

Organisational Climate and Employee Engagement – a Case Study of International Corporations

KATARZYNA SZCZEPANSKA-WOSZCZYNA, REGINA BOGACZYK

Abstract

The objective of the research is to investigate and pinpoint the expected impacts of the organisational climate on employee engagement. The research was conducted by means of a CAWI online survey among employees of international organisations with branches or representative offices in Poland, as well as Polish companies with their own organisational units abroad. The survey involved 835 employees at various organisational levels of the companies. The results of the empirical research clearly showed a strong positive relationship between the organisational climate and levels of engagement in work and in the organisation. It is possible to identify the dimensions of the organisational climate that are most closely related to employee engagement in general, namely the organisation and nature of work, autonomy, rewards and motivation, flexibility, a sense of psychological security and management.

Key word

organisational climate, employee engagement, human capital management

DOI: 10.23762/FSO_VOL11_N03_1

Katarzyna Szczepanska-Woszczyna¹

e-mail: kszczepanska@wsb.edu.pl

Regina Bogaczyk

e-mail: rbogaczyk@wsb.edu.pl

WSB University,
Dąbrowa Górnicza, Poland

¹Corresponding author

Introduction

Research shows that companies with a high level of employee engagement achieve better results than those in which employees show a lower level of engagement (Deszczyński, 2018, 125). Employee engagement translates into better business results (Zakobielska, 2017, 123) and customer ratings, which are higher by 10% in the group of companies with high levels of employee engagement, with a corresponding 20% increase in sales. The degree of employee engagement helps

predict the level of their achievements at work (Chusmir, 1988; Machaczka & Stopa, 2022), and the high level thereof has a significant impact on company effectiveness (Gaertner and Nollen, 1989). Employee engagement is manifested in the fact that they are more willing to take up challenges and go beyond common patterns, improve working methods and provide a positive benchmark for colleagues (Zbierowski & Gojny-Zbierowska, 2022). According to J.L. Caulfield and

A. Senger (2017) and R. Gerards (2018), engagement translates into a good workplace atmosphere, reduces the risk of conflict in the team, and helps employees feel part of the team, working together effectively for the organisation's interests. In turn, a lack of engagement results in greater employee absenteeism (Anthony-McMann et al., 2017). It also prompts them to leave the organisation (*Zaangażowanie 2022. Report*), which in turn generates costs, among others, those related to the subsequent recruitment and induction of new people to work in a given position, as well as a loss of the knowledge which experienced employees take with them when they leave. The company also loses the potential benefits of their relationships with customers and contractors which they have built throughout the period of employment. It is estimated that for the employer, the cost of non-engagement is 35% of the employee's salary. Human Capital Deloitte (2022) indicates that the phenomenon known as *the Great Resignation* is observed around the world, manifested by increased turnover and decreased engagement (Extended Tools). According to the results of surveys carried out in 2022 on a group of 975 people, as many as 80% of skilled employees are considering a change of place of employment, the most frequently indicated reasons for which were the low efficiency of organisational processes (46%), the low level of salaries (43%) and the lack of development opportunities (37%). This is confirmed by *The 2022 Global Employee Survey*, which says that the most common reasons for leaving the workplace include low salary (29%), feeling undervalued (27%) and a lack of opportunities for promotion (23%). Organisations should therefore focus their attention on the identified causes of the loss of staff and implement corrective actions.

An analysis of the literature shows that psychological and social factors are becoming increasingly important in human capital management. An increased amount

of attention is being paid to the role of the broadly understood well-being of employees, also recognising the benefits for the organisation in the form of greater employee engagement (Haffer and Haffer, 2018). At the same time, it is indicated that a favourable organisational climate helps to ensure the well-being and health of employees (Rożman et al., 2019), which plays a significant role in the functioning of the entire organisation. If it is favourable and positively assessed by its members, it contributes to their greater working comfort and overall physical and mental well-being (Viitala, Tanskanen and Sääntti, 2015; Mafini, 2016). As a background to relationships and a source of affective experiences, it influences a number of employee behaviours.

Cultural diversity, which is characteristic of most contemporary organisations, plays an important role in various areas of management, mainly including human capital management (Thai & Mai, 2023). Intercultural contacts are one of the most important factors in the personal development of employees, and the experience gained as a result of these interactions can also benefit the organisation. Cultural diversity directly affects the organisational climate.

Despite the increasing interest of researchers in the issue of engagement and the organisational climate, many questions remain open, as there are no studies which juxtapose the two phenomena and show the relationship between them, and the research results so far are ambiguous and relate to selected aspects of these issues (the theoretical gap), which makes it possible to consider this area cognitively interesting and one requiring further scientific exploration. There are also no research reports on the role of the organisational climate in building the engagement of employees of international corporations, which represents an empirical gap. Empirical research was conducted in international corporations due to the

growing number of foreign investments in Poland in recent years and the increased level of internationalisation of companies that are increasingly willing to invest abroad, employ foreigners, conduct trade and provide services in an international and intercultural environment.

In this orientation, the present study attempts to shed some light on the interplay between the organisational climate and employee engagement, involving the employees of international corporations. Its main contributions are as follows: (a) it responds to the structure of the dimensions of the organisational climate and the dimensions of employee engagement; (b) it elucidates the relationship between the organisational climate and the various components of the attitude of work engagement and organisational engagement; and (c) it reveals the dimensions of the organisational climate which are particularly relevant to the attitude of engagement in work and the organisation.

1. Literature review

Effective organisational management is determined by knowledge of the conditions and causes of people's behaviour in the organisation, their experiences in the work environment, emotions and attitudes towards work. Psychologists approach the issue of engagement from the perspective of the individual, searching for its origins in personality, character and temperament. A significant role in shaping this attitude is attributed to emotions and cognitive processes. Sociologists treat engagement as a process referring to the social context in which the employee engages in the functioning of the team. By contributing in the form of engagement, he or she contributes to the achievement of group and organisational objectives. From a managerial perspective, the effect of actions taken by the employee, the basis of which is engagement, as well as recognition of the mechanism that triggers

them will be most important. The conditions, sources and ways of stimulating it are still being sought.

The analysis of the literature indicates three different terms used by the authors, namely *commitment*, *involvement* and *engagement* (Chałupczak and J.M. Bugaj, 2020, 346; Waligóra, 2018, 105-106; Pec and Lewicka, 2022, 159). *Commitment* means attachment, affiliation, a strong emotional bond, as well as involvement in the organisation's affairs, loyalty and willingness to make an effort for the organisation (*organisational commitment*) (Korczyk, 2019; Kawka, 2017). *Involvement* means inclusion and is related to employee participation (Kobylińska and Majewski, 2023) and participation in decisions, whereas *engagement* (*work engagement*) means an emotional connection and refers to identification with the organisation and a positive attitude to working there (Stankiewicz, P.Łychmus and H.Bortnowska, 2019, 135). According to M. Łaguna et al. (2015), the difference between *involvement* and *commitment* is that *involvement* is related to the content of work, tasks and duties performed, while *engagement* refers to an attitude towards functioning within an organisation, and the strength of identification with its goals and values. However, there has been a link between *engagement* and *commitment*. According to Borkowska (2009), there are two types of *engagement*, namely passive (*commitment*), which means attachment to an organisation, and active (*involvement*), understood as being involved in the development of an organisation. Work engagement (employee engagement) is the execution of entrusted tasks with dedication and passion, but also the importance that is given to work in the value system. In turn, professional engagement expresses the degree of identification with the professional path and opportunities for the development of a given profession. The greater it is, the more effort has been put into obtaining rights and competencies in a given profession (Lewicka

and Krot, 2015). The possibility of pursuing a professional career created by the organisation significantly affects both engagement in work and affective engagement in the profession (Lewicka and Pec, 2018). Engagement in the social environment consists of finding pleasure in contacts and relationships in the team, identifying with other members of the organisation and making efforts to create and maintain a positive atmosphere of cooperation (Juchnowicz, 2010). Organisational engagement means employees identifying with its values and goals, with its mission and social image and attachment to the organisation (Griffin, 2021). It is also defined as joining the organisation by using one's own competencies to achieve its objectives (Listwan, Pocztowski and Stor, 2016).

Sun and Bunchapattanasakda (2019) identified two types of definitions of employee engagement, namely employee engagement as a multi-faceted construct (cognition, emotions and behaviours) and as a unitary construct (a positive state of mind, a dedicated willingness, the opposite of burnout). Organisational engagement is the psychological state of an employee who acts as an intermediary between individual and work resources and organisational performance (Wołpiuk-Ochocińska, 2017). Such perceived engagement determines the utilisation of one's own resources and the appropriate use of the properties of the work environment created by the organisation. According to W.H. Macey and B. Schneider (2008) and Pollak et al. (2017), engagement is a personality trait, i.e. a kind of inherent predisposition to engage, as a condition related to participation in the organisation, attachment and satisfaction with work, and as a behaviour of going beyond the defined scope and taking initiative.

It is also worth pointing out an approach to engagement based on Social Exchange Theory (SET) (Cropanzano et al., 2017; Bailey et al., 2017), which is a tendency to repay the benefits obtained when there is some

kind of transaction between the organisation and the employee. According to this theory, employee engagement is the result of their assessment of the benefits of employment within the organisation. The level of engagement is adequate given the working conditions created by the employer. The subject of the exchange is services (engagement in the execution of tasks) and support from the organisation. If employees assess the support they receive as genuine, they gain a sense of trust and become highly engaged (Zagenczyk et al., 2020; Murthy, 2017). A sense of organisational support affects job satisfaction, which in turn is reflected in the results achieved (Putsom, Sattayawaksakul, 2019). In accordance with the principle of reciprocity, employees who are convinced that their organisation supports them by providing an appropriate working environment pay it back through a higher level of engagement (Kurtessis et al., 2017; Obeng et al., 2020). If an organisation provides employees with the opportunity to meet their needs, aspirations, and ambitions, they reciprocate with their efforts. On the other hand, if employees see a discrepancy between workload and benefits, this can result in decreased engagement and quality of work.

M. Juchnowicz (2017) defines engagement as a particular type of attitude towards work related to identification with the values and objectives of the organisation and the desire to remain therein. Engagement is expressed through the readiness to pursue the interest of the organisation independently, effectively and passionately. The author also emphasises that the actions taken by engaged employees go beyond the assigned responsibilities. This is an important aspect, because without this it would be difficult to talk about engagement, but only about reliability, conscientiousness and honesty towards the employer. Therefore, engagement can be considered an added value to the established scope of the employee's responsibilities.

When considering different aspects of engagement, attention should be paid to clearly distinguishing this concept from motivation and job satisfaction (the concept of engagement is a broader category than motivation; it also includes identification with the organisation) (Sobocka-Szczapa, 2017). An important aspect of engagement is its multi-dimensional nature: intensity (a continuum from a lack of engagement to very intense engagement), direction (in a profession, work, the social environment, the organisation), dimension (cognitive, emotional, behavioural), and time variability, related to the level of energy and activity, which is at the same time a phenomenon subject to gradation; it is possible to be shaped by various activities on the part of the organisation (Kahn, 1990; Allen and Meyer, 1991). Research found that employee engagement attitudes positively correlate with the following: transformational leadership (Gerards, de Grip and Baudewijns, 2018), servant leadership (Marek, 2018), and perceived support from the organisation (Wang et al., 2019; Imran et al., 2020). Furthermore, the relationship between engagement and trust in the workplace and the broadly understood psychological benefits provided by the organisation to the employee (Victor and Hoole, 2017) were demonstrated. According to research reports, engagement correlates positively with development opportunities, the enrichment of work, the clarity of role in the organisation, the quality of work, its intensity, the feeling that work is done well, a sense of control and active coping at work (Bailey et al., 2017).

T. Kupczyk and P. Pietrakowski (2018) identify factors that are significantly related to employee engagement. They include the belief that supervisors care about employees, a sense of being appreciated for their work, the clarity of professional expectations, the ability to express their opinion and participate in decisions, a feeling that the work performed is important, supporting

the development of employees, the ability to perform tasks consistent with predispositions and competencies, and care for quality and good cooperation in the team. Engagement factors that require more attention from the managers of these companies include the relationships within teams and the atmosphere associated with good communication, trust, appreciation for employees and support for their development by their superiors.

It may be noted that some of the factors mentioned above are the essence of the organisational climate, which makes it possible to associate engagement with this area. It is the organisational climate that creates the unique character of the company and determines the working environment, affecting the functioning of employees, including their engagement. The better the employees assess the climate in the organisation to be, the more they engage in their work (Bahrami, 2016; Tokarski and Oleksa-Marewska, 2019).

The organisational climate is a unique phenomenon, defined as a collection of insights and assessments made by employees regarding the organisational environment. It reflects the reception of a set of main characteristics of the organisation by its members. It can also be understood slightly more broadly as the social and psychosocial environment which is characteristic of the organisation (Jokanović et al., 2020). The concept of the organisational climate is based on the assumption that it can be evaluated based on individual employee opinions about the working environment. The organisational climate determines not only how employees perceive the prevailing atmosphere in the working environment, but also the organisation as a whole (Seren Intepeler et al., 2019). This reflects how employees feel in such an environment (Saleem, Liang and Perveen, 2018; Saleem and Perveen, 2019). It is what the individual feels and receives. It is a place for positive emotions and

experiences in relation to working conditions in the organisation, co-workers, supervisors and the content of work. Summarised insights on interlinked elements of HR policy, including practices, organisational procedures and observation of what is expected, supported and rewarded in the organisation, coalesce into a shared perception of the organisational climate constituting a collective assessment of the conditions and situation of the organisation (Schneider et al., 2017). The analysis of the relevant literature leads to the conclusion that this is an important factor which determines the various mechanisms of human functioning in work situations. It is possible to influence changes in the attitudes and behaviours of employees and the intensification thereof in the direction desired by the organisation through the organisational climate (Kang et al., 2016). It shapes the quality of working conditions, interpersonal communication, levels of conflict, job satisfaction, employee motivation, as well as their mental and physical health and well-being.

G.H. Litwin and R.A. Stringer (1968) identified the following components of the organisational climate: loyalty, effort, a sense of humour, appreciation, formalisation, the relevance of goals, quality, clarity, a remuneration system, control, pressure, centralisation, a management style, an appraisal system, superior support, structure, autonomy, employee responsibility, flexibility, disclosure of information, conflicts, team discussions, relationships with the superior and management, participation in decisions, friendly team relationships, risk, cooperation, trust, challenges, and team engagement. This concept was developed by D.A. Kolb et al., who adopted dimensions such as autonomy, trust, an appraisal system, pressure, control, centralisation, employee appreciation, reward, responsibility, participation in decisions, friendly team relationships, relationships with superiors, effort and challenges. At the same time, he

distinguished four new components, including tradition, freedom, organisational achievements and the “spirit of professionalism” (Kolb, Rubin and McIntyre, 1971). L. Rosenstiel and R. Bögel (1992) include the following dimensions of the organisational climate: relationships between employees (atmosphere, cooperation, kindness, trust, possible conflicts), the management style of superiors: employee-oriented (support, positive motivation and reward, participation in decision-making, taking care of team relationships) or task-oriented (rigid rules, procedures, focus on effects, control, required obedience), work organisation (conditions, division of tasks, matching responsibilities to competencies, the number of responsibilities), information flow and communication (clarity of objectives, reliability of information, awareness of the role performed), representing employees’ interests (protection of employees’ rights in terms of security and adequate remuneration) and development opportunities (motivation, promotion, a level of satisfaction, appreciation). A negative assessment of any of the identified factors contributes to decreased work efficiency, so assessment and action to improve the climate can not only contribute to improving the “well-being” of employees, but consequently increase the efficiency of work.

Research into the organisational climate has concerned, among others, its relationships with the sense of security at work (Stasiła-Sieradzka, Chudzicka-Czupała and Znajmiecka-Sikora, 2020) and readiness to undertake training and transformational leadership (Puni et al., 2022). The impact of climate on employees’ affective states and the likelihood of burnout (Oleksi-Marewska, 2020) and workaholism (Oleksi-Marewska, 2019) were confirmed. The appropriate organisational climate is related to improved organisational performance; it also contributes to lower levels of absenteeism and turnover (Wziątek-Staśko and Krawczyk-Antoniuk, 2021).

Furthermore, it plays an important role in the organisation's application of various age management practices, which in turn translate into employee satisfaction and engagement. If perceived by employees as positive, it also generates positive behaviour, helping to achieve individual and organisational goals. The favourable organisational climate creates a positive organisational identity and influences the willingness of employees to make more effort to achieve organisational goals, which can be associated with engagement (Köse, 2016). The most important factor is the freedom to express ideas, which, in the authors' opinion, brings benefits such as greater innovation and confidence in generating new solutions (Yusnita, Sunaryo and Notosudjono, 2020; Szczepańska-Woszczyna, 2014). The result of managers' concern for the organisational climate is an improvement in performance and productivity (Szczepańska-Woszczyna, 2020; Obeng et al., 2020; Manuaba, Sujana and Widnyana, 2020; Ahadiat and Dacko-Pikiewicz, 2020), because the assessment of the organisational climate by employees shapes their motivation to work (Kusmaningtyas, 2020).

The literature review leads to the conclusion that the organisational climate has an impact on a number of important areas of the organisation's functioning, especially directly on its human capital, including the behaviour and attitudes of employees. Previous studies have also attempted to establish the relationship between organisational climate and employee engagement (Marzec, 2015; Shuck, Adelson and Reio, 2017; Hadi et al., 2020; Peplińska et al., 2020; Arya and Sainy, 2017; Rożman and Štrukelj, 2021), but these analyses are fragmentary. Research has shown that the organisational climate shapes the identification of employees with the organisation, their dedication to it and the quality of their work. It has been shown that appropriate communication, team collaboration and the involvement of

employees in the decision-making process have the greatest impact on engagement. A. Köse (2016) showed a positive relationship between work engagement and the organisational climate when examining teachers. The author also confirmed the relationship between the perceived support of the organisation and the assessment of the organisational climate by employees. If the organisational climate is in line with the expectations of employees, it strengthens their identification with the organisation, and the positive perception of the climate stimulates the desired behaviour, including making efforts to achieve organisational goals. Similar results were obtained in research into the relationships between the organisational climate of six dimensions (transparency, standards, responsibility, flexibility, reward and recognition, and team engagement) with teachers' engagement in emotional, cognitive and behavioural work (Abun et al., 2021).

The research results show that the organisational climate largely determines the functioning of a person in the working situation. The results of the literature review did not definitively resolve the question of its role in shaping employee engagement. There are no coherent and comprehensive studies combining these issues, especially with regard to the specificities of the climate prevailing in international corporations.

The following research questions were posed:

- RQ1:** Is there a significant relationship between the organisational climate and employee engagement in international corporations?
- RQ2:** What are the relationships between the organisational climate and the individual components of work engagement and organisational engagement?
- RQ3:** Is it possible to indicate the dimensions of the organisational climate which are particularly important to work engagement and organisational engagement?

2. Methodology

The aim of the research is to identify the relationship between the organisational climate and employee engagement in international corporations.

The research was conducted among employees of international organisations with branches or subsidiaries in Poland, as well as Polish companies with their own organisational units abroad. The research involved employees at various organisational levels of the companies, which allowed for a wide spectrum of results. The sample was randomly selected in a nationwide research panel, and the sample size was $n = 835$, which is associated with an estimate error of 3.38%.

The statistical analysis utilised PS IMAGO PRO 7.0 (IBM SPSS STATISTICS 27.0). The developed research tool was subjected to statistical verification based on the reliability factor of Cronbach's alpha (α) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). When assessing the adequacy of the set of variables for factor analysis, the Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin measure (KMO) and Bartlett's test of sphericity were used. The study of the relationship between the organisational climate (and its individual dimensions) and both organisational engagement and work engagement was conducted based on linear regression analysis. The analysis of the distributions of individual variables (organisational climate and employee engagement) was conducted by means of basic descriptive statistics and tests used to compare the population (Student's t -test, Mann-Whitney test, Anov test, Kruskal-Wallis test) and pairwise testing (Pearson correlation coefficient r , Spearman rho test and tests of their significance).

The research was conducted on the basis of the CAWI (Computer Assisted Web Interview) online survey technique by means of a survey questionnaire as the research tool. The questionnaire consisted of 77 statements divided into two parts: 1) a questionnaire on work engagement and

organisational engagement, 2) a questionnaire on the organisational climate.

Employee engagement was examined in two dimensions, namely work engagement and organisational engagement (with the consent of the authors, a questionnaire prepared by M. Juchnowicz, H. Kinowska and E. Rypina was used):

- as part of the scale of organisational engagement, a sub-scale related to the following components was distinguished: cognitive engagement (ZOP) – three items, behavioural (ZOB) – seven items, and emotional (ZOE) – nine items. The reliability of each of these subscales is satisfactory – the Cronbach's alpha for ZOP is 0.712, for ZOB 0.833, and for ZOE 0.895. Also, the reliability of the overall organisational engagement scale (ZO, 19 items) is high – the Cronbach's alpha is 0.935;
- as part of the scale of work engagement, a sub-scale related to the following components was distinguished: cognitive (ZPP) – three items, behavioural (ZPB) – three items, and emotional (ZPE) – nine items. The reliability of each of these subscales is satisfactory – the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for ZPP is 0.647, for ZPB 0.810, and for ZPE 0.877. Also, the reliability of the overall organisational engagement scale is high – the Cronbach's alpha is 0.924.

The responses to the scale corresponded to the following evaluations: (1) definitely not, (2) no, (3) probably not, (4) neither yes nor no (difficult to say), (5) yes, to a certain extent, (6) yes, (7) definitely. The questionnaire contains five statements with a reverse scale.

The organisational climate was assessed on the basis of a questionnaire composed of 53 items divided into 10 dimensions. The inspiration of the research tool was the Multidimensional Inventory of Organisational Climate Measurement (WIPKO) by G. Wudarzewski (2019), in which the author identified nine dimensions of the organisational climate and their

individual components, and which was updated by Regina Bogaczyk based on publications from 2012-2021. The questionnaire also included a scale to study a sense of psychological security (proposed by A.C. Edmondson (2018) and translated by A. Glińska-Neweś, J. Górka and D. Lewicka) and the scale of work overload (Mazzetti et al., 2016). The method of measuring each item (a seven-point Likert scale) and the low degree of asymmetry of variables allows for the analysis of their distributions using not only percentages, but also mean average (M) and other statistics. The reliability of measurement for each of the 10 constructs within the organisational climate scale is satisfactory, and for most of them can even be described as high. The Cronbach's alpha exceeds 0.7, and only for the "F2" Flexibility" construct is Cronbach's alpha coefficient relatively low (0.601), albeit still acceptable. The results are as follows:

F1. Management – $\alpha\text{-C} = 0.938$,

F2. Flexibility – $\alpha\text{-C} = 0.601$

F3. Communication – $\alpha\text{-C} = 0.766$

F4. Relationships within the team – $\alpha\text{-C} = 0.805$

F5. Autonomy – $\alpha\text{-C} = 0.760$

F6. Rewards and motivation – $\alpha\text{-C} = 0.872$

F7. Organisation and nature of work – $\alpha\text{-C} = 0.867$

F8. Approach to diversity – $\alpha\text{-C} = 0.684$

F9. Sense of psychological security – $\alpha\text{-C} = 0.878$

F10. Work overload – $\alpha\text{-C} = 0.684$

The reliability of the overall organisational climate is also high – the Cronbach's alpha is 0.964.

The dependent variable in the research was employee engagement in work and in the organisation, while the organisational climate was adopted as an independent variable.

3. Results and Discussion

Assessment of the relationship between the organisational climate and employee engagement

The overall organisational climate (F) is indeed statistically related to organisational engagement, in each of its terms (Table 1).

Table 1. Correlation coefficients between subscales (dimensions) of organisational climate and employee engagement

	F	Sub-scales of the organisational climate									
		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9	F10
Total engagement	0.804**	0.695**	0.712**	0.693**	0.648**	0.750**	0.741**	0.789**	0.697**	0.569**	0.315**
Organisational engagement	0.797**	0.692**	0.704**	0.687**	0.647**	0.724**	0.728**	0.785**	0.686**	0.575**	0.325**
Work engagement	0.790**	0.679**	0.702**	0.681**	0.629**	0.767**	0.738**	0.769**	0.692**	0.541**	0.288**
Organisational engagement, cognitive component	0.671**	0.582**	0.627**	0.664**	0.523**	0.590**	0.569**	0.693**	0.589**	0.471**	0.228**
Organisational engagement, behavioural component	0.747**	0.658**	0.694**	0.636**	0.595**	0.700**	0.691**	0.732**	0.646**	0.509**	0.261**

	F	Sub-scales of the organisational climate									
		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9	F10
Organisational en- gagement, emotional component	0.755**	0.649**	0.632**	0.633**	0.629**	0.677**	0.697**	0.737**	0.646**	0.571**	0.355**
Work engagement, cognitive component	0.748**	0.634**	0.692**	0.671**	0.579**	0.727**	0.720**	0.726**	0.663**	0.489**	0.246**
Work engagement, be- havioural component	0.745**	0.644**	0.677**	0.624**	0.582**	0.773**	0.682**	0.701**	0.660**	0.503**	0.206**
Work engagement, emotional component	0.719**	0.621**	0.616**	0.617**	0.586**	0.668**	0.668**	0.716**	0.622**	0.509**	0.314**

Source: based on research. **** $p < 0.001$; p – probability in Pearson's linear correlation coefficient significance test

Values of correlation coefficients between engagement measured as an average assessment of individual aspects show a strong positive correlation with the organisational climate – the correlation coefficients are high and statistically significant (Table 1). This means that engagement (overall organisational and work engagement – in all components) is higher for those employees whose overall assessment of the organisational climate is higher. The strongest link between engagement is observed in relation to the organisation and nature of work (F7), autonomy (F5), as well as rewards and motivation (F6) and flexibility (F2). Employee engagement is relatively least (albeit positively, moderately strongly and statistically) related

to a sense of psychological security (F9). This is especially true in relation to cognitive organisational and work engagement, although for other components the strength of the relationship is only slightly higher. The work overload, which is beyond the scale of the organisational climate, is also statistically significantly linked to employee engagement, although the correlation coefficients here are approx. 0.2-0.3, which indicates a weak effect size. However, the employees of multinational corporations who rate the work overload higher (meaning they experience it to a lesser extent) are, on average, more engaged.

The results indicate that the dimensions F1, F2, F5, F6, F7 and F9 (Table 2) play an important role.

Table 2. Dimensions of the organisational climate and total employee engagement

Explanatory variables	B	BETA	p	VIF
Constant	0.648		<0.001**	
F1. Management	-0.075	-0.089	0.034*	4.647
F2. Flexibility	0.108	0.106	0.004**	3.567
F5. Autonomy	0.158	0.192	<0.001**	4.229
F6. Rewards and motivation	0.177	0.219	<0.001**	4.685
F7. Organisation and nature of work	0.366	0.384	<0.001**	3.882
F9. Sense of psychological security	0.114	0.107	<0.001**	1.829
ANOVA		F(6; 828) = 298.9; $p < 0.001$ **		

Explanatory variables	B	BETA	p	VIF
R ²		0.684		
Corrected R ²		0.682		

Source: based on research. B – regression coefficient from the sample, BETA – standardised regression coefficient, p – probability in the Student t-test or ANOVA, VIF – variance inflation factor

Employee engagement is, *ceteris paribus*, higher when the organisational climate is at a higher level in terms of flexibility, autonomy, rewards and motivation, organisation and nature of work and the sense of psychological security ($B > 0$) and, perhaps surprisingly, the level of “management” is lower. In contrast, the impact of communication (F3), relationships within the team (F4), the approach to diversity (F8) and work overload (F10) is weaker (although not statistically significantly) compared to the above dimensions. While each of the dimensions of the organisational climate is important for building engagement, by juxtaposing their impact together, it turns out that engagement changes significantly if flexibility, autonomy, rewards and motivation, the organisation and nature of work, and psychological security are at a higher level, and if management is at a lower level. The organisation and nature of work ($BETA = 0.384$), followed by rewards and

motivation ($BETA = 0.219$) and autonomy ($BETA = 0.192$) are testament to the fact that the development of solutions that stimulate the building of the organisational climate in these dimensions is the most important factor in building employee engagement. The six dimensions of the organisational climate explained the variability of employee engagement to a significant extent (68.4%).

Organisational engagement

Linear regression analysis confirms a significant positive relationship between the organisational climate and employee engagement in the organisation (Table 3). An organisational climate rating which is higher by one point corresponds to an assessment of organisational engagement which is higher by an average of 0.853 points (on a seven-point scale). The organisational climate significantly explains the development of employee engagement in the organisation (63.5% thereof).

Table 3. Organisational climate and employee engagement in the organisation

Explanatory variables	B	BETA	p
Constant	0.608		
Total organisational climate	0.853	0.797	<0.001**
ANOVA		$F(1; 833) = 1450.0; p < 0.001^{**}$	
R ²		0.635	
Corrected R ²		0.635	

Source: based on research. B – regression coefficient from the sample, BETA – standardised regression coefficient, p – probability in the Student t-test or ANOVA, VIF – variance inflation factor

Taking into account the different dimensions of the organisational climate (F1-F9) and the work overload (F10), the dimensions F2, F5, F6, F7 and F9 (Table 4) play an

important role in organisational engagement. The higher the organisational climate in terms of flexibility, autonomy, rewards and motivation, the organisation and nature of

work and a sense of psychological security (in comparison with the above dimensions, the impact of communication, team relations, approach to diversity, and work overload are insignificant, but management is as well), the higher the level of employee engagement in the organisation, *ceteris paribus*. The organisation and nature of work are the most important in this regard (BETA = 0.405). The importance of rewards and motivation is more than twice as weak (BETA = 0.183). This time autonomy plays a weaker role (BETA = 0.099) than a sense of psychological security and flexibility. The five dimensions of the organisational climate explain 66.8% of the variability of organisational engagement.

Table 4. Organisational climate and employee engagement in the organisation

Explanatory variables	B	BETA	p	VIF
Constant	0.670		<0.001**	
F2. Flexibility	0.111	0.111	0.003**	3.449
F5. Autonomy	0.080	0.099	0.016*	4.143
F6. Rewards and motivation	0.145	0.183	<0.001**	3.819
F7. Organisation and nature of work	0.379	0.405	<0.001**	3.865
F9. Sense of psychological security	0.121	0.116	<0.001**	1.697
ANOVA	F(5; 829) = 332.9; p < 0.001**			
R ²		0.668		
Corrected R ²		0.666		

Source: based on research. B – regression coefficient from the sample, BETA – standardised regression coefficient, p – probability in the Student t-test or ANOVA, VIF – variance inflation factor

The results also confirm the importance of the organisational climate for the different components of organisational engagement (Table 5). Organisational engagement in cognitive, behavioural and emotional terms is higher when the assessment of the organisational climate is higher (an increase in the assessment of the organisational climate by one point is related to the fact that cognitive organisational engagement is higher by an average of 0.714 points, behavioural engagement is higher by an average of 0.849 points, and emotional engagement is higher by an average of 0.903 points).

Table 5. Organisational climate and employee engagement in the organisation – cognitive, behavioural and emotional components

Explanatory variables	B	BETA	p
Cognitive component			
Constant	1.775		<0.001**
Total organisational climate	0.714	0.617	<0.001**
ANOVA	F(1; 833) = 681.5; p < 0.001**		
R ²		0.450	

Explanatory variables	B	BETA	p
Corrected R ²		0.449	
Behavioural component			
Constant	0.582		<0.001**
Total organisational climate	0.849	0.747	<0.001**
ANOVA		F(1; 833) = 1053.1; p < 0.001**	
R ²		0.558	
Corrected R ²		0.558	
Emotional component			
Constant	0.239		0.073
Total organisational climate	0.903	0.755	<0.001**
ANOVA		F(1; 833) = 1107.6; p < 0.001**	
R ²		0.571	
Corrected R ²		0.570	

Source: based on research. B – regression coefficient from the sample, BETA – standardised regression coefficient, p – probability in the Student t-test or ANOVA, VIF – variance inflation factor

By comparing BETA standardised coefficients as well as the coefficients of determination, it can be concluded that the organisational climate has the greatest impact on the emotional dimension of organisational engagement.

Work engagement

Linear regression analysis confirms a positive significant relationship between the

organisational climate and work engagement (Table 6). An assessment of the organisational climate which is higher by 1 point corresponds to an assessment of work engagement being higher by an average of 0.913 points (on a seven-point scale). The organisational climate explains the development of work engagement of employees in international corporations to a significant extent, namely 62.4%.

Table 6. Organisational climate and work engagement

Explanatory variables	B	BETA	p
Constant	0.335		
Total organisational climate	0.913	0.790	<0.001**
ANOVA		F(1; 833) = 1382.7; p < 0.001**	
R ²		0.624	
Corrected R ²		0.624	

Source: based on research. B – regression coefficient from the sample, BETA – standardised regression coefficient, p – probability in the Student t-test or ANOVA, VIF – variance inflation factor

Taking into account the different dimensions of the organisational climate and work overload, the dimensions F1, F2, F5,

F6, F7 and F9 (Table 7) play an important role in work engagement. The higher the organisational climate in terms of flexibility,

autonomy, rewards and motivation, the organisation and nature of work and the sense of psychological security, the higher work engagement is, *ceteris paribus*, and the higher “management” is (compared to the above dimensions, the impact of communication, team relations, approach to diversity, and work overload is again weaker, i.e. statistically insignificant), the lower the level of work engagement, *ceteris paribus*. The two dimensions of the organisational climate – the organisation and nature of work (BETA = 0.333) and autonomy (BETA = 0.319) – play

the most important role in this case, followed by rewards and motivation (BETA = 0.232). The development of solutions to support the development of the organisational climate in these three areas can contribute most to increasing the work engagement of employees in international corporations. The importance of a sense of psychological security (BETA = 0.074) and flexibility (BETA = 0.080) is weaker in this case. The six dimensions of the organisational climate are explained by the variability of work engagement to a significant extent – 67.4%.

Table 7. Organisational climate and work engagement

Explanatory variables	B	BETA	p	VIF
Constant	0.616		<0.001**	
F1. Management	-0.123	-0.138	0.001**	4.647
F2. Flexibility	0.086	0.080	0.033*	3.567
F5. Autonomy	0.278	0.319	<0.001**	4.299
F6. Rewards and motivation	0.198	0.232	<0.001**	4.685
F7. Organisation and nature of work	0.338	0.333	<0.001**	3.882
F9. Sense of psychological security	0.083	0.074	0.006**	1.829
ANOVA	F(6; 828) = 285.6; p < 0.001**			
R ²	0.674			
Corrected R ²	0.672			

Source: based on research. B – regression coefficient from the sample, BETA – standardised regression coefficient, p – probability in the Student t-test or ANOVA, VIF – variance inflation factor

The importance of the organisational climate is also confirmed in terms of different components of work engagement (Table 8).

Table 8. Organisational climate and work engagement – cognitive component

Explanatory variables	B	BETA	p
Cognitive component			
Constant	0.934		<0.001**
Total organisational climate	0.831	0.748	<0.001**
ANOVA	F(1; 833) = 1055.4; p < 0.001**		
R ²		0.559	
Corrected R ²		0.558	
Behavioural component			
Constant	0.140		0.146
Total organisational climate	0.956	0.745	<0.001**
ANOVA	F(1; 833) = 1037.4; p < 0.001**		
R ²		0.555	
Corrected R ²		0.554	
Emotional component			
Constant	0.094		0.544
Total organisational climate	0.937	0.719	<0.001**
ANOVA	F(1; 833) = 892.4; p < 0.001**		
R ²		0.517	
Corrected R ²		0.517	

Source: based on research. B – regression coefficient from the sample, BETA – standardised regression coefficient, p – probability in the Student t-test or ANOVA, VIF – variance inflation factor

From the cognitive, behavioural and emotional perspectives, work engagement is higher when the assessment of the organisational climate is as well. An increase in the assessment of the organisational climate by one point is associated with the fact that cognitive work engagement is higher by an average of 0.831 points, behavioural engagement is higher by an average of 0.956 points, and emotional engagement is higher by an average of 0.937 points. At the same time, the organisational climate has the greatest impact on behavioural work engagement.

In the analysis of the above results, particular attention is paid to the adverse impact (the regression coefficient is negative) of the dimension of management on

total engagement and work engagement. It could be assumed that a positive relationship with one's superior, including his or her management style, support, knowledge of requirements and trust, should translate into greater employee engagement. However, it turns out that although a higher assessment of management as a climate dimension is associated with a higher level of organisational engagement, work engagement and overall engagement (correlation coefficients are high and statistically significant), if the impact of all dimensions together (regression analysis) is analysed, the dimension of management shows the opposite impact on the overall level of employee engagement and work engagement.

An explanation in terms of statistical analysis may be the strong correlation of this subscale with the others because the importance of management also fits into other dimensions, such as rewards and motivation, autonomy, flexibility or communication. The following dimensions have also been found to have a less significant impact on employee engagement: communication, team relationships, and an approach to diversity.

Conclusions

The results of the empirical research clearly showed a strong positive relationship between the organisational climate and organisational and work engagement. This relationship is approximately linear, which means that employees who positively assess the organisational climate are more engaged in both work and the organisation. The high value of the coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.647$) indicates that the organisational climate explains overall employee engagement to a significant extent (approx. 65%), and it explains 63.5% of employee engagement in the organisation and 62.4% of work engagement.

Work engagement from the cognitive, behavioural and emotional perspectives is higher when the assessment of the organisational climate is higher. At the same time, the organisational climate has the greatest impact on the behavioural dimension of work engagement. Similarly, organisational engagement from cognitive, behavioural and emotional perspectives is higher when the assessment of all dimensions of the organisational climate is more positive, with the strongest relationship being that between the climate and the emotional component of organisational engagement.

The dimensions of the organisational climate that are most closely related to overall employee engagement can be identified, namely the organisation and nature of work,

autonomy, rewards and motivation, flexibility, a sense of psychological security and management.

Although each of the dimensions of the organisational climate is important for building engagement (as indicated by the individual values of the correlation coefficient), when their collective impact is considered, it turns out that engagement (in total) is higher if dimensions such as the organisation and nature of work (BETA = 0.384), rewards and motivation (BETA = 0.219), autonomy (BETA = 0.192), flexibility (BETA = 0.106), and a sense of psychological security (BETA = 0.107), are assessed lower, but also if the management dimension is assessed lower as well (BETA = -0.089).

The higher employee engagement in the organisation is, the better the organisational climate in terms of flexibility (BETA = 0.111), autonomy (BETA = 0.099), rewards and motivation (BETA = 0.183), the organisation and nature of work (BETA = 0.405) and the sense of psychological security (BETA = 0.116). In turn, the higher work engagement is, the better the organisational climate is assessed in terms of the organisation and the nature of work (BETA = 0.333), autonomy (BETA = 0.319), rewards and motivation (BETA = 0.232), flexibility (BETA = 0.080), and the sense of psychological security (BETA = 0.074); but also, as in the case of total engagement, if the dimension of management is lower (BETA = -0.138)*.

A deeper knowledge of the importance of the organisational climate in building employee engagement should translate into the selection of appropriate ways of shaping it. The proper identification of the prevailing climate provides knowledge of crucial areas identified by employees, and corrective actions taken can contribute to improving the comfort of employees, and consequently improve the functioning of the company. It is therefore worth searching for opportunities to influence engagement through the organisational climate.

Funding: The project is funded under the program of the Minister of Education and Science titled “Regional Initiative of Excellence” in 2019-2023, project number 018/RID/2018/19, the amount of funding PLN 10 788 423,16.

References

- AARP Global Employee Survey (2022), OECD, Retaining Talent at All Ages, Ageing and Employment Policies, Retrieved from: <https://www.oecd.org/employment/retaining-talent-at-all-ages-00bdd06-en.htm> (accessed: 26.05.2022).
- 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.
- Ahadiat, A., Dacko-Pikiewicz, Z. (2020), Effects of ethical leadership and employee commitment on employees' work passion. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 21(2), 24-35.
- Anthony-McMann, P. E., Ellinger, A. D., Astakhova, M., Halbesleben, J. R. (2017), Exploring different operationalizations of employee engagement and their relationships with workplace stress and burnout, *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 28(2), 163-195.
- 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.
- Bahrami, M. A., Barati, O., Ghoroghchian, M. S., Montazer-Alfaraj, R., Ezzatabadi, M. R. (2016), Role of organizational climate in organizational commitment: The case of teaching hospitals. *Osong public health and research perspectives*, 7(2), 96-100.
- 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.
- Borkowska, S. (2009), Human Resource Management and Innovation in the Business Organization. *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, 2(67), 9-29.
- Caulfield, J. L., Senger, A. (2017), Perception is reality: Change leadership and work engagement. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(7), 927-945.
- Chałupczak, M., Bugaj, J. M. (2020), Wyzwania zaangażowania organizacyjnego – wymiary modelu badawczego.
- Chusmir, L. H. (1988), An integrative process model of organizational commitment for working women and men, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 3, 88-104.
- Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E. L., Daniels, S. R., & Hall, A. V. (2017), Social exchange theory: A critical review with theoretical remedies, *Academy of management annals*, 11(1), 479-516.
- Deszczyński, B. (2018), Empowerment pracowników w przedsiębiorstwach branży usług biznesowych, *Studia Oeconomica Posnaniensia*, 6(4).
- Edmondson, A. C. (2018), The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth. John Wiley & Sons.
- Extended Tools, The Great Unknown. Zarządzanie ludźmi w dobie pandemii, nowych modeli pracy oraz Great Resignation, Retrieved from: <https://lp.extended.tools/raporty-o-trendach>, (accessed 20.04.2023).
- Gaertner, K. N., Nollen, S. D. (1989), Career experiences, perceptions of employment practices, and psychological commitment to the organization, *Human relations*, 42(11), 975-991.
- Gerards, R., de Grip, A., Baudewijns, C. (2018), Do new ways of working increase work engagement?, *Personnel Review*, 47(2), 517-534.
- Griffin, R. (2021), Fundamentals of management. Cengage Learning.

- Hadi, S., Tjahjono, H. K., El Qadri, Z. M., & Prajogo, W. (2020), The influence of organizational justice and positive organizational behavior: systematic review and call for future research, *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 6(1), 67-84.
- Haffer, J., Haffer, R. (2018), Osobiste a zespołowe zaangażowanie w pracę, *Organizacja i Kierowanie*, 3 (182), 49-76.
- Imran, M. Y., Elahi, N. S., Abid, G., Ashfaq, F., & Ilyas, S. (2020), Impact of perceived organizational support on work engagement: Mediating mechanism of thriving and flourishing, *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 6(3), 82.
- Jokanović, B., Zivlak, N., Okanović, A., Čulibrk, J., & Duđak, L. (2020), The model of knowledge management based on organizational climate, *Sustainability*, 12(8), 3273.
- Juchnowicz, M. (2010), Zarządzanie kapitałem ludzkim a poziom zaangażowania pracowników, *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, 1(3-4), 57-66.
- Juchnowicz, M. (2017), Organizacja samoangażująca w realiach polskich, *Edukacja Ekonomistów i Menedżerów*, 45(3), 11-22.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990), Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, *Academy of management journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Kang, J. H., Matusik, J. G., Kim, T. Y., & Phillips, J. M. (2016), Interactive effects of multiple organizational climates on employee innovative behavior in entrepreneurial firms: A cross-level investigation, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(6), 628-642.
- Kawka, T. (2017), Zaangażowanie i partycypacja finansowa – fundamenty kształtowania wysokiej motywacji pracowników we współczesnej przestrzeni organizacyjnej, *Edukacja Ekonomistów i Menedżerów*, 43(1), 27-39.
- Kobylińska, U., Majewski, P. (2023), Kulturowe aspekty partycypacji – ujęcie teoretyczne, *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, 150(1), 94-111.
- Kolb, D. A., Rubin, I.M., McIntyre, J. M. (1971). *Organizational psychology: an experimental approach*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Korczok, J. (2019), Kreowanie zaangażowania pracowników poprzez wolontariat, *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Ekonomii i Informatyki w Krakowie*, (15), 79-101.
- Köse, A. (2016), The Relationship between Work Engagement Behavior and Perceived Organizational Support and Organizational Climate, *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(27), 42-52.
- Kupczyk, T., Pietrakowski, P. (2018), Czynniki zaangażowania pracowników jako determinanty zmian w zarządzaniu zasobami ludzkimi, *Przedsiębiorczość i Zarządzanie*, 19(10).
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., Adis, C. S. (2017), Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory, *Journal of management*, 43(6), 1854-1884.
- Kusmaningtyas, A. (2020), The Influence of Transformational Leadership, Organizational Climate, and Job Stress on Competence, Work Motivation, and Performance. In 17th International Symposium on Management (INSYMA 2020), 115-119.
- Lewicka, D., Krot, K. (2015), The model of HRM-trust-commitment relationships, *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 115(8), 1457-1480.
- Lewicka, D., Pec, M. (2018), The impact of human resources management on job involvement, The mediating role of vertical trust, *Folia Oeconomica Stetinensia*, 18(2), 34-45.
- Listwan, T., Pocztowski, A., & Stor, M. (2016), Managing human resources in Poland, Managing human resources in Central and Eastern Europe, 90-131.
- Litwin, G.H., Stringer, R.A. (1968), Motivation and organizational climate, division of research.
- Łaguna, M., Mielniczuk, E., Żaliński, A., Wałachowska, K. (2015), Przywiązanie do organizacji i zaangażowanie w pracę – koncepcje teoretyczne i problemy terminologiczne, *Medycyna Pracy*, 66(2), 277-284.
- Macey, W. H., Schneider, B. (2008), The meaning of employee engagement, *Industrial and organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.

- Machaczka, K., & Stopa, M. (2022). The influence of remote work in particular during the Covid-19 pandemic on changes in human behaviour patterns within organisations. *International Entrepreneurship Review*, 8(2), 67-78. <https://doi.org/10.15678/IER.2022.0802.05>
- Mafini, C. (2016). The contribution of organisational climate to employee well-being, *Journal of Applied business research (JABR)*, 32(4), 1157-1168.
- Manuaba, I. B. P., Sujana, I. W., & Widnyana, I. W. (2020), Influence of leadership and organizational climate on employee performance with job satisfaction as intervening variable at Denpasar National Polytechnic, *International Journal of Contemporary Research and Review*, 11(01), 21718-21728.
- Marek, A. (2018), Zarządzanie talentami w świetle teorii przywództwa służebnego, *Nowoczesne Systemy Zarządzania. Modern Management Systems*, (1), 27-37.
- Marzec, I. (2015), Rola klimatu organizacyjnego w kształtowaniu zaangażowania pracowników ośrodków pomocy społecznej na Śląsku, *Studia Ekonomiczne*, 232, 146-155.
- Mazzetti, G., Schaufeli, W. B., Guglielmi, D., Depolo, M. (2016), Overwork climate scale: Psychometric properties and relationships with working hard, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(4), 880-896.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment, *Human resource management review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Murthy, R. K. (2017). Perceived organizational support and work engagement, *International Journal of Advanced Educational Research*, 2(3), 72-74.
- Obeng, A. F., Quansah, P. E., Cobbinah, E., Danso, S. A. (2020), Organizational climate and employee performance: Examining the mediating role of organizational commitment and moderating role of perceived organizational support, *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 10(3).
- Olekśa-Marewska, K. (2020), Organizational climate as a mediating factor between occupational stress and prosocial organizational behaviours in knowledge-based organizations.
- Olekśa-Marewska, K. (2019), Związek między klimatem organizacyjnym a występowaniem zjawiska pracoholizmu w przedsiębiorstwach zatrudniających pracowników wiedzy, *Edukacja Ekonomistów i Menedżerów*, 51(1), 69-79.
- Pec, M., Lewicka, D. (2022), Zaangażowanie pracowników a przywiązanie organizacyjne – próba usystematyzowania pojęć, *Organization and Management*, 191(2), 157-171.
- Peplińska, A., Kawalec, K., Godlewska-Werner, D., & Połomski, P. (2020), Work Engagement, Organizational Commitment and the Work Satisfaction of Tax Administration Employees: The Intermediary Role of Organizational Climate and Silence in the Organizations, *Human Resource Management/Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*.
- Pollak, A., Chrupała-Pniak, M., Rudnicka, P., Paliga, M. (2017), Work engagement-A systematic review of polish research.
- Puni, A., Hilton, S. K., Mohammed, I., & Korankye, E. S. (2022), The mediating role of innovative climate on the relationship between transformational leadership and firm performance in developing countries: the case of Ghana, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 43(3), 404-421.
- Putsom, W., Sattayawaksakul, D. (2019), The relationship of perceived organizational support and organizational commitment to well-being as mediated by job satisfaction in not-for-profit organization, *Journal of Business, Governance, and Information Technology*, 1(1), 16-29.
- Rosenstiel, L., Bögel, R. (1992), Betriebsklima geht jeden an, *Bayerischen Staatsministerium für Arbeit, Familie und Sozialordnung, Monachium*.
- Rożman, M., & Štrukelj, T. (2021), Organisational climate components and their impact on work engagement of employees in medium-sized organisations, *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 34(1), 775-806.

- Rožman, M., Treven, S., Mulej, M., & Čančer, V. (2019), Creating a healthy working environment for older employees as part of social responsibility, *Kybernetes*, 48(5), 1045-1059.
- Saleem, M., Liang, Z. J., & Perveen, N. (2018), The Role of Organizational Climate and Its Impact on Industrial Turnover, *Human Resource Management Research*, 8(1).
- Saleem, M., & Perveen, N. (2019), Organizational climate and its impact on firm financial performance, *J. Hum. Resour. Manag.*, 1, 47-60.
- 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.
- Seren Intepeler, S., Esrefgil, G., Yilmazmis, F., Bengu, N., Gunes Dinc, N., Ileri, S., & Dirik, H. F. (2019), Role of job satisfaction and work environment on the organizational commitment of nurses: a cross-sectional study, *Contemporary nurse*, 55(4-5), 380-390.
- Shuck, B., Adelson, J. L., & Reio Jr, T. G. (2017), The employee engagement scale: Initial evidence for construct validity and implications for theory and practice, *Human Resource Management*, 56(6), 953-977.
- Sobocka-Szczapa, H. (2017), Culture of the Organization and Motivating Employees, *Przedsiębiorczość i Zarządzanie*, 18(1.2), 61-72.
- Stankiewicz, J., Łychmus, P., and Bortnowska, H. (2019), Autonomous teams as a way to increase the engagement of nonprofit members (case study), *Management*, 23(1).
- Stasiła-Sieradzka, M., Chudzicka-Czupala, A., Znajmiecka-Sikora, M. (2020), Work safety climate. Comparison of selected occupational groups, *PLoS one*, 15(12), e0243056.
- Sun, L., Bunchapattanasakda, C. (2019), Employee engagement: A literature review, *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 9(1), 63-80.
- Szczepańska-Woszczyna, K. (2014), The importance of organizational culture for innovation in the company. *Forum Scientiae Oeconomica* 2(3), 27-39.
- Szczepańska-Woszczyna, K. (2020), Management theory, innovation, and organisation: A model of managerial competencies. Routledge.
- Thai, Q.H., & Mai, K.N. (2023). An evolution of entrepreneurial culture studies: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 11(2), 31-62. <https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2023.110202>
- Zbierowski, P., & Gojny-Zbierowska, M. (2022). Talented enough to be a business leader? An alternative approach to entrepreneurs' traits. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 10(1), 175-187. <https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2022.100112>
- Tokarski, S., & Oleksa-Marewska, K. (2019), The importance of organisational climate and commitment of knowledge workers for increasing the competitive advantage of enterprises, *WSB Journal of Business and Finance*, 53(1), 13-21.
- Victor, J., Hoole, C. (2017), The influence of organisational rewards on workplace trust and work engagement, *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(1), 1-14.
- Viitala, R., Tanskanen, J., & Sääntti, R. (2015), The connection between organizational climate and well-being at work, *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 23(4), 606-620.
- Waligóra, Ł. (2018), Dimensions of engagement of employees. Review of tests, *World Scientific News*, (112), 96-106.
- Wang, X., Liu, L., Zou, F., Hao, J., & Wu, H. (2017), Associations of occupational stressors, perceived organizational support, and psychological capital with work engagement among Chinese female nurses, *BioMed research international*, 2017.
- Zbierowski, P., & Gojny-Zbierowska, M. (2022). Talented enough to be a business leader? An alternative approach to entrepreneurs' traits. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 10(1), 175-187. <https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2022.100112>

Katarzyna Szczepanska-Woszczyna, Ph.D., is an associate professor in the Management Department at WSB University, Dąbrowa Górnicza, Poland. She specialises in theoretical and practical issues related to management and strategic management. She is the author of numerous scientific papers on innovation management, entrepreneurship, managerial competencies, leadership, sustainable business, corporate culture, the organisational context of the influence of competencies on innovations as well as family business, published in peer-reviewed international journals. She is also a member of the scientific councils of several journals and conferences organised by a number of European universities. She was appointed as an Assessor in the Ministry of Science and Higher Education within the framework of the Science Operational Programme Human Resources Development as well as an expert of the Ministry of Regional Development. She holds a Ph.D. in management from the University of Economics in Katowice, as well as a postdoctoral degree (habilitation) from the Cracow University of Economics. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0731-8049>.

Regina Bogaczyk, MSc. is an academic teacher in the Department of Management at the WSB University in Dąbrowa Górnicza and a Deputy Dean of the WSB University's Campus in Cieszyn. She graduated from psychology and management and marketing (University of Silesia, Katowice), and completed postgraduate studies for forensic psychologists. She holds teaching qualifications as well. She is a career counsellor certified by the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy. She specializes in theoretical and practical issues concerning psychology and psychology of management. She is the author of scientific papers on intercultural management particularly related to organizational culture in international organizations and managerial competences in an intercultural environment. She is also a secretary of the Journal "Cultural Management: Science and Education". She is a member of the Scientific Society of Organization and Management as well as the Polish Psychological Society. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3800-9732>.