

# Employee Engagement: A Review of the Recent Empirical Literature

*Asst.Prof.Dr. Alaa Amin Hassan Omar, Business Administration Department, School of Management Studies, University of Khartoum, Khartoum, Sudan*

## ABSTRACT

*Employee Engagement is a topic in Human Resource Development (HRD) that has gained considerable attention in the recent years. Despite its importance in the industry, little has been done in terms of academic research in the subject area of Employee Engagement. Antecedents, consequences and correlations of Employee Engagement is still lacking in terms of research knowledge. This systematic literature review is a wakeup call for more empirical research to be done in the field. The review here focuses on four perspectives of employee engagement and concentrates on consequences and antecedents of employee engagement. The findings of this review will be useful as a guideline for future research in employee engagement and in HRD. This study reviews 30 empirical research papers on employee engagement.*

**Keywords:** *Employee engagement, literature review, Empirical research.*

---

## 1.INTRODUCTION

Employee engagement is a vast concept that touches almost all parts of human resource management aspects we know thus far, if every part of human resources is not addressed in the proper manner, employees fail to fully engage themselves in their job as a result to such kind of mismanagement (Markos & Sridevi, 2010). Employee engagement is an essential concept for better understanding and improving individual and organizational performance, nowadays employee engagement is crucial because organizations are becoming more demanding from their workers than ever before (Sahoo & Mishra, 2012). In addition, Rashid, Asad, and Ashraf (2011) stated that employee engagement is the key focus of both business entrepreneurs and academic researchers and is closely related to the issue of modern business environment, employee engagement is the becoming an important tool for every organization to gain competitive advantages over other organizations. Moreover, employee engagement has been linked in a positive manner with performance in many areas, including increased customer satisfaction, profitability & productivity, and reduced employee turnover (Brunetto, Teo, Shacklock, & Farr-Wharton, 2012; Chat-Uthai, 2013; Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Markos & Sridevi, 2010; Moreland, 2013; Yalabik, Popaitoon, Chowne, & Rayton, 2013). There are evidences that lack of employee engagement is financially harmful for organizations throughout the world. Conversely, organizations that is successful in developing engaged employees can achieve significant organizational benefits such as higher retention rates, improved productivity, and increased profit (Agarwal, Datta, Blake-Beard, & Bhargava, 2012; Brunetto et al., 2012; Chat-Uthai, 2013; Harter et al., 2002; Soane, Truss, Alfes, Shantz, Rees, & Gatenby, 2012).

There are a significant body of literature supporting the importance of employee engagement, but yet few empirical research on the antecedents and consequences of employee engagement (Arrowsmith & Parker, 2013; Christian, Garza, & Slaughter, 2011; Van Rooy, Whitman, Hart, & Caleo, 2011). Employee engagement has been a popular concept among business practitioners, while in the academic literature, the concept remains relatively new (Junghoon 2012; Remo, 2012; Truss, Shantz, Soane, Alfes, & Delbridge, 2013), and the relationships among potential antecedents and consequences of engagement as well as the components of engagement have not been rigorously conceptualized (Arrowsmith & Parker, 2013; Crawford, LePine, & Rich, 2010; Gupta & Kumar, 2012; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Reissner & Pagan, 2013; Saks, 2006; Van Rooy et al., 2011; Wollard & Shuck, 2011). There is a need for more exploration, growth and dialogues around the topic of employee engagement.

## 2. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this systematic literature review is to synthesize the recent empirical research on employee engagement. This article is broken into three main sections: (a) Methodology, (b) Historical overview of employee engagement, and (c) recent research on employee engagement.

## 3. Methodology of Literature Review

The aim of this review is to explore the recent empirical research on employee engagement from 2010- 2014. To extract pertinent research the electronic databases such as (EBSCO, Science Direct, Emerald, Sage Publication, etc) to search for articles, keywords used in the search included employee engagement, engagement at work, work engagement, personal engagement, and job engagement. The selection criteria for this review include those studies that were (1) written from 2010-2014 in English language (2) empirical studies (3) examined the engagement at work with in any work setting.

**Table -1**

Article citation	Journal	Research type/sample
Rich et al. (2010)	Academy of Management Journal	Empirical research: 245 full time firefighter and there supervisors.
Shuck et al. (2011)	Human Resource Development International	Empirical research: 283 workers in service, manufacturing, professional, nonprofit industries.
Reio and Sanders (2011)	Advances in Developing Human Resources	Empirical research: 272 employees in computer company.
Fairlie (2011)	Advances in Developing Human Resources	Empirical research: 574 employees in North Americans.
Sardar, Rehman, Yousaf, and Aijaz (2011)	Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business	Empirical research: 250 employees of four major private commercial banks of Pakistan.
Soane et al. (2012)	Human Resource Development International	Empirical research: 683 employees in retail organization
Vogelgesang, Leroy, and Avolio (2013)	The Leadership Quarterly	Empirical research: 451 military cadets
He, Zhu, and Zheng (2014)	Journal of Business Ethics	Empirical research: 222 employees a leading financial service organization in the United Kingdom.
Menguc et al. (2012)	Journal of Business Research	Empirical research: 482 service employees and customers in 66 retail stores.
Bakker et al. (2012)	Journal of Vocational Behavior	Empirical research: 144 employees from several occupations.
Ronald and Ghada (2010)	African Journal of Economic and Management Studies	Empirical research: 242 respondents male and female managers and professionals in various organizations and industries.
Takuma (2011)	European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences	Empirical research: 290 sale managers and sales supervisors of Japanese companies.
Othman and Nasurdin (2012)	Journal of Nursing Management	Empirical research: 402 staff nurses working in three general hospitals in Peninsular Malaysia.
Runhaar, Konermann, and Sanders	Teaching and Teacher Education	Empirical research: 211 teachers

(2013)		from six schools for secondary education in the Netherlands.
Yalabik, Popaitoon, Chowne, Julie and Bruce (2013)	The International Journal of Human Resource Management	Empirical research: 549 frontline service employees working in 15 top quality hotels in Turkey
Burke, Koyuncu, Fiksenbaum, and Tekin (2013)	Journal of Transnational Management	Empirical research: 377 clerical employees in the specialist lending division of a UK bank.
Handa and Gulati (2014)	Journal of Management Research	Empirical research: 333 frontline employees working in different retail formats.
Karanges, Beatson, Johnston, and Lings (2014)	Journal of Business Market Management	Empirical research: 200 non-executive employees.
Leary, Green, Denson, Schoenfeld, Henley, and Langford (2013)	The Psychologist-Manager Journal	Empirical research: 150 participants consisting of 110 undergraduate and 40 graduate MBA students attending three universities located in the southern United States.
Ariani (2013)	International Journal of Business Administration	Empirical research: 507 employees from service industries in Yogyakarta Indonesia.
Haq et al. (2010)	European Journal of Economics, Finance & Administrative Sciences	Empirical research: 189 respondents in two insurance organizations.
Rashid et al. (2011)	Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business	Empirical research: 250 employees in private commercial banks.
Rasli, Tat, Chin, and Khalaf (2012)	Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences	Empirical research: 418 and 425 questionnaires in 2010 and 2011 respectively in a multinational company involved in food and beverage related activities, with two manufacturing facilities and an administration centre in Malaysia.
Andrew and Sofian (2011)	American Journal of Economics & Business Administration	Empirical research: 104 HR officers at the Inland Revenue Board.
Andrew and Sofian (2012)	Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences	Empirical research: 104 HR officers working at the Inland Revenue Board.
Moussa (2013)	International Journal of Business & Management	Empirical research: 104 employees working in the healthcare and information technology industries in Saudi Arabia.
Rasheed, Khan, and Ramzan (2013)	Journal of Business Studies Quarterly	Empirical research: 303 employees working in the private and public banking sector of Lahore Pakistan.
Biswas and Bhatnagar (2013)	VIKALPA	Empirical research: 246 Indian Managers in six Indian organizations
Ali Abbaas and Altarawneh (2014)	International Journal of Business	Empirical research: 336 frontline employees of banks in Jordan.
Piyachat, Chanongkorn, and Panisa (2014)	DLSU Business & Economics Review	Empirical research: 1,349 current employees working in Thai petroleum industry.

Source: Author.

The distribution of existing studies from various sources is given in Table II

Particulars	No. of papers
Academy of Management Journal	01
Human Resource Development International	02
Advances in Developing Human Resources	02
The Leadership Quarterly	01
Journal of Business Ethics	01
Journal of Business Research	01
Journal of Vocational Behavior	01
African Journal of Economic and Management Studies	01
European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences	02
Journal of Nursing Management	01
Teaching and Teacher Education	01
The International Journal of Human Resource Management	01
Journal of Transnational Management	01
Journal of Management Research	01
Journal of Business Market Management	01
The Psychologist-Manager Journal	01
International Journal of Business Administration	01
Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business	02
Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences	02
American Journal of Economics & Business Administration	01
International Journal of Business & Management	01
Journal of Business Studies Quarterly	01
VIKALPA	01
International Journal of Business	01
DLSU Business & Economics Review	01

Table II. Distribution of reviewed articles from various sources.

Source: Author.

In the study the researcher has included studies from the year 2010 to 2014. Year wise classification of reviewing studies is given in **Table III**.

S. no.	Year	No. of publication
1	2010	2
2	2011	7
3	2012	7
4	2013	9
5	2014	5

Source: Based on author own calculation of reviewed studies

We further classified our review of literature on the basis of studies conducted on a particular country. Table IV provides a snapshot of country wise studies in our reviewed literature.

Country	No. of publications
USA	6
UK	3
Canada	1
The Netherlands	2
Australia	1



Japan	1
Malaysia	4
Turkey	1
India	2
Indonesia	1
Pakistan	4
Thailand	1
Saudi Arabia	1
Jordan	1
Egypt	1

Source: Based on author own calculation of reviewed studies.

#### 4. Historical Overview of Employee Engagement

A review of the literature indicates four major perspectives of engagement research include:

##### 4.1 Kahn's (1990) Approach

Kahn (1990) article "Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work" in an Academy of Management Journal was the first to introduce the concept of employee engagement in an academic research (Junghoon 2012; Kular, Gatenby, Rees, Soane, & Truss, 2008; Simpson, 2009). Kahn (1990) defined personal engagement as "the harnessing of organization member's selves to their roles; in engagement people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during role performance" (P. 694). According to Kahn (1990) the personal engagement and disengagement at work were found to be impact by three psychological conditions (meaningfulness, safety, and availability). Kahn defined meaningfulness as the positive "sense of return on investments of self in role performance" (p.705). Safety was defined as the ability to show one's self "without fear or negative consequences to self image, status, or career" (p.705). Availability was defined as the "sense of possessing the physical, emotional, and psychological resources necessary" for the completion of work (p.705). Moreover, May, Gilson, and Harter (2004) was the first empirical research testing Kahn's (1990) conceptualization of employee engagement and found that meaningfulness, safety, and availability were significantly related to employee engagement (Chang, 2011; Kular et al., 2008).

##### 4.2 Maslach et al.'s (2001) Approach

In 2001, Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter defined employee engagement as the positive antithesis to burnout, defining engagement as "a persistent positive affective state characterized by high levels of activation and pleasure" (p. 417). W.B. Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, and Bakker (2002) tested the Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001) framework using the MBI-GS and According to Schaufeli et al. (2002) work engagement is a "positive, fulfilling, work related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption" (p. 74). Vigor is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one's work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties. Dedication refers to being strongly involved in one's work and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge. Absorption is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work (Schaufeli et al., 2002, p.74). Use of The Job Demands-Resources Model (JD-R) (e.g., Albrecht, 2012; Arnold B. Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004; A. B. Bakker & Evangelia, 2008; Evangelia Demerouti & Bakker, 2011; E. Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001; Menguc, Auh, Fisher, & Haddad, 2012; Wilmar B. Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) as a framework for study has predominated this particular approach of engagement. Kahn (1990) and Maslach et al. (2001) provided the two earliest theoretical frameworks for explaining employee engagement (Saks, 2006). Many of the contemporary conceptualizations of engagement build from Kahn (1990) and Maslach et al. (2001) original works.

##### 4.3 Harter et al.'s (2002) Approach

Harter et al. (2002) were the first introduce of employee engagement at the business unit level and used an enormous database to link higher levels of employee engagement to increased business unit outcomes (Chang, 2011; Brad Shuck & Wollard, 2010). They defined engagement as "the individual's involvement and satisfaction with as well as enthusiasm for work" (p. 269). Luthans and Peterson (2002) extended Harter et al.'s (2002) model by examining the

relationship between managerial self-efficacy, the perception of effective management practices, and employee engagement. Results suggested a positive relationship between employee engagement and manager self-efficacy scores when managers rated employee effectiveness and when supervisees rated their manager's level of effectiveness. Luthans and Peterson (2002) concluded that "the most profitable work units of companies have people doing what they do best, with people they like, and with a strong sense of psychological ownership". In the model of employee engagement delineated by Harter, Schmidt, and Keyes (2003) four antecedent elements deemed necessary for engagement to occur within the workplace include: (a) clarity of expectations and basic materials and equipment being provided, (b) feelings of contribution to the organization, (c) feeling a sense of belonging to something beyond oneself, and (d) feeling as though there are opportunities to discuss progress and grow (Simpson, 2009).

#### **4.4 Saks's (2006) Approach**

In 2006, the first academic research to specifically conceptualize and test antecedents and consequences of employee engagement was Saks (2006). Saks believed employee engagement developed through a social exchange model and was the first to separate job engagement and organizational engagement into separate types of employee engagement. In his conceptualization, Saks defined the emerging multidimensional concept of employee engagement as "a distinct and unique construct consisting of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components associated with individual role performance" (p. 602). Results from Saks (2006) indicated that antecedent variables such as supportive climate, job characteristics, and fairness influenced the development of engagement and that employee engagement mediated the relationship between antecedent and outcomes variables. This research extended Schaufeli et al. (2002) model of engagement by suggesting engagement could be experienced emotionally and cognitively and manifested behaviorally (Brad Shuck, 2011). According to Shuck (2011) Saks viewed the development of engagement as absorption of a person's resources into the work they performed. This view paralleled not only Schaufeli et al. (2002) but also Kahn (1990) and Harter et al. (2002).

#### **5. Recent Research on Employee Engagement**

Following Kahn (1990) research by Rich, Lepine, and Crawford (2010) provided empirical study that job engagement mediated the relationship between value congruence, perceived organizational support, core self-evaluation, and the two outcome variables, task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. Rich et al. study extended Kahn's (1990) theory by considering the degree to which engagement serves as an important mechanism through which the antecedents of engagement impact job performance. Also found that intrinsic motivation, job involvement, and job satisfaction are not explain higher level of variance than engagement.

Another study by B. Shuck, Reio, and Rocco (2011) examined the links between job fit, affective commitment, psychological climate, and employee engagement, and the dependent variables, discretionary effort, and intention to turnover. An Internet-based survey battery of six scales was administered to a heterogeneous sampling of organizations from service, technology, healthcare, retail, banking, nonprofit, and hospitality fields. The results indicted Job fit, affective commitment, and psychological climate were all significantly related to employee engagement, while employee engagement was significantly related to both discretionary effort and intention to turnover.

Reio and Sanders (2011) investigated the frequency with which employees in a computer sciences company in the United States were the target of supervisor and coworker incivility as well as the link between this incivility and worker engagement. Results indicated that 78% of the participants had experienced supervisor incivility and 81% had experienced coworker incivility during the past year, both incivility variables were negative predictors of safety and availability engagement specifically, coworker incivility more powerfully predicted safety engagement whereas supervisor incivility was more closely linked with availability engagement.

Fairlie (2011) investigated the role of meaningful work in engagement and other employee outcomes such as burnout, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover cognitions and meaningful work characteristics had the strongest relationships with engagement and most other employee outcomes, relative to other work characteristics. In addition, meaningful work characteristics was the strongest unique predictor of engagement.

Sardar, Rehman, Yousaf, and Aijaz (2011) investigate the impact of HR practices on employee engagement in banking sector of Pakistan. The results showed that there is significant relationship among employee engagement

and decision making / co-ordination, performance reward systems and employee involvement where training and career development and employee performance appraisals are insignificantly related.

Soane et al. (2012) Build on Kahn's (1990) Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work theory and develop a model of engagement that has three requirements: a work-role focus, activation and positive affect. The model was operationalized in a new measure: the intellectual, social, Affective Engagement Scale (ISA Engagement Scale) comprising three facets: intellectual, social and affective engagement. The results indicated positive associations with three theoretically and empirically important outcomes: task performance, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and turnover intentions.

Vogelgesang, Leroy, and Avolio (2013) examined in a 3-month longitudinal study how leader behavioral integrity relates to individual follower work engagement, and how that relationship, in turn, connects to performance. The findings indicated that followers who rated their leaders as exhibiting more transparent communication at Time 1, also rated themselves as more engaged in their work role at Time 2 (3 weeks later), and that their perceptions of leader behavioral integrity mediated that relationship. Follower engagement also positively related to third-party ratings of follower performance at Time 3 lagged 3 months.

He, Zhu, and Zheng (2014) developed three propositions. First, based on the group engagement model, they hypothesized that procedural justice enhances employee engagement through employee organizational identification. Second, employees with stronger moral identity centrality are more likely to be engaged in their jobs. Third, procedural justice compensates for the effect of moral identity centrality on employee engagement. Specifically when procedural justice is higher, employee moral identity centrality plays a less significant role in employee engagement; whilst when procedural justice is lower, the effect of moral identity centrality on employee engagement is stronger. Results indicated support for all propositions.

Using of The Job Demands–Resources Model (JD–R) as a framework for study job resources versus job demands have repeatedly been identified as significant predictors of work engagement, Menguc et al. (2012) drawing on the Job Demand-Resource (JD-R) model, explored the antecedents and consequences of service employee engagement. The model examined the main effect of resources (autonomy, feedback, and support) on engagement and how the interaction among resources impacts engagement. Further, the model also examined the mediating role of engagement in linking resources to customers' perceived level of service employee performance. Results suggested that supervisory feedback is positively related to engagement while supervisory support is not. More engagement is related to more positive service employee performance. Also, engagement was a full mediator between supervisory feedback and service employee performance.

Ronald and Ghada (2010) examined potential antecedents and consequences of work engagement in a sample of male and female managers and professionals employed in various organizations and industries in Egypt. Antecedents included personal demographic and work situation characteristics as well as measures of need for achievement and workaholic behaviors; consequences included measures of work satisfaction and psychological well-being. The results indicated that first; both need for achievement and one workaholic job behavior are found to predict all three engagement measures. Second, engagement, particularly dedication, predicts various work outcomes (e.g. job satisfaction, intent to quit). Third, engagement, again, particularly dedication, predicted various psychological well-being outcomes but less strongly than these predicted work outcomes.

Takuma (2011) extend the causal model of work engagement by suggesting a mediated moderation model. The study assumed that structural empowerment and P-O fit interact to enhance work engagement via psychological empowerment. Results indicated that both structural empowerment and P-O fit have positive effects on work engagement via psychological empowerment, and that P-O fit functions as a moderator, that is, structural empowerment and P-O fit interacts to enhance work engagement via psychological empowerment.

Othman and Nasurdin (2012) addressed the question of whether social support (supervisor support and co-worker support) could contribute to the variance in work engagement using 402 staff nurses working in three general hospitals in Peninsular Malaysia. Findings indicated that supervisor support was positively related to work engagement. Co-worker support was found to have no effect on work engagement.

Arnold B. Bakker, Demerouti, and ten Brummelhuis (2012) examined whether the relationship between work engagement and job performance is moderated by the extent to which individuals are inclined to work hard, careful, and goal-oriented. Using sample of 144 employees from several occupations. Results indicated that work



engagement was positively related to task performance, contextual performance, and active learning, particularly for employees high in conscientiousness.

Runhaar, Konermann, and Sanders (2013) examined the influence of teachers' work context, in terms of autonomy and leader membership exchange (LMX), on the relationship between their work engagement and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). Finding showed that the influence of teachers' work context, in terms of autonomy and leader membership exchange (LMX), weakened the relationships between work engagement and OCBI and OCBO respectively.

Yalabik et al. (2013) investigated the role of work engagement in the relationships between affective commitment, job satisfaction and two employee outcomes – supervisor-rated job performance and self-reported intention to quit. The findings suggested that work engagement mediates the relationships from affective commitment to job performance and intention to quit. Work engagement also mediates the relationship from job satisfaction to job performance, and partially mediates the relationship from job satisfaction to intention to quit.

Burke, Koyuncu, Fiksenbaum, and Tekin (2013) examined potential antecedents and consequences of work engagement in a sample of 549 frontline service employees working in 15 top quality hotels in Turkey. The findings indicated lower levels of work engagement compared to normative data reflecting the way that frontline service work has been portrayed (low pay, long hours, and autocratic supervision). Personal demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, level of education) and work situation characteristics (e.g., job tenure, size of property) were weakly and inconsistently related to levels of work engagement. Also work engagement was significantly related to job satisfaction, employee use of voice behavior, intent to stay, and lower levels of work-family and family work conflict.

Handa and Gulati (2014) explored the relationship between personality and employee engagement amongst frontline personnel in the organized retail industry in India. Findings indicated that there is a positive relationship between the extraversion and conscientiousness personality traits and employee engagement.

Karanges, Beatson, Johnston, and Lings (2014) investigated whether social factors, namely perceived support and identification, play a mediating role in the relationship between internal communication and engagement. Findings stated that organizations and supervisors should focus internal communication efforts toward building greater perceptions of support and stronger identification among employees in order to foster optimal levels of engagement.

Leary, Green, Denson, Schoenfeld, Henley, and Langford (2013) examine, from the subordinate's perspective, the relationship of dysfunctional leadership dispositions to employee engagement, job satisfaction and burnout. Findings indicated that Leadership factors associated with intimidation and avoiding others have a significant relationship with employee engagement, job satisfaction, and burnout.

Ariani (2013) tested the relationship between employee engagement, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and counterproductive work behavior (CWB). The result indicated a significant positive relation between employee engagement and OCB and a significant negative relation between employee engagement and CWB and between OCB and CWB. This result also indicated no differences between employee engagement of female and male.

Researchers using the Harter et al. (2002) approach have continued to release updates, Haq, Ali, Azeem, Hijazi, Qurashi, and Quyyum (2010) tapped the relationship of transformational leadership with employee creativity. Further investigation were undertaken to explore the mediating role of employee intention to engage himself into creative work process on the relationship of transformational leadership and employee creativity. Using sample of 189 respondents was taken through questionnaire from two organizations in Islamabad, Pakistan. Results revealed that transformational leadership is positively related to employee creativity. Further, employee's engagement in creative work process fully mediated the relationship of transformational leadership and creativity.

Rashid et al. (2011) investigated the factors persuading employee engagement and Linkage of employee engagement to personal & organizational performance in banking sector of Pakistan. The results showed that there is significant relationship among employee engagement and decision making / co-ordination, performance reward systems and employee involvement where as training and career development and employee performance appraisals are insignificantly related.



Rasli, Tat, Chin, and Khalaf (2012) assessed the level of employee engagement in a multinational company involved in food and beverage related activities, with two manufacturing facilities and an administration centre in Malaysia it is objective was to assess whether engagement levels have improved or not, i.e., whether basic needs, management support, teamwork and growth levels for 2011 is higher than those for 2010. The findings indicated that there were significant differences in basic needs and teamwork but indifferences in management support and growth.

Following Saks (2006) work by O. C. Andrew and Sofian (2011) presented a study that engages people who drive execution and organizational performance. The study tested a model of the drivers of employee engagement on two measures of employee engagement, which are the job engagement and organization engagement, using the social exchange theory as a theoretical foundation. It also revealed the significant difference between job engagement and organization engagement. The study addresses concerns on how to provide a framework to enable organization engage their employees to drive execution. Also the findings of this study supported that SET can be used as a theoretical framework in understanding the construct of employee engagement.

Ologbo C. Andrew and Sofian (2012) conducted a study on 104 HR officers working at the Inland Revenue Board of Malaysia with the purpose ascertaining the uncertainty about the influence of individual factors of employee engagement on work outcomes using the measures of employee engagement (job and organization engagements) as the mediating variables and the social exchange theory as the theoretical underpinning. The findings of this study showed a significant difference between job engagement and organization engagement; with co-employee support as a major individual factor that influences both measures of engagement and the work outcomes.

Moussa (2013) examined selected antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. The researcher distributed surveys among 104 employees working in the healthcare and information technology industries in Saudi Arabia. The results indicated that job characteristics and rewards are the two antecedents that have a positive relationship with employee engagement. Study findings revealed that job characteristics induced employee engagement while reward and recognition induced organizational engagement.

Rasheed, Khan, and Ramzan (2013) examined the relationship between the antecedents and consequences of employee engagement in the banking sector of Pakistan. Results indicated that there is a significant relationship between perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support and organizational justice with job engagement and organization engagement. Also the findings indicated that job engagement and organization engagement are positively related to organizational citizenship behavior.

Biswas and Bhatnagar (2013) assessed the mediating role of employee engagement between perceived organizational support (POS) and person-organization fit (P-O fit) as the antecedents and organizational commitment and job satisfaction as the consequences. The findings suggest that when individuals perceive positive levels of organizational collaboration, they are intrinsically encouraged towards exerting considerably higher levels of effort. The notion that P-O fit deals with the congruence between employees' personal values and those of the organization makes for greater meaningfulness and psychological safety leading to higher levels of employee engagement. A high level of employee engagement reflects a greater trust and loyal relationship between the individual and the organization.

Ali Abbaas and Altarawneh (2014) investigated the relationship between the two measurements of employee engagement (job engagement and organizational engagement and organizational commitment measured by three key measurements which are: affective (emotional) commitment; continuance (maintenance) commitment; and normative commitment. findings showed that frontline employees who have high job engagement and organizational engagement will have high level of affective commitment and normative commitment. On the other hand, high employees' job engagement can meaningfully affect employees' continuance commitment.

Piyachat, Chanongkorn, and Panisa (2014) tested the relationships among employer branding, employee engagement, and discretionary effort via the effect of employee expectation. The results indicated that there were strong positive relationships between employer branding and employee engagement, employee engagement and discretionary effort, employer branding and discretionary effort, employer branding and employee expectation, and employee expectation and employee engagement.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Employee engagement had gained much popularity in recent years. Though there is increasing contributions of few empirical research on the concept of employee engagement yet, there is a remain room for more rigorous research. This paper contributes to employee engagement literature as more tractable recent empirical research for future research. This review highlighted much of the known scholarly literature on employee engagement and provide preliminary information needed to begin theoretical or framework development and to encourage more rigorous research on the concept of employee engagement. We believe that significant research opportunities exist with employee engagement and we provide researchers and practitioners with guidance for extending research in this important area.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Agarwal, U. A., Datta, S., Blake-Beard, S., & Bhargava, S. (2012). Linking LMX, innovative work behaviour and turnover intentions: the mediating role of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 17(3), 208-230.
- Albrecht, S. L. (2012). The influence of job, team and organizational level resources on employee well-being, engagement, commitment and extra-role performance Test of a model. [Article]. *International Journal of Manpower*, 33(7), 840-853. doi: 10.1108/01437721211268357
- Ali Abbaas, A., & Altarawneh, I. I. (2014). Employee Engagement and Organizational Commitment: Evidence from Jordan. [Article]. *International Journal of Business*, 19(2), 192-212.
- Andrew, O. C., & Sofian, S. (2011). Engaging People who Drive Execution and Organizational Performance. [Article]. *American Journal of Economics & Business Administration*, 3(3), 569-575.
- Andrew, O. C., & Sofian, S. (2012). Individual Factors and Work Outcomes of Employee Engagement. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40(0), 498-508. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.222
- Ariani, D. W. (2013). The Relationship between Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Counterproductive Work Behavior. [Article]. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 4(2), 46-56. doi: 10.5430/ijba.v4n2p46
- Arrowsmith, J., & Parker, J. (2013). The meaning of 'employee engagement' for the values and roles of the HRM function. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*(ahead-of-print), 1-21.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & ten Brummelhuis, L. L. (2012). Work engagement, performance, and active learning: The role of conscientiousness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 555-564. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2011.08.008
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43(1), 83-104. doi: 10.1002/hrm.20004
- Bakker, A. B., & Evangelia, D. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. [Article]. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223.
- Biswas, S., & Bhatnagar, J. (2013). Mediator Analysis of Employee Engagement: Role of Perceived Organizational Support, PO Fit, Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *VIKALPA*, 38(1), 27.
- Brunetto, Y., Teo, S. T. T., Shacklock, K., & Farr-Wharton, R. (2012). Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, well-being and engagement: explaining organisational commitment and turnover intentions in policing. *Human Resource Management Journal*.
- Burke, R. J., Koyuncu, M., Fiksenbaum, L., & Tekin, Y. (2013). Antecedents and Consequences of Work Engagement Among Frontline Employees in Turkish Hotels. *Journal of Transnational Management*, 18(3), 191-203.

- Chang, W., J. (2011). The concept of employee engagement: a comprehensive review from a positive organizational behavior perspective. [Article]. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 24(2), 49-69. doi: 10.1002/piq.20110
- Chat-Uthai, M. (2013). Leveraging Employee Engagement Surveys Using the Turnover Stimulator Approach: A Case Study of Automotive Enterprises in Thailand. [Article]. *International Journal of Business & Management*, 8(6), 16-21. doi: 10.5539/ijbm.v8n6p16
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative Review and test of its Relations with Task and Contextual Performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89-136. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x
- Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 834-848. doi: 10.1037/a0019364
- Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2011). The job demands–resources model: Challenges for future research. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 37(2), 1-9.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 86(3), 499.
- Fairlie, P. (2011). Meaningful Work, Employee Engagement, and Other Key Employee Outcomes: Implications for Human Resource Development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), 508-525. doi: 10.1177/1523422311431679
- Gupta, V., & Kumar, S. (2012). Impact of Performance Appraisal Justice on employee engagement : A study of Indian professionals. *Employee Relations*, 35(1), 4-4.
- Handa, M., & Gulati, A. (2014). Employee Engagement. [Article]. *Journal of Management Research (09725814)*, 14(1), 57-67.
- Haq, I. U., Ali, A., Azeem, M. U., Hijazi, S. T., Qurashi, T. M., & Quyyum, A. (2010). Mediation Role of Employee Engagement in Creative Work Process on the Relationship of Transformational Leadership and Employee Creativity. [Article]. *European Journal of Economics, Finance & Administrative Sciences*(25), 94-101.
- 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(2), 268-279. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2003). Well-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes: A review of the Gallup studies. In C. L. M. Keyes & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well-lived*. (pp. 205-224). Washington, DC US: American Psychological Association.
- He, H., Zhu, W., & Zheng, X. (2014). Procedural Justice and Employee Engagement: Roles of Organizational Identification and Moral Identity Centrality. [Article]. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122(4), 681-695. doi: 10.1007/s10551-013-1774-3
- Junghoon , L. (2012). *Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement: Empirical Study of Hotel Employees and Managers*. Ph.D, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY.
- Kahn, W. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal engagement and disengagement at work. [Article]. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724. doi: 10.2307/256287
- Karanges, E., Beatson, A., Johnston, K., & Lings, I. (2014). Optimizing employee engagement with internal communication: A social exchange perspective. [Article]. *Journal of Business Market Management*, 7(2), 329-353.
- Kular, S., Gatenby, M., Rees, C., Soane, E., & Truss, K. (2008). Employee engagement: a literature review. uk: kingston university.

- Leary, T. G., Green, R., Denson, K., Schoenfeld, G., Henley, T., & Langford, H. (2013). The relationship among dysfunctional leadership dispositions, employee engagement, job satisfaction, and burnout. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 16(2), 112-130. doi: 10.1037/h0094961
- Luthans, F., & Peterson, S. J. (2002). Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy. *Journal of Management Development*, 21(5), 376-387. doi: 10.1108/02621710210426864
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The Meaning of Employee Engagement. [Article]. *Industrial & Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30. doi: 10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x
- Markos, S., & Sridevi, M. S. (2010). Employee Engagement: The Key to Improving Performance. [Article]. *International Journal of Business & Management*, 5(12), 89-96.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422.
- 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. [Article]. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 77(1), 11-37.
- Menguc, B., Auh, S., Fisher, M., & Haddad, A. (2012). To be engaged or not to be engaged: The antecedents and consequences of service employee engagement. *Journal of Business Research*(0). doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.01.007
- Moreland, J. (2013). Improving Job Fit Can Improve Employee Engagement and Productivity. [Article]. *Employment Relations Today (Wiley)*, 40(1), 57-62. doi: 10.1002/ert.21400
- Moussa, M. N. (2013). Investigating the High Turnover of Saudi Nationals versus Non-Nationals in Private Sector Companies Using Selected Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement. *International Journal of Business & Management*, 8(18).
- Othman, N., & Nasurdin, A. M. (2012). Social support and work engagement: a study of Malaysian nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*.
- Piyachat, B., Chanongkorn, K., & Panisa, M. (2014). The Mediate Effect of Employee Engagement on the Relationship between Perceived Employer Branding and Discretionary Effort. [Article]. *DLSU Business & Economics Review*, 24(1), 59-72.
- Rasheed, A., Khan, S., & Ramzan, M. (2013). Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement: The Case of Pakistan. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 4(4).
- Rashid, H. A., Asad, A., & Ashraf, M. M. (2011). Factors Persuading Employee Engagement and Linkage of EE to Personal & Organizational Performance. [Article]. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(5), 98-108.
- Rasli, A., Tat, H. H., Chin, T. A., & Khalaf, B. (2012). Employee engagement and employee shareholding program in a multinational company in Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40(0), 209-214. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.182
- Reio, T. G., & Sanders, R. J. (2011). Thinking About Workplace Engagement: Does Supervisor and Coworker Incivility Really Matter? *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), 462-478. doi: 10.1177/1523422311430784
- Reissner, S., & Pagan, V. (2013). Generating employee engagement in a public-private partnership: management communication activities and employee experiences. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*(ahead-of-print), 1-19.
- Remo, N. (2012). *Comparing Two Models of Employee Engagement: An Examination of Antecedents and Outcome Variables*. Ph.D. NR78869, University of Windsor (Canada), Canada. Retrieved from



<http://search.proquest.com/docview/1199016954?accountid=14645> ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT) database.

- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and Effects on Job Performance. [Article]. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635. doi: 10.5465/amj.2010.51468988
- Ronald, J. B., & Ghada, E.-K. (2010). Work engagement among managers and professionals in Egypt: Potential antecedents and consequences. [DOI: 10.1108/20400701011028158]. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 1(1), 42-60.
- Runhaar, P., Konermann, J., & Sanders, K. (2013). Teachers' organizational citizenship behaviour: Considering the roles of their work engagement, autonomy and leader-member exchange. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 30(0), 99-108. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.10.008>
- Sahoo, C. k., & Mishra, S. (2012). A Framework towards Employee Engagement: The PSU Experience. [Article]. *ASCI Journal of Management*, 42(1), 94-112.
- Sakari, T., Kirsikka, S., Timo, A., & Jouko, N. (2011). Work engagement in eight European countries: The role of job demands, autonomy, and social support. [DOI: 10.1108/01443331111149905]. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 31(7), 486-504.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. [Article]. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619. doi: 10.1108/02683940610690169
- Sardar, S., Rehman, A., Yousaf, U., & Aijaz, A. (2011). Impact of HR Practices on Employee Engagement in Banking Sector of Pakistan. [Article]. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2(9), 378-389.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. [Article]. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315. doi: 10.1002/job.248
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92.
- Shuck, B. (2011). Integrative Literature Review: Four Emerging Perspectives of Employee Engagement: An Integrative Literature Review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 10(3), 304-328. doi: 10.1177/1534484311410840
- Shuck, B., Reio, T. G., & Rocco, T. S. (2011). Employee engagement: an examination of antecedent and outcome variables. [Article]. *Human Resource Development International*, 14(4), 427-445. doi: 10.1080/13678868.2011.601587
- Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee Engagement and HRD: A Seminal Review of the Foundations. *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(1), 89-110. doi: 10.1177/1534484309353560
- Simpson, M. R. (2009). Engagement at work: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 46(7), 1012-1024. doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2008.05.003
- Soane, E., Truss, K., Alfes, K., Shantz, A., Rees, C., & Gatenby, M. (2012). Development and application of a new measure of employee engagement: The ISA Engagement Scale. *Human Resource Development International*.
- Takuma, K. (2011). Empowerment, P-O Fit, and Work Engagement: A Mediated Moderation Model. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*(38).
- Truss, C., Shantz, A., Soane, E., Alfes, K., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Employee engagement, organisational performance and individual well-being: exploring the evidence, developing the theory. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(14), 2657-2669. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2013.798921
- Van Rooy, D. L., Whitman, D. S., Hart, D., & Caleo, S. (2011). Measuring Employee Engagement During a Financial Downturn: Business Imperative or Nuisance? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(2), 147-152.

- Vogelgesang, G. R., Leroy, H., & Avolio, B. J. (2013). The mediating effects of leader integrity with transparency in communication and work engagement/performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*(0). doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.01.004>
- Wollard, K. K., & Shuck, B. (2011). Antecedents to Employee Engagement: A Structured Review of the Literature. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), 429-446. doi: 10.1177/1523422311431220
- Yalabik, Z. Y., Popaitoon, P., Chowne, J. A., & Rayton, B. A. (2013). Work engagement as a mediator between employee attitudes and outcomes. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*(ahead-of-print), 1-25.

