

EMPLOYEE WORK ENGAGEMENT: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL STATE OF THE ART REVIEW

Sunaina Ahuja*

Dr. Sanjay Modi**

ABSTRACT

The construct of work engagement is truly multidimensional and has been elaborated from various perspectives. Its dynamics have been explored in the context of change in the psychological contract between the employer and the employee in the contemporary era. This paper unveils a lucid understanding of the work engagement construct from a holistic perspective through a comprehensive review of literature. The classic and the contemporary research studies clarifying various dimensions of work engagement have been carefully examined. Findings from extant research have been categorized into various themes elaborated upon in this paper. Construct novelty and uniqueness have been established after a thorough review in comparison with earlier known constructs such as organizational commitment, job involvement and workaholism. The behavioral characteristics of engaged employees have been isolated. The scales available for measurement of work engagement have been explored. A comparison of work engagement frameworks focusing on its antecedents and consequences has been drawn. Interestingly, literature reveals that the phenomenon of work engagement is not limited to individuals and has the tendency to crossover to others in the environment, whether in work life or in family life. Engaged leaders displaying action readiness tend to have a more positive team climate inspiring their team mates to go the extra mile. Work engagement is also reported to have a positive association with work family facilitation. Finally work engagement has been categorically placed on the research agenda highlighting the need for exploring its relationship with job crafting, work life balance, work stress and organizational commitment through empirical studies.

Keywords : *work engagement, employee engagement, job crafting, performance*

* Associate Professor (Human Resource Management) , Lovely Professional University, Punjab, India

** Professor (School of Business) and Executive Dean (Faculty of Business and Arts), Lovely Professional University, Punjab, India

Introduction

In their quest for organizational excellence and value maximization contemporary organizations struggle to effectively manage talent and transform employees into engaged associates who are willing to go the extra mile. Bruce Henderson, the founder of Boston Consulting Group believed that dedicated people, their ideas, and a commitment to acting with integrity has enormous potential to create value, influence the evolution of industries, and indeed, to change the world (us.greatrated.com). A perusal of Fortune's list of the 100 best companies to work, reveals wide diversity in the tangible and intangible rewards they offer, with the common outcome of being able to successfully engage their workforce (fortune.com). According to The Great Place to Work Model, a great workplace is one where organizational objectives are achieved with employees who enjoy working, take pride in their work and give their personal best as a team, in an environment of trust. The ingredients of a great workplace include great challenges, atmosphere, rewards, pride, communication and great bosses too (greatplacetowork.com). Consistent participation of companies like Google Inc, SAS and The Boston Consulting Group in surveys like Great Places to Work is an indicator of their concern for employee engagement. Most of the companies surveyed acknowledge the need to provide an environment in which employees perceive their work to be meaningful and themselves to be empowered to contribute towards organizational and societal goals. The top ranking companies are able to engage employees from the most diverse backgrounds and at different stages of their personal and professional lives. They do so by going all out to take the widest range of measures from provision of personalized work space, free food, space to grow vegetables and even avail the facility of nap pods (us.greatrated.com). Unfortunately, the scenario depicted in Fortune's List of Great Places to Work is not representative of the common workplace where the large majority of the workforce is employed. Studies reveal that employee engagement seems to be on a continued decline (Shuck & Wppard, 2008). Despite the low numbers of engaged employees, organizational leaders rate employee engagement among the top priorities of their organizations (Ketter, 2008) since it has a great association with job performance (Merrill, et al., 2013). Engagement has a statistically positive relationship with productivity, profitability, employee retention, safety, and customer satisfaction (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999; Coffman & Gonzalez-Molina, 2002). Similar relationships have not been shown for traditional organizational constructs such as job satisfaction (Fisher & Locke, 1992). Gruman and Saks

(2011) suggest that incremental performance may be best achieved by orienting the performance management system to promote employee engagement. Organizations need to build an environment which truly inspires people to give their best. The challenges associated with facilitating an organizational environment that promotes work engagement are well documented. In this context work culture support has been identified an important factor for predicting higher supervisor support, colleague support and work engagement (Biggs, Brough and Barbour, 2014).

Engaging employees entails a closer examination of the unwritten, psychological contract between the employer and the employees. It is distinguishable from the formal written contract of employment which identifies mutual duties and responsibilities in a generalized form. The psychological contract represents the mutual beliefs, perceptions, and informal obligations between the employer and employee. For most part of the last century the deal was pretty clear. In return for their labor, the employees demanded a high degree of job security along with a slow and steady increase in remuneration. The onset of the twenty first century has brought a paradigm shift in the psychological contract. A typical employer is faced with the pressure to cut costs, use cutting edge technology for higher productivity and play against rivals trying to poach both employees and customers. This is coupled with high employee attrition rates and corresponding lower average length of service, thus increasing the direct costs for replacement and decreasing the organization's ability to develop long-term customer relationships and implement strategies that are people dependent. Upon examining the employees' paradigm of the psychological contract it is evident that they now believe that one needs to change jobs more frequently to ensure continued salary growth and career advancement. The idea of a 'job for life' is fading and current focus is upon creating employability for future anywhere across the globe (Aselstine and Alletson , 2006). This necessitates a detailed analysis of the concept on the basis of extant research findings.

Work engagement as a construct

Engagement has become an important issue, not only for academics and researchers but also for practitioners in organizations (May, Gilson & Harter, 2004). Interest in engagement arose with the shift in focus in industrial psychology to positive organizational behavior (Rothmann & Storm , 2003; Strumpfer, 2003). Research by Schaufeli et al. (2002)

stimulated studies regarding employee engagement as the antipode of burnout. In order to gauge the construct validity of work engagement amongst employees the several definitions available in extant literature need to be examined. The following paragraphs present such definitions categorized according to similarity of content rather than chronology.

Some authors define engagement in terms of already known psychological constructs such as the individual's involvement, satisfaction and enthusiasm for work (Harter, Schmidt and Hayes, 2002) ; a high internal motivational state (Colbert et al. , 2004). The term 'committed employees' has been used as a synonym for engaged employees by Fleming et al. (2005), Gallup Organization researchers. Fleming and Asplund (2007) liken employee engagement to the concept of customer engagement, which has the dimensions of confidence, integrity, pride and passion.

Work engagement has also been defined in terms of the results it is supposed to produce i.e. an illusive force that motivates employees to higher levels of performance. It has been termed as a coveted energy similar to commitment towards the organization, job ownership and pride, more discretionary effort, passion and excitement. It has been considered an amalgam of commitment, loyalty, productivity and ownership (Wellins and Concelman , 2005). On similar lines, engagement is defined in terms of two dimensions namely an individual's contribution to the company's success and personal satisfaction in the role. Full engagement represents an alignment of maximum job satisfaction with maximum job contribution (HR Anexi and Blessing White, 2008).

The most vivid understanding of engagement as a unique construct, different from earlier known constructs has been brought about by conceptualizing it in terms of the characteristics of engaged employees. In this school of thought, Kahn (1990) conceptualized personal engagement as the harnessing of organization member's selves to their work roles wherein people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally in varying degrees during role performances. Thus, engaged employees put much effort into their work because they identify with it. According to Kahn (1990) a dynamic, dialectical relationship exists between the person who drives personal energies into his or her work role on the one hand, and the work role that allows this person to express him or herself on the other hand. Kahn's conceptualization is based on two premises namely work redesign model of Hackman & Oldham (1980) stating that the psychological experience of work drives people's attitudes and behaviors

and secondly individual, interpersonal, group, intergroup, and organizational factors simultaneously influence these experiences (Alderfer, 1985). Inspired by the work of Kahn (1990), Rothbard (2001) took a slightly different perspective and defined engagement as a two-dimensional motivational construct that includes attention and absorption. Interestingly, the most contemporary research on work engagement has been stimulated by research on burnout. Maslach and Leiter (1997) termed engagement as the positive antipode of burnout. They rephrased burnout as an erosion of engagement with the job. In the view of these authors, work engagement is characterised by energy, involvement and efficacy, which are considered the direct opposites of the three burnout dimensions namely exhaustion, cynicism and lack of professional efficacy respectively. Schaufeli et al. (2002) partly agree with Maslach and Leiter's (1997) description, but take a different perspective and define work engagement in its own right. Burnout and engagement are not perfectly negatively correlated. An employee who is not burned-out may score high or low on engagement, whereas an engaged employee may score high or low on burnout. Furthermore, burnout and engagement may be considered on two independent dimensions of activation and identification. Activation ranges from exhaustion to vigour, while identification ranges from cynicism to dedication. Burnout is characterised by a combination of exhaustion or low activation and cynicism or low identification, whereas engagement is characterised by vigour or high activation and dedication or high identification. Schaufeli et al. (2002) define engagement as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that refers to a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual or behaviour. It consists of three dimensions namely vigour, dedication and absorption. Vigour is characterised by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one's work, not being easily fatigued, and persistence even in the face of difficulties. Dedication is characterised by deriving a sense of significance from one's work, by feeling enthusiastic and proud about one's job, and by feeling inspired and challenged by it. Absorption is characterised by being totally and happily immersed in one's work and having difficulties detaching oneself from it. Time passes quickly and one forgets everything else that is around. In later years engagement has been defined in terms of how each individual employee connects with the organization and with customers (Lucey and Hines, 2005).

Construct novelty and uniqueness

The question remains as to whether engagement is a unique concept or merely a repackaging of other constructs. Recent research has provided some empirical evidence of employee engagement being a distinct construct (Christian et al., 2011; Rich, et al., 2010; Shuck et al., 2011). Macey, W.H and Schneider, B. (2008) and Shuck et al. (2013) have discretely established work engagement as a unique concept, despite its obvious overlap with organizational commitment, job involvement and workaholism.

In the engagement literature, some authors such as Fleming, et al. (2005) used the term commitment. The Corporate Executive Board (2004) suggested that engagement is the extent to which employees commit to someone or something in their organization, how hard they work, and how long they stay as a result of that commitment. Commitment can be understood as a person's attachment or attitude towards an organization (Saks, 2006). Engagement is not an attitude but rather a state and operationally speaking, the degree to which persons are attentive and absorbed in their work (Saks, 2006). Organizational commitment is comparatively stable over time, while engagement is subject to fluctuations as employees interpret and interact with a myriad of environmental stimuli in the workplace (Kahn, 1990).

Comparing engagement with job involvement, the latter implies a state of self engagement in the job (Brown, 1996). Job involvement is seen in contemporary definitions of engagement as a part of engagement but not equivalent to it (Salanova et al., 2005). From another perspective, engagement may be considered as an antecedent to job involvement such that individuals who experience deep engagement in their roles should identify with their jobs (May et al., 2004). Job involvement is a cognitive judgment about the job itself, which is tied to self-image (May et al., 2004 and Saks, 2006), whereas employee engagement is a wider, more inclusive construct comprising of energy and enthusiasm towards the job (Christian et al., 2011; Kahn, 1990; Rich et al., 2010).

Another interesting investigation is that of the perceived similarity between work engagement and workaholism thus answering the question whether engaged employees are workaholics. The term workaholism was coined by Oates (1971), who describes it as the compulsion or the uncontrollable need to work incessantly. Hence, workaholics tend to spend an exceptional amount of time to work and persistently think about work, even when not working,

suggesting thereby that workaholics are obsessed with their work. Starkly opposite to these characteristics, the behavior of engaged employees shows that they are not addicted to work (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008). Unlike workaholics, they enjoy doing things outside work, do not feel guilty when not working and do not work hard because of a strong and irresistible inner drive. Rather, the engaged employees work because they enjoy doing so. On the whole, engagement is clearly established as a novel and unique concept. The argument is supported by the findings of Rich et al. (2010) who found that the simultaneous investment of cognitive, affective, and physical energies into performance-related outcomes represents something unique, differentiating engagement from other potentially related variables. Engagement is now an established term in both managerial and academic literature and appears unlikely to be abandoned as a fad (Guest 2013).

Behavioural manifestations of work engagement

The behavioral characteristics of engaged workers reflect numerous aspects simultaneously e.g. organizational citizenship behavior, role expansion, proactive behavior and demonstrating personal initiative, all focused towards achieving organizational objectives. Engaged employees are passionate and always try to go an extra mile in doing their work. When seen from the behavioral angle work engagement is the opposite of burnout; engagement is characterized by energy, involvement, and professional efficacy – the direct opposites of the three core burnout dimensions viz. exhaustion, cynicism and professional inefficacy (Maslach and Leiter, 1997). After looking at the behavioural manifestations of work engagement, a question arises as to what is the rationale for varied levels of employee engagement behavior? The question is well addressed by Saks (2006) in terms of social exchange theory (SET). According to SET, when two or more parties interact with reciprocal interdependence, mutual obligations are generated. With passage of time, relationships evolve into mutual commitments as long as the parties abide by certain rules of exchange. For example, when individuals receive economic and socio-emotional resources like recognition and being valued by their organization, they feel obliged to respond in kind and repay the organization (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). This is consistent with Robinson et al.'s (2004) description of engagement as a two-way relationship between the employer and employee. One of the methods for individuals to repay

their organization is through their level of engagement. That is, employees will choose to engage themselves to varying degrees and in response to the resources they receive from their organization.

A significant aspect of engaged employees behavior is their inclination towards job crafting. Studies reveal that employees do not just let life happen to them, rather, they try to affect what happens in their lives (Grant and Ashford, 2008) . Employees may modify their job design by negotiating different job content and assigning meaning to their tasks or jobs (Parker & Ohly, 2008). Particularly, engaged employees behave in such a way. Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) call the process of employees shaping their own jobs “job crafting”; this includes the physical and cognitive changes individuals make in their tasks or relational boundaries. Physical changes refer to the form, scope or number of job tasks, whereas cognitive changes refer to perception of the job. Relational boundaries include employees’ discretion over their social interactions while doing the job. Job crafting has the potential to improve employees’ balance of job demands with resources, increasing their person–job fit. Wrzesniewski et al. (1997) suggest that employees who view their work as a calling (i.e., focus on enjoyment or fulfillment) are more likely to engage in job crafting, because work is more central to their lives. In a longitudinal study by Chan (2013) daily diary method was used to investigate the effects of job crafting behaviours on employees' self-reported work performance and engagement. The results revealed that when demands were high, increasing structural resources improved engagement further than when demands were low. When autonomy was high, increasing structural resources improved both engagement and performance further than when autonomy was low.

Any discussion on the behavioral aspects of engaged employees would be incomplete without elaboration upon the consequences of over indulgence in work. While work engagement is a virtuous concept, over indulgence in work might lead to some unwanted / unforeseen negative consequences for the engaged employees. In a survey study conducted by Bakker et al. (2004) amongst a representative sample of the Dutch workforce it was found that work engagement was positively related to working overtime and taking work home. Further, the work-life balance literature reveals that work-home interference slows recovery from stress and may lead to health related issues (Geurts & Demerouti, 2003). Particularly the absorption component of work engagement appears to evoke unhealthy behavior. Pines et al. (1981) found

that employees who are more vulnerable towards falling in the ‘over engagement trap’ are the ones who have been “on fire” at one time . Employees who are so immersed in their work that they forget to rest and recover, may develop health problems, disturb their work-life harmony and fall into the trap of ‘presenteeism’ or ‘workaholism’. Thus it can be said that there is a thin line between engagement and over-engagement and by crossing it, one does more harm than good to self as well as the larger system. The onus lies largely on organizations and partly on employees to define the limits of engagement behavior which would enable the right work -life balance and avoid falling in the over engagement trap.

Measurement of work engagement

For measuring employee work engagement, the most prominent and popular is the 12 questions instrument developed by Gallup Organization which has been referred by various authors as the Q12, Gallup Workplace Audit (GWA) or Gallup Engagement Index. Buckingham and Coffman (1999) refer to four theoretical constructs that the items measure, What do I get? What do I give? Do I belong? and How can we grow? Maslach and Leiter (1997) assess work engagement by the opposite pattern of scores on the three dimensions of Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) – low scores on exhaustion and cynicism, and high scores on efficacy are indicative for engagement. An alternative instrument for the assessment of work engagement is the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) (Demerouti , et al., 2010). This instrument was developed originally to assess burnout, but includes both positively and negatively phrased items, and hence it can be used to assess work engagement as well by recoding the negatively framed items. The OLBI includes two dimensions: one ranging from exhaustion to vigour and the second ranging from cynicism to dedication. The reliability and factorial validity of the OLBI has been confirmed in studies conducted in Germany, Greece, the Netherlands, the USA, and South Africa. The most often used instrument to measure engagement is Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) a self-reporting instrument that has been validated in many countries across the world (Schaufeli et al., 2002). UWES includes 15 items for the assessment of the three engagement dimensions including vigor, dedication and absorption. Schaufeli et al. (2006) subsequently developed a nine-item version of the UWES and provided evidence for its cross-national validity. Both the scales are relevant in investigating work engagement status. UWES

has quite satisfactory psychometric properties viz. the three subscales are internally consistent and stable across time; the three-factor structure is confirmed and seems to be invariant across samples from different countries.

The Dynamics of work engagement

A holistic understanding of the concept of work engagement requires a comparative analysis of the various frameworks that bring out the engagement dynamics. Extant literature was reviewed to explore the various theories, models and frameworks of work engagement. Four distinct engagement frameworks propounded over the last two decades were identified viz. Kahn (1990), Saks (2006), Bakker and Demeroutti (2008) and Macey and Schneider (2008). In order to deduce commonalities and unique contributions of each of these studies some parameters of comparison were required. For bringing out the engagement dynamics, comparison was made on parameters as basic as the terminology used, delving deeper into the dimensions of work engagement construct, finally comparing the antecedents and consequences of work engagement. A summarized comparison has been made :

Table I : A comparative analysis of the dynamics of work engagement

Framework → Parameters ↓	Kahn (1990)	Saks (2006)	Bakker and Demeroutti (2008)	Macey and Schneider (2008)
Terms used	Personal Engagement	Employee engagement	Work engagement	Employee engagement
Dimensions	Physical, cognitive and affective	Job engagement and organizational engagement	Vigour, dedication and absorption	Trait, state and behavioural engagement
Antecedents	Psychological meaningfulness (predicted by job enrichment and role fit)	Job characteristics	Job resources	Work attributes
	Psychological safety (predicted by rewarding co-worker)	Perceived Supervisory support and	Supervisory coaching and social support	Transformational leadership and trust

	and supportive supervisor relations)	perceived organizational support		
	Psychological availability (predicted by individual resources and work-role insecurities)	Individual perception about distributive and procedural justice	Personal resources (optimism, self efficacy, resilience, self esteem)	Trait engagement (personality traits - proactive, conscientious)
Consequences	Individual performance : task and Role	Job satisfaction	In- role performance	Proactive behavior / initiative
	Interpersonal relationships, group and intergroup dynamics	Organization commitment	Extra- role performance	Role expansion
	Management style and process	Organization citizenship behavior	Creativity	Organization citizenship behavior
	Organizational norms	Intention to quit	Financial turnover	Adaptive
Unique feature	A classic framework that formed a sound base for later studies.	Organization engagement distinct from job engagement and more powerful in predicting outcome variables	Job resources, job demands and personal resources as the main antecedents of work engagement	Engagement established as a unique construct.

Source : Author's analysis on the basis of literature review

Table I brings out the similarities and unique features on all parameters identified for comparison. An analysis of the dimensions of work engagement proposed by all the frameworks tabulated above brings out two very important aspects of the construct. First, work engagement is a matter pertaining to the physical, cognitive and affective domains of the individual. One is completely engaged when the body, mind and heart are immersed into work. Second engagement is exhibited in the form of a psychological state, an amalgam of personality traits and behaviors at work.

Upon analyzing the antecedents and consequences of work engagement Table I reveals that there are commonalities in these parameters across the four frameworks. For

instance, Kahn (1990) propounded psychological meaningfulness as an important antecedent of work engagement and elaborated that it is predicted by the degree of job enrichment and role fit. On parallel lines, Saks (2006) established that employee engagement depends on job characteristics. This was elaborated further by Bakker and Demeroutti (2008) who identified job resources such as performance feedback, social support, and supervisory coaching which exclusively predict engagement. Macey and Scheneider (2008) supplemented the findings by isolating work attributes such as variety, challenge and autonomy that determine work engagement. A comparison of the consequences of work engagement as per the four frameworks tabulated in Table I reveals that Kahn (1990) concluded that work engagement affects the interpersonal relationships, group and intergroup dynamics which is in consonance with the findings of Saks (2006), Bakker and Demeroutti (2008) and Macey and Schneider (2008).

Hence it can be concluded that all the frameworks have many aspects in common. Even the dissimilar aspects are complimentary to each other rather than contradictory. Future research can assimilate all the known models so far and propose a more holistic model clarifying the engagement dynamics.

Crossover and spillover effects of work engagement

Crossover or emotional contagion can be defined as the transfer of positive (or negative) experiences from one person to the other (Westman, 2001). Barsade (2002) conducted an innovative laboratory study in which the transfer of moods among people in a group and its influence on performance was examined. It was concluded that the pleasant mood of a colleague influenced the mood of the other team members during a simulated managerial exercise. The positive mood transfer resulted in more cooperative behaviour and better task performance. In a similar vein, Sy et al. (2005) found that when leaders were in a positive mood, individual team members experienced more positive mood and groups displayed more coordination thus spending less effort than groups with leaders in a negative mood. Managers play a key role in promoting work engagement among their team mates. A sample survey of nursing staff working in acute care hospitals revealed that nurses who work for managers demonstrating higher levels of authentic leadership report greater work engagement (Bamford et.al, 2013). Engaged workers

who communicate their optimism and pro-active behaviors to their colleagues, create a positive team climate, independent of the demands and resources they were exposed to (Bakker et al., 2006). Furthermore, it appears that employees who take the positive feelings from their work to home or vice versa exhibit higher levels of engagement compared to those where there is no positive cross-over between the two different domains (Montgomery et al., 2003). In a study among working couples it was shown that wives' levels of vigor and dedication uniquely contribute to husbands' levels of vigor and dedication (Bakker et al. , 2003). Work engagement is positively related to work-family facilitation and in contrast, workaholism shows a positive relationship with work-family conflict (Bakker et al. , 2014). Hence, it can be said that both engagement as well as the lack of it is contagious as it crosses over from one member to the other whether at work or in personal life.

Conclusion

While competing in the global arena, companies are restructuring and realigning their people management strategies to suit business needs. Most of these organizations who used to think of capital simply as shares, cash, investments, or some sort of wealth have changed their views and added employee development and performance management as strategic business priorities (Batista – Taran et al., 2009). Engaged employees have consistently shown to be more productive, profitable, safer, healthier, and less likely to leave their employer (Fleming & Asplund, 2007; Wagner & Harter, 2006). Hence, engagement is a rich field of scholarly interest that holds great promise for researchers and practitioners alike. Towards its culmination this paper intends to put work engagement on the research agenda by bringing out that most of the studies on work engagement have used a cross-sectional design and cannot explain why even highly engaged employees may have an off day and sometimes show below average or poor performance. Daily changes in work engagement can be examined using diary studies. An important advantage of diary research is that it relies less on recalling the past, since the questions relate to individuals' perceptions and feelings on a certain day. On the behavioral aspects of engaged employees, very few studies have been conducted to study the relationship between job crafting and work engagement. Further studies are recommended to investigate the impact of job crafting on work engagement, individual performance and well-being. Not much is known about engagement at the group or team level, and explorations of this would be a fruitful

avenue for future research. Since work engagement is found to crossover from work to family setting , it is vital to study whether work engaged employees are likely to enjoy a better work life balance than their less engaged counterparts and whether the work engagement of the leader is likely to create a positive team climate thereby affecting the level of experienced stress. Further empirical studies are recommended to elucidate the dynamics of this relationship. At the personal level, resilience is likely to increase the stress coping capacity of individuals and can be another dimension for further research. Increased understanding of the engagement construct and an examination of the relationships it shares with organizational commitment, job involvement and workaholism could help both HRD professionals as well as organizational behavior literature base.

Employee engagement is more likely to be sustainable when employee well-being is also high (Robertson and Cooper, 2010). Further research exploring the links between employee engagement and well-being is needed. The link between HRM, engagement and performance at the level of the individual and the firm is clearly a fruitful avenue for future research endeavor, particularly since there is evidence that engagement may be associated not only with raised levels of performance but also with enhanced well-being (Schaufeli, 2013). Finally work engagement has been categorically placed on the research agenda highlighting the need for exploring its relationship with job crafting, work life balance, work stress and organizational commitment through empirical studies.

References :

- Alderfer, C. P. (1985). An Intergroup Perspective On Group Dynamics. In J. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Behaviour* (pp. 190-222). Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall .
- Aselstine, K., & Alletson, K. (2006). *A new deal for 21st century workplace*. Retrieved May 25, 2010, from Ivey Business Journal: www.iveybusinessjournal.com
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a Model of Work Engagement. *Career Development International*, 13 (3), 209-223.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2003). The Socially Induced Burnout Model. In S. Shohov (Ed.), *Advances in Psychology Research* (Vol. 25, pp. 13-30). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the Job Demands - Resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management* , 43, 83-104.

Bakker, A. B., Gierveld, J. H., & Van, R. K. (2006). *Success factors amongst female school principals in primary teaching: A study on burnout, work engagement and performance*. Diemen, The Netherlands : Right Management Consultatnts .

Bakker, A. B., Shimazu, A., Demerouti, E., Shimada, K., & Kawakami, N. (2014). Work engagement versus workaholism: A test of spillover-crossover model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29 (1), 63-80.

Bamford, M., Wong, C. A., & Laschinger, H. (2013). The influence of authentic leadership and areas of worklife on work engagement of registered nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 21, 529-540.

Barsade, S. (2002). The ripple effect: emotional contagion and its influence on group behaviour. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 644-677.

Batista-Taran, L. C., Shuck, M. B., Gutierrez, C. C., & Baralt, S. (2009). The Role of Leadership Style in Employee Engagement. In M. S. Plakhotnik, S. M. Nielsen, & D. M. Pane (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Eight Annual College of Education & GSN Research Conference* (pp. 15-20). Miami: Florida International University.

Biggs, A., Brough, P., & Barbour, J. P. (2014). Relationships of individual and organizational support with engagement: Examining various types of causality in a three-wave study . *Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health and Organisations*, 236-254.

Boston Consulting Group. (2014). Retrieved October 27, 2014, from <http://us.greatrated.com/the-boston-consulting-group>

Brown, S. P. (1996). A Meta-analysis and Review of Organizational Research on Job Involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 235-255.

Buckingham, M., & Coffman, C. (1999). *First Break All the Rules: What the World's Greatest Managers Do Differently*. New York: Simon & Shuster.

Chan, F. (2013). Effects of Job crafting on Work Engagement and Performance. *Honours Thesis, University of Queensland* .

Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement : A quantitative review and test of its relationship with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64 (1), 89-136.

Coffman, C., & Gonzalez-Molina, G. (2002). *Follow this path : How the world's greatest organizations derive growth by unleashing human potential*. New York: Warner Books, Inc.

Colbert, A. E., Mount, M. K., Harter, J. K., Witt, L., & Barrick, M. R. (2004). Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 599-609.

Corporate Executive Board . (2004). *Driving Performance and Retention through Employee Engagement : A Quantitative Analysis of Effective Engagement Strategies* . Retrieved November 9, 2014, from www.usc.edu/programs/cwfl/assets/pdf/Employee%20engagement.pdf

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social Exchange Theory : An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management* , 31, 874-900.

Demerouti, E., Mostert, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Burnout and Work Engagement : A Thorough Investigation of the Independency of Both Constructs. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* , 15 (3), 209-222.

Fisher, C. D., & Locke, E. A. (1992). The New Look in Job Satisfaction Research and Theory. In C. J. Cranny, P. C. Smith, & E. F. Stone (Eds.), *Job Satisfaction : How People Feel about their Jobs and How It Affects Their Performance*. NY : Lexington Books.

Fleming, J. H., & Asplund, J. (2007). *Human Sigma*. New York: Gallup Press.

Fleming, J. H., Coffman, C., & Harter, J. K. (2005). Manage your Human Sigma. *Harvard Business Review* , 83, 106-115.

Fortune - Best Companies 2014. (2014). Retrieved October 27, 2014, from <http://fortune.com/best-companies>

Geurts, S., & Demerouti, E. (2003). Work / Non-work Interference : A Review of Theories and Findings. In M. Schabracq, J. Winnubust, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *The Handbook of Work and Health Psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 279-312). Chichester: Wiley.

Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The Dynamics of Proactivity at Work. *Research in Organizational Behaviour* , 28, 3-34.

Great Place to Work Institute. (2014). Retrieved October 27, 2014, from <http://www.greatplacetowork.com>

Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance Management and Employee Engagement . *Human Resource Management Review* , 21 (2), 123-136.

Guest, D. E. (2013). Employee Engagement: Fashionable Fad or Long Term Fixture? In C. Truss, K. Alfes, R. Delbridge, A. Shantz, & E. C. Soane (Eds.), *Employee Engagement in Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). Work Redesign Reading . Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement and business outcomes- A meta-analysis . *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 87, 268-279.

- HR Anexi and Blessing White . (2008). *The Employee Engagement Equation in India* . Business World.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work. *Academy of Management Journal* , 33 (4), 692-724.
- Ketter, P. (2008). What's the big deal about employee engagement . *Training and Development* , 44-49.
- Lucey, J. B., & Hines, P. (2005). Why major lean transitions have not been sustained? *Management Services* , 49 (2), 9-14.
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement . *Industrial and Organizational Psychology* , 1, 3-30.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work . *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* , 77, 11-37.
- Merrill, R., Aldana, S. G., Pope, J. E., Anderson, D. R., Coberley, C. R., Grossmeier, J. J., et al. (2013). Self-Rated Job Performance and Absenteeism According to Employee Engagement, Health Behaviours and Physical Health. *Journal of Occupational & Environmental Medicine* , 55 (1), 10-18.
- Montgomery, A., Peeters, M. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Den Ouden, M. (2003). Work - home interference amongst newspaper managers: Its relationship with Burnout and Engagement. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping* , 16, 195-211.
- Oates, W. (1971). *Confessions of a workaholic : The facts about work addiction*. New York: World Publishing.
- Parker, S. K., & Ohly, S. (2008). Designing Motivating Jobs. In R. Kenfer, G. Chen, & R. Pritchard (Eds.), *Work Motivation : past, present and future*. SIOP: Organization Frontier Series.
- Pines, A. M., Aronson, E., & Kafry, D. (1981). *Burnout : From tedium to personal growth* . New York: Free Press.
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal* , 617-635.
- Robertson, I. T., & Cooper, C. L. (2010). Full engagement: The integration of employee engagement and psychological well-being. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal* , 31, 324-336.
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). *The Drivers of Employee Engagement*. Retrieved December 12, 2014, from Institute for Public Relations: <http://www.instituteforpr.org/employee-engagement-5/>

Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or Depleting? The Dynamics of Engagement in Work and Family Roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 655-684.

Rothmann, S., & Storm, K. (2003). Work Engagement in the South African Police Service. *11th European Congress of Work and Organizational Psychology*, (pp. 14-17). Lisbon.

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21 (7), 600-619.

Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiro', J. M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty : The mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90 (12), 171-227.

Schahufeli, W. B. (2013). What is Engagement? In C. Truss, K. Alfes, R. Delbridge, A. Shantz, & E. C. Soane (Eds.), *Employee Engagement in Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Schahufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a brief questionnaire : a cross national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 701-16.

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

Shaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. The conceptualization and measurement of work engagement : A review. In A. B. Bakker, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work Engagement : Recent Developments in Theory and Research* . New York: Psychology Press.

Shuck, B., & Wppard, K. (2008). Employee engagement: Motivating and connecting with tomorrow's workforce. *New horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 22 (1), 48-53.

Shuck, B., Ghosh, R., Zigarmi, D., & Nimon, K. (2013). The Jingle Jangle of Employee Engagement: Further Exploration of the Emerging Construct and Implications for Workplace Learning and Performance . *Human Resource Development Review*, 12 (1), 11-35.

Shuck, B., Reio, T., & Rocco, T. (2011). Employee engagement: An antecedent and outcome approach to model development . *Human Resource Development International*, 14, 427-445.

Strumpfer, D. W. (2003). Resilience and Burnout : A stitch that could save nine. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 33, 69-79.

Sy, T., Cote, S., & Saavedra, R. (2005). The contagious leader: Impact of leader's affect on group member affect and group processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 295-305.

Wagner, R., & Harter, J. (2006). *12: The Elements of Great Managing*. Washington, D.C: The Gallup Organization.

Wellins, R., & Conelman, J. (2005). *Personal engagement driving growth at the see-level*. Retrieved May 25, 2010, from www.ddiworld.com/pdf/ddi_personalengagement_ar.pdf

Westman, M. (2001). Stress and Strain Crossover. *Human Relations*, 54, 557-91.

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job : Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 179-201.

Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, careers and callings: People's reactions to their work. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 21-33.

