SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY PUBLISHING HOUSE

SCIENTIFIC PAPERS OF SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY 2025
ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT SERIES NO. 226

PREDICTING WORK ENGAGEMENT THROUGH ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE: INSIGHTS FROM A POLISH STUDY

Katarzyna DURNIAT

Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Historical and Pedagogical Sciences, University of Wrocław;
katarzyna.durniat@uwr.edu.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-4830-5044

Purpose: The aim of the study was to investigate whether Organizational Climate and its dimensions: Co-workers, Leadership, Work Organization, Information and Communication, Representation of Employees' Interests, Promotion and Rewards (Rosenstiel, Boegel, 1992) can predict Work Engagement and its components: Vigour, Dedication, and Absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002, 2003).
Design/methodology/approach: A cross-sectional survey was conducted in 2022 on a heterogeneous sample of Polish employees (N = 229). The study used a Polish adaptation of Rosenstiel and Boegel's Organizational Climate Questionnaire (1992; cf. Durniat, 2012, 2018), which includes 55 items across 7 subscales (Cronbach's α = 0.81-0.90), as well as a Polish adaptation of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Szabowska-Walaszczyk et al., 2011) in its 17-item version (3 subscales; Cronbach's α = 0.81-0.88). Correlation and linear regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationships between the studied variables, with the expectation of significant and positive associations.
Findings: Two factors of organizational climate, i.e. the 'Leadership' and 'Co-workers' interactions' emerged as key predictors of work engagement, while other climate factors demonstrated weaker or non-significant impacts on employee engagement. Surprisingly, the 'Representation of employees' interests' negatively predicted work engagement (especially 'Vigour'). Moreover, the 'General perception of organizational climate' may be more impactful for work engagement than specific climate dimensions.
Research limitations: The cross-sectional design prevents causal inferences, and the relatively small sample size constrains the generalizability of the results.
Practical implications: Managers and organizations should foster a positive organizational climate, especially investing in leadership development and team-building initiatives - key factors enhancing employee engagement.
Originality/value: The findings offer a valuable contribution by identifying organizational climate factors that enhance work engagement, and appear to represent the first study of this kind conducted in Poland.
Keywords: organizational climate, work engagement, UWES, relationships, predictions.
Category of the paper: Research paper.

1. Introduction

The most recent Gallup report on the state of the global workplace indicates that in 2023, global employee engagement stagnated, and overall employee wellbeing declined. According to Gallup's findings only 23% of employees globally (13% in Europe; 10% in Poland) fall in the group of engaged, while 62% of employees globally (72% in Europe; 75% in Poland) are not engaged, while 15% of workforce globally (16% in Europe; 15% in Poland) show active disengagement (Gallup, 2024). These figures highlight a concerning state of employee engagement, with Europe having the lowest proportion of engaged employees among all regions, and Polish employees exhibiting even lower engagement than the European average. Furthermore, Gallup report underscores that business units with high employee engagement tend to experience substantially greater employee well-being, along with increased productivity, profitability, and sales, compared to teams with lower engagement levels. It also provides compelling evidence that reducing workforce disengagement contributes to positive organizational outcomes. In its 2024 meta-analysis (the largest study of its kind, encompassing data from over 183,000 business units across 53 industries and 90 countries) Gallup found that business units with high employee engagement tend to experience significantly greater employee well-being, along with increased productivity, profitability, and sales, compared to those with lower engagement levels. Notably, according to Gallup's study results, engagement is driven more by socio-organizational factors at the business-unit level - especially the presence of engaged and supportive managers - followed by strong communication, clarity of purpose and role expectations, opportunities for development, and a strengths-based approach, than by macroeconomic factors such as national labor policies and the vibrancy of job markets (Clifton, Harter, 2019; Gallup, 2024).

This paper investigates the relationship between organizational climate and work engagement, examining both overall and specific dimensions of these constructs. By analysing data from a Polish sample, the study explores the extent to which different aspects of organizational climate predict work engagement and its components: vigour, dedication, and absorption. The results are discussed in the context of international scientific literature.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. Organizational climate

The concept of organizational climate has captivated researchers and practitioners over the last six decades (for overview see: Ehrhart et al., 2025; Ostroff et al., 2003; Schneider et al., 2017; Schein, 2000). A growing body of scientific work aims to differentiate it from

organizational culture (e.g., Ostroff et al., 2003; Payne, 2000; Schein, 2000) while examining its relationships with employee behaviour and organizational outcomes (e.g., Goodman, Dingli, 2013; Payne et al., 1976; Patterson et al., 2004, 2005). Organizational climate is a multidisciplinary phenomenon, drawing from Gestalt psychology, social anthropology, and organizational theory - particularly influenced by the Human Relations movement (cf. Schneider et al., 2011; Schneider, Barbera, 2013).

Although there are many ways in which organizational climate has been defined, in the most widely accepted modern paradigms, it is understood as the collective perceptions and the significance employees attribute to the policies, practices, and procedures they encounter in the organisation, as well as the behaviours they see being rewarded, supported, and expected in the workplace (Ostroff et al., 2003; Schneider et al., 2011, 2017; Schein, 2000). These perceptions refer to the key, relatively stable characteristics of an organisation (such as leadership, cooperation, communication, work organisation, recognition, and support) which differentiate one organisation from another and significantly influence the behaviour of its members. Researchers emphasise that organizational climate emerges from employees' interactions with leadership, HR practices, coworkers, and organizational norms and reflects how individuals and groups perceive their work environments (Ehrhart et al., 2025; Schneider et al., 2011, 2017).

Within the outlined organizational climate paradigm, we can place the concept developed by German scientists Rosenstiel and Boegel (1992; cf. Durniat, 2012, 2018). This concept emerges from Kurt Lewin's (1951) psychological field theory, in which he emphasised the importance of an individual's subjective perception of their environment in determining human behaviour. In line with this, Rosenstiel and Boegel (1922) assumed that human behaviour in an organisation results from two fundamental factors: personality and environment. Accordingly, researchers claimed that organizational climate emerges from a dynamic interaction between the organisation (with its formal characteristics and cultural features, such as mission, goals, power distance, and leadership) and the employees (with their needs, expectations, competencies, and values). According "organizational climate is a notion referring to the features of the entire internal environment of a given organisation, as perceived and evaluated by groups of its members" (Rosenstiel, Boegel, 1992, p. 22). Although organizational climate is a collective concept, it can be measured at both individual and organizational levels (Schneider et al., 2013, 2017). Rosenstiel and Boegel (1992) identified six core dimensions of organizational climate, which form the basis of the main scales of their tool: (1) Co-workers (concerns the quality of relationships, mutual trust and cooperation with co-workers), (2) Leadership (refers to the approach taken by leaders and managers, including decision-making processes and leadership style), (3) Organization of work (describes the adequacy and efficiency of task allocation, workflow, and overall organization of work processes), (4) Information and communication (concerns the clarity, reliability, efficiency, and transparency of communication within the organization), (5) Representation of employees' interests (assesses how effectively employees' interests are represented and advocated for

within the organisation, particularly through trade unions, workers' councils, and similar bodies), (6) Promotion and rewards (concerns the adequacy and effectiveness of the organizational system of rewards and promotion opportunities) (cf. Durniat, 2012, 2018).

Research indicates that positively assessed organizational climate dimensions, such as supportive leadership, autonomy, communication, trust, and recognition, enhance work motivation, engagement and satisfaction (Bakker, Demerouti, 2007; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Rožman, Štrukelj, 2021). Supportive leadership helps employees feel valued and motivated, while mutual trust, open communication and strong relationships foster a sense of security and connection, further enhancing employee engagement (cf. Holloway, 2012; Kahn, 1990; Meyer et al., 2004; Mazzetti et al., 2023).

2.2. Work engagement

Work engagement refers to the positive, fulfilling, and motivational state in which employees become deeply involved with their work. This concept was first introduced to scientific discourse by Kahn (1990), later on evolved primarily through the work of organizational psychologists Schaufeli, Bakker, and their colleagues, who developed the most recognizable definition and theoretical model of work engagement (cf. Schaufeli et al., 2002, 2003, 2004; Bakker et al., 2008, 2010). They defined this phenomenon as "A positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigour, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002, p. 72). Vigour reflects high energy, resilience, and persistence at work, even in challenging situations. Dedication involves deep involvement, enthusiasm, and a strong sense of meaning and accomplishment. Absorption is characterized by full immersion in work, where time passes quickly due to intense concentration and engrossment (cf. Schaufeli et al., 2002; Bakker et al., 2010). It is worth underlying that absorption differs substantially from vigour and dedication, which have been theoretically and empirically identified as the core dimensions of work engagement (Schaufeli, Bakker, 2004). It resembles flow, a state of deep concentration that may not always be linked to motivation or commitment (Schaufeli, Bakker, 2004). Research shows that absorption, rather, functions as a long-lasting mood or a temporary state in which a person is fully focused on and deeply immersed in their job (cf. Schaufeli, Bakker, 2004; Mazzetti et al., 2018, 2023).

The antecedents and consequences of work engagement have been widely researched and thoroughly described in the scientific literature (e.g., Bailey et al., 2017; Bakker et al., 2010; Mazzetti et al., 2023; Meyer et al., 2004; Wefald et al., 2011). Studies indicate that high work engagement is influenced by various individual and socio-organizational factors, foremost among them supportive and inspiring leadership, as well as a favorable organizational climate (Abun et al., 2021; Arya, Sainy, 2017; Rahmadani et al., 2022; Rožman, Štrukelj, 2021; Szczepańska-Woszczyna, Bogaczyk, 2023). In turn, high work engagement increases employee satisfaction and job performance, innovation and creativity, mental health and well-being,

as well as organizational outcomes and overall success (Bakker et al., 2008; Patterson et al., 2004, 2005; Rahmadani et al., 2020, 2022).

3. Research hypothesis

Based on the literature review and research findings, the following research hypotheses have been proposed:

H1: Organizational climate and its factors (co-workers, leadership, organization of work, information and communication, representation of employees' interests, career opportunities and rewards and general impression) are positively correlated with work engagement and its factors (vigour, dedication, and absorption).

H2: Organizational climate and its factors (as cited above) significantly and positively predict work engagement (as unidimensional phenomenon) and its factors: vigour, dedication, and absorption.

H3: Among all the factors of organizational climate, leadership will be the most significant positive predictor of work engagement.

4. Data collection and sample description

The study was a cross-sectional survey conducted in Wrocław in 2022, involving 229 participants (average age: 35.7, SD = 11.4), selected from a population of working adults. Respondents were tested individually or in small groups by a trained pollster. Participation was voluntary and anonymous. The surveyed individuals were informed of the scientific aims of the study and completed a paper-and-pencil version of the questionnaires. They were assured the right to withdraw from the study at any time without providing a reason. Detailed sociodemographic data for the sample is provided in Table 1.

Table1.
Socio-demographic data of the sample (N = 229; 2022)

Demographic category		Count	%	Demographic category		Count	%
Sex	woman	143	62.4	**Sector**	public	111	48.9
	man	85	37.1		private	114	50.2
	missing data	1	0.4		missing data	2	0.9
Age	up to 25 years	48	21	**Position**	director	10	4.5
	26-35 years	74	31.4		supervisor	28	12.6
	36-45 years	55	24		specialist	85	38.3
	above 45 years	54	23.6		subordinate	98	44.1
	missing data	0	0		missing data	1	0.5

Cont. table 1.

Branch	industry	28	12.3	**Seniority**	up to 1 year	22	9.6
	commerce	20	8.8		above 1 to 3 years	59	25.8
	services	55	24.2		above 3 to 6 years	27	11.8
	administration	22	9.7		above 6 to 10 years	36	15.7
	education	38	16.7		above 10 years	85	37.1
	health service	11	4.8		missing data	0	0
	others	53	23.3				
	missing data	0	0				

Source: Own research.

5. Instruments and methods

5.1. Organizational climate questionnaire

The organizational climate was assessed using the questionnaire developed by Rosenstiel and Boegel (1992) in the Polish adaptation by Durniat (2012, 2018). The tool was designed to capture the multidimensional nature of organizational climate. The Polish version of the test comprises 55 items divided into 6 main subscales: (1) Co-workers (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.86$; 9 items; e.g., "If anyone has problems at work, they can always count on their workmates" and "Everyone can freely express their own opinions and feelings"), (2) Leadership (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.92$; 12 items; e.g., "Good work is well appreciated by our superiors" and "The superiors understand our problems and worries"), (3) Work organization (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.81$; 7 items; e.g., "The aims and tasks we are faced with make an interesting challenge" and "Interesting and uncommon tasks are distributed fairly"), (4) Information and communication (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.90$; 10 items; e.g., "We are often informed about facts and decisions that have already been made" and "The management of our company is ready to consider employees' ideas and suggestions"), (5) Representation of employees' interests (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.81$; 5 items; e.g., "The interests of employees are fully respected in our company" and "Even when the staff's interests conflict with management's, there is always a solution that satisfies everyone"), (6) Promotion and rewards (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.85$; 7 items; e.g., "There are many opportunities to get promoted" and "Professional achievements are well evaluated in our company"). The test also includes a scale measuring 'General perception of organizational climate' (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.85$; 5 items; e.g., "Working in our company is nice" and "Our company cares about the well-being of employees"), highly correlated with particular climate dimensions.

The questionnaire uses a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (I strongly disagree) to 5 (I strongly agree), with higher scores indicating a better organizational climate. Factorial and reliability analyses confirm that the organizational climate questionnaire can be interpreted as either a unidimensional measure (providing an overall score) or a multidimensional tool for

assessing specific aspects of organizational climate. The Polish adaptation demonstrates excellent reliability and validity across multiple studies and meets all psychometric requirements. It is suitable for scientific research and can be applied to both group- and individual-level analyses (cf. Rosenstiel, Boegel,1992; Durniat, 2016, 2018).

5.2. Work engagement scale (UWES)

Work engagement was measured using the 17-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) (Schaufeli et al., 2002, 2003) adapted for the Polish context by Szabowska-Walaszczyk et al. (2011). The UWES-17 evaluates three key dimensions of engagement through its subscales: Vigour (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.81$; 6 items; e.g., "When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work" and "At work, I feel bursting with energy"), Dedication (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.88$; 5 items; e.g., "I am enthusiastic about my job" and "I am proud of the work I do"), and Absorption (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.84$; 6 items; e.g., "When I am working, I forget everything else around me" and "I am immersed in my job"). Each item is rated on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (always/daily), with higher scores indicating greater levels of work engagement. The scale can be used to assess engagement as either a single construct, represented by an overall score (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.94$), or as a multidimensional construct comprising the three subscales (Schaufeli et al., 2002, 2003).

6. Statistical solution and results

All statistical analyses were performed using JAMOVI (version 2.3.18) software. In the initial step, descriptive statistics and Pearson's r correlations between all the variables included in the study were computed. This analysis allowed for the exploration of the overall pattern of relationships between organizational climate and work engagement factors. The obtained correlation matrix demonstrates a general pattern of significant, positive, and moderate correlations (ranging from 0.32 to 0.52) between all dimensions of organizational climate and work engagement (cf. Table 2). This means that, as expected, higher assessments of organizational climate are associated with higher levels of work engagement, and vice versa.

Table 2.
Means, standard deviations, and correlation matrix (Pearson's r) between Organizational Climate (overall score) and UWES-17 scales (N=229; 2022)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.Organizational Climate (overall)	108.6	36.40											
2. Co-workers	31.3	6.05	0.71										
3. Leadership	38.8	9.94	0.93	0.58									
4. Work organization	24.3	4.90	0.80	0.54	0.69								

Cont. table 2.

5.Communication	31.8	7.88	0.90	0.55	0.79	0.68							
6. Employees' interests	16.2	4.29	0.81	0.53	0.71	0.55	0.74						
7. Promotion and rewards	21.3	5.87	0.81	0.42	0.73	0.55	0.71	0.67					
8. UWES (overall)	63.4	18.20	0.52	0.38	0.48	0.39	0.46	0.34	0.43				
9. Vigour	22.4	6.40	0.49	0.34	0.46	0.36	0.41	0.30	0.40	0.91			
10. Dedication	19.9	6.37	0.48	0.34	0.45	0.36	0.43	0.31	0.38	0.92	0.77		
11.Absorption	22.1	7.23	0.45	0.31	0.44	0.35	0.40	0.32	0.38	0.91	0.72	0.75	
12. General impression of Org. Climate	16.9	4.43	0.83	0.57	0.75	0.67	0.70	0.58	0.58	0.53	0.52	0.50	0.45

Note. $p < 0.001$; M = mean; SD = standard deviation.

Source: Own research.

Next, regression analyses were conducted to examine whether organizational climate and its dimensions can predict work engagement, measured as both a uni- and multi-dimensional phenomenon. The results of the regression analyses are presented in the Appendix (cf. Appendix, Table 1).

In the first step, a simple linear regression was performed (model 0) to examine the relationship between 'Organizational climate' and 'Work engagement' (both measured as unidimensional constructs). The results indicated that 'Organizational climate' significantly predicted 'Work engagement' ($\beta = .519$, $p < .001$). The overall model was statistically significant ($F(1, 227) = 83.7$, $p < .001$), explaining 27% of the variance ($R^2 = .27$). This finding suggests that a more favourable work climate is associated with higher work engagement.

In the second step, a multiple linear regression model (model 1) was applied to assess the predictive power of specific organizational climate factors on overall work engagement.

The model 1. (predicting 'Work engagement' as unidimensional variable) was well-fitted to the data ($F(6, 222) = 14.0$, $p < .001$) and explained 23% of the variance ($R^2 = .23$). The results indicated that 'Work engagement' was significantly and positively predicted by 'Interactions with co-workers' ($\beta = .16$, $p = .031$) and 'Leadership' ($\beta = .23$, $p = .043$). Furthermore, a marginally significant positive relationship was found between 'Career opportunities and rewards' and 'Work engagement' ($\beta = .16$, $p = .070$), while a marginally significant negative relationship was observed between 'Work engagement' and 'Representation of employees' interests' ($\beta = –.16$, $p = .087$). This suggests that when employees feel well-represented, their personal engagement in work may decline. However, this result did not reach the conventional threshold of statistical significance ($p < .05$). The remaining organizational climate factors (i.e. 'Organization of work' and 'Communication') did not significantly contribute to the model (cf. Appendix, Table 1).

Subsequently, it was tested whether the six distinct factors of organizational climate significantly predict specific aspects of work engagement: Vigour, Dedication and Absorption. In the case of 'Vigour' as the dependent variable (model 2), the model was well-fitted to the data ($F(6, 222) = 13.2$, $p < .001$) and explained 24% of the variance ($R^2 = .24$). The results indicated that 'Vigour' was significantly and positively predicted by 'Leadership' ($\beta = .26$,

p = .021) and ‘Interactions with co-workers’ (β = .22, p = .003). Moreover, a marginally significant positive relationship was found between ‘Vigour’ and ‘Career opportunities and rewards’ (β = .16, p = .075). Interestingly, ‘Vigour’ showed a significant negative relationship with the ‘Representation of employees’ interests’ (β = –.29, p = .035), suggesting that as employees perceive their interests to be more effectively represented, they may feel less urgency or motivation to invest high energy and engagement, leading to lower levels of vigour. The remaining organizational climate factors (i.e. ‘Organization of work’ and ‘Communication’) did not significantly predict ‘Vigour’.

The next regression model (model 3) was well-fitted to the data ($F(6, 222) = 11.3$, $p < .001$) and explained 21% of the variance ($R^2 = .21$). The results showed that ‘Dedication’ was significantly predicted by ‘Leadership’ (β = .23, p = .051) and marginally positively predicted by ‘Communication’ (β = .20, p = .072). However, the four remaining organizational climate factors did not significantly predict ‘Dedication’ (cf. Supplement, Table 1).

Finally, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict ‘Absorption’ (model 4) from organizational climate factors. The overall model was statistically significant ($F(6, 222) = 9.33$, $p < .001$) and explained 18% of the variance ($R^2 = .18$). However, none of the individual predictors reached statistical significance. These results suggest that other (unmeasured) factors may be more influential in determining absorption in work.

It is worth highlighting that when the seventh predictor, namely ‘General impression of organizational climate,’ was introduced into the multiple regression models (model 5; cf. Appendix, Table 1), the models remained well-fitted to the data and explained slightly larger portions of variance in the dependent variables (i.e. for ‘Work engagement’: 32%, ‘Vigour’: 29%, ‘Dedication’: 25%, ‘Absorption’: 20%). Moreover, the ‘General impression of organizational climate’ significantly predicted ‘Work engagement’ as a unidimensional phenomenon (β = .36, p < .001), as well as its dimensions; respectively: ‘Vigour’ (β = .37, p < .001), ‘Dedication’ (β = .35, p < .001), and ‘Absorption’ (β = .27, p = .006) (models: 6, 7, 8 – which details are available from the author upon request). Thus, this predictor proved to be a stronger and more significant factor of ‘Work engagement’ (and its dimensions) than the distinct factors of organizational climate included in the models 1, 2, 3, and 4. At the same time (comparison between model 1 and 5 predicting overall ‘Work engagement’) some predictors that were initially significant in the original model 1 (i.e. ‘Interactions with co-workers’ and ‘Leadership’) lost their statistical significance after the inclusion of this new variable in model 5 (cf. Appendix, Table 1). This effect may be attributed to the fact that ‘General impression of organizational climate’ is highly correlated with the six distinctive dimensions of organizational climate, which were included in the model. As a result, it may absorb some of their explanatory power, causing their significance levels to drop.

7. Discussion

This study examined the relationship between organizational climate and work engagement, focusing on both overall engagement and its dimensions: vigour, dedication, and absorption. The findings provide partial support for the hypotheses, confirming that while organizational climate is associated with work engagement (supporting H1) and 'Leadership' is the most significant positive predictor of engagement (supporting H3), not all climate factors significantly and positively predict engagement and its components (partially supporting H2).

The obtained results indicate that 'Leadership' and 'Interactions with Co-workers' significantly predict overall work engagement, suggesting that supportive, employee-oriented leadership and positive interpersonal relationships at work foster higher levels of employee engagement. This aligns with previous research emphasizing the role of transformational leadership and social support in promoting engagement (e.g., Bakker et al., 2010; Holloway, 2012; Schaufeli, Bakker, 2008; Wefald et al., 2011), as well as with findings from more recent studies (e.g., Kohnen et al., 2024; Mazzetti et al., 2023).

Interestingly, Gallup found that as much as 70% of the variance in team engagement can be attributed to the manager and leadership style (Clifton, Harter, 2019; Gallup, 2024). The Gallup report states: "While economic prosperity and labor protections are strongly correlated with less misery at work, engagement is more closely tied to interpersonal relationships with one's manager. An effective manager motivates team members, moving them from indifferent to inspired" (Gallup, 2024, p. 19). These results can be explained through the framework of Self-Determination Theory (Deci, Ryan, 2000), emphasizing that inspiring and engaged leaders who foster cooperation and mutual trust fulfill employees' basic needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, which, in turn, boost their level of work engagement (cf. Mazzetti et al., 2023; Rahmadani et al., 2020, 2022).

Furthermore, 'Career opportunities' and rewards' showed a marginally significant positive relationship with work engagement, suggesting that access to career development and recognition may play a role in fostering engagement, albeit at a weaker level than initially expected. This aligns with job resources theory, which posits that employees are more engaged when they perceive opportunities for professional growth and fair compensation (Bakker, Demerouti, 2007; Demerouti et al., 2001; Mazzetti et al., 2023; Schaufeli, Bakker, 2004). However, given its marginal significance, future studies should explore whether this relationship is influenced by moderating variables, such as job tenure or organizational hierarchy.

Interestingly, the 'Representation of employees' interests negatively predicted 'Vigour', contradicting the assumption that all organizational climate factors enhance engagement (cf. Abun et al., 2021; Szczepańska-Woszczyna, Bogaczyk, 2023). This unexpected finding suggests that employees who perceive their interests as well-represented may, paradoxically,

exhibit lower energy and enthusiasm at work. One possible explanation is that strong employee representation reduces a sense of urgency or proactive engagement, leading to decreased vigour. This result can be interpreted through 'Conservation of Resources Theory' (1981; cf. Hobfoll, Shirom, 2001), which posits that individuals strive to acquire and protect valuable resources such as energy and psychological well-being. When employees feel secure in the representation of their interests, they may experience reduced pressure to actively invest energy in advocating for their needs, leading to lower vigour. In this context, strong employee representation may contribute to a more stable but less intensely engaged workforce. Alternatively, organizations that highly emphasize employee interests may still present other stressors (e.g., job demands, role ambiguity, or bureaucratic constraints) that could diminish energy levels. However, this counterintuitive finding warrants further investigation to better understand these dynamics.

Notably, when 'General impression of organizational climate' was introduced as an additional predictor, the new models explained a larger proportion of variance in work engagement and its dimensions. Moreover, some previously significant predictors lost their statistical significance. This suggests that employees may evaluate organizational climate holistically, with an overall positive perception of the workplace playing a more influential role in work engagement than individual dimensions of organizational climate (cf. Abun et al., 2021; Arya, 2017; Rožman, Štrukelj, 2021). Given the high correlations between the 'General Impression of Organizational Climate' and other specific climate factors, this may explain why previously significant predictors lost their explanatory power. Moreover, this result underscores the complexity of relationships in organizational settings, where variables are often interdependent rather than acting in isolation. Future analyses could explore mediating or moderating effects to better understand the interplay between these factors.

Finally, the analysis of 'Absorption' showed that none of the organizational climate dimensions significantly predicted this aspect of engagement. This suggests that absorption may be driven by individual factors (e.g., personality traits, intrinsic motivation) or task-related characteristics (e.g., job complexity, autonomy) rather than by broader organizational conditions (cf. Bakker et al., 2008; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Wefald et al., 2011). Future research could explore these alternative influences on absorption to better understand its determinants. Moreover, the results from the current study align with findings from a recent large-scale meta-analytic study on the antecedents and outcomes of work engagement, which showed that the absorption dimension of engagement (in comparison to vigour and dedication) consistently exhibited weaker associations with all investigated variables (Mazzetti et al., 2023). Such findings can be explained by earlier evidence suggesting that absorption is somewhat distinct, less stable, and the least central indicator of work engagement. Empirical research proves that absorption is a more transient state of deep involvement, which can sometimes overlap with workaholism or flow experiences rather than motivation or commitment (Mazzetti et al., 2018). These findings warrant further exploration.

8. Study limitations and Future Research Directions

While these findings provide valuable insights, some limitations must be acknowledged. First, the reliance on self-reported measures raises concerns about common method bias. Second, the cross-sectional design prevents causal inferences, making it unclear whether ‘Organizational climate’ influences ‘Work engagement’ or whether engaged employees perceive their work environment more positively. Future longitudinal or experimental studies could help clarify the direction of these relationships. Moreover, the marginal significance of some predictors (e.g., ‘Career opportunities and rewards’) suggests that their impact on engagement might be context-dependent, varying across different employee groups or organizational settings. Furthermore, the unexpected negative relationship between ‘Representation of employees' interests’ and ‘Vigour’ warrants further investigation, as qualitative studies could provide deeper insights into why this effect occurs. Finally, although the study used a heterogeneous sample that helped increase statistical power, the relatively small sample size constrains the generalizability of the results. Future research should consider employing lager and more representative sampling methods to enhance external validity.

9. Conclusion

This study underscores the role of organizational climate and its factors, especially the critical role of leadership and co-worker relationships in fostering work engagement, highlighting the need for organizations to invest in leadership development and team-building initiatives. In line with these findings, Gallup’s report states that “A great manager builds an ongoing relationship with an employee grounded in respect, positivity and an understanding of the employee’s unique gifts. Great managers help employees find meaning and reward in their work. As a result, employees take an interest in what they do, leading to higher productivity and enjoyment” (Gallup, 2024, p. 19).

The current study results also suggest that a holistic perception of organizational climate may be more impactful than individual climate dimensions. However, the negative relationship between representation of employees' interests and vigour presents an intriguing finding that requires further exploration. Addressing these questions through future research could provide deeper insights into how organizations can cultivate an engaging and supportive work environment.

The results of this study should be of interest to both scientists and practitioners, internationally and particularly in Poland, where levels of work engagement appear to be alarmingly low and even lower than in other European countries, which themselves lag behind regions such as North America or Southeast Asia, as shown in Gallup's 2024 report.

References

1. Abun, D., Menor, R.I., Catabagan, N.C., Magallanes, T., Ranay, F.B. (2021). Organizational climate and work engagement of employees of Divine Word Colleges in Ilocos Region, Philippines. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, *10(1),* 107-121.
2. Arya, R., Sainy, M. (2017). To study the impact of organizational climate on employee engagement in the banking sector with special reference to State Bank of India, Indore. *Prestige e-Journal of Management and Research*, *4(1),* 64-81.
3. Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., Fletcher, L. (2017). The meaning, antecedents, and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *19(1),* 31-53.
4. Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands- resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *22*, 309-328.
5. Bakker, A.B., Albrecht, S., Leiter, M.P. (2010). Key questions regarding work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *20(1),* 4-28.
6. Bakker, A.B., Schaufeli, W.B., Leiter, M.P., Taris, T.W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, *22(3),* 187-200.
7. Clifton, J., Harter, J. (2019). *It's the manager: Moving from boss to coach*. Gallup Press.
8. Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M. (2002). Self-determination research: Reflections and future directions. In: E.L. Deci, R.M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 431-441). University of Rochester Press.
9. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., 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 & Health*, *27(4),* 279-286.
10. Durniat, K. (2012). Polish adaptation of L. Rosenstiel and R. Boegel's organizational climate diagnosis questionnaire. *Polish Journal of Applied Psychology*, *10(1),* 49-72.
11. Durniat, K. (2018). Kwestionariusz do pomiaru klimatu organizacyjnego Rosenstiela i Boegela – Polska adaptacja i normalizacja. *Studia Oeconomica Posnaniensia*, *6(3),* 49-72.
12. Ehrhart, M. G., Schneider, B., Macey, W.H. (2025). *Organizational climate and culture: An introduction to theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

13. Gallup, (2024). *State of the Global Workplace: 2024 Report. The Voice of the World's Employees.* Washington: Gallup.
14. Goodman, M., Dingli, S. (2013). Organizational climate and culture for optimizing innovation. In: M. Goodman, S. Dingli (Eds.), *Creativity and strategic innovation management* (pp. 123-145). Routledge.
15. Hobfoll, S.E., Shirom, A. (2001). Conservation of resource theory: Applications to stress and management in the workplace. In: R.T. Golembiewski (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (2nd ed., pp. 57-80). Marcel Dekker.
16. Holloway, J.B. (2012). Leadership behavior and organizational climate: An empirical study in a non-profit organization. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, *5(1),* 9-35.
17. Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33(4),* 692-724.
18. Kohnen, D., De Witte, H., Schaufeli, W.B., Dello, S., Bruyneel, L., Sermeus, W. (2024). Engaging leadership and nurse well-being: The role of the work environment and work motivation – a cross-sectional study. *Human Resources for Health*, *22, 8*.
19. Mazzetti, G., Robledo, E., Vignoli, M., Topa, G., Gugliemi, D., Schaufeli, W.B. (2023). Work engagement: A meta-analysis using the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model. *Psychological Reports*, *126*, 1069-1107.
20. Mazzetti, G., Schaufeli, W.B., Guglielmi, D. (2018). Are workaholism and work engagement in the eye of the beholder? A multi-rater perspective on different forms of working hard. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 34(1),* 30-40. https://doi.org/10.1027/ 1015-5759/a000318
21. Meyer, J.P., Becker, T.E., Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: A conceptual analysis and integrative model. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89(6),* 991-1007.
22. Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A.J., Tamkins, M.M. (2003). Organizational culture and climate. In: W.C. Borman, D.R. Ilgen, R.J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology, Vol. 12* (pp. 565-593). Wiley.
23. Patterson, M., Warr, P., West, M. (2004). Organizational climate and company productivity: The role of employee affect and employee level. *Centre for Economic Performance, No. 626*. London School of Economics and Political Science.
24. Patterson, M., West, M., Shackleton, V. et al. (2005). Validating the organizational climate measure: Links to managerial practices, productivity, and innovation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26(1),* 379-408.
25. Payne, R.L. (2000). Climate and culture: How close can they get? I: N. M. Ashkenasy, C.P.M. Wilderom, M.F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate*. Sage.
26. Payne, R.L., Fineman, S., Wall, T.D. (1976). Organizational climate and job satisfaction: A conceptual synthesis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *16*, 156-175.

27. Rahmadani, V.G., Schaufeli, W.B., Stouten, J., Zhang, Z., Zulkarnain, Z. (2020). Engaging leadership and its implication for work engagement and job outcomes at the individual and team level: A multi-level longitudinal study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(3),* 776. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17030776
28. Rahmadani, V., Schaufeli, W.B., Fauzia, R, Nazriani, D. (2022). The moderating effect of employee growth climate on the relationship between work engagement and job outcomes among plantation workers in north Sumatra, Indonesia. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 968572.
29. Rosenstiel, L., Boegel, R. (1992). *Betriebsklima geht jeden an.* Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Arbeit, Familie und Sozialordnung.
30. Rožman, M., Štrukelj, T. (2021). Organizational climate components and their impact on work engagement of employees in medium-sized organizations. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja, 34(1),* 775-806.
31. Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B. (2003). *Work Engagement Utrecht Scale: Preliminary manual.* Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University.
32. 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(3),* 293-315.
33. 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(1),* 71-92.
34. Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B. (2022). Work engagement: A critical assessment of concept and measurement. In: W.R. Tuch, A.B. Bakker, L. Tay, F. Gander (eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology assessment* (pp. 273-295). Göttingen: Hogrefe.
35. Schein, E. (2000). Sense and nonsense about culture and climate. In: N.M. Ashkanasy, C.P.M. Wilderom, M.F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture & climate*. Sage.
36. Schneider, B., Barbera, K.M. (Eds.) (2013). *The Oxford handbook of organizational climate and culture*. Oxford University Press.
37. Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M.G., Macey, W.H. (2011). Perspectives on organizational climate and culture. In: S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Vol. 1. Building and developing the organization* (pp. 373-414). American Psychological Association.
38. Schneider, B., González-Romá, V., Ostroff, C., West, M.A. (2017). Organizational climate and culture: Reflections on the history of the constructs in the Journal of Applied Psychology. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102(3),* 468-482.
39. Szabowska-Walaszczyk, A., Zawadzka, A., Wojtaś, M. (2011). Zaangażowanie w pracę i jego korelaty: Adaptacja skali UWES autorstwa Schaufeliego i Bakkera. *Psychologia Jakości Życia*, *10(1),* 57-74.

40. Szczepańska-Woszczyna, K., Bogaczyk, R. (2023). Organizational climate and employee engagement: A case study of international corporations. *Forum Scientiae Oeconomia*, *11(3),* 9-29.
41. Wefald, A.J., Reichard, R.J., Serrano, S.A. (2011). Fitting engagement into a nomological network: The relationship of engagement to leadership and personality. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *18(4),* 522-537.

Appendix

Table 1.
Linear regression analyses' results. Prediction of work engagement on the basis of organizational climate (measured as uni- and multi-dimensional constructs)

Dependent variable: UWES (overall) (F(1.227) = 83.7; p < .001); R2 adj. = 0.266					
	B	**Beta**	**SE**	**t**	**p**
(Intercept)	17.458		5.2272	3.34	< .001
Organizational climate (overall)	0.260	**0.519**	0.0284	9.15	**< .001**
1. Dependent variable: UWES (overall) (F(6.222) = 14.0; p < .001); R2 adj. = 0.225					
(Intercept)	18.258		6.184	2.953	0.003
Co-workers	0.483	**0.1606**	0.223	2.169	**0.031**
Leadership	0.416	**0.2269**	0.204	2.033	**0.043**
Organization of work	0.107	0.0287	0.315	0.339	0.735
Communication	0.398	0.1720	0.254	1.565	0.119
Employees' representation	-0.679	-0.1598	0.395	-1.718	0.087
Carrier opportunities and rewards	0.500	0.1611	0.283	1.763	0.079
2. Dependent variable: Vigour (UWES) (F(6.222) = 13.2. p < .001); R2 adj. = 0.242					
(Intercept)	6.45352		2.1929	2.9429	0.004
Co-workers	0.23561	**0.22260**	0.0790	2.9818	**0.003**
Leadership	0.16798	**0.26061**	0.0725	2.3168	**0.021**
Organization of work	0.00865	0.00662	0.1118	0.0774	0.938
Communication	0.08974	0.11038	0.0901	0.9962	0.320
Employees' representation	-0.29792	**-0.19941**	0.1401	-2.1272	**0.035**
Carrier opportunities and rewards	0.17952	0.16465	0.1005	1.7862	0.075
3. Dependent variable: Dedication (UWES) (F(6.222) = 11.3; p < .001); R2 adj.= 0.213					
(Intercept)	5.4825		2.2246	2.464	0.014
Co-workers	0.1295	0.1230	0.0802	1.616	0.108
Leadership	0.1444	**0.2251**	0.0736	1.963	**0.051**
Organization of work	0.0282	0.0217	0.1134	0.249	0.804
Communication	0.1652	0.2043	0.0914	1.808	0.072
Employees' representation	-0.2444	-0.1644	0.1421	-1.720	0.087
Carrier opportunities and rewords	0.1311	0.1208	0.1020	1.286	0.200
4. Dependent variable: Absorption (UWES) (F(6.222) = 9.33; p < .001); R2 adj.= 0.180					
(Intercept)	6.3218		2.5743	2.456	0.015
Co-workers	0.1181	0.0989	0.0928	1.274	0.204
Leadership	0.1034	0.1422	0.0851	1.215	0.226
Organization of work	0.0700	0.0474	0.1312	0.533	0.594
Communication	0.1426	0.1555	0.1058	1.348	0.179
Employees' representation	-0.1363	-0.0809	0.1644	-0.829	0.408
Carrier opportunities and rewards	0.1889	0.1536	0.1180	1.601	0.111
5. Dependent variable: UWES (overall) (F(7.221) = 15.0; p < .001); R2 adj.= 0.300					
(Intercept)	19.118		5.997	3.188	0.002
Co-workers	0.326	0.1082	0.220	1.482	0.140
Leadership	0.154	0.0842	0.209	0.738	0.462
Organization of work	-0.153	-0.0411	0.313	-0.489	0.625
Communication	0.250	0.1081	0.249	1.003	0.317
Employees' representation	-0.649	-0.1528	0.383	-1.695	0.091
Carrier opportunities and rewards	0.494	0.1594	0.275	1.800	0.073
General impression of organ. climate	1.467	**0.3572**	0.374	3.920	**< .001**

Note. B = unstandardized regression coefficient; Beta = standardized regression coefficient; SE = regression coefficient error; significant regression coefficients are highlighted in bold.

Source: Own research.