

# Employee Engagement: A Literature Review

Moammar Jamal Ayyubi<sup>1</sup>, Dr. S.K. Singh<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Junior Research Fellow, School of Studies in Commerce, Jiwaji University, Gwalior. M.P.

<sup>2</sup>Professor and Head of the Department, School of Studies in Commerce, Jiwaji University, Gwalior. M.P

## Abstract

Employees are one of the main resources and part of the organization. They play a crucial role in running to the organization. Good relation between owner and employees is important for achieving the desired goal and better working condition, payment system, relations between employees etc. in also so important for an employee for smoothly helping to operate the business. Employee Engagement is that construct which can do all the above works effectively. For remaining the employees engaged for a long time, it is important for the employer that he recognize their work, appreciate their work when needed, allow them to participate for making any important decision making etc. In this paper, various definitions and thoughts and aspects of Employee Engagement has been explained. This is a review paper and many articles, research papers are included for studying this research paper.

**Keywords:** Employee Engagement, Satisfaction, Dedication, Emotion, Self-Presence Etc.

## 1. Introduction

in this fast-changing corporate world, every organization wants to cover the maximum part of the market and profit shares as well, and this can only be possible for the organization when it has a good no. of that employees who are always ready to contribute their effort to the organization to meet its goal. and the success of an organization depends on satisfaction of the employees who are working in that organization. When a worker is satisfied then, he will have the affection for the organization and for the owner as well. This affection and connection of the employee for the above entities is called engagement.

in other words, engagement may be described that an employee is well connected with the organization. He works with satisfaction and happiness with the colleagues, supervisors etc. an engaged employee is more beneficial and positively effective for the organization. He uses his full potential and effort for the organization and give the quality work and the outcome is the product is manufactured in low prices and in good quality so that company earn more profit. If an employee thinks that organization is giving him more attention and its thinks about employee well-being then, they work with full of their extent, and if it is an adverse situation, then the company not only goes into the loss but it losses those employees also who are one of the most valuable assets in the organization.

## 2. Objective of the study

The aim of the study of this research paper is to explain about the employee engagement. what is employee engagement and what are the various views of this concept Are given by various researchers in this article.

### 3. Methodology

This paper is explanatory in nature. To understand about Employee Engagement, various research papers have been reviewed to study about this topic.

### 4. Employee Engagement in the view of prominent scholars

The word Employee Engagement was not used commonly and popular and was not known by any name but when William Kahn, professor of department of psychology, Boston University, published a paper with the title of "Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work" in the journal of Academy of management journal, this concept of employee engagement got so fame and popularity (Kahn, 1990). And in this way the term employee engagement was come to existence and so, he was the first to propose the concept of personal engagement and thus, he is known as the father of employee engagement.

To know why a person spent a different way for themselves to one's work role, Kahn took help of Goffman. Engagement is seen by the spending the personal energies into their roles like cognitively, physically and emotionally. In this form a person will full of power and enthusiasm means engaged and with low power and enthusiasm means disengaged.

further, Kahn states that "personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional), active, full role performances, and the simultaneous employment and expression of a person's 'preferred self' in task behaviors" are all important. (Kahn, 1989) The following prerequisites had to be met in order to do this: "their work meaningful, reasonably safe, and resourced proportionately" (Kahn, 1990).

In addition, Kahn points out, "the simultaneous employment and expression of a person's 'preferred self' in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional), and active, full role performances." (Kahn, 1990) The following conditions were required for this to happen: "their work meaningful, reasonably safe, and proportionately resourced" (Kahn, 1990). With the help of prior research studies, Shuck and Wollard (2010) conducted a survey on employee engagement. and they find out that there are many different definitions of employee engagement and each definition is related to sole research studies. They finalized that employee engagement in different definition is dynamic and can be confusing. The employee engagement has not the clear meaning by which a concrete definition can not be given. The outcome of the study explains that anticipated organizational consequences can be achieved by employee's sound mental, behavioral and emotional condition. (Shuck & Wollard, 2010) the employee's above three conditions should be in the proper state to make an organization effective and dynamic.

Shuck and Rio (2014) has discussed about employee engagement. He had given the statement about it that the employee engagement depends more on employee's condition (physical, mental and emotional) than employee's characteristics. here, the level of employee engagement totally depends on the consistency and perseverance of the employees in the organization. The more consistency and perseverance, the more employee engagement is there.

In the research with insurance company employees, May et al. (2004) revealed that Kahn's three conceptual elements of employee engagement (work meaningful, resourced proportionately and safety) are crucial. These three elements displayed an important constructive relationship with engagement. The important constructive relationship was found for their work meaningful. Another significant element was psychological safety, which is also positively related to making "resourced proportionately" instead accomplishing it. (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004).

Saks (2006) had conducted a research, and at last he coined the concept of employee engagement as the name of job engagement (which is known as executing the job role) and organization Engagement (executing the Character of a fellow of an organization) he describes that an employee is a person who is the member of an organization working with the responsibility and efficiency by which an organization may be able to achieve its goal.

In 2002, Schaufeli et al. has described the work engagement in a different way. He said that when an employee, full of vigor, dedication and absorption, towards their work and organization execute the work keeping the positive mind set for the work, that is called work engagement (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002).

On the basis of psychological point of view, Sweetman and Luthans (2010) has described engagement is a situation which represents a favorable environmental condition. It is the constant condition which doesn't change frequently and which is not established for only short period of time.

Mahenduru et al. has said that employee engagement is the concept where employees love to do the job what they have said to do and they proud after doing the job. It is the degree of commitment towards the job that a person executes and until however long the individual remains with the organization as the results of their commitment.

In the research paper titled "employee engagement – a review of current research and its implications" published in 2006, John Gobbins has found out six key drivers who influences the employee engagement. the key drivers were- 1) nature of job, 2) trust and integrity, 3) co-workers and team members, 4) pride about companies, 5) relationship between employee performance and company integrity, and 6) career growth opportunities. It is pointed out as sensitive emotional connection because while performing the job, an employee feels connected and influenced towards his or her organization and work full of his/ her extent.

On the organizational level, Barrick and his colleagues developed the concept of employee engagement named "collective organizational engagement" in 2015. It is different from aggregated individual-level engagement and it is defined as "shared perceptions of organizational members" where the members of the organization devote their time, effort, energy. as a whole physically, mentally and emotionally.

Motivating job engagement, human resource management and transformational leadership behavior of the CEOs are the three factors contribute to collective employee engagement. And the attempt of these things are applied by strategic implementation.

While defining engagement, Macey and Schneider (2008) combined behavior and psychological state. The defined engagement as a state specifying high levels of involvement in the job and the organization, positive energy and a sense of self presence in work.

Mark Gatenby et al. (2009), found engagement to be a two-way relationship. For the employer it was about creating a great work environment and for the employee it is a concept that places flexibility, change and continuous improvement at the center of everything. Both of them will have to reciprocate to create an engagement culture.

The publication of the Conference Board of USA (2006) describes employee engagement as an intensified emotional association that an employee feels for his or her organization that influences him or her to utilize greater discretionary effort to his or her work.

Swathi.S (2013): According to the study on effective Employee Engagement factors it was observed that no single factor or specific type of factor will be suiting the person or the industry. The factor keeps on changing on time to time and industry to industry.

## 5. Conclusion:

The engagement in the organization is so much essential and the organization with engaged employees shows many clues and symbols that helped to recognize the engagement. Reduction in turnover in employees, increment in profit, reduction in complain from the employees, etc. many symbols and indications are there which are helpful of a better employee management relation. Help of various author has been taken for describing and understanding employee engagement in the better way. When the owner of the company cares about the employees, cares for their welfares, then employees work with full of their strength and thus, both of the parties uplift the benefits mutually. An engaged employee not only work for himself, but he works in organization thinking his own work. And in this way the whole entity gets a better outcome.

## 6. References:

1. Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human resource development review*, 9(1), 89-110.
2. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1,
3. Sweetman, D., & Luthans, F. (2010). The power of positive psychology: Psychological capital and work engagement. *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*, 54, 68.
5. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92
6. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
7. May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(1), 11-37.
8. Barrick, M. R., Thurgood, G. R., Smith, T. A., & Courtright, S. H. (2015). Collective organizational engagement: Strategic implementation and firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 111–135.
10. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
11. Swathi, S. (2013). Effecting employee engagement factors. *International journal of scientific and research publications*, 3(8), 1-3.