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2.1 Employee Engagement

The movement of ‘Positive Psychology’ initiated by Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi in 2000 to examine that how normal people can flourish under relatively benign conditions. As a subject Positive Psychology focus on wellbeing, satisfaction, hope, optimism, flow and happiness. In the field of HRM/OD its focus is building positive qualities in life and work rather than repairing negative aspects. One of these attributes is Employee Engagement.

The natural outcomes of positive emotions and attitudes are individuals who are motivated, engaged and focused at work. Because individuals and organizational health are interdependent, an understanding of emotions and attitudes as they relate to healthy work benefits both parties. (James Campbell Quick et al, 2009)

We mostly use the term ‘Engagement’ in concern with marriage, wedding ceremony or a promise to marry. As per Merriam-Webster Dictionary it means “emotional involvement and commitment”. In relation with employees’ performance the term ‘Employee Engagement’ was coined by Kahn in 1990.

If we utilies both of the above meanings, the sense of the term Employees’ Engagement is very much clear. As a couple take care of each other in good and bad time after engagement similarly engaged employees and employer/ organizations take care of each other and they are emotionally involved and committed. Therefore it is a state of emotional and intellectual involvement that employees have in an organization.

In recent years, there has been a great deal of interest in employee engagement. Though initially this topic was adopted by consulting organizations for research and practice yet this is most discussed field of HR in developing counties like US, UK, New Zealand etc.
Unfortunately, much of what has been written about employee engagement comes from the practitioner literature and consulting firms. There is a surprising dearth of research on employee engagement in the academic literature (Robinson et al., 2004).

As per Alan M. Saks, most of what has been written about employee engagement can be found in practitioner journals where it has its basis in practice rather than theory and empirical research. (Alan M. Saks, 2006).

Employees’ Engagement refers to how employees behaviourally apply themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during role performances (Kahn 1990). To be physically engaged, employees devote their physical and mental energies and resources wholly into their role performance (Khan 1090).

To be cognitively engaged, employees are actually aware of their mission and role in their work environment, have what they need to do their work, opportunities to feel an impact and fulfillment in their work, and perceive chances to improve and develop (Harter, Schmidt, and Keyer 2002; Luthan and Peterson 2002). To be emotionally engaged is to form meaningful connections to others like co-workers, supervisors and customers, and to experience trust, empathy and concern for others’ feelings (Harter, Schmidt, and Keyer 2002; Luthan and Peterson 2002).

In this chapter we will study the definitions and approaches for the construct of employee engagement its relation with other related constructs. Also the reviews of studies related to engagement at national and international level are discussed. For another hot issue of work-life interface, formal and informal family friendly initiatives, work life enrichment and environment requirement for these initiatives are discussed.
2.2 Defining Employee Engagement

‘Employee Engagement’ is relatively new term in HR literature and came into prominence from 2000 onwards. From the evolution of this concept by Kahn (1990), numerous definitions can be derived from practice and research. The term Employee Engagement/Job Engagement is defined by many researchers, consultancies and industries. But here we only will discuss the definitions of researchers.

In the academic literature, a number of definitions have been provided. Kahn (1990, p. 694) defines personal engagement as “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances. Personal disengagement refers to “the uncoupling of selves from work roles; in disengagement, people withdraw and defend themselves physically, cognitively, or emotionally during role performances” (p. 694). Therefore we can say that according to Kahn (1990, 1992), engagement means to be psychologically present when occupying and performing an organizational role.

Numerous definitions also creates ambiguity in understanding this construct and differentiating from other related constructs like employee’s satisfaction, involvement, employee’s commitment, organization citizenship, discretionary effort etc.

The literature revealed that the conceptualization and definition of the construct (Employee Engagement) is frequently contaminated with its identification with other outcome variables such as job involvement, intrinsic motivation, organization commitment and organization citizenship behavior. (J. Bhatnagar 2007a; Saks 2006)

Most of what has been written about employee engagement can be found in practitioner journals where it has its basis in practice rather than theory and empirical research. (Alan M Saks 2006). Especially in the last decade academicians are now slowly joining the fray, and both parties are saddled with competing and inconsistent interpretations of the meaning of the construct. To have a clear picture about this construct we can divide all definitions into three sets of approaches.
2.2.1 Three Approaches for Employee Engagement Construct

Therefore to understand this construct of employee engagement we can divide it to three distinct approaches viz. The Role Theory Approach, the Burn Out Approach and the Social Exchange Theory (SET). (Pati & Pankaj Kumar 2010)

The Role theory Approach defines personal Engagement as “the harnessing of organization members” selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during the role performances (Kahn 1990).

Thus engagement is understood as “psychological presence” while occupying and performing an organization role.

The Burnout Approach was initiated by Maslach and Leiter in 1997 argues that engagement is positive antithesis of burnout or we can say it is opposite to burnout. According to them Engagement is energy, involvement and efficacy which is opposite to burnout dimensions of exhaustion, cynicism and ineffecticiency.

In 2002 Schaufeli et al disprove his approach and added that it is not possible that both the concepts are perfectly negatively correlated with each other and defined engagement as “a positive, fulfilling, work related state of mind is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption”.

Social Exchange theory (SET) approach given by Saks in 2006. According to this approach it is difficult for employees to vary their job performance because of regular evaluation, relation with compensation and other administrative decisions. But employees are more likely to exchange their engagement for resources and benefits provided by the organization. Therefore displaying varying degree of engagement is result of what economic and socio-emotional resources they are receiving from the organization.

2.2.2 Employee Engagement and Burnout

According to Maslach, burnout contains three sub-constructs i.e. emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion refers to a
lack of energy and a feeling that one’s emotional resources are used up due to excessive psychological demands. Depersonalization is characterized by the treatment of others as objects rather than people through cynical, callous, and uncaring attitudes and behaviors. Diminished personal accomplishment refers a tendency to evaluate oneself negatively due to the failure to produce results.

Maslach and Leiter (1997) expanded Kahn’s (1990) conceptual work and argued that engagement is situated at the opposite end of the continuum of job burnout, characterized by energy (rather than exhaustion), involvement (rather than cynicism), and a sense of efficacy (rather than reduced professional efficacy). Therefore, the existing MBI (Maslach Burnout Inventory) scale can serve as an engagement measure. Schaufeli et al. asserted that although job engagement is the antithesis of job burnout, engagement is the independent state of mind separate from burnout. Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) defined job engagement as ‘“a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind”’ (p. 295) and specified three unique dimensions of engagement: vigor, dedication, and absorption; measured by the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES).

As per Wilmar Schaufeli & Arnold Bakker (2004), Work engagement is defined as follows: ‘Engagement is a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Rather than a momentary and specific state, engagement refers to a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior. 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’
Accordingly, vigor and dedication are considered direct opposites of exhaustion and cynicism, respectively. The continuum that is spanned by vigor and exhaustion has been labeled energy or activation, whereas the continuum that is spanned by dedication and cynicism has been labeled identification (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2001).

2.3 The Benefits of Employees’ Engagement

Employee engagement and psychological well-being are different but related constructs. It has been proved by the researchers that the engagement of employees is the result of psychological well-being.

As per Ivan T. Robertson et al, it should now be clear that psychological well-being is important for employees. In fact it may be even more important for employers and organizations. Explaining the reasons he said, people with higher levels of psychological well-being learn and problem solve more effectively, are more enthusiastic about change, related to others more positively, and accept change more rapidly. It is difficult to think of another set of characteristics, apart from job-specific skills, that are more important to an organization’s success.

As cited by J. Bhatnagar and Soumendu Biswas, more recently employee engagement has been related to building a firms’ competitive advantage. Employee engagement in fact can make or break the business bottom line (Lockwood 2006), Martel (2003:30, 42) is of the opinion that in order to obtain high performance in postindustrial, intangible work that demands innovation, flexibility, and speed, employers need to engage their employees. They say that objectives are more easily met when employee are engaged are more likely to fall short when they are not.

They further said that in a study they proposed linkage between firm performance and employee engagement, but in a reverse feedback loop. This entails that those firms which are finically robust will have a higher employee engagement score.

The above studies reveal that performance and financial status of an organization is directly related to the engagement of employees of that organization. Practitioners and academics tend to agree that the consequences of employee engagement are positive (Saks 2006).
As cited by Sandeep Kular et al, there is a general belief that there is a connection between employee engagement and business results; a meta-analysis conducted by Harter et al (2002:272) confirms this connection. However, engagement is an individual-level construct and if it does lead to business results, it must first impact individual-level outcomes. Therefore, there is reason to expect employee engagement is related to individuals’ attitudes, intentions, and behaviours. Although neither Kahn (1990) nor May et al (2004) included outcomes in their studies, Kahn (1992) proposed that high levels of engagement lead to both positive outcomes for individuals, (eg quality of people’s work and their own experiences of doing that work), as well as positive organisational-level outcomes (eg the growth and productivity of organisations).

From the above discussion it is clear that employee engagement is sought field of researchers and practitioners for the benefit of employees and employers. The practitioner and consultancies have given long list and data of benefits of this construct. And researchers also in favor of practice and for further research of this construct.

2.4 Related Constructs of Employee Engagement

Numerous definitions of Employee Engagement sometimes confuse its meaning as compared to other related terms. Few constructs like work engagement, Job involvement, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) are more close to employee engagement and sometimes confuse the scholars.

It would appear that there are sufficient grounds for arguing that engagement is related to, but distinct from, other constructs in organisational behaviour (Saks 2006). For example, Robinson et al (2004) state that “engagement contains many of the elements of both commitment and OCB but is by no means a perfect match with either. In addition, neither commitment nor OCB reflect sufficiently two aspects of engagement - its two way nature, and the extent to which engaged employees are expected to have an element of business awareness.”

To clarify the ambiguity, the main related constructs of employee engagement are discussed as below:
2.4.1 Job Involvement

Job Involvement focuses on the relationship between employees and their job; how they feel about their work and the level of significance they place on their performance in terms their own self worth (Robbins, Waters - Marsh, Cacioppe, & Millett, 1994). The overlap between job involvement and engagement lies in employees’ enthusiasm for their work and the resulting self efficacy (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Job involvement is a narrower concept than engagement as it only involves the relationship between employees and their job, and not their work environment, work colleagues or organisation. May et al. (2004) proposed that engagement differed from job involvement in that it involves emotional, behavioural and intellectual components, where as job involvement is primarily intellectual. May et al. also positioned job involvement as an antecedent to engagement as “individuals who experience deep engagement in their roles should come to identify with their jobs” (p, 12). Job involvement, Job satisfaction and Job Commitment are the outcomes or consequences of Employee Engagement. Still further research is recommended to clarify the causal direction of the engagement / job involvement relationship.

2.4.2 Job Satisfaction

Employee Engagement is more than simple job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is an older and widely researched construct that took root in the mid 1970’s. Job satisfaction is how content an individual is with his or her job. In 1976, it was defined as, “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Brief & Weiss 2002). It can also be described as harnessing of one’s self to his or her roles at work. But in engagement, people express themselves cognitively, physically, and emotionally while performing their work roles (Kahn, 1990).

There are differing views on whether job satisfaction is an antecedent to or consequence of Employee engagement. Andrew Brown from Mercer Delta Consulting views engagement as a progressive combination of satisfaction, motivation, commitment and advocacy, positioning job involvement as an antecedent of engagement (Melcrum Publishing, 2005). On the other hand, Saks (2006) used multiple regression analysis to confirm job satisfaction as a consequence of
engagement. The causal relationship between job satisfaction and engagement is still to be confirmed.

2.4.3 Organization Commitment

Employee Commitment to an organization has been defined in a variety of ways including an attitude or an orientation that links the identity of the person to the organization.

Modway, Porter and Steers (1982), who did much of original research in this field, characterized it as a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and a strong desire to maintain membership in an organization.

According to Meyer & Allen (1997) an employee’s liking for an organization is affective commitment; it includes identification with and involvement in the organization. Employees with strong affective commitment continue employment with the organization because they want to do so (Cohen 1993). Continuance commitment refers to an awareness of the cost associated with leaving the organization. And finally normative commitment reflects a feeling of obligation.

O’Reilly & Chatman (1986) have argued that commitment reflect the psychological bond that tie the employee to the organization. The nature of that bond can take three forms i.e. compliance, identification, internationalization. Compliance occurs when attitudes and behavior are adopted not because of shared beliefs but simply to gain specific rewards. Identification occur influence to establish and maintain relationship; i.e. an individual may respect a group’s values without adopting them. And internationalization occurs when influence is accepted because the induced attitudes and beliefs are congruent with one’s own values.

2.4.3.1 Relation Between Organization Commitment and Employee Engagement

There are different views of different authors regarding the relation of Organization Commitment and Employee Engagement. Kahn (1990) suggests the engagement is a changing phenomenon, it is not constant like commitment. Individuals would have moments of personal engagement
rather than levels of engagement on a continuum. If referring to employee engagement and all the definitions, employee engagement would be a constant especially if there is evidence to the employee that the organisation is implementing initiatives in order to create feelings of being valued and involved (Justine Ferrer 2005).

According to Mowday et al (1979) Organization commitment is stable over time; it develops slowly but constantly. Commitment develops as a result of experience of the employee and that are consistent with expectations and basic needs of the employee.

Portar et al. (1974) refer many similarities between engagement and commitment. Feelings of being valued and involved, a sense of loyalty, connection and identification with the organisation and the extra effort on behalf of the organization are all consistent similarities between definitions of employee engagement and organizational commitment. There is further scope of research for the comparative analysis of these both constructs.

2.4.4 Work Engagement

Like employee engagement, work engagement is a relatively new concept coming from organizational psychology that only recently has been given theoretical definitions and instruments for assessment (Hallberg, 2005). Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), measures three dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption which is Work Engagement.

Vigor is “being fully charged with energy and resilient in one’s work even during a regular ‘dull’ day when nothing particular happens.” Dedication is, “being proud of one’s work and convinced that what one performs is significant.” And absorption is “being carried away by work, forgetting everything in one’s surroundings. As per the previous researches there is no marked distinction between employee engagement and work engagement. We can say that work engagement is modified form of employee engagement.
2.4.5 Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

OCB is an informal and voluntary behavior in which employee goes beyond contractual obligations towards the wellbeing of the organization and people involved in it.

Employee engagement has been found to be positively related to individual job performance. Studies have found positive relationship between employee engagement and organizational performance outcomes: employee retention, productivity, and profitability. Employee engagement would be a predictor to organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and may lead to intention to leave (Bhatnagar & Biswas, 2010).

Using social exchange theory and organizational support theory as a theoretical basis, the employees who feel that their place of employment is providing a safe are more likely to become engaged and display OCB.

In a layman’s language a good citizen always cares and never hamper his city (organization) but an engaged person is emotionally attached to his/her partner (organization). So the purview of engagement is more strong, large and effective that OCB. Employee engagement is a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its values. Practices of engagement among employees can improve OCB.

Rafferty et al (2005) draw the distinction on the basis that engagement is a two-way mutual process between the employee and the organization. In Sharpley’s (2006) (as cited in Harrad 2006) definition of engagement there must be a mutual feeling of support between the employee and the organisation.

As per studies of Ariani D. W. (2013) employees who exhibited higher levels of engagement were found to contribute to their organizations with higher levels of individual OCB and lower levels of CWB.
2.4. 6 Discretionary Effort / Behaviour

Discretionary effort” is the extent to which employees give extra effort to their work. It is one of the outcomes of employee engagement, which also involves a mental and emotional commitment to the job/organisation. Discretionary effort is given by an employee in exchange for some benefit and results in increased productivity.

As cited by Mervyl McPherson of EEO in his report (2007), discretionary effort was defined by the Corporate Leadership Council (CLC), (2002:4b) as the “extent to which employees put their full effort into their job, are constantly looking for ways to do their job better, are willing to put in the extra effort to get a job done when necessary, and believe that people would describe them as enthusiastic about the work they do”. Their definition included a “willingness to go above and beyond the call of duty, such as helping others with heavy workloads, volunteering for additional duties, and looking for ways to perform their jobs more effectively”.

He further says, Employee engagement definitions vary from “a positive emotional connection to an employee’s work” to “engaged employees are inspired to go above and beyond the call of duty to help meet business goals” (CLC 2004:9b). The CLC definition of employee engagement is “the extent to which employees commit to something or someone in their organisation and how hard they try and how long they stay as a result of that commitment” (2004:10a). This includes discretionary effort as a by-product or output of engagement.

Discretionary behavior is closely linked to employee perceptions of fairness and equity at the workplace and the employee attitudes, views and perception of fairness can be influenced by a whole raft of HR ad organizational practices which in turn shape work place behavior. (Robinson Izabela, p 93).

Though little research has been done to link engagement and discretionary effort, still the evidence to date indicates that discretionary effort or behaviour is one among the outcomes of Employee Engagement.
2.5 Measurement of Employee Engagement

At present number of consultants and practitioners are analyzing and depicting employee engagement with their own style and way. The oldest is Gallup Organization and afterwards Towers Perrin, Hewitt Consultants, Blessing White, Decision Wise, CIPD, Tower Watson etc.

There is no generalized way to measure employee engagement. For example Gallup suggests 12 questions (Q12), as Do you know what is expected of you at work? Do you have the materials and equipment you need to do your work right? At work, do you have the opportunity to do what you do best every day? In the last seven days, have you received recognition or praise for doing good work? Etc. etc. And Towers Perrin uses their 9 questions to measure engagement and then they put respondents into three "buckets"- Highly engaged, moderately engaged and disengaged.

In academic field also few academicians developed few scale to measure engagement. The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) developed by Wilmar Schaufeli & Arnold Bakker is permitted by them for the research work and is widely used. It includes the three constituting aspects of work engagement: vigor, dedication, and absorption.

Vigor is assessed by the following six items that refer to high levels of energy and resilience, the willingness to invest effort, not being easily fatigued, and persistence in the face of difficulties.
1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy
2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous
3. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work
4. I can continue working for very long periods at a time
5. At my job, I am very resilient, mentally
6. At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well

Dedication is assessed by five items that refer to deriving a sense of significance from one’s work, feeling enthusiastic and proud about one’s job, and feeling inspired and challenged by it.

1. I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose
2. I am enthusiastic about my job
3. My job inspires me
4. I am proud on the work that I do
5. To me, my job is challenging

Absorption is measured by six items that refer to being totally and happily immersed in one’s work and having difficulties detaching oneself from it so that time passes quickly and one forgets everything else that is around.

1. Time flies when I’m working
2. When I am working, I forget everything else around me
3. I feel happy when I am working intensely
4. I am immersed in my work
5. I get carried away when I’m working
6. It is difficult to detach myself from my job

The development of UWES

Originally, the UWES included 24 items of which the vigor-items (9) and the dedication-items (8) for a large part consisted of positively rephrased MBI-items. After psychometric evaluation in two different samples of employees and students, 7 items appeared to be unsound and were therefore eliminated so that 17 items remained: 6 vigor items, 5 dedication items, and 6 absorption items (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá & Bakker, 2002a). Subsequent psychometric analyses uncovered two other weak items so that in some studies also a 15-item version of the UWES has been used (e.g., Demerouti, Bakker, Janssen & Schaufeli, 2001). They also developed short scales with 9 and according to them these are equally good to analyze the engagement of employees.

The Table below shows the internal consistencies (Cronbach's α) of the scales of the various versions of the UWES (for the short UWES-9, and UWES-15).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UWES-9</td>
<td>9,679</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.89 – .97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWES-15</td>
<td>9,679</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.90 – .96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWES-17</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.91 – .96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Review of studies of Employees’ Engagement

If we type ‘employee engagement’ on search engine google we get about 41,100,000 results in 0.22 seconds and every HR/OD consultant is working on this area. In the last decade the academic world is also taking interest still there is dearth of empirical studies by the researches in this field.

To start with no discussion about employee engagement can be undertaken without mentioning the name of W.A. Khan. Conceptually, Kahn began with the work of Goffman (1961) who proposed that, “people’s attachment and detachment to their role varies” (Kahn 1990:694)

Though most comprehensive study to date of employee engagement has come from The Gallup Organization’s research using the Q12 instrument but here we will try to enlist empirical studies done by academicians in the field of employee engagement at international and national level.

2.6.1 International Studies:

Kahn (1990) conceptualized the term Engagement at works. He expresses that each performance is as good as the amount of self that is present. For example in the role of employee the more self that is incorporated into the job and the workings of the organisation the better the performance or the better the employee will be. To measure this degree of self Kahn (1990) created and defined personal engagement and disengagement which refers to the harnessing of employee selves to work roles and through expressing themselves cognitively, emotionally and physically; engagement is the degree and amount of involvement in the organisation, and disengagement is the degree of withdrawal.
His work used the methods of observation and interviewing to conduct a qualitative study of personal engagement among 16 camp counselors and 16 architectural firm members. Kahn found that people draw upon themselves to varying degrees while performing work tasks and they can commit themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally in the various roles they perform. Or, they may choose to withdraw and disengage from their work roles and work tasks. Results of Kahn’s study suggest that there are three psychological conditions that shape how people perform their roles -- meaningfulness, safety, and availability.

Kahn’s (1990) work also concluded that people have dimensions of themselves that they prefer to use and express in the course of role performance. If they can match their preferred actions with the psychological conditions existent in their work environment and work roles, then they will engage with the job (Kahn, 1990).

Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002) in their study completed a meta-analysis of prior studies on employee engagement that were conducted by the Gallup Organization. The researchers examined the relationship between employee satisfaction-engagement, and the business-unit outcomes of customer satisfaction, productivity, profit, employee turnover, and accidents. Harter et al. (2002) noted that one of the defining elements of employee engagement is the actionable quality of the measured concepts. In other words, employee engagement is related to meaningful business outcomes and many of the core issues of engagement are ones over which managers can have substantial influence. High levels of satisfaction and employee engagement were positively correlated with customer satisfaction, profitability, productivity, and safety outcomes. On average, business units that had employee scores in the top quartile range on the engagement scale had a one to four percent higher profitability. Additionally, businesses who scored in the top quartile on engagement boasted lower turnover percentage rates (Harter et al., 2002).

James K. Harter et al (2002), “Business-Unit-Level Relationship Between Employee Satisfaction, Employee Engagement, and Business Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis”, They made a study on 7,939 business units in 36 companies, this study used meta-analysis to examine the relationship at the business-unit level between employee satisfaction–engagement and the business-unit outcomes of customer satisfaction, productivity, profit, employee turnover, and
accidents. Generalizable relationships large enough to have substantial practical value were found between unit-level employee satisfaction– engagement and these business-unit outcomes. One implication is that changes in management practices that increase employee satisfaction may increase business-unit outcomes, including profit.

Two hypotheses have examined in this study were as follows:

**Hypothesis 1**: Business-unit-level employee satisfaction and engagement will have positive average correlations with the business-unit outcomes of customer satisfaction, productivity, profit, employee retention, and employee safety.

**Hypothesis 2**: The correlations between employee satisfaction and engagement and business-unit outcomes will generalize across organizations for all business-unit outcomes. That is, these correlations will not vary substantially across organizations, and in particular, there will be few if any organizations with zero or negative correlations.

Further they conclude from this study that employee satisfaction and engagement are related to meaningful business outcomes at a magnitude that is important to many organizations and that these correlations generalize across companies. An efficient composite of items measuring issues at the heart of the workplace—issues that are important to employees and those managers can influence—has substantial implications for a further understanding of the true nature of overall satisfaction at the business-unit level. The effect sizes for the employee engagement composite measure of antecedents to satisfaction (a short 12-item form) were of similar magnitude to the effect sizes for the more broadly defined overall satisfaction measure, even after correction for measurement error in the independent variables. Our results have implications not only for the design of instruments that measure the theoretical construct of interest but also for instruments used as the basis for practice. The potential for longitudinal research in the area of employee engagement and satisfaction rests on the usefulness of instruments for managers and employees. Useful instruments are those that provide information that managers can act on to improve their management practices. Future research should emphasize longitudinal designs that study changes in employee satisfaction– engagement, the causes of such changes, and the resulting usefulness
to the business. The best opportunity for such research within businesses may rest on the application of efficient and intuitively actionable measures of the constructs of interest.

May, Gilson, and Harter (2004) conducted a field study in a large Midwestern insurance agency. Using a survey format they explored why some individuals fully engage in their work while others become alienated or completely disengaged. Results of this study confirmed that engagement differs from simple job satisfaction. They agreed that engagement actually entails the active use of emotions and behaviors in addition to cognitions. Overall, study results supported Kahn’s earlier work in that psychological meaningfulness and safety were positively linked to employee investment in work roles. Additionally, job enrichment and role fit were positively related to psychological meaningfulness. Having a supportive supervisor and good relations with co-workers were related to feelings of psychological safety on the job.

Robinson D, Perryman S, Hayday S (2004) studied “The Drivers of Employee Engagement”. The first step in our research was to investigate what HR professionals understood or meant when they used the term ‘engagement’. A clear view of the behaviours demonstrated by the engaged employee emerged:

- belief in the organisation
- desire to work to make things better
- understanding of business context and the ‘bigger picture’
- respectful of, and helpful to, colleagues
- willingness to ‘go the extra mile’
- keeping up to date with developments in the field.

For analysis they used data from IES’ 2003 attitude survey of over 10,000 employees in 14 organisations in the NHS. Twelve attitude statements representing engagement were tested; all were found to ‘sit together’ reliably, to comprise a single indicator of engagement.

Study data revealed that engagement levels can vary, in association with a variety of personal and job characteristics and with experiences at work. Some key findings were:
• engagement levels decline as employees get older – until they reach the oldest group (60 plus), where levels suddenly rise, and show this oldest group to be the most engaged of all
• minority ethnic respondents have higher engagement levels than their white colleagues
• managers and professionals tend to have higher engagement levels than their colleagues in supporting roles, although people in the latter group appear to owe greater loyalty to their profession than to the organisation in which they practise their craft
• engagement levels decline as length of service increases
• having an accident or an injury at work, or experiencing harassment (particularly if the manager is the source of the harassment) both have a big negative impact on engagement
• employees who have a personal development plan, and who have received a formal performance appraisal within the past year, have significantly higher engagement levels than those who have not.

Research shows that committed employees perform better. If we accept that engagement, as many believe, is ‘one step up’ from commitment, it is clearly in the organisation’s interests to understand the drivers of engagement. Analysis of the NHS case study data indicates that opinions about, and experiences of, many aspects of working life are strongly correlated with engagement levels. However, the strongest driver of all is a sense of feeling valued and involved. This has several key components:

• involvement in decision making
• the extent to which employees feel able to voice their ideas, and managers listen to these views, and value employees’ contributions
• the opportunities employees have to develop their jobs
• the extent to which the organisation is concerned for employees’ health and wellbeing.

Ulrika Eriksson Hallberg (2005) in her study “Studies of Work Engagement, Type A Behavior and Burnout” she explained the association between being ‘on fire’ and burnout. More specifically, the thesis focused largely on two representations of involvement in work (work engagement and Type A behavior) and their respective relationships to burnout. Another pervasive theme was construct validity in assessing burnout and work engagement. These themes
were addressed in four empirical studies, conducted in a sample of healthcare workers (Study I) and a sample of information communication technology consultants (Studies II, III, and IV).

The results presented in this dissertation support the construct validity of Swedish versions of the MBI and UWES. It was further indicated that emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (or cynicism) constitute the core aspects of burnout, and that work engagement was more prominently associated with lack of health complaints than job involvement and organizational commitment. A conclusive suggestion encourage both research and practice to explore how work engagement may best be enhanced using job redesign.

In a 2006 cross national study, Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova (2006) surveyed 14,521 employees in various occupations, using a self-report questionnaire that measured work engagement. The researchers found that engagement is not only the opposite of burnout but that it has its own characteristics, which were labeled vigor, dedication, and absorption. The researchers concluded that engagement is similar to burnout in that it is a stable, non-transient state that increases slightly with age. Additionally, blue collar workers were less engaged than managers, educators, and police officers. Engagement did not seem to differ systematically between genders (Schaufeli et al., 2006).

Main finding are longitudinal analyses of Type A behavior and burnout indicated that these variables were associated in cross-sectional data. However, no association between change in Type A behavior and burnout (or vice versa) was established to indicate that Type A behavior predicted an increase in burnout (at least not over the one-year interval that the present study comprised). Possibly, this result indicates that the association between Type A behavior and burnout is more complicated than can be surmised from the relatively sparse approach in the present study. Future research should investigate whether Type A behavior and burnout share a common association through workload. Moreover, the results suggested that Type A behavior was related only to the emotional exhaustion component of burnout, something that has been noted elsewhere as well (see Maslach et al., 2001). It could be that Type A behavior predicts exhaustion, although not the particular response of burnout. Future research should investigate
Type A behavior, burnout and exhaustion from a motivational perspective to shed more light on the psychological mechanisms involved.

The longitudinal analyses of work engagement and burnout supported the notion that these constructs are bipolar opposites, as they appeared to be interdependently (and negatively) related. Hence, the present study supported the notion that burnout is an erosion of engagement. Additionally, this result indicated that motivational frameworks may add to the understanding of the associations between involvement in work and negative outcomes. If burnout is to be understood as an erosion of work engagement, but is unrelated to Type A behavior (which also constitutes a kind of involvement in work), this implies that burnout occurs only as a result of certain kinds of involvement. However, other kinds of involvement (e.g., Type A behavior) may still have negative effects (e.g., fatigue) on health. Through viewing work engagement as a manifestation of intrinsic motivation, the motivational component in burnout (see Schaufeli, 1999) is further underscored, something that may facilitate the differentiation between burnout as operationalized by the MBI and other kinds of work-related exhaustion, e.g. exhaustion syndrome (Socialstyrelsen, 2003).

Alan M. Saks (2006) in his research “Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement” surveyed 102 employees in a variety of industries and in one study tested a model of antecedents and consequences of job and organizational engagement.

The purpose of this study was to test a model of the antecedents and consequences of job and organization engagements based existing models of engagement and SET. This study provides one of the first empirical tests of the antecedents and consequences of employee engagement and makes a number of contributions to this new and emerging area.

He surveyed 102 employees working in a variety of jobs and organizations. The average age was 34 and 60 percent were female. Participants had been in their current job for an average of four years, in their organization an average of five years, and had on average 12 years of work experience. The survey included measures of job and organization engagement as well as the antecedents and consequences of engagement.
This is the first study to make a distinction between job and organization engagement and to measure a variety of antecedents and consequences of job and organization engagement. As a result, this study addresses concerns about that lack of academic research on employee engagement and speculation that it might just be the latest management fad.

The results as sited by the author are: First, this study approached engagement as role specific with respect to one’s job and organization. In fact, the results demonstrate that job and organization engagements are related but distinct constructs. Participants’ scores were significantly higher for job engagement compared to organization engagement. In addition, the relationships between job and organization engagement with the antecedents and consequences differed in a number of ways suggesting that the psychological conditions that lead to job and organization engagements as well as the consequences are not the same. As well, both job and organization engagements explained significant and unique variance in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intention to quit, and OCBO. These findings are the first to suggest that there is a meaningful distinction between job and organization engagements.

Second, this study found that a number of factors predict job and organization engagement. While POS predicted job and organization engagement, job characteristics predicted job engagement and procedural justice predicted organization engagement. Third, the results of this study indicate that job and organization engagement are related to employees’ attitudes, intentions, and behaviors. In particular, job and organization engagements predicted job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intention to quit, and OCBO while only organization engagement predicted OCBI. Furthermore, organization engagement was a much stronger predictor of all of the outcomes than job engagement. Fourth, like several other studies (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Sonnentag, 2003), the results of this study suggest that employee engagement partially mediates the relationship between antecedent variables and consequences.

Finally, the results of this study suggest that employee engagement can be understood in terms of SET. That is, employees who perceive higher organizational support are more likely to
reciprocate with greater levels of engagement in their job and in the organization; employees who are provided with jobs that are high on the job characteristics are more likely to reciprocate with greater job engagement; and employees who have higher perceptions of procedural justice are more likely to reciprocate with greater organization engagement. Engaged employees are also more likely to have a high-quality relationship with their employer leading them to also have more positive attitudes, intentions, and behaviors.

David S. Gill (2007), “Employee Selection and Work Engagement: Do Recruitment and Selection Practices Influence Work Engagement?”, the objective of this study was to investigate the effect employee selection and recruitment practices had on work engagement and to determine how much of an impact various selection methods have on engagement, organizational practices beyond job design. This study served to expand the literature on antecedents and outcomes of work engagement to include human resources practices, such as Realistic Job Previews (RJP) and selection tests, as antecedents. A sample of 161 Information Technology helpdesk support representatives, who were grouped by receiving or not receiving an RJP and a selection test, were assessed on the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, and Bakker, 2002). Additional analyses were conducted to determine the predictability of engagement on individual (e.g., personal health and job satisfaction) and organizational outcomes (e.g., turnover intentions and performance). Overall, results suggest that human resources practices should be included in the work engagement model.

He concludes as the goal of this study was to investigate the effect employee selection and recruitment practices had on work engagement. Several researchers proposed employee engagement in the workplace (Kahn, 1990; Maslach, 1998). Other researchers identified engagement as a phenomenon occurring in the workplace (Harter et al., 2002; Salanova, Agut, & Peiro, 2005; Schaufeli & Salanova, 2005; Shirom, 2004). As the body of work increased, researchers also identified common antecedents and consequences of engagement (e.g., Saks, 2006). Few if any studies looked at how employees were recruited and selected and the impact those human resources practices have on work engagement. The strength of this study is the identification that what is done before employees are hired and how the employees are selected
into the organization matters. Although additional research should be conducted to determine how much of an impact various selection methods have on engagement, organizational practices beyond job design matter.

Additionally, the results highlighted the need for more research on work engagement models. As the body of work increases with regard to work engagement, the proposed models of engagement will begin to include more complex relationships between engagement and antecedents and outcomes (e.g., reciprocal, recursive). Although personality was not a factor included in this study, it is one that shows great promise. From research on vigor and personality by Shraga and Shirom (2007), the individual is a variable that is commonly left out of the equation. Much like the original conceptualization of job burnout, engagement is still primarily viewed as a state concept. As further investigation of work engagement is conducted the individual will begin to play a larger role (Macey & Schneider, 2007). This body of work suggests that state concepts are important (e.g., length of time on the job). However there are still variables that should be investigated that may account for some of the variance remaining within work engagement.

An additional strength of this work is the connection between personal health and engagement. The results found for the relationship between health and work engagement support results found in previous studies (e.g., Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006). This work adds personal health to the list of benefits of having employees who are engaged in their work.

The organizational outcomes studied did not yield significant results as predicted, which is contradictory to other studies conducted (e.g., Harter et al., 2002). The better predictor of the organizational outcomes was job satisfaction. This result further identifies interactions of variables that are still unknown. Truly the results point to the need for further research on work engagement to determine whether this is an older concept repackaged and marketed to executives (i.e., job satisfaction), or whether the concept of engagement is more complicated than previous theories of work motivation, satisfaction, person-job fit, and performance. If engagement is truly a new concept, with the supported benefits identified in previous studies, it is time to look at engagement as a complete model, and include the full cycle of the employee, from recruitment to the individual and organizational outcomes.
Gabriel M. De La Rosa (2008), In this study the applicability of the Demands Control Support (JDCS) model to understanding employee engagement is tested using survey responses from employees working in the United States of America and Internationally. Results support Karasek’s (1989) interpretation of the JDC(S) model, suggesting additive, linear relationships between self reported perceptions of demands, control, and support incrementally explained variance in self reported employee engagement. Results highlight the importance of considering employee perceptions of job demands, job control, and job support to understanding employee engagement. Also, the possibility of cultural values which may influence the importance of work characteristics is discussed.

The purpose of the current study was to test the applicability of the JDC(S) model to explain employee engagement. Specifically, both strain based and buffer based hypotheses are tested in such a way to highlight the theoretical contributions of interpretations of the JDC(S) model in explaining employee engagement. The current study looked at perceptions of demands, control, and support as a model for predicting employee engagement within a sample of American and international employees working for a multi-national organization. The current study also advances our understanding of employee engagement in that data collected from employees residing in Europe, Asia, Latin America, and North America are analyzed in such a way to highlight contextual factors that may influence the theoretical and practical issues inherent in the JDC(S) framework.

The findings of the current research study would likely receive interest from both practitioners and researchers. When creating and delivering employee engagement “initiatives”, practitioners should consider the major tenants of the JDC(S) theory and, most importantly the implications of the JDC(S) theory. Put simply, the implications of the JDC(S) model are to carefully consider levels of job demands, job control, and support simultaneously. Results of the current study suggest the main effects proposed by the JDC(S) model are indeed applicable when considering supervisors and managers working in various cultures.

Given the positive relationship between job demands and employee engagement it is tempting to conclude that all employees should be given extensive job demands in an attempt to increase
employee engagement. The current research does not entirely support this conclusion. While the current research did uncover a positive relationship between demands and engagement and other aspects of the JDC(S), it is only logical to assume that there are bounds on the range of demands that an employee can experience before becoming excessively taxed and fatigued.

Because demands, control, and support all displayed additive relationships with ratings of employee engagement, the current research echoes calls by past researchers (e.g., Johnson & Hall, 1988; Karasek, 1989) to simultaneously consider the effects of demands, control, and support. It is particularly important for those employed in a supervisory or managerial role have substantial demands, adequate job relevant decision latitude, and receive adequate support from organizational leaders. Employee engagement can be understood as the extent to which an employee is personally invested in his or her job performance, the extent to which an employee will care about how well he or she performs job duties depends, to some extent, on characteristics of the job such as job demands, job control and support from organizational leadership.

The current study does provide an important perspective to the applicability of the JDC(S) model to emerging topics in the field of occupational health psychology and Industrial/Organizational Psychology as a whole. Interestingly, the positive relationship between demands and engagement is intriguing; this highlights the importance of considering the nature of the criterion and explanatory variables when expanding theoretical models. The potential for a positive relationship between desired organizational outcomes and job demands does emphasize the contributions of the orientation of positive psychology.

Andrew J. Wefald (2008), in his study “An Examination of Job Engagement, Transformational Leadership, and Related Psychological Constructs”, he sought to critically examine the concept of engagement as well as provide empirical evidence regarding its place in the nomological network of job attitudes. Both theoretically and empirically, engagement has been linked to personality and leadership variables; however, no research to date has attempted to examine all three concepts together. This research additionally sought to link engagement, personality, and leadership in a theoretically based model. Participants (N=382) at mid-sized financial institution
completed a survey comprised of demographic items, attitude measures, a leadership measure, and a personality measure. Results indicated that the Schaufeli and Britt measures of engagement substantially overlap with job satisfaction and affective commitment; however, the Shirom measure (called vigor) is not redundant with job satisfaction or affective commitment. Hypothetical models of engagement, personality, and leadership were not good fits with the data; however, two modified models (one with Schaufeli’s engagement and one with Shirom’s vigor) had marginally acceptable fits. Further, hierarchical regressions indicated a strong connection between engagement and leadership and between engagement and personality.

This research began with four broad goals. The first broad goal was to critically examine engagement and other related psychological constructs such as job satisfaction, job involvement, perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, and life satisfaction. The second broad goal was to bring together engagement and transformational leadership and to examine how or whether an individual’s level of engagement is related to their perceptions of their leader’s transformational leadership, i.e. the perceived characteristics of his or her leader. The third goal of this research was to examine the role of personality in an individual’s level of engagement. Here the goal was to begin to examine whether engagement was more trait-like or more state-like in nature. The previous research has shown that personality has been linked both theoretically and empirically to engagement and leadership (e.g. Judge, & Bono, 2000; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Wefald et al., 2007). The fourth and final broad goal of this research was to examine the relationships of engagement, leadership, and personality.

This research showed there were strong links between engagement/vigor, personality, and leadership. Followers’ reports of leadership predicted engagement and individual difference variables also predicted engagement/vigor. The hypothesized models of how all three concepts fit together were not supported, but modified models and the regression results suggested there are many links between all three concepts.
The results also point to Shirom’s concept of vigor as, perhaps, the most distinct from other constructs such as job satisfaction and affective commitment. Two of the components of vigor added unique variance beyond that of job satisfaction and affective commitment, demonstrating that it is not fully redundant with those other constructs. Further, the confirmatory factor analyses suggested that the vigor concept has a better operationalization and possibly a better construction than the Schaufeli engagement concept. Only a modified one-factor model of Schaufeli’s engagement had an acceptable fit with the data, whereas both a (modified) one and three factor model of Shirom’s vigor had acceptable fits. The Britt measure is conceptually and operationally a one-factor model of engagement (Britt, 2003). As such factor analyses were not run on the Britt measure.

Andrew J. Wefald and Ronald G. Downey (2009), he investigated the factor structure of W. B. Schaufeli et al.’s measure of engagement and academic engagement’s relation to academic satisfaction and found the Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction to be highly related constructs. The Previous researchers found a 3-factor structure of engagement that comprises vigor, dedication, and absorption. The authors administered to a sample of university students a questionnaire on their level of engagement in academic work and various other measures. The results did not confirm the 3-factor structure.

To explain why these results differ from research that primarily Schaufeli, Salanova, et al. (2002) conducted, he said, it may be possible because of cultural differences that exist between the United States and other countries where Schaufeli and colleagues conducted research (Spain for Schaufeli, Salanova, et al.; Spain, Portugal, and the Netherlands for Schaufeli, Martinez, et al., 2002).

Susan L. Sweem (2009), the study titled as “Leveraging Employee Engagement through a Talent Management Strategy: Optimizing Human Capital through Human Resources and Organization Development Strategy in a Field Study”. This field study explores how talent management and employee engagement are defined and investigates how a talent management strategy affects employee engagement within a US service unit of a coatings/chemical company. It also explores how human resources (HR) and organization development (OD) can support a
talent management strategy. Using a mixed methods approach of implementing various interventions within the service unit and comparing the results with the other US business units through survey data and semi-structured interviews, the findings conclude that the key components of talent management are a continuously improving work environment, an open climate and clear top communication. The components of the engagement construct are: A supervisor who coaches; employee development; transparent trust; meaningful and challenging work; and commitment. Based upon these constructs and this field study, a talent management strategy does significantly increase employee engagement.

She concludes that talent management strategy has a direct impact on employee engagement as seen through the talent management model lens. Talent management is a holistic concept that must be viewed from several angles in order to truly impact strategy. What is so vital in this strategy is that it encompasses not only the direct employee experience (i.e. recruitment, development, and retention) but also includes the culture and climate of the organization. The communications from senior level management to employees and supervisors within all levels of the organization plays a significant role. With a dynamic environment, continuous improvement in organizations becomes a challenge. However, if the talent within an organization can adapt and have the freedom to actually create change, organizations can move forward with innovation and creativity.

It is the human capital within an organization that can provide this competitive advantage and opportunity. Organizations develop strategies to grow and expand. It is the talent of the organization that brings this to fruition. The culture and climate must be appropriate for the organizational goals to succeed. The HR/OD function has the responsibility for providing the tools to management and employees of an organization in order to create the appropriate climate and communicate the appropriate messages. The HR/OD function permeates the strategy within the organization. Talent management is strategic HR/OD.

Alan M. Saks (December 2011), the study “Workplace spirituality and employee engagement” describe the importance of Workplace Spirituality for Employee Engagement Maintenance. A model of workplace spirituality and employee engagement is presented in
which three dimensions of workplace spirituality (transcendence, community, and spiritual values) relate to employee engagement through four psychological conditions (meaningfulness in work, meaningfulness at work, safety, and availability).

The author shows how workplace spirituality and employee engagement are in fact similar and that both topics focus on creating workplaces in which people can find meaning and fulfillment in and at work and immerse themselves in their roles.

He concludes that, workplace spirituality and employee engagement are both current and exciting topics in the management literature. However, even though they are both concerned with the spirit at work and focus on improving employee well-being and organizational performance, they have continued to evolve independently of one another. In this paper, I have shown how they are in fact similar and that both topics focus on creating workplaces in which people can find meaning and fulfillment in and at work and immerse themselves in their roles. By integrating these two topics, a much richer and more complete approach to both areas will result.


The aim of this study was to determine firstly, whether leader empowering behaviour, role clarity and psychological empowerment predict employee engagement, secondly if role clarity moderates the relationship between leader empowering behaviour, psychological empowerment and work engagement and finally to determine if work engagement predicts intention to leave within the business unit.

For that a survey research design was used. A convenience sample \( n = 179 \) was taken from a business unit in a chemical organisation. The Leader Empowering Behaviour Questionnaire, Measures of Role Clarity and Ambiguity Questionnaire, Measuring Empowerment Questionnaire, Utrecht Work Engagement Scale and the Intention to Leave Scale were administered.
The analyses showed that a leader’s behaviour is related to employees’ experiences of the work environment. A higher level of development was related to higher role clarity. Therefore, when a leader focuses on the development of employee, they are more aware of the expectations that are placed upon them.

High levels of meaning correlated with high levels of vigour, dedication and absorption. Therefore, when employees experience their work as meaningful they will concurrently experience higher levels of energy in doing their work, be more enthusiastic in completing work-related tasks and demonstrate high levels of focus in their work. High levels of impact are related to elevated levels of dedication, which indicates that when employees feel they have control over their work environment they will react with increased eagerness in doing their work.

The canonical analysis showed that leader empowering behaviour (development, accountability and authority), role clarity and psychological empowerment (competence, meaning, impact and self-determination) are strongly related to the three categories of work engagement (vigour, dedication and absorption) and intention to leave.

Isabel Sanchez-Hernandez & David Grayson (2011),” Internal Marketing for Engaging Employees on the Corporate Responsibility Journey”.

As cite by the authors, Internal Marketing has been developed directly from conventional marketing theory (Woodruffe, 1995). It is based on the assumption that the accumulated knowledge of the marketing function can be used within the organization itself in order to gain competitive advantage in the market as well.

The purpose of this paper is to explore whether internal marketing could be a powerful tool for engaging employees on the corporate responsibility journey. A conceptual approach based on literature review is carried out to determine the existing possibilities provided by internal marketing to enhance corporate responsibility.

The authors discuss the propositions in the finding as, rreflexion from the extant literature indicates that, because employee engagement matters, internal responsibility should be put first.
The internal marketing umbrella, including “selling internally” the idea of responsibility, facilitating internal communication, enhancing corporate volunteering or the possibility to become a social intrapreneur, could help to align employees’ needs with corporate responsibility goals.

**Junghoon Lee (2012),** this study empirically tested relationships among antecedents and consequences of employee engagement in the hotel setting. In particular, this study provided theory-based empirical evidence regarding whether employee evaluations of self (i.e., core self-evaluations) and perceptions of organizational environment (i.e., psychological climate) affect employee engagement. This study also investigated how employee engagement directly and indirectly leads to intrinsic rewards, job satisfaction, personal attachment to an organization (i.e., organizational commitment), and the (LMX). Results of hypothesis testing showed that core self-evaluations and three components of psychological climate (managerial support for service, interdepartmental service, and team communication) positively influence employee engagement. The results also revealed that employee engagement is positively associated with all the outcome variables. This study further demonstrated that LMX mediates the relationships of employee engagement with job satisfaction and organizational commitment; job satisfaction mediates the relationships between employee engagement and organizational commitment and between LMX and organizational commitment.

2.6.2 **Indian Studies:**

The availability of empirical studies by researchers related to employee engagement is less in India and compared to the western world. Most of the available studies are survey of a particular industry. Few potential research oriented studies are as given below:

**Pallavi Srivastava and Jyotsna Bhatnagar (2007),** “Talent Acquisition Due Diligence Leading To High Employee Engagement: Case Of Motorola India MDB.”
These researchers explain that talent has become the key differentiator for human capital management and for leveraging competitive advantage. With better talent acquisition, employee engagement improves and so does the productivity. Maximizing team engagement, motivation, and retention through due diligence in talent acquisition is vital in today’s highly competitive environment.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss some of the talent management practices and also to investigate talent acquisition and its relationship to levels of employee engagement. The researchers did the investigation with the aid of a case study on Motorola India- Mobile Devices Business.

The aim of the current study was to highlight the impact of due diligence in talent acquisition which is the most crucial problem faced by the organizations in the present times. They have found that by reflecting recruitment and culture need fit, an environment is created at the workplace where employees feel more passionate about their work and exhibit the behaviours that organizations need to drive better results.


The writer says, Talent management is fast gaining a top priority for organizations across the world. Trends for talent management, talent wars, talent raids and talent shortage, talent metrics retention and concerns for talent strategy are expressed in the literature, across various countries like the USA, the UK, Australia, Japan, China, India, and across Asia (see Yeung, 2006; Ruppe, 2006; Dunn, 2006; Chugh and Bhatnagar, 2006; Lewis and Heckman, 2006; Lewis, 2005; Branham, 2005; Bennett and Bell, 2004).

The purpose of this paper is to investigate talent management and its relationship to levels of employee engagement using a mixed method research design.
In the first phase she surveyed on a sample of 272 BPO/ITES employees, using Gallup q12. Focused on group interview discussion based on reasons for attrition and the unique problems of employee engagement. In the second phase, one of the BPO organizations from the phase I sample was chosen at random and exit interview data was analyzed using factor analysis and content analysis.

In the results in first phase low factor loadings indicated low engagement scores at the beginning of the career and at completion of 16 months with the organization was found. High factor loadings at intermediate stages of employment were indicative of high engagement levels, but the interview data reflected that this may mean high loyalty, but only for a limited time. In the second phase factor loadings indicated three distinct factors of organizational culture, career planning along with incentives and organizational support. The first two were indicative of high attrition.

**Chauhan Daisy (2009) “Effect of Job Involvement on Burnout”,** she studied correlation Job Involvement with Burnout (which is considered opposite of Employee Engagement). In her study she found that Job Involvement had negative correlation with De-personalization and Emotional Exhaustion and positive correlation with Personal Accomplishment. The correlations results indicate that burnout can be minimized /avoided if the individuals develop a high level of involvement in their jobs and they are able to identify themselves psychologically with their jobs.

She found that Job involvement had a negative correlation with the two negative dimensions of Burnout i.e DE-Personalization and Emotional Exhaustion and positive correlations with Burnout Personal Accomplishment.

The researchers explained the importance of Work–Life balance the core of issues central to human resource development (HRD), Work Family Conflict & Work Family Enrichment.

This paper proposes a conceptual model to be tested empirically. The construction of a robust scale for measurement of Work-Life Balance is emphasized. The proposed model focuses on the correlates of Work-Life Balance construct and its relationship with other variables such as employee engagement, emotional consonance/dissonance and turnover intention.

They have made seven propositions viz. 1- Experience of WLB will have an impact of higher centrality of work value in an employee’s life cycle. 2- Experience of WL Imbalance will be impacted by high demands at work only when the centrality of family value is higher to an employee. 3- Higher the need of the employee for personal space, family and work demands will lead to an experience of Work Life imbalance. 4a) - Higher Work Life Balance leads to higher Employee Engagement mediated by emotional consonance. 4b)- Emotional consonance leads to lower intention to quit mediated by Work Life Balance. 5- High WLB will lead to High Employee Engagement, and low intention to quit. 6- Higher the emotional consonance, higher is the Work Life Balance mediated by Employee Engagement.

Pati Surya Prakash & Pankaj Kumar (July 2010) “Employee Engagement: Role of Self-Efficacy, Organizational Support & Supervisory Support.”

This study argues that differences between Self –Efficacy levels in employees are primarily responsible for differences in displayed Engagement. Based on the findings the study argues and defines engagement as expressed empowerment pertaining to a role thus enriching the management literature concerning engagement. They conclude that employee engagement necessitates a workforce that is attributed with self-efficacy as a dispositional trait. They also argue that empowered employee can be expected to be engaged. Also it is pointed that this condition may not hold well in bureaucratic organizations. Further they say that the absence of anyone of the empowerment conditions shall result eventually in disengagement. More specially, the absence of self efficacy shall inhibit individuals from self expression thus forcing them to limit their activities to extremity scripted roles.

This study emphasizes the importance of employee engagement and also identifies various aspects that have a significant moderating effect on it. It also proves that there is a strong relationship between employee engagement and employee performance that further insists the significance. Regression analysis predicts that, out of the various important factors that have an overall moderating effect on employee engagement, there are two factors that came out with significant path validity or t value. Working environment and Team and co-worker relationship is found to have significant t value in relating with employee engagement.

She has proved strong relationship between employee engagement and employee performance in Indian scenario. This study has confirmed that nearly 65% of employee performance is influenced by employee engagement.

It is suggested by her that as many studies along with this study has proved the strong relationship between employee engagement and employee performance, it is high time for organisations to note that employee engagement has to be improved for which the identified factors may be used as means to achieve the same. This will result in enriched employee performance as the study has confirmed that nearly 65% of employee performance is influenced by employee engagement.


This study is one among the good studies to access the determinants of employee engagement in Indian based on series of studies. This study is conducted by Shri Ram Center to analyze organizational climate and its role in driving employee engagement. The perception of about 40,000 employees was sought to brought to light work life balance, Job Content, Monetary Benefits and Team Orientation as common drivers of employee engagement. Three key drivers of engagement for non-executives were: Union /Association with management, Recognition and
rewards and Welfare facilities. This study has found the drivers of engagement in Indian scenario.

The findings are Executives and non-executives alike, were relatively more satisfied with the job and perceived a high sense of involvement and commitment in their work and the organization. Same was not true of the Managerial Practices (Communication System, Participative Management, Executive Management Relations, Lateral Trust, Objectivity and Rationality, and Subordinate Development), Development of Employees (Scope for Advancement, Recognition and Appreciation, Performance Appraisal, Training and Development, Delegation of Authority, and Job Content), and Industrial Relations (Union Management Relations, Grievance Handling, and Approach to Discipline).

As per this study the following six management functions have emerged in order of importance as critical determinants of Executive's Engagement.

- **Job Content**: (autonomy, challenging opportunities for learning).
- **Compensation/Monetary Benefits**: (attractive salary vis-à-vis qualifications and responsibility, adequate compensation for the work and intra-organization parity).
- **Work Life Balance**: (appreciative of personal needs, able to spend time with family).
- **Top-Management Employee Relations**: (approachability of top management, their values and ethical conduct, equality in treatment, respecting the views of subordinates, providing an environment of working together).
- **Scope for Advancement and Career Growth**: (well-designed policy, adequate opportunities for career growth and advancement, clearly laid down career growth paths; implementation of the promotion policy in a fair and transparent manner, help to the employees in achieving growth).
- **Team Orientation/Team Work**: (importance, cooperation in inter and intra department teams).
Saradha H and Dr Harold Andrew Patrick (2011), “Employee Engagement In Relation To Organizational Citizenship Behavior In Information Technology Organizations”

As per author several literatures on OCB have highlighted the relationship between OCB and productivity, in-role performance, and business unit performance. However there has been no research established to find out if there is any influence of OCB on employee engagement.

The research deals with two constructs relevant to employees organizational behavior namely employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior which influences the organization’s performance. The aim of the research presented in this paper is to investigate which among the drivers of employee engagement has the highest influence on employee engagement. 235 employees were surveyed and a reliable and standardized instrument was adopted. The findings indicated moderate level of engagement and OCB experienced by employees and significant relationship was found between engagement and OCB. Current career intention, job satisfaction, pay & benefits, management, equal opportunities, and organization citizenship behavior had a significant influence on employee engagement. The detail findings and implications are discussed in the paper.

The author concludes that the willingness of the employee to stay with the company and his job satisfaction levels indicate the level of employee engagement to a higher extent. Good employee retention techniques, Challenging job, good pay and benefits package, improved managerial system with unambiguous evaluation feedback, equal opportunities in internal vacancies, followed by enhancing the Organizational Citizenship Behavior could improve the levels of employee engagement.

The objectives of this study were to understand the linear association between the Emotional Intelligence and Work Engagement behavior and to identify the dominant variables of Emotional Intelligence which influence the Work Engagement behavior.

In the research it is found there is a significant linear association between the Overall Emotional Intelligence and Overall Work Engagement behavior. It is critically observed the pearsons correlation co-efficient value of .377(**) indicates positive weaker relationship between the above said variables which is a reflection of Emotional Intelligence behavior alone will not influence Work Engagement behavior. It is also suggested that the managers need to identify those variables which influence Work Engagement behavior apart from the existing Emotional Intelligence construct variables used for this study. The factor analysis of the study extracts eight dimensions out of 29 variables in the research after reviewing Emotional Intelligence construct. It is suggested that the managers need to focus on these eight Emotional Intelligence dimensions when they explore Emotional Intelligence study.

**Priyanka Anand (2011)**, the study focuses on the two important HR practices of performance appraisal and employee engagement in the hotel industry. The research was conducted in ITC Maurya evaluates their practices relating to HR processes. The basic methods and systems are described keeping in mind the general trend in the Industry. ITC Maurya conducts the Q12 gallup survey on its employees, this method is used to access the existing levels of satisfaction amongst employees. It is found that the employees were involved and highly satisfied with the work environment. The performance appraisal standards are updated and different methods of appraisal are used across the organization. The employees were aware of the criteria for appraisals and also related a sense of importance to them. The incentives and initiatives taken by the Hotel for various levels in the organization were communicated to all the employees.

**Vaijayanthi P. at el (2011)**, the main purpose of this study is to ascertain the status of employee engagement and the factors that impede better employee engagement. In the findings of this study the factors are confirm infrastructure , cross functional discussions , communication & interaction with the corporate office employees , reflection on the feedbacks and proper support and orientation through induction programs. And inadequate interaction with peers from other
locations/offices, lack of accountable response from the corporate office for issues including dearth of personnel, employee facilities, deficient communication regarding seminars, workshops, and other training sessions from the corporate office, and inadequate visits by the business team to be the tumbling blocks for better employee engagement.


This report constitutes a summary of findings on the cumulative data collected from the different organizations of China and India from four organizations viz GKN (UK, India, China), AkzoNobel (Netherlands, India, China), Tesco HSC (India) and InsureCo1 (Asia-Pacific).

In their finding regarding measurement of engagement by firms they found that there are many different scales being used across companies to measure engagement and there are multiple dimensions of engagement for the best way to measure engagement.

Regarding framework of effective performance management practices which may enhance engagement they found a broad range of outcomes of the performance management process (from training to pay rises, from job rotation to bonuses) has the strongest impact on most types of employee engagement. In other words, the performance management process needs to be seen to be leading to outcomes which are valued by the employee.

Regarding relationship between work climate, job characteristics and employee engagement they observed that work climate and job characteristics have a differential effect on employee engagement. Both job and organization resources (performance feedback, autonomy, development opportunities, task variety, welfare, and support from line manager, colleagues and senior management) are linked to positive employee engagement of all types, and might therefore be useful tools for enhancing engagement.

This research attempts to find whether being a part of the mentoring relationship enables employee engagement. The researchers took survey sample of 170 sales / marketing professionals at different levels in the organizational hierarchy of Mumbai region. They have found that there was a significant difference in the employee engagement scores of respondents who were a part of mentoring relationship. This indicates that the organizations that plan to invest their resources in establishing a mentoring program will see a significant effect on the employee engagement levels of their workforce.

He found that respondents in the survey who were a part of the mentoring relationship scored high on the dimensions of company perception, development opportunities, work environment and information and communication in the questionnaire. i.e. they felt that their organization is a better place to work for and were positive about the senior leadership. They also perceived that the organization provided opportunities for them to grow in their careers and that they were well informed about the future course that the organization would be taking. This further supports the hypothesis under consideration for the study.

He concludes as results from the Triple Creek survey report (2010) found that mentoring positively impacts employee engagement and can have lasting positive repercussions for organizations. It has been established repeatedly that providing quality mentoring relationships throughout the organization increases employee engagement in multiple ways. The research paper has highlighted that mentoring does have a significant impact on engaging employees.

Swatee Sarangi & R. K. Srivastava, (2012), unraveled the dimensions of organizational culture and communication which need to be focused for enhancing vigor, dedication and absorption of employees (Employees’ Engagement) in the India Nationalized Banking Sector.

Kumar Alok & D. Israel (2012), this study’s main objects are to understand how in an organization a) authentic leadership relates to work engagement and psychological ownership, and b) psychological ownership interferes with the relationship between authentic leadership and
work engagement. They found through regression analysis that authentic leadership indirectly relates to work engagement of employees through the full mediation of organization based promotive psychological ownership.

**Soumendu Biswas et al (2013) “Linking distributive and procedural justice to employee engagement through social exchange: a field study in India.”**

The researchers have linked justice perceptions to employee outcomes and have referred to social exchange as its central theoretical premise. They used Saks’ (2006) 11-item scale that takes into account both job engagement and organizational engagement comprising of five and six items.

They tested a conceptual model linking distributive and procedural justice to employee engagement through social exchange mediators, namely perceived organizational support (POS) and psychological contract. Employing the social exchange perspective, a conceptual model was developed and tested with data collected from 238 managers and executives in manufacturing and service sector firms in India. Importantly, their study contributes to existing literature on organizational justice, social exchange and employee reactions. They establish distributive and procedural justice as primary determinants of POS, and procedural justice as a key antecedent of psychological contract in organizations. They further extend this chain of relationships by testing and supporting the mediating role of POS and psychological contract between justice perceptions and employee engagement.

Findings suggest that perceived organizational support mediated the relationship between distributive justice and employee engagement, and both perceived organizational support and psychological contract mediated the relationship between procedural justice and employee engagement. The study supports the inclusion of distributive justice, procedural justice, POS and psychological contract in models of employee engagement.
They suggest, given the role of POS and psychological contract in the process of employee–organization exchange, organizations are required to employ actions that significantly augment POS and fortify the notion of psychological contract.


**Vishal Gupta and Sushil Kumar (2013)** “Impact of performance appraisal justice on employee engagement: a study of Indian professionals”

Performance appraisal is one of the most important human resource management practices as it yields critical decisions integral to various human resource actions and outcomes. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between perceptions of performance appraisal fairness and employee engagement in the Indian business context.

The study was conducted in two parts. The first part explored the relationship between justice perceptions and a one-dimensional conceptualization of engagement. The second part explored the relationship between justice perceptions and a three-dimensional conceptualization of engagement. The relationships between justice perceptions and engagement were analyzed using zero-order correlations and hierarchical regression analysis.

The results of the study show that distributive justice and informational justice take precedence over procedural justice. Employees who feel that they have been given fair ratings also tend to believe that the procedures followed are fair and just. When an employee feels that the outcomes (salary hike, rewards, etc.) commensurate with the effort put in, he/she reciprocates it with greater vigor, dedication and is more engaged (physically, cognitively and emotionally) in his/her job.
The study findings suggest a significant positive association between distributive and informational justice dimensions and employee engagement. Distributive justice and informational justice dimensions were found to have a stronger impact on employee engagement conceptualized as antipode of burnout.

2.7 Organization Support as an Antecedent of Employee Engagement

Seeing the interest of consulting community and academicians most of the prominent organizations are practicing or thinking to practice employee engagement policies and practices.

When we think to practice this construct the first and foremost practical question comes into our mind that what factors will engage or disengage the employees. Though these antecedents can differ with job, organization and location still few can be the generalized. We will review the literature regarding antecedents of employee engagement.

In the report, “Supportive managers: What are they? Why do they matter?” it has been found that ‘Employees with supportive managers are more likely to have high job satisfaction, high organizational commitment and lower level of job stress and life stress.’(Stephenie Okerman, HRFOCUS /July 1999)

Robinson D et al (2004) in their study ‘The Drivers of Employee Engagement’ which was supported by IES Research Networks give ten derivers for employee engagement viz training development and career, immediate management, performance and appraisal, communication, equal opportunity and fair treatment, pay and benefits, health and safety, cooperation, family friendliness and job satisfaction.

May et al. (2004), while testing empirically the Khan’s model found that that meaningfulness, safety, and availability were significantly related to engagement. They also found that job enrichment and role fit were positive predictors of meaningfulness; rewarding co-worker and supportive supervisor relations were positive predictors of safety.
According to Alan M Saks, both Kahn’s (1990) and Maslach et al.’s (2001) models indicate the psychological conditions or antecedents that are necessary for engagement, they do not fully explain why individuals will respond to these conditions with varying degrees of engagement. A stronger theoretical rationale for explaining employee engagement can be found in social exchange theory (SET). SET argues that obligations are generated through a series of interactions between parties who are in a state of reciprocal interdependence. Therefore if the managements are demanding engagement they have to be supportive for the employees.

While discussing antecedents Alan discusses Job Characteristics, Perceived organization Support, Perceived Supervisor Support, Rewards and Recognitions, Procedural Justice and Distributive Justice as important factors for employee engagement.

Rama J. Joshi and J.S. Sodhi (July 2011) discussed drives of engagement in indian scenario. According to them work life balance, job content, monetary benefits and team orientation as common drivers of engagement for both executives and non-executives. Scope for advancement and top-management employee relations were the additional key drivers of engagement for executives. Three other key drivers of engagement for the non-executives were; union/association management relations, recognition and rewards and welfare facilities.

As cited by Andrew J. Wefald (2008), the concept of Perceived organizational support (POS) is developed by Eisenberger and his colleagues (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). POS stems from the idea that a person’s commitment to an organization is strongly influenced by that person’s perception that the organization is committed to them. The basis for POS is social exchange since employment is often seen as an exchange of effort and loyalty for money. POS is a general perception that a person’s organization cares for and values them (Eisenberger et al., 1990). POS has been found to be negatively related to absenteeism (Eisenberger et al., 1986), but positively related to innovation, affective commitment, and conscientiousness (Eisenberger et al., 1990).
To provide family friendly initiatives is a prominent support given by the leaders and organizations. So, we can make this proposition from the above researches that family friendly initiatives i.e. initiatives to balance work and life of employees is one among the prominent antecedent / driver for employee engagement.

2.8 Family Friendly Initiatives to Resolve Work-life Interface

All over the world the organizations are demanding more and more from their employees; parallel to this these are focusing more on the motivation and recognitions of the employees to enhance productivity. A healthy balance of work and family life is strategy that the new-age management is aiming at.

Present workforce consists of many working fathers and mothers; whose aim is to find a balance between work and family roles is a matter of concern for them and the organizations.

The current work scenario is marked by the fast pace of change, intense pressure, constant declines, changing demographics, increased use of technology and the co-exiting virtual workplace. Juxtaposed with this, the increase in average income and rise in living standards have individuals striving for better work atmosphere. (Tara Shankar & J Bhatanagar (2010)

In India, the demographic changes are seen in the forms of increasing number of women in the workforce (Census of India, 2001), breakage of joint family system and urbanization factors have made it essential for the new generation employees. Technological advancement is seen in increased reliance on and use of internet and telecommunication. As a result, many employees are taking work outside office, which has blurred the boundary between work and family (Cooper, 1998). Environmental changes are evidenced in increasing number of firms in the services sector (NASSCOM Newsline, 2008a), which require employees to work longer, frequently interact with customers and work across varied time zones. As a result, the distinct boundary between work and family has diluted. (Rupashree Baral & Shivganesh Bhargava 2008)
After analyzing the overall scenario it is the need of hour to plan and practice policies and practices that can resolve the work-life conflict of the present generation X and Y. Thought there is dearth of initiatives taken by Indian government and employers in this direction but this is hot topic in the western world and developed countries.

As cited by Rupashree Baral and Shivganesh Bhargava (2008), recently, scholars have made efforts to examine the positive impact of work-family interface referred as work-family enrichment (Greenhaus and Powell, 2006; Carlson et al., 2006), positive spillover (Allis and O’Driscoll, 2008; Hammer et al., 2005), work-family facilitation (Rotondo and Kincaid, 2008; Wayne et al., 2006; Balmforth and Gardner, 2006) or work-family synergy (Beutell and Wittig-Berman, 2008) on individual’s attitude and behaviour. Greenhaus and Powell (2006, p. 6).

The UK labour government has adopted both approaches. Aspects of family-friendly policy, influenced by the EU, can be seen in new legislation to support working parents and carers. This policy agenda is partly driven by demographic trends in the UK population which indicate that by 2010 more women will have joined the labour market, and that 1 in 5 of workers will be mothers. Furthermore, due to an ageing population up to ten million people will have caring responsibilities for elderly relatives by 2010 (Department of Work and Pensions, 2001; cited in Williams and Jones, 2005). The Government has been actively promoting flexible working as a way to increase employment opportunities particularly for people with family responsibilities, thus enhancing their access to the labour market. There is also evidence that employees’ expectations to be able to work flexibly, whether or not their claims are supported by the legislation, are increasing. (Liz Doherty 2006)

Today, women make up 40 percent of the global workforce, and they are becoming an increasingly important part of the world’s formal workforce as they shift from agricultural work to industry and service sector jobs. (International Labor Office. 2008) Family-friendly policies can help the women employees to balance the work and family responsibilities, yield benefits for themselves, for their families, and their employers.
Family-friendly policies can benefit employers also, can help them for retaining highly skilled employees who might otherwise seek more accommodating employers or leave the workforce entirely. Implementing of family-friendly policies can also decrease absenteeism, enhance productivity, and can improve employers’ attraction ability.

The Family-Friendly Workplace Model is best applied to companies that make a significant investment in training employees and/or must comply with national or international employment standards. With greater urbanization and the shift to work in the formal sector, the demand for companies to provide family-friendly benefits is likely to grow. The FFW Model helps businesses to easily analyze the relative costs and rewards of offering family-friendly benefits. Using the model enables businesses to reap the potential cost savings of family-friendly policies and contribute to improved health for employees, their families, and the broader community. (US Aid focus on India; http://ghiqc.usaid.gov)

2.8.1 Family friendly Initiatives for Emotionally Healthy Workplaces

The individuals’ and organization health are interdependent; an understanding of emotions and attitude related to healthy workplace will benefit both employees and employers. The natural outcomes of emotionally healthy workplaces are motivation, commitment, engagement and focus at work.

According to American Psychological Association, “whole workplace health” that leads to an emotionally healthy workplace has at least five key dimensions:

- Employee involvement in decision making and job autonomy.
- Work-Life balance through flexible work scheduling and other means.
- Employee growth and development through continuing education and leadership development.
- Health and safety through physical safety and psychological security.
- Employee recognition through monitory and non-monitory rewards.
When competition and competitive behavior goes to the extreme, it is dysfunctional and destructive. The emotionally healthy workplace is achievement oriented yet emphasizes cooperation over competition. To be healthy, competition must be managed and balanced with cooperation. (James Campbell Quick et al 2009)

As per James Campbell et al, healthy workplaces are those in which individuals flourish and organizations prosper. The mechanism through which this is accomplished are several. Empowerment through participation and self-determination, flexible work schedules and result oriented work environment, continuous learning opportunities etc all are critical to health and flourishing.

It means we can only have emotionally healthy employees i.e. engaged employees if we have emotionally healthy workplace. Since work-life balance is one of the prominent factors for the development of emotionally healthy workplaces therefore for the rise of organizations, adoption of family friendly initiatives is must.

2.8.2 Formal Organizational Initiatives

To frame formal work-life balance initiatives is the need of hour for the organizations and HR professionals. In the Asia Pacific countries particular concerns for families include the impact of people marrying older in life or not at all, rural urban migration and gender inequality in remuneration and career development. These socio demographic changes place pressure on firms to be proactive in addressing issues concerning work-life balance, including the provision of Family Friendly Workplace arrangements (Hall, L. & Liddicoat, L. (2005).

The critical question is whether Work Life Balance (WLB) is for the individuals to receive and maintain or ii is the responsibility of the employer? In the former discourse, research has looked into WLB as a personal choice. In addition, values, worker type, role demand and conflict are some of the elements that domain has emphasized. In the second discourse, research has focused on family friendly policies offered by organizations including flexible work arrangement. (Tara Shankar & Jyotsna Bhatnagar 2010).
As given by Tara Shankar & Bhatnagar the 10 best organizations which Fortune (2009) quote, are the ones, where employees feel “encouraged to balance their work and personal life”. For example the company ‘Mattel’ provide 13 paid holidays, two paid days for volunteer in schools, two onsite child-care centers, five paid days of paternal leave (for new mothers and fathers) adoption assistance, half days on Fridays all year long and on site toy stores that offer discounts to their employees.

As cited by Fang-Tai Tseng (2012), that numerous studies have shown that working–hour reduction is a tough yet beneficial labour policy to both the employees and the employers (Bosch & Lehnorff 2001, Kramar 1993, MacInnes 2005, Perry-Smith & Blum 2000, Thornwaite 2004, Strachan & burgess 1988, Solomon 1994.

Therefore the favored companies are those which have formal friendly initiatives to balance WLB. We can divide these initiatives into two parts viz a) Employees’ benefit policies and b) Work reorganization programs.

In the first category employees are made comfortable and helped to take care their dependents while doing their duty along with uninterrupted career. In Indian legislation the provisions crèche facility, feeding breaks, three months maternity leave and paternity leaves are provided. In many developed counties facilities like on-site child care and/or elder care, child care and/or elder care subsidies and/or referral services, paid family and medical leave, release time work to participate in school and community events; and limits on business travels (frequency and distance) are provided.

In second category provisions like restructuring of jobs and duties, telecommuting arrangements, part-time and job sharing opportunities and Flexible working scheduling programs are included.

In India only few MNCs and prominent ITES companies are providing the facilities of flexible location (telecommuting) and time facilities but these facilities are widely used in the developed counties.
Different types of formal friendly initiatives practiced are dependent care support (of child and aging relatives), On-site child care, Other child care assistance, Flexible work arrangements, Flexi time (i.e. flexible starting and quitting time), Telecommuting (part-time and full-time), Compressed work week, Job sharing, Shift flexibility, Part time work etc. etc. as per a SHRM survey it is found that top five formal friendly initiatives are:

- Dependent care flexible spending account (71% respondents)
- Flexi-time (55% respondents)
- Family leave above required leave of Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) (39% respondents)
- Telecommuting on part time bases (34% respondents)
- Compressed work weeks (31% respondents)

2.8.3 Informal Organizational Initiatives

According to social exchange theory, by offering informal family friendly culture the organizations demonstrate their efforts in favour of the wellbeing of their employees.

As cited by Deepak Chawla & Neena Sondhi (2011), the more ‘Supportive’ organizations shape an implicit psychological contract (Rousseau 1995) between the organization and the individual. This aids and enhances his work/non work conflict and at the same time increases and individual’s sense of commitment.

Informal initiatives / support are the support given by family members, colleagues and supervisors to decrease the load and or stress of work-life interface and which is not part of written rules and regulations.

Linda Duxbury & Chrisopher Higgans, a business professor of University of Western Ontario has researched the role of managers in allowing employees to successfully balance work-life needs. In the report, Supportive Managers: What Are they? Why Do They Matter? It is found “tremendous amount of inequity in organizations today as supervisors act as gatekeepers to many of the benefits offered by the firm…..employees who work for ‘supportive’ supervisors who trust and
respect their employees and who base their decisions on circumstances rather than ‘the book’ report less stress and greater productivity ….in the report they said “Employees with supportive managers are more likely to have high job satisfaction, high organizational commitment and lower level of job stress and life stress. (Stephenie Overman, HRFOCUS/July 1999)

From the above research it is clear that there is need to change the mind set of supervisors, management and other supporters. These initiatives can be provided by helping an employee by adjusting his/her job or short timing to cater any family responsibility, counseling services in the organization or at least listening his/her problem for catharsis.

Julie Holliday Wayne at el (2006), found in their research the relation of enrichment to important work outcomes. Their findings suggest the importance of the individual and informal and emotional support and provide actionable elements to alter to increase enrichment between work and family.

2.8.4 Family Friendly Initiatives and Work-life Enrichment

As cited by Susan Cartwright and Cary L. Cooper in their book ‘Organizational Well-Being’, Work-life Enrichment defined by Greenhaus and Powell (2006), emphasizes that “experience in role improve the quality of life in other role” (p.73). Researches advocate that work-life enrichment and work-life conflict are considered to be independent constructs, as research has found almost no evidence on their correlation (Fone 2003). The writers give two types of Work-life Enrichment i.e. Instrumental and Affective enrichment. Instrumental enrichment refers to skills and abilities acquired in one domain and applied in other. The resources such as perspective, flexibility, psychological and physical social-capital and material resources belong to this category. Affective enrichment refers to positive emotions or affect transmitted to another role. E.g. as an employee leaves work in a positive mood and acts more positively towards his family members at home, which leads to the enhancement of his affect and performance as a spouse and parent (Edwards and Rothbard 2000).
Family-friendly initiatives practiced by the organization and co-workers are an important antecedent of Work-Life Enrichment. That has positive spillover effect on the family life of the employees. As cited by Susan Cartwright and Cary L. Cooper, Glass and Finley (2002), reviewed scholarly articles that examined the effects of family friendly benefits (Flexi-time, parental leaves and child care) from the time period 1988 to 2002, concluding that studies conducted to that point provided support for positive effect on psychological wellbeing which in turn will positively influence the family domain.

We can conclude that the Employee Engagement is new construct, though practiced much but still its definition and relations to other related construct is a matter of discussion. For work-life balance is also a hot topic for the new age employees and employers. Though the relation between employee engagement and family friendly initiatives was discussed by researchers but the above review indicates that not much research work has been done on this topic with reference to corporate enterprises in India.