2017**, 100, 88-100, [10.1016/j.jvb.2017.03.002](#).
17. Sabine Sonnentag; Charlotte Fritz; The Recovery Experience Questionnaire: Development and validation of a measure for assessing recuperation and unwinding from work.. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* **2007**, 12, 204-221, [10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.204](#).
18. Heleen van Mierlo; Arnold B. Bakker; Crossover of engagement in groups. *Career Development International* **2018**, 23, 106-118, [10.1108/cdi-03-2017-0060](#).
19. Patrícia L. Costa; Ana Margarida Passos; Arnold B. Bakker; Direct and Contextual Influence of Team Conflict on Team Resources, Team Work Engagement, and Team Performance. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research* **2015**, 8, 211-227, [10.1111/ncmr.12061](#).
20. Maria Tims; Arnold B. Bakker; Daantje Derks; Willem Van Rhenen; Job Crafting at the Team and Individual Level. *Group & Organization Management* **2013**, 38, 427-454, [10.1177/1059601113492421](#).
21. Murray R. Barrick; Gary R. Thurgood; Troy A. Smith; Stephen H. Courtright; Collective Organizational Engagement: Linking Motivational Antecedents, Strategic Implementation, and Firm Performance. *Academy of Management Journal* **2015**, 58, 111-135, [10.5465/amj.2013.0227](#).

22. Daniela Gutermann; Nale Lehmann-Willenbrock; Diana Boer; Marise Born; Sven C. Voelpel; How Leaders Affect Followers' Work Engagement and Performance: Integrating Leader–Member Exchange and Crossover Theory. *British Journal of Management* **2017**, 28, 299-314, [10.1111/1467-8551.12214](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12214).
23. R. William Doherty; The Emotional Contagion Scale: A Measure of Individual Differences. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* **1997**, 21, 131-154, [10.1023/a:1024956003661](https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1024956003661).
24. James B. Stiff; James Price Dillard; Lilnabeth Somera; Hyun Kim; Carra Sleight; Empathy, communication, and prosocial behavior. *Communication Monographs* **1988**, 55, 198-213, [10.1080/03637758809376166](https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758809376166).
25. Arnold B. Bakker; Evangelia Demerouti; The crossover of work engagement between working couples. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* **2009**, 24, 220-236, [10.1108/02683940910939313](https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940910939313).
26. Arnold B. Bakker; Akihito Shimazu; Evangelia Demerouti; Kyoko Shimada; Norito Kawakami; Crossover of work engagement among Japanese couples: Perspective taking by both partners.. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* **2011**, 16, 112-125, [10.1037/a0021297](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021297).
27. Arnold B. Bakker; Simon L. Albrecht; Michael Leiter; Key questions regarding work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* **2011**, 20, 4-28, [10.1080/1359432x.2010.485352](https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2010.485352).
28. Schaufeli, W.B.; Bakker, A.B.. The conceptualization and measurement of work engagement: A review; Bakker, A.B.; Leiter, M.P., Eds.; Psychology Press: New York, NY, 2010; pp. 10-24.
29. Wilmar B. Schaufeli; Arnold B. Bakker; Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* **2004**, 25, 293-315, [10.1002/job.248](https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248).
30. Bruce Louis Rich; Jeffrey A. Lepine; Eean R. Crawford; Job Engagement: Antecedents and Effects on Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal* **2010**, 53, 617-635, [10.5465/amj.2010.51468988](https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.51468988).
31. K. Alfes; Amanda Shantz; C. Truss; Emma Soane; The link between perceived human resource management practices, engagement and employee behaviour: a moderated mediation model. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* **2013**, 24, 330-351, [10.1080/09585192.2012.679950](https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.679950).
32. Bakker, A.B.. Building engagement in the workplace.; Burke, R.J.; Cooper, C.L., Eds.; Routledge: Oxon, UK, 2009; pp. 50-72.
33. Jonathon R.B. Halbesleben; Anthony R. Wheeler; The relative roles of engagement and embeddedness in predicting job performance and intention to leave. *Work & Stress* **2008**, 22, 242-256, [10.1080/02678370802383962](https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802383962).
34. Mina Westman; Stress and Strain Crossover. *Human Relations* **2001**, 54, 717-751, [10.1177/0018726701546002](https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726701546002).
35. Arnold B. Bakker; Evangelia Demerouti; Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International* **2008**, 13, 209-223, [10.1108/13620430810870476](https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430810870476).
36. Mina Westman; Amiram D. Vinokur; Unraveling the Relationship of Distress Levels Within Couples: Common Stressors, Empathic Reactions, or Crossover via Social Interaction?. *Human Relations* **1998**, 51, 137-156, [10.1177/001872679805100202](https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679805100202).
37. Westman, M.. Crossover of stress and strain in the family and in the workplace.; Perrewe, P.L.; Ganster, D.C., Eds.; JAI Press/Elsevier Science: Greenwich, CT, 2002; pp. 143-181.
38. Bakker, A.B.; Demerouti, E.. The spillover-crossover model. ; Grzywacs, J.; Demerouti, E., Eds.; Psychology Press: Hove, UK, 2013; pp. 54-70.
39. Akihito Shimazu; Arnold Bakker; Evangelia Demerouti; How Job Demands Affect an Intimate Partner: A Test of the Spillover-Crossover Model in Japan. *Journal of Occupational Health* **2009**, 51, 239-248, [10.1539/joh.18160](https://doi.org/10.1539/joh.18160).
40. Bakker, A.B.; Demerouti, E.. Job-demands resources theory. In *Work and Wellbeing*.; Chen, P.Y.; Cooper, C.L., Eds.; Wiley Blackwell: Ne York, NY, 2014; pp. 37-64.
41. Wilmar B. Schaufeli; Marisa Salanova; Vicente González-Romá; Arnold B. Bakker; The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies* **2002**, 3, 71-92, [10.1023/a:1015630930326](https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1015630930326).
42. Akihito Shimazu; Wilmar B. Schaufeli; Is Workaholism Good or Bad for Employee Well-being? The Distinctiveness of Workaholism and Work Engagement among Japanese Employees. *Industrial Health* **2009**, 47, 495-502, [10.2486/indhealth.47.495](https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.47.495).
43. Akihito Shimazu; Wilmar B. Schaufeli; Kazumi Kubota; Norito Kawakami; Do Workaholism and Work Engagement Predict Employee Well-being and Performance in Opposite Directions?. *Industrial Health* **2012**, 50, 316-321, [10.2486/indhealth.ms1355](https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.ms1355).
44. Alfredo Rodríguez-Muñoz; Ana Isabel Sanzvergel; Evangelia Demerouti; Arnold Bakker; Engaged at Work and Happy at Home: A Spillover–Crossover Model. *Journal of Happiness Studies* **2013**, 15, 271-283, [10.1007/s10902-013-9421-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9421-3).

45. Ilona Van Beek; Toon Taris; Wilmar Schaufeli; Workaholic and work engaged employees: Dead ringers or worlds apart?. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* **2011**, 16, 468-482, [10.1037/a0024392](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024392).
46. Sigal G. Barsade; The Ripple Effect: Emotional Contagion and its Influence on Group Behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **2002**, 47, 644-675, [10.2307/3094912](https://doi.org/10.2307/3094912).
47. Thomas Sy; Stéphane Côté; Richard Saavedra; The Contagious Leader: Impact of the Leader's Mood on the Mood of Group Members, Group Affective Tone, and Group Processes.. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **2005**, 90, 295-305, [10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.295](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.295).
48. Peter Totterdell; Steve Kellett; Katja Teuchmann; Rob B. Briner; Evidence of mood linkage in work groups.. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **1998**, 74, 1504-1515, [10.1037//0022-3514.74.6.1504](https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.74.6.1504).
49. Brough, P.; Westman, M.. Crossover, culture, and dual-earner couples; Shockley, K.M.; Shen, W.; Johnson, R.C., Eds.; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2018; pp. 629-645.
50. Lili Tian; Huihui Chen; Lejie Zhu; Dahua Tang; E. Scott Huebner; Ying Yang; Huijing Yang; Crossover of Weekly Work Engagement Among Dual-Working Couples. *Journal of Business and Psychology* **2016**, 32, 441-453, [10.1007/s10869-016-9451-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-016-9451-z).
51. Konstantinos Chiotis; George Michaelides; Crossover of Work Engagement: The Moderating Role of Agreeableness. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **2022**, 19, 7622, [10.3390/ijerph19137622](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19137622).
52. Arnold B. Bakker; Mina Westman; I.J. Hetty van Emmerik; Advancements in crossover theory. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* **2009**, 24, 206-219, [10.1108/02683940910939304](https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940910939304).

Retrieved from <https://encyclopedia.pub/entry/history/show/60986>