

Facets of Employee Engagement - A Literature Review

*Maya Salimath G

**Dr B Rose Kavitha

*Research scholar, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore

**Dean/Director-Academics & Research, Silicon City College,
K R Puram –Bangalore.

Abstract:

Motivated and engaged employees tend to contribute more in terms of organizational productivity and support in maintaining a higher commitment level leading to the higher customer satisfaction. Employee engagement is the level of commitment and involvement an employee has towards their organization and its values. An engaged employee is aware of business context, and works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization. It is a positive attitude held by the employees towards the organization and its values. The paper focuses on various dimensions of employee engagement with its definitions and the various frameworks. The present paper aims to understand the basic concept of employee engagement and to study the different dimensions of employee engagement with the help of review of literature. This paper is based upon review of literature and secondary data collected from various websites, journals, magazines, newspapers and reference books. Literature review has shown prior research work done in this area.

1. Introduction

The concept of employee engagement is a measurement of how happy employees are with their respective jobs, working environment and how efficient their performance levels are? Managing high morale among employees can be of remarkable benefit to any organization, as actively engaged workers are more productive and stay loyal to the company. Organizations with high employee engagement levels are more productive and more profitable than those organizations with low levels of employee engagement.

2. Definition of Employee Engagement

Ever since its evolution, numerous definitions can be derived from practice and research. To date, there is no single and generally accepted definition for the term employee engagement. This is evident if one looks at the definitions forwarded for the term by three well-known research organizations in human resource area, let alone individual researchers. Below are the definitions:

According to Kahn (1990) employees can be engaged on one dimension and not the other. However, the more engaged the employee is on each dimension, the higher the level of employee engagement. Maslach and Leiter (1997) initially defined the engagement construct as the opposite of burnout (i.e., someone who is not experiencing job burnout must be engaged in their job.) Luthans and Peterson (2002) elaborated on Kahn's work on employee engagement, which provides a convergent theory for Gallup's empirically derived employee engagement. They opined that that to be emotionally engaged is to form meaningful connections with others and to experience empathy for them. In contrast, being cognitively engaged refers to those who are acutely aware of their mission and role in their work

environment. Similarly Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002,) defined active engagement in terms of “high levels of activity, initiative, and responsibility.”

Schaufeli et al. (2002) define employee engagement as “a positive fulfilling, work related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption”. They further state that engagement is not a momentary and specific state, but is “a more persistent and pervasive affective – cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior” Harter, Schmidt and Hayes (2002) define employee engagement as “the individual’s involvement and satisfaction with as well as enthusiasm for work ”. Hewitt (2004) defines employee engagement as the employees desire to say (speak positively about the organization), stay (desire to be a member of the organization) and strive (go beyond the expected for the organization) Mount, Harter, Witt, and Barrick (2004) defined engagement in terms of a “high internal motivational state.”

Wellins and Concelman (2004) suggest that “Employee engagement is the illusive force that motivates employees to higher levels of performance. This coveted energy is an amalgam of commitment, loyalty, productivity an ownership.” they further added that it includes, “feelings and attitudes employees have towards their jobs and their organization. ” Robinson, Perryman and Hayday (2004), define “engagement as a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its values. An engaged employee is aware of the business context, works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization”. Lucey, Bateman and Hines (2005) have deciphered that “Employee Engagement is how each individual connects with the company and the customers”

Development Dimensions International (DDI), (2005), defines Employee Engagement as “the extent to which people value, enjoy and believe in what they do.” Macey and Schneider (2008) looked at engagement attitudinally and behaviorally. They distinguished three broad conceptualizations of employee engagement, namely state, trait, and behavioral engagement. Sarkar (2011) opined that employee engagement is a barometer that determines the association of a person with the organization. Perrin’s Global Workforce Study (2003) uses the definition “employees’ willingness and ability to help their company succeed, largely by providing discretionary effort on a sustainable basis.” According to the study, engagement is affected by many factors which involve both emotional and rational factors relating to work and the overall work experience.

Gallup organization defines employee engagement as the involvement with and enthusiasm for work. Gallup as cited by Dernovsek (2008) likens employee engagement to a positive employees’ emotional attachment and employees’ commitment. Robinson et al. (2004) define employee engagement as “a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its value. An engaged employee is aware of business context, and works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization. The organization must work to develop and nurture engagement, which requires a two-way relationship between employer and employee.” This verdict and definition forwarded by Institute of Employment Studies gives a clear insight that employee engagement is the result of two-way relationship between employer and employee pointing out that there are things to be done by both sides.

Fernandez (2007) shows the distinction between job satisfaction, the well-known construct in management, and engagement contending that employee satisfaction

is not the same as employee engagement and since managers cannot rely on employee satisfaction to help retain the best and the brightest, employee engagement becomes a critical concept. Other researchers take job satisfaction as a part of engagement, but it can merely reflect a superficial, transactional relationship that is only as good as the organization's last round of perks and bonuses; Engagement is about passion and commitment-the willingness to invest oneself and expand one's discretionary effort to help the employer succeed, which is beyond simple satisfaction with the employment arrangement or basic loyalty to the employer

(Blessing White, 2008; Erickson, 2005; Macey and Schnieder ,2008). Therefore, the full engagement equation is obtained by aligning maximum job satisfaction and maximum job contribution. Stephen Young, the executive director of Towers Perrin, also distinguishes between job satisfaction and engagement contending that only engagement (not satisfaction) is the strongest predictor of organizational performance (Human Resources, 2007).

3. Importance of Employee Engagement

Employees are an asset to an organization. Using the organization's intellectual capital has become an important source of competitive advantage. (Artur, 1994; Becker and Huslid, 2000; Buckingham and Vosburgh; 2001) One way organizations can successfully navigate these challenges and capitalize on their intellectual capital is to foster employee engagement. Engaged employees are energized and passionate about the work they do. With passion come excitement, enthusiasm and productivity. (Kroth and Boverie, 2003) It is very much an organization's self interest that can build wealth as fast as disgruntled one can destroy it. (Catlette and Hadden, 2001)

Engaged employees are committed, motivated, energetic and enthusiastic about problem solving. They are absorbed in their work, put their heart into their jobs, are excited about doing a good job, exert energy in their work and are a source of competitive advantage for their employees. (Katzenbach, 2000) Each individual employee has direct and unilateral control over amount of discretionary effort he or she chose to make available to the organization (Catlette and Hadden, 2001).An engaged employee will consistently outperform and achieve new standards of excellence. (Harter, Schmidt and Hayes, 2002).

A survey conducted by Towers Perrin (2003) asserted that what drives employee engagement is when a company aligns its programs and practices within its framework to drive the right behavior from employees through to customers; it positioned itself to realize an appropriate return on people investment. On the contrary, when an organization builds its people programs in a strategic and operational vacuum- with no explicit or implicit links between behavior and investment, it will lead to drop in return on investment, profitability and customer retention. This report reflects on the need for organizations to focus on factors that influence engagement like competitive pay, followed by balance between work and personal life, advancement opportunities, competitive benefits, challenging work, merit pay, learning and development opportunities, competitive retirement benefits, caliber of co-workers and an employer with good reputation (Beauchesne, 2005)

As demonstrated in a study of hotel and restaurant service quality by Salanova, Agut and Peiro (2005), the employee's level of job engagement, measured by the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzáles-Romá, & Bakker,

2002), predicted the overall service climate of the organization, which in turn predicted employee performance and customer loyalty. According to Corporate Leadership Council (2004), engaged employees are more likely to exhibit discretionary efforts and improve individual performance. They are less likely to experience cynicism and exhaustion.

Consulting firm Watson Wyatt (2004) after conducting extensive surveys concluded that employees with higher line of sight are expected to earn 18 percent more profits. Towers Perrin again conducted an interesting survey of 664,000 employees across various countries in 2006; its findings revealed that a higher level of employee engagement actually translated in improved financial outcomes of the organizations in terms of operating income, net income and earnings per share. The findings echoed that organizations with high levels of employee engagement, operating income improved by 19.2 percent in the 12 months, while organizations with low levels of employee engagement, operating income declined by 32.7 percent. A highly engaged employee force attributed to increase in net-income by 13.7 percent versus a 3.8 percent decline for peer companies. In yet other measure earnings- per -share rose by 27.8 percent among companies with highly engaged employees as compared to a decline in 11.2 percent for other analyzed companies.

Gallup (2006) studied approximately 24,000 organizations and compared the top quartile and bottom quartile financial performance with engagement scores. Organizations with employees having engagement scores in the bottom quartile averaged 31-51 percent more employee turnover, employee turnover, 51 percent more inventory shrinkage and 62 percent more employee accidents. While those with engagement scores in the top quartile averaged 12 percent higher customer advocacy, 18 percent higher productivity and 12 percent higher profitability.

Sarkar's study of employee engagement practices in the manufacturing sector in May 2011 reflected that engaged employees in an organization are drivers of high productivity and high customer satisfaction. She has suggested that the most likely benefits of having engaged employees in an organization are, decreased attrition rates, employees support in downtrend of the business also decreased absenteeism and employees become brand ambassadors of the organization

4. Theoretical Framework of Employee Engagement

According to Cavana, Delahaye and Sekaran (2001) frameworks enable researchers to bring together and make sense of ideas, concepts and variables that impact on research outcomes in a logical manner: „the framework discusses the interrelationships among the concepts and/ or variables that are deemed to be integral to the dynamics of the situation being investigated“. The supporting structure of the framework indicates how the researcher will make sense of the information in the effort to investigate the problem.

In research on employee engagement the dominant frameworks are distinct in this supporting role and are identified in the following seven categories:

(i) The Well-Being Approach: Schaufeli et al (2002) investigated engagement and disengagement, under the umbrella term: well- being. Well-being was identified as a higher order construct of the two items: engagement and disengagement. Essentially, well-being can be described as the positive emotional state of an employee and consists of two dimensions: activation and identification. This builds upon the taxonomy of the independent dimensions of activation and pleasure

introduced by Watson and Telling (1985). Activation incorporates the continuum of human states from exhaustion to Vigor. Identification, on the other hand incorporates the range in attitude from cynicism to dedication. Together, these also represent a reflection of either engagement or burnout. Thus, the well-being framework links with the positive psychology approach and the burnout/engagement duality.

Herter et al (2003), from The Gallup Institute, also took a well-being approach in their investigation of engagement. They identified that employee well-being encompasses employee engagement. The Gallup Workplace Audit (GWA) (Harter et al. 2002; Harter et al. 2003) which is also known as the Q12 (Echols 2005), was used by Gallup researchers to measure the distinction between employees being engaged, disengaged or „not engaged“ at work. The difference between the two frameworks is structured in the type of engagement the researchers were investigating. Schaufeli et al. (2002) were interested in work engagement while Harter et al., (2003) focused on their broader term of employee engagement.

In support of the GWA, Luthans and Peterson's (2002) scholarly contribution, found that the GWA conceptually fitted some of the ideas proposed by Kahn (1990) that personal engagement is the degree of self a person presents in their work roles. Briefly, people can express themselves through being physically, emotionally and cognitively engaged. Luthans and Peterson (2002) found that the GWA fitted with the emotional and cognitive engagements. The well-being approach proposes a way of looking at and investigating engagement. In particular, it points to a link with the burnout/ duality and the positive psychology Framework

(ii) Burnout-Engagement Duality and Positive Psychology: In addition to the well-being approach, other engagement research builds on the original burnout literature (Demerouti et.al. 2001a; Gonzalellez-Roma et al. 2006; Langelaan et al. 2006; Maslach & Leiter 1997; Maslach, Schaufeli&Leiter2001Schaufeli & Bakker 2004; Schaufeli et al. 2002). Freudenberg (1974) first introduced the term „burn-out“, which was followed by the seminal work of Maslach (1982). Burn-out was conceptualised by Freudenberg as having aspects of exhaustion and being worn out from the work being done. Maslach and Leiter (1997; 2000) built an engagement framework from the burnout literature identifying the ideas of energy, involvement and professional efficacy as engagement. In other words, they argued if you are engaged at work, it follows that you have high energy, high levels of involvement and an increased sense of professional efficacy. Engagement according to Maslach and Leiter is the exact opposite of burnout.

Three engagement elements reflect opposite scores on the three burnout elements: exhaustion, cynicism and lack of professional efficacy. Subjects scoring low scores on cynicism and exhaustion and high scores on lack of efficacy would indicate an engaged employee (Leiter & Maslach 2000). Such a score would also predict a high rating on the activation and identification dimension as propositioned in the well-being framework (Schaufeli et al. 2002). Schaufeli and Bakker (2001, in Schaufeli et al. 2002; Schaufeli & Bakker 2004) progress the idea of engagement and burnout further, through developing a counter engagement scale. Their research used a positive psychology approach and a well-being framework which in essence examined the positive aspects of optimal human functioning rather than the dysfunctions (Csikszentmihalyi 1996; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi 2000). Despite Maslach and Leiter's (2000) assertion that burnout and engagement are opposites, Schaufeliet.al's (2002) work suggested that burnout is not the exact anti- pole to

engagement. Instead, Schaufeli et al. (2002) indicate that engagement and burnout should rather, be measured independently of each other. This is because from a positive psychology viewpoint, with a specific focus on overall well-being, burnout is the „erosion of engagement in the job“ (Schaufeli et al. 2002). The research on engagement in this area has focused on the engagement aspects of vigor, dedication and absorption. High scores on all engagement elements would indicate an engaged employee (Demerouti et al. 2001a; Demerouti et al. 2001b; Demerouti et al. 2003; Gonzalez-Roma et al. 2006; Langelaan et al. 2006; Llorens et al. 2007; Schaufeli & Bakker 2004; Schaufeli et al. 2002). Alternatively, low scores on the engagement dimensions do not indicate burnout.

(iii) The Job Demands and Resources Model: More recently, an alternative framework of employee engagement was proposed by Llorens et al. (2006) who used a „job demands resources model“ to explain engagement, following from similar work by Demerouti et al (2001b). This model has been used to explain how employees“ working conditions influence their health and commitment to the organization (Llorens et al. 2006). It is suggested in the model that job demands and job resources can together impact on the development of burnout in individuals by influencing both exhaustion and disengagement (Demerouti et al. 2001b). Job demands have been described as encompassing „physical, social and organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or mental effort and are associated with physiological and psychological costs“ (Llorens et al. 2006).

Resources, on the other hand are those „physical, social or organizational aspects of the job that are functional in achieving work goals, reducing job demands or stimulating personal growth, learning and development“ (Llorens et al. 2006). For example, this could involve having support structures, job control and autonomy and performance feedback (Bakker et al. 2005). Job demands and resources have an effect on employee motivation, resulting in increased engagement when they are optimal (Llorens et al. 2006). Excessive job demands are specifically linked with the burnout and negative aspects of exhaustion and disengagement (Demerouti et al. 2001b) and job resources have been described as the beginning of the motivational process (Hackman & Oldham 1975, 1980) with engagement being the end result (Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli 2005; Demerouti et al. 2001a; 2001b; Hakanen, Bakker & Demerouti 2005; Hakanen, Bakker & Schaufeli 2006). The job demands and resources frameworks investigate work engagement as articulated by Schaufeli and colleagues (2002), and is limited to the investigation of work engagement. This framework essentially provides an antecedent investigation of engagement, rather than investigating engagement as a state.

(iv) The Depletion and Enrichment Framework: Another framework proposed by Rothbard (2001), focuses on role engagement investigated through a depletion or enrichment framework. The depletion framework proposes that multiple engagements can lead to individuals having a „negative emotional response to that role“ (Rothbard 2001). In other words, multiple roles can place demand, greater obligations and pressure on an individual which lead to strain and stress, thus negative responses. The enrichment framework (role accumulation), on the other hand, according to Rothbard (2001), suggests that engaging in multiple roles can have a sustaining and enriching effect on the individual, bringing pleasurable experiences. As with previous frameworks, the role enrichment (accumulation) model has some similarities with the well-being approach (Schaufeli et al. 2002;

Harter et al. 2003). There is a focus on a greater sense of self in the positive and individually one feels fulfilled and valued.

Engagement according to Rothbard (2001) is measured via the degree of absorption and attention employees put into their role. From this perspective, attention is defined as the time spent thinking about and concentrating on the role. Absorption, according to Rothbard (2001) indicates the intensity of one's focus, which indicates an emotional idea. The notion of absorption is also linked to ideas first proposed by Goffman (1961) and Kahn(1990) regarding the state of absorbing oneself in role. Schaufeli and Bakker (2001) also conceptualized engagement as having a proponent, called absorption, which is the state of being fully concentrated and engrossed in a role. Mauno, Kinnunen and Ruokolainen (2007) suggest that engagement as proposed by Schaufeli and Bakker, (2004) is consistent with that provided by Rothbard (2001). These ideas suggest that the propositions about absorption are all very similar, and refer to the same emotional state. Kahn (1990) also proposed that absorption was a state of engagement but his investigation focused more on being personally engaged or personally disengaged at work (expressed physically, cognitively and emotionally). Therefore, this determines some ways in which engagement of self can be different.

(v) Social Exchange Theory: Another engagement framework was proposed by Saks (2006) using social exchange theory. Social exchange theory (Blau 1964) indicates that as relationships develop, a sense of loyalty emerges along with an enhancement of trust and commitment. Saks (2006) noted that „obligations are generated through a series of interactions between parties who are in a state of reciprocal interdependence“. According to social exchange theory, exchanges will usually result in obligations from one to another. For example, the organization will provide the economic resources to remain with that organization. The employee is likely to reciprocate, according to social exchange theory. Saks (2006) proposed that the reciprocation would be in the form of engagement to the job or the organization. Using Kahn's (1990) conceptualization, Saks (2006) acknowledges that employees are reciprocating by offering greater levels of engagement to their work or organization. They are engaging more of themselves into their work roles. The idea of social exchange theory ties in with the work of Homans (1958) who viewed social behaviors that people use as a way of reciprocal exchange. Further, Gouldner (1960) developed the idea that people create norms of reciprocation based on how the work of others is reciprocated. This would dictate how an individual behaves in social exchanges. We reciprocate the good work of others and we, as individuals create norms that indicate our future reciprocal behaviors Saks (2006) developed his own measures of work and organizational engagement that reflected psychological presence at work. Both of the scales measured only one construct each. This is contrary to some of the other scales where engagement is reflected as multiple constructs (Kahn 1990; 1992; Langelaan et al. 2006; Leiter&Maslach 2000; May et al. 2004; Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova 2006; Schaufeli et al. 2002).Saks (2006), utilizing social exchange theory has provided a different view of engagement and one that incorporates Kahn's psychological presence (1990) which in turn, is expressed cognitively, physically and emotionally.

(vi) The Consultant Frameworks: The consultant frameworks are used as a purchase product for organizations and the consultants are selling a service. This is necessary to acknowledge as they generally lack the academic rigor of the management and psychology disciplines. However they are relevant to the

investigation of the concept of engagement and they can contribute to a better understanding of the diversity and similarities between the other academic frameworks. In the consultant contributions to the work on engagement, there is a focus on the emotional aspects of dominant frameworks. The consultant contributions usually incorporate the term employee engagement, because of the service they are selling, they are specifically targeting the employee potential. The Towers Perrin (2003) framework is essentially an emotional/rational duality of engagement. This duality suggests that the emotional aspects of engagement are the emotions that employees have towards work, or their personal feelings associated with the work. Rational engagement is also referred to as rational endurance which encompasses aspects surrounding working towards the organizational goals; getting the job done: connecting individual actions to organizational goals, objectives and success. Similarly, the Corporate Leadership Council (CLC) offers a similar framework but renames the factors: emotional and rational commitment. The change in word from „engagement“ to „commitment“ may not have significance to the consulting profession but according to Hallberg and Schaufeli (2006), academically, a clear distinction should be made between engagement and commitment. This is consistent with the findings of Rothbard (2001) and Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter (2001) who also provide discussion on this distinction (see also Saks 2006). Bringing in commitment ideas is also consistent with Hewitt and Associates (2005) who frame engagement in terms of the emotional and intellectual commitments to the organization. Again the distinctions between engagement and commitment are not made clear in their model. This is problematic for researchers on engagement, where there is this lack of clarity.

The ISR (2004a; 2004b; 2004c) provide a framework of engagement that encompasses cognitive, affective and behavioral components. They term this: thinking, feeling and acting, respectively. Thinking incorporates the belief in and support for the goals and values of the organization, the affective or the “feeling” aspect refers to developing a sense of belonging and attachment to, and pride in, the organization. The behavioral or, acting aspects comprise two elements: putting in the extra effort for the benefit of the organization and an intention to remain with the organization.

There are many similarities drawn between the various consultant contributions, and they are essentially simplistic frameworks for the purpose of enhancing the commercial value of their service.

Nevertheless, the consultant contributions do provide guiding frameworks for the investigation of engagement, as they also have similarities with the academic frameworks.

(vii) Job Involvement Framework: The phenomenon of Job involvement was first observed and presented by Lodahl and Kejner (1965) by discussing various data on the impact of job design elements on job involvement. He elaborates that job involvement is the value and significance assigned by an individual to his present job. Reitz and Jewell (1979) explicates that job involvement is linked to, importance of work in individuals routine or daily life. The high level of importance given by an individual to his work results in loyalty towards his job as well as the organization and will also affect the performance of individual. Further job factors can influence the involvement level of individual in his job (Vroom, 1962). At workplace job involvement is high when employees are enthusiastic about their job

and take part in job related matters (Allport, 1943), they see job as most important and significant part in life (Dubin, 1966). (Hackman & Oldham 1975, 1976, 1980), proposed in their job characteristics model (JCM) that features of job can affect the job involvement because these features may encourage the internal motivation of employees. From an individual employee perspective job involvement as significant to individuals own growth and satisfaction within the work environment as motivation and attitude directed to goal (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Kahn, 1990; Lawler & Hall, 1970). Other researchers Lawler (1992) and Pfeffer (1994) also argued that through job design, job involvement could be increased. Job involvement is defined as „the degree to which the job situation is central to the person and his or her identity (Lawler & Hall, 1970). Kanungo (1982) maintained that job involvement is a „cognitive or belief state of psychological identification“. Job involvement is thought to depend on both need saliency and the potential of a job to satisfy these needs. Thus job involvement results form a cognitive judgment about the needs satisfying abilities of the job. Past research has also demonstrated that job involvement has been related to job characteristics such as task autonomy, task significance, task identity, skill variety and feedback, and supervisory behaviors such as leader consideration, participative decision making and amount of communication (Brown, 1996).

5. Dimensions of Employee Engagement

According to Deci and Ryan (1987) management which fosters a supportive work environment typically displays concern for employees' needs and feelings, provides positive feedback and encourage them to voice their concerns, develops new skills and solve work related problems. Purcell et al. (2003) highlighted that employee engagement is only meaningful if there is a more genuine sharing of responsibility between management and employees over issues of substance. Their study also revealed that involvement indecisions affecting the job or work to be an important factor, which was strongly associated with high levels of employee engagement thus demonstrating it is an important driver

Lucas et al. (2006) viewed that Employee voice can be defined as the ability for employees to have an input into decisions that are made in organizations. Robinson et al. (2004) highlighted the importance of, feeling valued and involved as a key driver of engagement. Within this umbrella of feeling valued and involved there are a number of elements that have a varying influence on the extent to which the employee will feel valued and involved and hence engaged. Robinson et al. (2004) stated that this can be a useful pointer to organizations towards those aspects of working life that re-quire serious attention if engagement levels are to be maintained or improved.

Penna (2007) presents a hierarchical model of engagement. This model indicates that staff is seeking to find "meaning" at work. Penna defines "meaning" as fulfillment from the job. Fulfillment comes from the employee being valued and appreciated, having a sense of belonging to the organization, and feeling as though they are making a contribution, and is matching with the underlying theoretical framework of Robinson. Penna states that the organization becomes more attractive to new potential employees and becomes more engaging to its existing staff.

Robinson (2006) recommended that there is considerable evidence that many employees are greatly underutilized in the workplace through the lack of involvement in work-based decisions. Beardwell and Claydon (2007) found that

Employee involvement is seen as a central principle of 'soft' HRM, where the focus is upon capturing the ideas of employees and securing their commitment. Critics have argued that employee involvement has management firmly in control and very limited real influence is given to employees. According to Lawler and Worley (2006) for a high-involvement work practice to be effective and for it to have a positive impact on employee engagement, employees must be given power.

Buchanan and Huczynski (2004) defined perception as the dynamic psychological process responsible for attending to, organizing and interpreting sensory data. According to Robinson (2006) individuals categorize and make sense of events and situations according to their own unique and personal frame of reference, which reflects their personality, past experiences, knowledge, expectations and current needs, priorities and interests. May et al. (2004) argued that employee engagement is related to emotional experiences and wellbeing. Wilson (2004) remarked that feelings connect us with our realities and provide internal feedback on how we are doing, what we want and what we might do next ... Being in organizations involves us in worry, envy, hurt, sadness, boredom, excitement and other emotions.

Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) opined that engaged employees are likely to have a greater attachment to their organization and a lower tendency to quit. Truss et al. (2006) found that, overall, engaged employees are less likely to leave their employer. The Towers Perrin (2003) identified both emotions and rationality as core components. They found that emotional factors are linked to an individual's personal satisfaction and the sense of inspiration and affirmation they get from their work and from being a part of their organization. Moore (2004) & Crabtree (2005) found that family stress and work-related stress may be interlinked. According to Robinson (2006), employee engagement can be achieved through the creation of an organizational environment where positive emotions such as involvement and pride are encouraged, resulting in improved organizational performance, lower employee turnover and better health.

6. Conclusion

Employee engagement is linked with the emotional, cognitive and physical aspects of work and how these factors are integrated. The concept of employee engagement should not be regarded just another HR strategy. Employee's engagement is a long term process and linked to core tenants of the business like as, values, culture and managerial philosophy. Employees require to be adopting in a working environment which will lead them to display behavior that organizations are looking for. An organization has to promote the factors which have a positive effect of engagement through every business activity that they do. After reviewing research, it can be concluded that high levels of employee engagement may lead to improved employee commitment & involvement towards respective jobs and thus creating a motivated workforce – that will work together to achieve the common goals of the organization.

7. References:

1. Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (1987). The support of autonomy and the control of behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 1024-1037. Development Dimensions International, Inc., available www.ddiworld.com (accessed on October 30, 2011)

2. Purcell, J., Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., Rayton, B. & Swart, J. (2003). *Understanding the People and Performance Link: Unlocking the Black Box*. London, CIPD.
3. Purcell, J. (2006). *Change Agenda, Reflections on Employee Engagement*. London, CIPD.
4. Lucas, R., Lupton, B. and Mathieson, H. (2006) *Human Resource Management in an International Context*. London, CIPD.
5. Robinson, I. (2006). *Human Resource Management in Organisations*. London, CIPD.
6. Robinson D, Perryman, S. & Hayday, S. (2004). *The Drivers of Employee Engagement, Institute for Employment Studies*, Brighton, Report 408, retrieved on December 14th, 2011.
7. Penna (2007). *Meaning at Work Research Report*, http://www.penna.com/contentfiles/penna/content/research/e7031f6c-e95e-49ba-9ecc-fad74a0829ec/meaning_at_work.pdf, Accessed on 20 December, 2012
8. Beardwell, J. and Claydon, T. (2007). *Human Resource Management, A Contemporary Approach*. 5th ed. Harlow, Prentice Hall.
9. Buchanan, D. & Huczynski, A. (2004). *Organizational Behaviour. An introductory text*, 5th ed. Harlow, FT/Prentice Hall.
10. May, D.R. Gilson, R.L. and 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 Organisational Psychology*, Vol 77, pp11-37.
11. Wilson, F. (2004). *Organisational Behaviour and Work, A Critical Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford, Oxford University Press
12. Schaufeli, W.B. & Bakker, A.B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 25, 293-315.
13. Truss, C., Soane, E., Edwards, C., Wisdom, K., Croll, A. and Burnett, J. (2006) *Working Life: Employee Attitudes and Engagement 2006*. London, CIPD.
14. Moore, K. (2004) 'the healthy balance among work, family, and personal relationships: Fact or fiction?' *Proceedings of the APS Psychology of Relationships Interest Group 4th Annual Conference*, pp79-84.
15. Kahn, W.A. (1990), "Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 692-724.
16. Maslach, C. and Leiter, M.P. (2008), "Early predictors of job burnout and engagement", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 93, pp. 498-512.
17. Luthans, F., Avey, J.B., Avolio, B.J. and Peterson, S.J. (2010), "The development and resulting performance impact of positive psychological capital", *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, Vol. 21, pp. 41-67.
18. Demerouti, E. and Cropanzano, R. (2010), "From thought to action: employee work engagement and job performance", in Bakker, A.B. and Leiter, M.P. (Eds), *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research*, Psychology Press, New York, NY, pp. 147-163.