

Predictors of Employee Engagement in Public & Private Insurance Companies

Sugandh Rawal

It has been observed that if a manager totally ignored employees, 40 % of them will be actively disengaged in their jobs. If a manager focuses on employees' weaknesses, 20 % will be disengaged. Only 1 % of workers will be disengaged if the boss focuses on employees' strengths. The Indian insurance industry is in a booming phase. There is greater exposure to employees in terms of monetary and non-monetary benefits. The results of logistic regression signified that team co-ordination, organizational support and working environment are better in public sector insurance companies, whereas the in the private sector only procedural justice is better.

Sugandh Rawal is Assistant Professor, PDM College of Engineering, Bahadurgarh. E-mail:sugandhrawal009@gmail.com

Introduction

According to surveys, Indian employees are found more engaged with 46 percent of fully engaged to global average of 34 percent. However 54% of Indian employees are not satisfied with their jobs and HR professionals are required to take proactive steps. In the developing economies the war for talent is high and loyalty to stay is low. The engagement data indicates that employees may be attracted to work for a company with a strong reputation, but high turnover risks still apply as these same employees may go to a competitor for more pay, better benefits, and career advancement as soon as the opportunity is presented. The evidences of employee disengagement are salaries, work ethics, manager self-efficacy and rules and procedures followed in organizations. If a manager totally ignored employees, 40 % of them will be actively disengaged in their jobs. If a manager focuses on employees' weaknesses, 20 % will be disengaged. Only 1 % of workers will be disengaged

Positive mentoring helps in increasing the productivity.

if the boss focuses on employees' strengths. It means positive mentoring helps in increasing the productivity (Sange & Srivasatava, 2012). It's not only the work culture that brings the engagement but irresistible organizations are needed. The irresistible organizations are characterized by five elements i.e. meaningful work, great management, growth opportunities, flexible environment, and inspirational leadership.

In this age of information and uncertainty, more and more people have started recognizing the importance of insurance. The insurance industry has witnessed many spectacular changes in terms of advancement in technology, strengthening of the existing customer base and acquiring new customers. The Indian insurance industry is in a booming phase. In the post-liberalization phase, due to the opening up of industry for private players, there is greater exposure to employees in terms of monetary and non-monetary benefits which engage them in the organization. The foremost challenge before the insurance companies is the attraction and retention of customers as well as engaging employees to its various policies. This has forced the companies to rethink on their customer service strategy by adopting an employee-centric approach. From the service profit chain perspective, employee engagement is recognized to be an important determinant of customer retention and ultimately the success of service organization. In addition, for capturing customer feedback in the insurance industry, organizations should also be proactive in gathering employee feedback.

By increasing employees' engagement levels, organizations can expect an increase in performance of up to 20 percentile points and 87% reduction in employees' probability of departure.

The employee engagement is important for the performance improvement. Gallup research shows that well-managed workgroups are more profitable (44 percent higher), more productive (50 percent higher) and have higher degrees of customer loyalty (50 percent higher). While Corporate Leadership Council (2004) states that by increasing employees' engagement levels, organizations can expect an increase in performance of up to 20 percentile points and 87% reduction in employees' probability of departure. The highly engaged employees outperform the average ones by two deciles and are dramatically less likely to leave the organization.

Employee Engagement Predictors

Employee engagement is an emotional bond between the employer and the employee, along with the common financial incentives like increments, bonuses and other prerequisites. A conducive atmosphere in the organization also raises the employee to the level of an engaged employee. Engaged workers are considered important as they deliver better performance. The engagement is a psychological and behavioral outcome that leads to better employee performance. The six categories of work experience that must be considered by the employers are work

people do, people they work with, opportunities, total rewards, company practices and general quality of life. These drivers were found helpful in understanding the needs of their employees and focus on the specific areas of improvement to improve the business results (Aon Hewitt, 2013). The engaged employees are fully equipped with joy, enthusiasm and zeal. Because they have quick accessibility to resources, healthy environment and positive energies surround them.

Previous studies have proved that engagement is directly related to the performance. The individual attitude and behavior is shaped by the policies, procedures, perception of justice and others. The fairness and favorable elements like polices have positive bearing on employee engagement. The procedural justice explains better organization behavior because justice beliefs are better at representing the view of the organization values (Moorman et al., 1993). Other drivers like working environment have a direct effect on the employees' wellbeing. Physical demands and work conditions lead workers to perform tasks and are likely to be associated with the engagement. Rewards, interpersonal relations, security and accessibility increase the engagement level (Kahn, 1990). Karyn Greengrove (2008) also includes building a positive environment and trust. Trust helps in building collaborative work environment and resonating leadership style results in employee engagement. Recruitment strategies such as flexible work environment, career development, recognition, workplace autonomy, adequate resources, and work life balance are keys

for engagement drivers. Interpersonal relations help the employees in development of new skills. Supportive environment and healthy relations help in increasing the learning ability of an individual. They play a crucial role in developing a work culture suited to meet the individual's objectives. While Greenberg Margaret & Arakawa Dana (2006) reported that the team influences an employee performance and interpersonal relations indicate higher project performance and increased engagement level. Engagement level has been measured in terms of job engagement and organizational engagement. Job engagement and organizational engagement increase due to support from the organization. Job characteristics like challenging work, variety in job and autonomy build job engagement. And organizational engagement increases due to the higher procedural justice i.e. perception of fairness at work (Saks, 2006). Shuck et al. (2011) suggested that when employees perceived their managers as supportive, they felt as if they contributed to their place of work, and experienced an appropriate level of challenge in their work; they were more likely to engage.

Job characteristics like challenging work, variety in job and autonomy build job engagement.

Brunetto Yvonne et al. (2011) compared the relationship among private and public sector nurses using a survey in 2008. The supervisor-subordinate relations accounted for a high degree of variance in relation to satisfaction with the

teamwork. The other factors that could explain the differences between public and private sector nurses' behavior were the individual nurse' workload, the particular management structure, the composition and size of teams, and even perceptions of job autonomy. Innovation and creativity breeds in a supportive and healthy environment. Recognition, motivation and encouragement received from the managers influence the performance in right direction. Ologbo C. Andrew & Saudah Sofian (2012) revealed that employees who have perceived support from the co employees are more likely to reciprocate with greater level job engagement and organization engagement. Employees who are provided with adequate development (training, skills and learning) are more likely to be more engaged in their job role and organization roles; and would repay with greater organization engagement. The employees who perceived higher value congruence, organizational support, and core self-evaluations reported an increased level of engagement (Rich et al., 2010).

Cho Julia et al. (2006) found that support, availability of resources and power in organizations were the most significant to increase the engagement level. However, other predictors of empowerment like the opportunity and information availability were also significant. Working conditions like safety, noise and lightning have important roles in building an engagement level. An engaged employee is highly satisfied with one's job and free from strains and burnout. Xanthopoulou et al. (2007) indicated that self-efficacy, organization-based self-esteem, and op-

timism make a unique contribution to explain variance in work engagement over time, over and above the impact of job resources and previous levels of engagement. Bakker (2009) considered job resources and personal characteristics as antecedents for work engagement in his study. The findings state that job resources such as social support from colleagues and supervisors, performance feedback, skill variety, autonomy, and learning opportunities are positively associated with work engagement.

Joshi & Sodhi (2011) emphasized on work life balance, job content, monetary benefits and team orientation for both executives and non-executives (supervisor and workers). While 'scope for advancement' and 'top-management employee relations' were the additional key drivers of engagement for executives, three other key drivers of engagement for non-executives were 'union/association management relations', 'recognition & rewards' and 'welfare facilities'. Psilou (2011) proposed the incentives as a tool for involvement and achievement of employees. Companies need to link performance evaluation criteria to sustainability targets, so that the employee reward system can be aligned to the sustainability strategy. Sarkar (2011) identified the intrinsic motivation and training & development as important factors that are affecting the employee engagement in manufacturing industries to a higher degree. The factors that were having a significant impact apart from the above factors were top management, manager/supervisor, coworkers, pay, benefits, HR policies, re-

sources, career opportunities, recognition and physical work environment. The main reasons for companies in Finland to use profit-sharing/personnel funds are that the companies want to enhance commitment, knowledge about company activities and employee motivation (Vartiainen & Sweins, 2002).

The learning opportunity with higher compensation increases leadership capacity and widens the scope for career development.

Maslach (2011) considered workload, control, rewards, community, fairness and value as predictors of burn-out and engagement. Albrecht Simon & Andreetta Manuela (2011) feelings of empowerment will lead employees to be motivated and engaged and also to feelings of connection and belongingness to their organization. Sange & Srivasatava (2012) proposed challenging learning assignments that broaden knowledge and develop skills that contribute to an upturn in the business. It can be ensured through presence of mentoring relationship within an organization. The learning opportunity with higher compensation increases leadership capacity and widens the scope for career development. The varying organizations in terms of culture and policies have differentiated the employee's perception to be engaged and committed to one's organization. The lucrative compensation benefits and facilities attract them most. There is a need to study all those factors that affect employee engagement in public and private sector companies.

Sample

This study was carried out in the insurance industry considering public and private sector companies in Delhi-NCR region, (especially Delhi, Gurgaon and Faridabad) three each of the respective sector. The purposive sampling technique was used to select the respondents and employees on companies' payroll were taken as a criterion for selection. The employees on payroll as the subject is case sensitive and deals with engagement which could be better studied with permanent employees. A total of 400 respondents were studied 200 each of public and private sector companies after discarding the questionnaire unfit for analysis.

Questionnaire

The reliability of the questionnaire on predictors of employee engagement scale was $\alpha = 0.938$. The concerned literature was studied and different employee engagement practices were extracted. A total of 40 practices affecting employee engagement in the form of statements was designed under 9 heads (fig 1). The respondents were asked to choose the appropriate category in the five point Likert scale from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. The responses were then clubbed through mean score and analyzed.

Analysis

The predictors of employee engagement in public and private sector companies were extracted using logistic regression analysis in SPSS version 16.0. The

Fig. 1 Predictors of Employee Engagement

Authority in decision making Freedom in job Availability of resources No interference Opportunity to present views	Working Environment
Friendly environment Innovative ideas Mutual trust Enjoyment within team	Team Coordination
Simple and easy Fair and transparent Moral and ethical procedures Performance noticeably	Procedural Justice
Challenges in job Ability to perform Scheduled job New learnings in job Means a lot	Job Characteristics
Queries effectively answered Support for healthy discussion Addressing issues of performance Healthy relations Suggestions equally acceptable	Supervisor Support
Support to acquire higher qualification Cares for individual needs Encouraged to express feelings Overall growth.	Organizational support
Private health care benefits Pension and similar benefits Recreational facilities Cash bonus/stock rewards	Incentives
Lifetime job security Equal consideration Benefits according to rewards Benefits according to performance	Motivation
Opportunity for business tours Learning from business tours Training opportunities	Enhancement and Learning

40 statements were clubbed on the basis of mean value. The clubbed predictors shown in Table I were entered in the logistic regression model to predict the group membership.

This study uses the dichotomous (categorical) variable as public sector and private sector insurance companies. The public sector and private sector insurance companies have been taken as

Table I Predictors of Employee Engagement

Measures	Insurance Companies	Mean	Std. Deviation
Authority in decision making	Public sector	4.175	0.86
	Private sector	4.22	0.95
Availability of resources	Public sector	4.095	0.92
	Private sector	4.3	0.86
Freedom in job	Public sector	4.065	1.07
	Private sector	4.02	0.58
No interference	Public sector	4.13	0.90
	Private sector	4.12	0.89
Opportunity to present views	Public sector	4.18	0.74
	Private sector	4.24	0.89
Working environment	Public sector	4.129	0.66
	Private sector	4.18	0.57
Friendly environment	Public sector	4.3	0.66
	Private sector	4.08	1.00
Innovative ideas	Public sector	4.305	0.67
	Private sector	4.16	0.97
Mutual trust	Public sector	4.295	0.78
	Private sector	4.96	5.81
Enjoyment within team	Public sector	4.37	0.54
	Private sector	4.2	0.78
Timely information	Public sector	4.27	0.56
	Private sector	4.22	0.58
Team coordination	Public sector	4.308	0.43
	Private sector	4.324	1.39
Simple & easy	Public sector	4.095	0.94
	Private sector	4.2	0.8
Fair & transparent	Public sector	4.09	0.84
	Private sector	4	0.75
Moral & ethical procedures	Public sector	4.205	0.83
	Private sector	4.1	0.7
Performance noticeably	Public sector	4.195	0.65
	Private sector	4.04	0.75
Procedural justice	Public sector	4.14625	0.63
	Private sector	4.085	0.55
Challenges in job	Public sector	4.3	0.74
	Private sector	4.34	0.84
Ability to perform	Public sector	4.305	0.82
	Private sector	4.04	0.98
Scheduled jobs	Public sector	4.17	0.64
	Private sector	4.16	0.68
New learning in job	Public sector	4.4	0.65
	Private sector	4.2	0.75

Means a lot	Public sector	4.26	0.80
	Private sector	4.1	0.50
Job characteristics	Public sector	4.287	0.50
	Private sector	4.168	0.53
Effectively answered	Public sector	4.115	0.94
	Private sector	4.3	0.81
Support for healthy discussion	Public sector	4.24	0.86
	Private sector	4.12	0.68
Addressing issues of performance	Public sector	3.835	1.03
	Private sector	3.64	1.18
Healthy relations	Public sector	4.33	0.74
	Private sector	3.84	0.61
Suggestions equally acceptable	Public sector	4.105	0.80
	Private sector	4	0.69
Supervisor support	Public sector	4.125	0.58
	Private sector	3.98	0.47
To acquire higher qualification	Public sector	3.985	0.85
	Private sector	4.9	7.08
Cares for individual needs	Public sector	3.925	1.04
	Private sector	3.66	0.79
Encouraged to express feelings	Public sector	4.18	0.79
	Private sector	4	0.87
Overall growth	Public sector	4.215	0.74
	Private sector	4.14	0.72
Organizational support	Public sector	4.07625	0.63
	Private sector	4.175	1.83
Private health care benefits	Public sector	4.045	0.94
	Private sector	3.92	0.72
Pension and similar benefits	Public sector	4.325	0.72
	Private sector	3.7	0.83
Recreational facilities	Public sector	3.795	0.96
	Private sector	4.08	0.82
Cash bonus/ stock option rewards	Public sector	3.945	1.12
	Private sector	4.18	0.77
Incentives	Public sector	4.0275	0.61
	Private sector	3.97	0.51
Lifetime job security	Public sector	3.995	0.84
	Private sector	3.64	0.94
Equal consideration	Public sector	4.01	0.95
	Private sector	3.96	0.72
Enough motivation to develop	Public sector	4.34	0.59
	Private sector	3.96	0.66
Rewards according to performance	Public sector	3.98	0.98
	Private sector	4.18	0.79

Rewards according to seniority	Public sector	4	0.83
	Private sector	4.24	0.62
Motivation	Public sector	4.065	0.52
	Private sector	3.996	0.45
Opportunity for business tours	Public sector	3.825	1.12
	Private sector	3.52	0.95
Learning from tours	Public sector	3.82	1.06
	Private sector	3.68	0.93
Training opportunity	Public sector	4.26	0.72
	Private sector	4.3	0.67
Enhancement & learning	Public sector	3.96833	0.77
	Private sector	3.83333	0.59

the dependent variable. All the nine predictors such as working environment, team coordination, procedural justice, job characteristics, supervisor support, organizational supports, incentives, motivation; enhancement & learning have been entered as independent variables.

Results

Accuracy rate of the model is checked to apply the logistic regression. Then the contribution of each predictor in the logistic regression has been checked. An improvement of accuracy rate from 50% to 98.2% (null model without predictors to model with predictors) is a good signal to continue the logistic regression. It signifies the highest degree of reliable and accurate results. Each predictor has been checked for its significant contribution and all predictors have been found significant at 1% level in predicting the group membership between public and private sectors.

Different measures of model fitness in logistic regression have been shown in Table 2. First is Omnibus test which uses chi square value to tell the fitness

of the model. It is based on the assumption that the model that has been fitted is accurate. The omnibus test model coefficient gives a chi square value of 484.479, $df=9$, $p < 0.05$. It means the model is a poor fit and includes only constant, hence predictors are significantly different in public and private sector companies. The -2 log likelihood statistics is 70.038 which measures how poorly model predict the predictors, here it is small, smaller it is, better it is. The addition of category of insurance company reduced -2 log likelihood by chi square value of 484.479 (554.517-70.038) and again proves to be better as it is falling.

The other measure Cox & Snell R Square needs to be below 1, it is 0.702 which is a good indicator. Nagelkerke R Square measures the variance anticipated by the predictors in determining the dependent variable. It is 0.936 means 93.6% of variance in the dependent variable is predicted by the independent variable. The association of predictors of employee engagement explained for the two categories, i.e. public and private in-

insurance companies is 93.6%. Indeed a good signal to the researcher that a good number of predictors of employee engagement have been taken for the analysis and can be used to find the association. All the model fitness tests favor the researcher to use the logistic regression.

Table 2 Logistic Model Fitness Test

Model Fitness Tests	Value	df	Sig.
Omnibus Tests	484.479	9	.000*
-2 Log likelihood (step 0)	70.038		
(step 1)	29.671		
Cox & Snell R Square	0.702		
Nagelkerke R Square	0.936		

H_0 : The model is a good fitting model.

H_1 : The model is not a good fitting model means predictors have some significant effect.

* $p < 0.05$

Step0 = null model without predictors affecting employee engagement

Step 1= model with predictors affecting employee engagement

Table 3 Predictors Affecting Employee Engagement in the Public & Private Sector Insurance Companies

Predictors Affecting Employee Engagement	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Working Environment	1.778	0.795	4.997	1	0.025*	5.915
Team coordination	3.329	1.128	8.704	1	0.003*	27.911
Procedural justice	-2.855	1.033	7.631	1	0.006*	0.058
Job characteristics	0.503	0.973	0.267	1	0.606	1.653
Supervisor support	1.173	1.055	1.235	1	0.267	3.231
Organizational support	3.489	1.292	7.287	1	0.007*	32.744
Incentives	-0.13	0.942	0.019	1	0.89	0.878
Motivation	1.552	1.191	1.698	1	0.193	4.721
Enhancement & learning	0.957	0.694	1.897	1	0.168	2.603
Constant	-36.402	5.86	38.586	1	0	0

B= coefficient

S.E= Standard error

Exp (B) = exponent of coefficient

* $p < 0.05$

The predictors of engagement have been shown in Table 3. The coefficients have been defined from the public sector point of view. The important predictors have been drawn out using Wald statistics and Exp (B).

The most important predictor is organizational support with a coefficient of (B= 3.489) and Wald Statistics of 7.287 at $p= 0.007$. The public sector has been favored for organizational support with respect to the private sector, which is approximately 32.744 times better. The employees are supported to acquire higher qualifications for their development. In short the employee's needs are taken care of with the organizational objectives in public sector companies.

Employee's needs are taken care of with the organizational objectives in public sector companies.

The second predictor is team coordination with Wald Statistics 8.704, favoring the public sector with Exp (B) = 27.911. It means that public sector respondents enjoy in their team, which is approximately 27 times more as compared to private sector respondents. The public sector scored high on account of mean value for the mutual trust, sharing of innovative ideas, and exchange of information within the team.

The third most important and significant predictor is working environment. The Exp (B) signify that public sector companies have 5.915 times better environment as compared to private sector

companies. It signifies the availability of resources, high level of freedom to work in the public sector insurance companies. It can be inferred that the availability of resources, freedom to express views and no interference in the work increases the employee engagement level of public sector employees.

The important and significant predictor favors private sector companies for procedural justice. The Wald Statistics of procedural justice is 7.631 with Exp (B) = 0.058. It signifies that the private sector employees are engaged due to 'transparent and ethical' procedures followed in the workplace. Also, it is only 0.058 times better in private sector companies as compared to public sector companies.

The remaining five predictors show insignificant differences in public and private sector insurance companies. Irrespective of the insignificant result, the motivation is 4.721 times better in the public sector and supervisor support is 3.231 times better in the public sector.

Another important predictor is enhancement & learning which is 2.603 times better in the public sector. The public and private sectors do not significantly differ in terms of enhancement & learning as per this study. It means the opportunity to learn from the tours and training practices prevail in both the sector in the same extent.

The job characteristics which is only 1.653 times better in the public sector. The better 'learning and development opportunities', 'healthy environment' in

the public sector induced the employees to work with more zeal and enthusiasm. The 'new learning' and 'scheduled job' prosper better in the public sector. Likewise, the degree to which employees perceive their work as meaningful also persuades them to be more engaged and committed.

The last important predictor, incentives, favors the private sector, which is only 0.878 times better. The non-financial incentives like social security benefits, recreational facilities, and rewards are always found high in private sector companies. Because of intense competition, high sales targets persuade the employers to satisfy their employees with some incentives.

The coefficients have been used to present logistic regression equation which is as follows:

Public sector = 1.778 (working environment) + 3.329 (team coordination) - 2.855 (procedural justice) + 0.503 (job characteristics) + 1.173 (supervisor support) + 3.489 (organizational support) - 0.130 (incentives) + 1.552 (motivation) + 0.957 (enhancement & learning) - 36.402

Private sector = - 1.778 (working environment) - 3.329 (team coordination) + 2.855 (procedural justice) - 0.503 (job characteristics) - 1.173 (supervisor support) - 3.489 (organizational support) + 0.130 (incentives) - 1.552 (motivation) - 0.957 (enhancement & learning) + 36.402

The positive sign of coefficient in the above equation shows the association to

the same sector, while the negative sign shows the association to the other sector.

Predictors of employee engagement are more supportive in the public sector as compared to private sector.

In short, three predictors mentioning team coordination, organizational support and working environment have been found better in public sector insurance companies, whereas the in the private sector insurance companies only procedural justice has been found better. The remaining five predictors specifying job characteristics, supervisor support, incentives, motivation and enhancement & learning are insignificant in the public and private sector companies. The smallest value of Wald statistics is responsible for the insignificant difference in the public and private sector insurance companies. It may be concluded that predictors of employee engagement are more supportive in the public sector as compared to private sector in this study.

Discussion

The engagement leads to less absenteeism, higher intention to stay, more willingness to work, extra effort to put on and more productive and healthier staff. It is directly linked to the profitability of an organization in terms of increased customer retention and higher sales volume, low cost on the absenteeism and high productivity. Engaged employees have positive behaviors, attitudes and in-

tentions derived from a high level of mutual relationship with their co employees and employer. There are set of workplace features that in combination are crucial to fostering high engagement. The combination of various predictors is helpful in enhancing the engagement level. The managers should consider some of the issues like feeling of being valued (connect), challenging task, clear, vision, giving feedback, recognition, considering their needs, creating the confidence (Sejits & Crim, 2006). The leader's behavior has been found the most influencing determinant of employee outcomes. The empowering leadership is likely to have a stronger impact on psychological empowerment which is connected to intrinsic motivation and creative process engagement (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Being respected is considered beyond rewards and recognition at some point of time in professional life.

The predictors of employee engagement have been found better in the public sector in this study. The predictors such as working environment, team coordination and support from organization favored the public sector companies. The private sector companies are suggested to have more attention on these three predictors. The healthy relations within the organization and accessibility to resources would certainly add to employee engagement and organizational commitment level. The private sector companies are also required to think over the job characteristics, supervisor support, motivation and enhancement & learning opportunities. It has been observed that the healthy relations, equality, better promotional opportunities, rec-

reation facilities would certainly help in involving the employee in his work. Results from this study are consistent with research by Kahn (1990) who suggested that when employees perceived their work as meaningful, they were more likely to be engaged and less likely to leave their place of employment.

When employees perceived their work as meaningful, they were more likely to be engaged and less likely to leave their place of employment.

The transparency in the procedures and better rewards and incentives in the private sector have increased the employee engagement level and hence can be used as a better management tool in the public sector companies. The rewards and incentives have also been important in the study of Joshi & Sodhi (2011).

Scope for Further Research

The study has considered the limited variables, other unobserved exogenous variables can be considered. Others like socio cultural predictors, biographic predictors etc can also be studied. The insurance companies are very large in number, a comparison of life and general insurance companies can be considered for further study. Also single sector could have been considered to extract the drivers of engagement. Some measures of engagement must be designed and extent of relationship between predictors and engagement must

be checked for reliable and appropriate suggestions.

References

- Albrecht, Simon L. & Andretta, Manuela (2011), "The Influence of Empowering Leadership, Empowerment and Engagement on Affective Commitment and Turnover Intentions in Community Health Service Workers: Test of a Model", *Leadership in Health Services*, 24(3): 228-37.
- Aon, Hewitt (2013), "Trends in Global Employee Engagement", retrieved from <http://www.aon.com/attachments/human-capital consulting/2013 Trends in Global Employee Engagement Highlights.pdf>
- Brunetto, Y. R., Farr-Wharton & K H Shacklock (2011), "Using the Harvard HRM Model to Conceptualize the Impact of Changes to Supervision Upon HRM Outcomes for Different Types of Public Sector Employees", *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 22(3): 553-73.
- Cho Julia, Laschinger & Wong Carol (2006), "Workplace Empowerment, Work Engagement and Organizational Commitment of New Graduate Nurses", *Nursing Leadership*, 19 (3)
- Corporate Executive Board (2004), "Driving Performance and Retention through Employee Engagement, Corporate Leadership Council", Retrieved from <http://www.mckpeople.com.au/SiteMedia/w3svc161/Uploads/Documents/760af459-93b3-43c7-b52a-2a74e984c1a0.pdf>
- Greenberg, Margaret H. & Arakawa Dana (2006), "Optimistic Managers & Their Influence on Productivity & Employee Engagement in a Technology Organization", *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 2 (1)
- Joshi, Rama J. & Sodhi, J.S. (2011), "Drivers of Employee Engagement in Indian Organizations", *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 47(1).
- Kahn, W.A. (1990), "Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work", *Academy of Management Journal*, 33: 692-724.
- Karyn, Greengrove (2008), "Creating Sustainable Employee Engagement Strategies", *Canadian Theses*, Royal Roads University.
- Maslach, Christina (2011), "Burnout and Engagement in the Workplace: New Perspectives", *The European Health Psychologist* available at http://www.business-standard.com/article/finance/insurance-density-falls-for-first-time-in-india-report-112122200105_1.html
- Moorman, Robert, H., Niehoff, Brain, P. & Organ, Dennis W. (1993), "Treating Employee Fairly and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Sorting the Effects of Job Satisfaction, Organization Commitment and Procedural Justice", *Plenum Publishing Corporation*, retrieved from <http://cobacourses.creighton.edu/rmoorman/pdf/Treating%20Employees%20Fairly.pdf>, 24 July 2011
- Ologbo C. Andrew & Saudah, Sofian (2012), "Individual Factors and Work Outcomes of Employee Engagement", Original Research Article Procedia, *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40: 498-508.
- Psilou, Elissavet Angeliki (2011). Incentives for Effective Employee Engagement in Corporate Sustainability, Master dissertation, Harvard University. Retrieved from http://static.squarespace.com/static/4ffc3ba1e4b036a61fbde6ff/50db1c81e4b034c91168dfaf/50db1c87e4b034c91168e9b5/1308082339074/Psilou_Thesis%201.pdf
- Rich B. L., Crawford, E. R. & Lepine, J. A. (2010), "Job Engagement: Antecedents and Effects on Job Performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3): 617-35.
- Saks, A. M. (2006), "Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7): 600-19.

- Sange, Rabiya & Srivasatava, R.K., (2012), "Employee Engagement and Mentoring: An Empirical Study of Sales Professionals", *Synergy*, 10(1):
- Sarkar, Shulgana (2011), "A Study on Employee Engagement at Manufacturing Industries", *Global Management Review*, 5(3).
- Sejts Gerard & Crim Dan (2006), "What Engages Employees The Most or, The Ten C's of Employee Engagement"? *Ivey Business Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.boardoptions.com/employeeengagement.pdf>
- Shuck, B., Reio, T.G. Jr & Rocco, T.S. (2011), "Employee Engagement: an Examination of Antecedent and Outcome Variables", *Human Resource Development International*, 14(4): 427 – 45.
- Sulekha Nair (2014), "Surprising? 46 percent Indians Happy with Their Jobs and Bosses", retrieved from <http://firstbiz.firstpost.com/corporate/46-percent-indian-employees-happy-jobs-bosses-109000.html>
- The Gallup Organization (2004), [online] Available at: www.gallup.com Accessed on 28th September, 2011.
- Vartiainen, M. & Sweins, C. (2002), "Employee Ownership Funds in Finland – Functionality and Personnel Outcomes", *Finnish Administrative Studies*, 21(3): 221– 45.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A.B., Dollard, M.F., Demerouti, E., Schaufeli, W.B., Taris, T.W. & Schreurs, P.J.G., (2007), "When Do Job Demands Particularly Predict Burnout? The Moderating Role of Job Resources", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22: 766-86.
- Zhang, Xiaomeng & Bartol, Kathryn M. (2010), "Linking Empowering Leadership and Employee Creativity: the Influence of Psychological Empowerment, Intrinsic Motivation, and Creative Process Engagement", *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(1): 107-28.