

DRIVERS OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT - A CHRONOLOGICAL LITERATURE REVIEW EXCLUDING INDIA

Sasmita Choudhury*, Manoj Kumar Mohanty**

* *Manager-RBSK (NRHM) RGH, Rourkela, Odisha, India. Email: sasmita9090@gmail.com*

***Larsen & Toubro Limited, India. Email: manojacademics@gmail.com*

Abstract: *In the era of rapidly changing globalization and diminishing value of geographical, political, and social boundaries, people are considered the only performing asset. Organizations have shifted from human resource model of operating to human resource management model, which takes care of each attribute of human value in terms of business performance. Generating and retaining engaged employees has become a top job for the human resource department and top management. Organizations have understood the requirement of talent, passion, and commitment in today's business scenario. So, tracing the drivers of employee engagement is now a mandatory task. We are trying to explore the drivers of engagement through published literature and works throughout the world (excluding India). The span of the study is from 1990 to 2017. The countries covered under this study are USA, UK, Germany, Netherlands, UAE, Australia, Malaysia, Ghana, Korea, Canada, New Zealand, Scotland, Shanghai, and South Africa.*

Keywords: *Employee Engagement, Engagement Drivers, Literature Review, Chronological Order, Countries Other than India*

INTRODUCTION

Employee engagement (EE) has become the focus area of management in recent years. The importance of employee engagement in the workplace has increased its use and popularity. The Gallup Organization is focusing on employee engagement and how to improve the levels of engagement. This is because corporate performances have demonstrated existence of a strong linkage between some conceptualizations of engagement, worker performance and business outcomes (The Gallup Organization, 2004). Recently employee engagement has become a concerned subject for business houses, consulting firms and research institutions. But the antecedents and consequences are yet to be discovered in its full length. Employee engagement not only can be defined but also can be measured in various ways in different fields. It is truly global, as it seemingly combines job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment and intention to stay which ultimately results in high productive workplace and organization. Engagement attributes may differ from organization to organization. Depends on business profile engagement attributes may vary. But considering the human affair the majority of feelings/engagement drives more or less same. Top management must review the drivers in due courses and formulate suitable strategies to retail or increase the engagement

This study is making an attempt to explore the dimensions which are directly or indirectly impacting the engagement level and subsequent positive organizational outcomes through published research works. The span of the study is from 1990 to 2017. The countries covered under this study are USA, UK, Germany, Netherlands, UAE, Australia, Malaysia, Ghana, Korea, Canada, New Zealand, Scotland, Shanghai, and South Africa.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Kahn (1990) has been credited with developing the concept of employee engagement. Drawing from the earlier work of Goffman (1961), Kahn developed the idea of employee engagement. He suggested that people's attachment and detachment from their roles varied. When an individual's behavior shows lack of separation between that person and his or her role, it indicates role embracement, and when an individual's behavior reveals a resistance to a disdained role, it indicates role distance. On the basis of this distinction, Kahn has focused specifically on how people occupy their roles at work in varying degrees or how much people are psychologically present during particular moments of role performances at work. Kahn sets these varying degrees of psychological conditions of 'overlap' between the self and the role at work on a continuum from personal engagement

on one end to personal disengagement on the other. Kahn defines personal engagement as the 'harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles. According to Kahn, when they are engaged, people employ and express themselves psychically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances. He defined disengagement as uncoupling of selves from work roles where people withdraw and defend themselves psychically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances. In his qualitative mapping of the general conditions of experience that influence degrees of personal engagement, Khan (1990) finds that there are three psychological conditions associated with engagement or disengagement: (1) Meaningfulness (2) Safety and (3) Availability. Consequently, workers were more engaged when they were in situations that offered them psychological meaningfulness and psychological safety and when they were more psychologically available. Further he suggested that due to these three factors employees got fully engaged and gave their best of the ability to the organization and productivity.

Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002) conducted meta-analysis of 7,939 business units in 36 companies and identified significant relationships between employee engagement and improved customer satisfaction, productivity, profits, decreased turnover and accidents. They clearly established link between engaged employee and productivity. This research explored that the drivers of the employee engagement are employee well-being and positive workplace. They strongly believed that employees spend most of their time in workplace and a positive and vibrant workplace provides satisfaction and puts positive energy to employees. This motivates them to put the best of their efforts for higher productivity, improved product quality and high inner satisfaction.

Harter, Schmidt, and Killham (2003) conducted a survey on employee engagement, job satisfaction and business level performance with the help of The Gallup Organization. They observed that the quality of an organization's human resource was perhaps the leading indicator of its growth and sustainability. The attainment of a workplace with high-caliber employees started with the selection of the right people for the right jobs. After employees had been selected, they made decisions and take actions every day that impact the success of their organizations. Many of these decisions and actions were influenced by their own internal motivations and drives. One could also hypothesize that the way employees were treated and the way they treat one another can positively affect their actions or can place their organizations at risk. They observed that the employee engagement drivers in the organization were clarity in expectations of management towards the employees,

input of basic needs for performing task in the form of materials and equipment, opportunity for each employee to perform the best, recognition of good work, caring culture, encouragement for self-development, respect to the opinions of the employee, clarity in organizational mission, committed to maintain quality, creating best friends at work, feedback on progress and opportunity to learn and grow concept.

Loehr (2005) found through his research that through engagement not only employer gets benefit but also individuals get benefit. Individual engagement benefits include enthusiasm, greater value to the employer, improved physical health, and happiness. These individual benefits lead to higher productivity, employee retention and increase of bottom line of the organization. He believes that full engagement begins with personal commitment to invest your best energy every day. It is difficult to engage others if not ourselves engaged.

Saks (2006) conducted a survey on 102 employees working in different organizations and jobs. The average age of the employees was 34 years and 60 per cent of them were female. The participants had an average work experience of twelve years, out of which they must have worked for five years in their organization and an average of four years in their current job. The study focuses on organizational and job engagement. Also this study emphasized on the antecedents and consequences of engagement. The findings of the study show that there is a meaningful difference between job engagement and organization engagements. The support at workplace perceived by the employees is having impact on both organizational and job engagement and the organizational justice system influence organizational engagement. Further he advocated that job and organization engagement determines job satisfaction, organizational commitment, rate of retention, and organizational behavior. This study uniquely makes a distinction between job and organization engagement and predicts the antecedents and consequences of job and organization engagement. 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 and low intention to quit. Engaged employees are also more likely to have a high-quality relationship with their employer leading them to have more positive attitude, intention, and behavior as well as increased productivity.

Higgs (2007) advocates that there is a growing recognition in the business world that it are the people who provide a sustainable basis for a company's competitive advantage and productivity. Corporate world is serious about how employees' expectations can best be managed and how the latest thinking on employee motivation can be tied to an

applicable human resources strategy. Through his research he explored that attractive financial rewards (in relation to competitor's organizations, rather than in an absolute sense), good benefits compared to competitor organizations, flexible benefits packages were important for engagement. A strong sense of shared ownership of purpose is also very vital for engagement. In commercial organizations this tends to entail share options. However, in both public and private sector it entailed involvement in decisions and clear shared vision relating to the purpose of the organization (www.researchgate.net). A high level focus is on investment for the development of all employees. A strong positive climate and organizational culture also contribute to the level of engagement. In relation to this, the importance of the role of an employee's immediate line manager is seen to be very important.

Cawe (2006) carried out research on employee engagement in South Africa. In attempt to assist businesses in this regard studies of factors that promote employee engagement have been investigated. The research was qualitative as well as quantitative in nature. A number of respondents from across the length and breadth of South Africa participated in the study. The findings identified employee engagement strategy, the culture of engagement, leadership and management, talent mind-set, communication and knowledge sharing, organizations reputation and branding as prominent factors for business in South Africa.

Stairs, Galpin, Page, and Linley (2006) argue that traditional method of motivating and engaging employees relied heavily on financial reward. Employees tolerated poor management, long working hours, even poor working conditions, provided their basic 'physiological, safety and belonging needs', in Maslow's terms, were satisfied and money was key to achieving this. But with changing time financial and material rewards lose their ability to satisfy above a certain, identifiable level, and organizations need to develop and adopt broader strategies to harness the intellectual and emotional resources within their workforce and satisfy the increasing demands employees are making in their desire for personal fulfillment and meaning. This research indicates some of the important *drivers* of employee engagement which are Organizational affiliation, Autonomy and influence, Work-work and work-life balance, Opportunities for growth, Role factors, Reward culture, Quality of relationships, Quality of supervision, and Work culture. This research also suggests that by delivering an improved employment experience to employees, organizations, and HR departments specifically have a critical role to play in getting the best from staff, which is a key driver of performance in today's economy.

Greenberg and Arakawa (2006) explore the link between optimistic managers, productivity and employee engagement

of 86 employees and 17 managers in Information Technology firms. The data analysis supports the claim that positive leadership is correlated to employee engagement and performance, and further extends the importance of optimism in the workplace. Managers greatly influence employee well-being and engagement, which in turn plays a significant role in organizational performance. This research also speaks that engaged managers can create more engaged employees, manage projects effectively, can make employees more productive and can create a vibrant and productive workplace.

Chen (2007) carried out research in China to find out the drivers of the employee engagement. Data collected through an internet survey from foreign invested companies in Shanghai. He found that the drivers of the employee engagement are financial rewards, participation in decision making process, job autonomy, performance feedback in task level resources. These factors shape employee engagement and increase the level of attachment to the organization and enhance productivity level.

Scotland government, UK (www.scotland.gov.uk/socialresearch, 2007) carried out research in Scotland on employee engagement. Their observations clearly indicate that the organization has a responsibility to lead engagement, and there are several key areas the organization can address to encourage engagement among its employees. Those key areas are Leadership, effective management, open and two-way communication, pay and benefits, fair and equal treatment, employing the 'right' workforce, career development and training, working hours, and health and safety. However, there is no 'one size fits all' model of engagement, and different employees will place different emphases on the extent to which they value each of these elements in return for 'going the extra mile'.

Ryan (www.citehr.com, 2007) defined eight key drivers for employee engagement. These eight key drivers influence emotion and create extra effort for the organizational benefit. The drivers are: Trust and integrity, Nature of the, Line of sight between employee performance and company, Career Growth, Pride about the company, Co-workers/team, Employee development and Relationship with one's manager.

Miller (2008) carried out a research in the USA to find out the engagement levels in specific company. The purpose of this study was to collect data from the production employees at XYZ Manufacturing Company on employee engagement. Production employees were asked to fill up a questionnaire containing twelve questions survey developed by The Gallup Organization to measure employee engagement. The employees of the production unit were taken as the sample

unit for the survey because they were the employees having the greatest influence on the production, quality, and changes in the current systems. The result of the study revealed that employee engagement is a key driver for organizational success. High level of engagement promotes retention of talent, fosters customer loyalty, and improves organizational performance. Engagement is influenced by some key factors such as recognition, workplace culture, communication, managerial styles, trust, and respect.

Townsend and Gebhardt (2008) in their research observed that top management commitment, leadership, 100 per cent employee involvement with a structure, communications, training, measurement, recognition, gratitude and celebration are having impact and encourage employee engagement in different ways. The primary vehicle for employee engagement is the 100 per cent employee involvement with a structure. Typically this is by creating a network of teams with every person on the payroll being on at least one team (typical name: quality team) from the outset of the process. Each team has a trained team leader, with the common beginning point being the hierarchical senior. In following years, employees who want to exhibit or hone their leadership skills can fill those roles.

Cristina and Patrik (2008) conducted a literature survey on employee engagement and pilot interviews with ten professionals. The outcome of the research is environment, leadership, job, and individual factors which are connected to employee engagement and having very high impact on productivity. Environmental engagement factors have positive connection between organizational and individual values, the quality of the workplace relationships, and work-life balance. Leadership engagement factors include vision and integrity. Job engagement factors include the meaningfulness of the job, its level of challenge, and the amount of control the employee has on the job. Finally, individual factors related to engagement include resilience, locus of control, active coping style, self-esteem, neuroticism, and extraversion. The author suggests that the connections between organizational leadership, job, and individual characteristics are particularly relevant for engagement. They suggest leaders should be educated on engagement, career development opportunities, performance improvement, professional development, work-life balance, and initiatives that enhancing workplace relationships are likely useful to increase engagement. Further they observe individuals want to make a difference, and are more engaged when they perceive their organization to be ethical and trustworthy.

Bakker and Schaufeli (2008) through their research on engagement indicate that there are three approaches exist to employee engagement. In first stage the motivating

resources identified for engagement are support and recognition from colleagues and supervisors, performance feedback, opportunities for learning and development, and opportunities for skill use. Secondly, the expected outcome of the engagement is considered in terms of commitment and extra-role behavior. The third approach defines engagement independently from job resources and positive organizational outcomes such as commitment as a positive, fulfilling, affective motivational state of work-related well-being that is the antipode of job burnout.

Macey and Schneider (2008) suggest that much of the appeal to organizational management is driven by claims that employee engagement drives improve bottom line results. The research indicates that they 'have established a conclusive, compelling relationship between engagement and profitability through higher productivity, sales, customer satisfaction, and employee retention'. Further they define engagement as a psychological state has variously embraced one or more of several related ideas, each in turn representing some form of absorption, attachment, and/or enthusiasm. Operationally, the measures of engagement have for the most part been composed of a potpourri of items representing one or more of the four different categories: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, psychological empowerment, and job involvement. Engagement as a state has a strong affective tone connoting, at a minimum, high levels of involvement (passion and absorption) in the work and the organization (pride and identity) as well as affective energy (enthusiasm and alertness) and a sense of self-presence in the work.

Park and Rainey (2008) conducted research with the objective to relate quality of political and administrative leadership with employee engagement in public sector employees. This study conducted in Republic of Korea and found that quality of political and administrative leadership is having positive influence on employee engagement.

Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, and Schaufeli (2009) examined longitudinal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. On the basis of conservation of resources theory, they hypothesized that job resources, personal resources, and work engagement are reciprocal over time. The study was conducted among 163 employees, who were followed-up over a period of 18 months on average. They found that job and personal resources relate positively to work engagement. Additionally, work engagement relate positively to job and personal resources. The model that best fit was the reciprocal model, which showed that not only resources and work engagement but also job and personal resources were mutually related. These findings support the assumption of conservation of resources theory that various types of resources and

well-being evolve into a cycle that determines employees' successful adaptation to their work environments and lead to organizational engagement. The finding that job and personal resources are reciprocal across time is in line with the learning-generalization model of Kohn and Schooler (1982), according to which individuals tend to generalize their work-related learning experiences to their off-job situation, and vice versa. Thus it is argued that over time individuals through learning experiences form stronger positive beliefs about themselves and comprehend or create resourceful work environments. Furthermore job and personal resources are highly correlates to each other and to work engagement. This finding provides a straightforward answer to the on-going discussion regarding the sequence of effects in explaining work-related well-being. On the other hand, work psychological models have established the role of work characteristics as the main initiators of the process that leads to employee wellness.

Simpson (2009) conducted a literature review on employee engagement. The purpose of this review was to identify and synthesize the engagement at work research in the nursing organization, business, and organizational psychology literature so as determine the state of the science of engagement at work. The 20 studies of antecedents and/or consequences of engagement at work included in this review occurred within multiple work settings and among various types of employees mainly targeting seven nursing-based organizations. Six of the studies relied on the burnout/engagement construct and one study utilized that of employee engagement. The syntheses of the 20 studies of antecedents and/or consequences of engagement at work provide consistent findings—with organizational predictors (versus individual factors) significantly impacting engagement at work. Key findings suggest organizational factors versus individual contributors significantly impact engagement at work.

Southard (2010) conducted a survey of 111 employees including doctors, managers, nurses and health care staffs, and more than 1300 patients of a hospital to find out the relationship between employee engagement and patients satisfaction. Employees' level of engagement directly affects the quality of service provided by their organization. Therefore, highly engaged employees are beneficial to an organization. By comparing hospital work-unit level employee engagement data to individual patient satisfaction data, this study reveals that the level of employee engagement within the work-unit influences patient satisfaction when satisfaction is determined by a simple measure. This is not, however, the case when comparing the level of employee engagement to a complex measure of patient satisfaction. The findings of this study provide insight into the environmental

influence of engaged employees upon client satisfaction. Understanding when work-unit engagement affects different levels of client satisfaction provides insight for determining realistic organizational goals for client satisfaction, which is useful to hospital management as well as the broader realm of public administration.

Jessica and Helena (2011) through their research on employee engagement observed that organizations aspire to have engage employees and spend considerable resources to measure and improve employee engagement. The purpose of their research is to investigate the link between leader behaviors and follower engagement. Research carried out in an insurance firm of New Zealand using data from direct reports. Factor analysis was conducted out on the data taken through pilot study with JRA 360 degree feedback instrument. Subsequently, a linkage analysis was conducted to establish the relationship of the resultant leadership factors with JRA's employee engagement measure. Correlation and regression results showed that supports team was the strongest predictor of engagement; semi-partial correlations showed that the three leadership factors overlapped in their relationships with engagement, with supports team predicting most unique variance.

Gruman and Saks (2011) through their research explore employee engagement and its linkage to performance management system. They argue that engagement is a key driver of individual attitudes, behavior, and performance as well as organizational performance, productivity, retention, financial performance, and even shareholder return. However, although engagement surveys are useful for benchmarking employee engagement levels in organizations, the use of an engagement survey for the management of employee engagement has a number of limitations. First, it relies on employees' self-reports of their levels of engagement and there is ample evidence in the literature of a self-serving bias when employees report their own behavior such as performance and absenteeism. Second, the potential drivers of engagement or those work conditions that might be related to employee engagement might not be important for all employees. In other words, the best approach for improving employee engagement might depend on each employee rather than aggregate levels of various working conditions. Third, modifications to various drivers of engagement are not likely to have a strong and lasting effect on engagement levels unless such changes are integrated with other parts of the organization and HR system. In other words, to be effective there is a need to be a series of well-integrated and connected practices and programs that focus on developing and measuring employee engagement. Fourth, the use of engagement surveys is an organizational-level approach and does not enable an organization to

develop or monitor the engagement of individuals or hold them accountable for their engagement. Finally, engagement surveys are best suited for measuring employee engagement feelings or state engagement. However, as already indicated, it is behavioral engagement that leads directly to job performance. Therefore, they argue that a more effective and integrated approach for enhancing and managing employee engagement is to manage engagement the same way that job performance is managed. This is more important to the extent that employee engagement behavior is an antecedent of job performance. They suggest there are three phases of employee engagement and performance management. The first stage of the engagement management process involves performance agreement. The main activities at this stage involve goal setting and a review and agreement of the psychological contract. Secondly In the engagement facilitation stage, the primary focus is on identifying and providing employees with the resources they need to become engaged. As indicated earlier, this involves resources that will enable employees to experience meaningfulness, safety, and availability. The main activities at this stage involve job design, coaching and social support, leadership, and training. Finally a key component of performance management and in fact a cornerstone of the process is the appraisal and evaluation of employee performance. In the context of employee engagement, this process should also include an assessment of an employee's engagement behavior (e.g., persistence, proactivity, role expansion, and adaptability) in addition to job performance. The main activities during this stage are performance appraisals and feedback. However, for the purpose of enhancing engagement, trust and justice perceptions are especially important.

Slatten and Mehmetoglu (2011) developed a conceptual model and tested on a survey with a sample size of 279. The samples are selected from the frontline employees of hospitality industry. The survey result shows that employee engagement is closely linked to employees' innovative behavior. Accordingly the study an engaged frontline workforce is having high impact to the organization. The results also revealed that role benefit, job autonomy, and strategic attention were all significantly related to higher employee engagement. They further advocated that there is greater importance for managers of having an engaged workforce and all managers must understand that engagement is a major driver to innovative behavior. The key aspect of this study is managers should measure regularly the engagement of their workforce, which will create innovativeness of the employee, which will make them more engaged and productive.

Shuck, Rocco, and Albornoz (2011) explored employee engagement by collecting documents, conducted semi-

structured interviews and recorded observations at a large multinational service corporation ranked as one of the best places to work. The result shows relationship development and attachment to co-workers, workplace climate and opportunities for learning are the engagement drivers. The result also suggests that good relationship with co-workers at workplace, relationship with direct line manager, role in organizational culture and learning facility at workplace motivates employees and increases engagement level.

Men (2012) examined the impact of corporate leadership and organizational reputation on employee engagement. He conducted online survey of 500 fortune companies with a sample size of 157. He found there is positive impact of CEO's image and organizational reputation on employee engagement. As the public 'face' of the company, a CEO helps define the organization's image to internal and external stakeholders. CEO expertise gauges the extent to which employees perceive the CEO as a source of valid assertions, and as possessing the necessary skills and knowledge for his or her position. CEO trustworthiness is seen as the degree of employee confidence and acceptance towards the CEO and his or her messages. Perceived organizational reputation is defined as the overall employee evaluation of the organization over time. This evaluation includes emotional appeal, products and services, financial performance, vision and leadership, work environment, and social responsibility.

Robertson, Birch, and Cooper (2012) tested the impact of psychological well-being on employee engagement and productivity. This study used cross sectional survey method with a sample size of 9000 and conducted well-being audits to determine the impact of psychological well-being on work and production. Data were collected from 12 separate UK organizations (both public and private sector). These organizations represented a range of industries like manufacturing, higher education, police forces, utilities and financial services. Through multiple regression analyses they found that there is a positive relationship between psychological well-being and work performance. Through psychological well-being employees can exhibit positive job and work attitude. This study clearly established that employees having higher levels of psychological well-being are healthier both mentally and physically at work, live long, live happier lives and productive too.

Choo, Mat, and Al-Omari (2013) examined the impact of organizational practices on employee engagement in Malaysia. The sample selected from a multinational electronics firm with a sample size of 97. The study shows that organization practices, organizational communication, reward and recognition, and employee development are the vital factors which increase the employee engagement level. This study also evidenced the significant relationship

between organizational practices and employee engagement.

Menguc, Auh, Fisher, and Haddad (2013) studied the effect of supervisory support, supervisory feedback, and perceived autonomy on employee engagement. They have used Job Demand Model (JD-R) to test the impact. The research carried out in Canadian retail sector with a sample size of 482. The objectives of this study were to examine (a) the antecedents to service employee engagement, (b) the consequences of engagement, (c) the mediating role of engagement in linking the antecedents to the consequences, and (d) the moderating effect of perceived autonomy on the antecedent–engagement relationship.

The study revealed that

- a) Supervisory feedback and perceived autonomy promoted service employee engagement. Clear and objective expectations and guidelines for performance and suggestions for how to make improvements made a difference;
- b) Engagement has implications for customer-related outcomes means engaged employees can create satisfied customers;
- c) Engagement operates as a full mediator between supervisory feedback and customers' evaluation of employee performance; and
- d) There is a positive interaction between supervisory support and perceived autonomy, and a negative interaction between supervisory feedback and perceived autonomy.

Bedarkar and Pandita (2014) studied drivers of employee engagement along and its impact on the level of employee performance and well-being at workplace. This study recognized that specifically three drivers, namely communication, work-life balance and leadership can influence employee engagement significantly by exploring global level literatures of employee engagement.

Rana, Ardichvili, and Tkachenko (2014) studied the drivers of employee engagement in USA from HR perspective. This study found that job design, job characteristics, supervisor, co-worker relationships, workplace environment and HRD practices are the major influencers of employee engagement.

Kaliannan and Adjovu (2015) found from their research in telecommunication companies of Ghana that employee engagement strategies deployed in the organizations creates employee engagement and satisfaction. The role of management in engaging talent management practices can lead to employee engagement and work satisfaction.

Nair and Salleh (2015) conducted research on appraisal justice, trust and its impact on employee engagement. This study is conducted in Malaysia. Study suggests appraisal justice has a direct link with employee engagement with trust as a catalyst.

Taneja, Sewell, and Odom (2015) studied the employee engagement drivers and the role of global managers to induce engagement among employee. This study suggests the global drivers of engagements are organizational invest in corporate social responsibility, focus on customer, supporting workplace for democracy, work-life balance and rewarding culture.

Hanaysha (2016) conducted survey at public universities in northern Malaysia to understand the employee engagement attributes. The study suggests organizational learning can lead to employee engagement and subsequent organizational commitment. This study also suggests adopting effective human resource practices can increased performance and lead organizational competitiveness.

Whiteoak and Mohamed (2016) conducted research in Australian Asphalt and Pavement Industry to understand the relationship between safety and employee engagement in workplace. Views of 27 supervisors and 207 frontline workers were taken. The result indicates that there is a direct link between workplace safety and employee engagement. Employee engagement and productivity can be improved significantly with relatively small improvements in worker perceptions of safety.

Kwon, Farndale, and Park (2016) argued that individual employee voice and its recognition in a formal way creates work engagement by study carried out at USA. This research suggests that work engagement is influenced by three factors i.e. the degree of power distance, the extent of empowering leadership and participation and quality of relationship between employee and supervisor.

Mehrzi and Singh (2016) explores the enabling attributes of employee engagement in public sector at UAE. This study found that leader, team, perceived organizational support and organizational culture has direct impact on employee engagement.

Bandura, Bandura, Lyons, and Lyons (2017) conducted research on employee engagement and skill building. This study in USA, founds that when organization started building skill among employees, they feel its valuable and express satisfaction on that. This leads to involve more in the assignments and commitment to work. If organizations will listen to the voices of employees about their want and what they want to learn the workplace certainly will change to a

positive and vibrant place to work.

Gawke, Gorgievski, and Bakker (2017) found employee intrapreneurship gives positive impact on employee engagement in Netherlands. Organizations should allow employees to work and development their intrapreneurship skills for the benefits of the organization and for themselves.

Saks (2017) suggests only finding employee engagement through research will not help organizations to generate engagement. This study carried out at USA. Management has to put them on practice to derive actual benefits. Organization must follow a structural approach to generate engagement. The steps suggested by the author in their model to overcome implementing employee engagement barriers are (a) The Engagement Definition Barrier, (b) The Engagement Referent Barrier, (c) The Engagement Measurement Barrier, (d) The Engagement Driver Barrier and (e) The Engagement Strategy Barrier.

Sievert and Scholz (2017) conducted research in Germany and suggests use of social tools in organization's internal communications can bring out engagement among employees. On the platform of digitalization internal social media fosters stronger employee engagement. In a best case scenario, it can change employee engagement, enhance knowledge management, leadership structure and can even

change the business models of companies fundamentally.

Ruck, Welch, and Menara (2017) through their research explores linkage between organizational communication system and employee engagement. Also this research explores employee satisfaction with the opportunities to exercise the employee voice within organization. He has carried out research in UK based organizations taking a sample size of 2066. The study found that there is direct link between organizational communication and recognition of employee voice with employee engagement.

OBSERVATIONS FROM LITERATURE REVIEW

It is observed from the review of various research studies that employee engagement has a direct impact on organizational productivity. High productivity is possible only from engaged employees. Apart from the productivity, employee engagement also creates loyalty, customer satisfaction, employee retention, enhanced quality, reputation, attracts talent, good safety records for organization, less turnover, enthusiasm among employee, sound physical health and the most important the bottom line of the organization. A quick look of the employee engagement drivers that the review of literature reveals has been given in Table 1.1 .

Table 1.1: Summary of employee engagement attributes based on review of studies (Excluding India)

Studies abroad			
Sl. No.	Researcher	Theme	Key findings (Engagement drivers)
1	Kahn (1990)	How people occupy their roles at work in varying degrees or how much people are psychologically present during particular moments of role performances at work.	1. Meaningfulness 2. Safety at work 3. Psychological availability at work.
2	Harter et al. (2002)	Identification of significant relationships between employee engagement and improvements in customer satisfaction, productivity, profits, turnover, and safety records.	1. Employee well-being 2. Positive workplace
3	Harter et al. (2003)	Survey of employee engagement, job satisfaction and business level performance	1. Clarity in expectations 2. Resources, 3. Opportunity at work 4. Recognition 5. Caring 6. Encouragement 7. Opinion honouring 8. Mission clarity 9. Quality commitment 10. Congenial environment 11. Feedback.

Studies abroad			
Sl. No.	Researcher	Theme	Key findings (Engagement drivers)
4.	Loehr (2005)	Survey of engagement and its benefits to employee and the employer.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enthusiasm 2. Greater value to the employer 3. Improved physical health 4. Happiness
5	Saks (2006)	Study of the difference between job and organization engagements and that perceived organizational support predicts both job and organization engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Job satisfaction 2. Organizational commitment 3. Job characteristics 4. Organizational citizenship
6	Higgs (2007)	To explore employee engagement through financial benefit and organization climate.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shared ownership 2. Investment for the development 3. positive climate and organizational culture 4. Employee's immediate line manager 5. Attractive financial rewards, Good benefits compared to that of the competitor organizations
7	Cawe (2006)	Study of the factors that promotes employee engagement in order to assist businesses.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership and management 2. Talent Management 3. Communication and knowledge sharing 4. Organizations reputation and branding
8	Seijts and Crim (2007)	To study the role of leaders to implement selected ten parameters over the organizational effectiveness and employee's level of engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Connection, 2. Career development 3. Vision Clarity 4. Conveying feedback 5. Congratulating performance 6. Recognition of contribution 7. Control over jobs 8. Collaboration 9. Credibility 10. Confidence
9	Stairs et al. (2006)	Study of the traditional method of motivating and engaging employees with financial reward	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organizational affiliation 2. Autonomy and influence 3. Work-work and work-life balance 4. Opportunities for growth 5. Role factors 6. Reward culture 7. Quality of relationships 8. Quality of supervision and Work culture 9. Loyalty 10. Performance- motivation
10	Greenberg and Arakawa (2006)	To study the link between optimistic managers, productivity, and employee engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Optimism in the workplace 2. Employee well-being 3. Engaged managers
11	Chen (2007)	To conduct research in china to find out the drivers of the employee engagement.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Financial rewards 2. Participation in decision making process 3. Job autonomy 4. Performance feedback in task level resources

Studies abroad			
Sl. No.	Researcher	Theme	Key findings (Engagement drivers)
12	Scottish Executive Social Research (2007)	To study on key areas of organization which can drive and lead engagement of employee.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership 2. Effective management 3. Open and two-way communication 4. Pay and benefits 5. Fair and equal treatment 6. Employing the 'right' workforce 7. Career development and training 8. Working hours
13	Soldati (2007)	Study of eight important factors affecting employee engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Trust and integrity 2. Nature of the job 3. Line of sight 4. Career Growth opportunities 5. Company Pride 6. Co-workers 7. Employee's skills 8. Relationship
14	Ryan (2007)	Study on key drivers influence emotion and create extra effort for the organizational benefit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Trust and integrity 2. Nature of the 3. Line of sight between employee performance and company 4. Career Growth 5. Pride about the company 6. Co-workers/team 7. Employee development 8. Relationship with one's manager
15	Park and Rainey (2008)	Relation between political and administrative leadership with employee engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality of political leadership 2. Administrative leadership
16	Miller (2008)	To study the impact of employee engagement in promoting retention of talent, foster customer loyalty, and improve organizational performance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recognition 2. Workplace culture 3. Communication 4. Managerial styles 5. Trust and respect
17	Townsend and Gebhardt (2008)	To study the impact of top management's commitment and Leadership on employee engagement.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commitment of top management 2. Leadership style 3. Employee involvement with a structure 4. Communications 5. Training 6. Measurement and Recognition 7. Gratitude and celebration
18	Cristina and Patrick (2008)	To conduct literature survey on Leadership, Environmental and employed engagement.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organizational leadership 2. Job, and individual characteristic resilience 3. Locus of control 4. Active coping style 5. Self-esteem 6. Neuroticism, and extraversion 7. Ethical and trustworthy organization

Studies abroad			
Sl. No.	Researcher	Theme	Key findings (Engagement drivers)
19	Bakker and Schaufeli (2008)	To study different approaches exist to employee engagement.	1. commitment fulfillment 2. Affective motivational state 3. Work-related well-being
20	Macey and Schneider (2008)	To study on employee engagement and bottom line profit of the organization.	1. Job satisfaction 2. Organizational commitment 3. Psychological empowerment 4. Job involvement 5. Sense of self-presence in the work
21.	Simpson (2009)	To identify and synthesize the engagement at work research in the nursing organization, business, and organizational psychology literature so as determine the state of the science of engagement at work	1. Organizational factors 2. Individual contributors
22	Xanthopoulou et al. (2009)	To examine longitudinal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement.	1. Job resources 2. Personal resources
23	Southard (2010)	To find out the relationship between employee engagement and patients satisfaction in a hospital	1. Environmental influence 2. Work-unit engagement.
24	Xu and Thomas (2010)	To conduct a study to establish the relationship of the resultant leadership factors with the organizations employee engagement.	1. Supports team 2. Effective performance 3. Integrity
25	Gruman and Saks (2011)	To explore employee engagement and its linkage to performance management system	1. Work conditions 2. Integrated Systems 3. Accountability
26	Slatten and Mehmetoglu (2011)	Study of employee engagement linkage with employees' innovative behavior	1. Perceptions of role benefit 2. Job autonomy 3. Strategic attention
27	Shuck et al. (2011)	To explore employee engagement and the interpretation of the engaged employee to their work	1. Relationship development 2. Attachment to co-workers 3. Workplace climate 4. Opportunities for learning
28	Robertson et al. (2012)	To study the impact of psychological well- being on employee engagement and productivity.	1. psychological well- being
29	Men (2012)	To examine the impact of corporate leadership and organizational reputation on employee engagement.	1. Products and services quality 2. Financial performance 3. Vision and leadership 4. Work environment 5. Social responsibility.
30	Menguc et al. (2013)	Study of the effect of supervisory support, supervisory feedback, and perceived autonomy on employee engagement	1. Supervisory support 2. Perceived autonomy
31	Choo et al. (2013)	To examine the impact of organizational practices on employee engagement	1. Organizational communication 2. Reward and recognition 3. Employee development
32	Bedarkar and Pandita (2014)	Study on the drivers of employee engagement along and its impact on the level of employee performance and well-being at workplace	1. Communication 2. Work-life balance 3. Leadership
33	Rana et al. (2014)	Study the drivers of employee engagement in USA from HR perspective.	1. Job design 2. Job characteristics 3. Supervisor and co-worker relationships 4. Workplace environment 5. HRD practices

Studies abroad			
Sl. No.	Researcher	Theme	Key findings (Engagement drivers)
34	Kaliannan and Adjovu (2015)	Study of engagement strategies deployed in the organizations creates employee engagement and satisfaction.	1. Talent management practices
35	Nair and Salleh (2015)	Study on appraisal justice, trust and its impact on employee engagement.	1. Appraisal justice 2. Trust
36	Taneja et al. (2015)	Engagement drivers and the role of global managers to induce engagement among employee.	1. Invest in corporate social responsibility 2. Focus on customer 3. Supporting workplace for democracy 4. Work-life balance 5. Rewarding culture
37.	Hanaysha (2016)	To understand the employee engagement attributes	1. Organizational learning 2. Adopting effective human resource practices
38	Whiteoak and Mohamed (2016)	Relationship between safety and employee engagement in workplace	1. Workplace safety
39	Kwon et al. (2016)	Individual employee voice and its recognition on engagement	1. Empowering leadership 2. Quality of relationship between employee and supervisor.
40	Mehrzi and Singh (2016)	Enabling attributes of employee engagement in public sector	1. Leader 2. Team 3. Perceived organizational support 4. Organizational culture
41	Bandura et al. (2017)	Employee engagement and skill building issues	1. Honouring the voices of employees about their want 2. Understanding what employee want to learn
42	Gawke et al. (2017)	Study on impact of employee intrapreneurship skills with engagement level	1. Development of intrapreneurship skills
43	Saks (2017)	Initiatives of organizations to generate engagement by removing barriers with structural approach	1. Structural approach to generate engagement 2. Removal of engagement barriers
44	Sievert and Scholz (2017)	Study on digitalization and internal social media on employee engagement	1. Social tools in organization's internal communications
45	Ruck et al. (2017)	Linkage of organizational communication system and employee engagement	1. Organizational communication 2. Recognition of employee voice

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Employee engagement is the level of commitment and involvement that the employees have towards their organization and the organizational values. Engaged employees provide the company increased productivity, higher financial returns, lower attrition, greater talent pool, and higher morale and create emotional engagement and loyal customers. Employee engagement is associated with many desirable outcomes such as job satisfaction,

intention to stay, high productivity, job performance and customer satisfaction. Organizations with a greater number of engaged employees typically have lower operating costs, higher customer satisfaction and higher profits. The degree to which employees are engaged can have a significant impact on the success of the organization. Keeping this in view, the present study attempts to trace the drivers of employee engagement through published research works for a span of 27 years (1990–2017) and various countries other than India. The outcome of this study in the form of engagement drivers are Meaningfulness at work, Safety

at work, Psychological availability at work, Employee well-being, Positive workplace, Clarity in expectations, Resources, Opportunity at work, Recognition, Caring, Encouragement, Opinion honouring, Mission clarity, Quality commitment, Congenial environment, Feedback, Enthusiasm, Greater value to the employer, Improved physical health, Happiness, Job satisfaction, Organizational commitment, Organizational citizenship, Shared ownership, Investment for the development, positive climate and organizational culture, Employee's immediate line manager, Attractive financial rewards, Good benefits compared to that of the competitor organizations, Leadership and management Talent Management, Communication and knowledge sharing, Organizations reputation and branding, Autonomy and influence, Work-work and work-life balance, Quality of relationships, Loyalty, Engaged managers, Participation in decision making process, Job autonomy, Participation in decision making process, Job autonomy, Social tools in organization's internal communications, Organizational communication and Recognition of employee voice.

REFERENCES

- Al Mehrzi, N., & Singh, S. K. (2016). Competing through employee engagement: A proposed framework. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 65(6), 831–843.
- Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 308–323.
- Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Positive organizational behavior: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 147–154.
- Bandura, R. P., Bandura, R. P., Lyons, P. R., & Lyons, P. R. (2017). Using a skill-building tool to enhance employee engagement. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 25(6), 1–5.
- Bedarkar, M., & Pandita, D. (2014). A study on the drivers of employee engagement impacting employee performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 133, 106–115.
- Bhatnagar, J. (2007). Talent management strategy of employee engagement in Indian ITES employees: Key to retention. *Employee Relations*, 29(6), 640–663.
- Cawe, M. (2006). *Factors contributing to employee engagement in South Africa*. Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, pp. 1–113.
- Chalofsky, N., & Krishna, V. (2009). Meaningfulness, commitment, and engagement: The intersection of a deeper level of intrinsic motivation. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 11(2), 189–203.
- Chen, J. (2007). *Study of employee engagement in Chinese context*. Burnaby: Simon Fraser University.
- Choo, L. S., Mat, N., & Al-Omari, M. (2013). Organizational practices and employee engagement: A case of Malaysia electronics manufacturing firms. *Business Strategy Series*, 14(1), 3–10.
- Cristina, M. S. W., & Patrick, D. P. (2008). A perfect match: Decoding employee engagement – Part I: Engaging cultures and leaders. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 40(3), 122–128.
- Devendhiran, S., Devendhiran, S., Wesley, J. R., & Wesley, J. R. (2017). Spirituality at work: Enhancing levels of employee engagement. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, 31(5), 9–13.
- Gawke, J. C., Gorgievski, M. J., & Bakker, A. B. (2017). Employee intrapreneurship and work engagement: A latent change score approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 100, 88–100.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Encounters: Two studies in the sociology of interaction*. Oxford: Bobbs-Merrill, pp. 1–152.
- Greenberg, M., & Arakawa, D. (2006). Optimistic managers and their influence on productivity and employee engagement in a technology organization. *Master of Applied Positive Psychology*, 1–33.
- Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21, 123–136.
- Gupta, V., & Kumar, S. (2013). Impact of performance appraisal justice on employee engagement: A study of Indian professional. *Employee Relations*, 35(1), 61–78.
- Hanaysha, J. (2016). Testing the effects of employee engagement, work environment, and organizational learning on organizational commitment. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 229, 289–297.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268–279.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Killham, E. A. (2003). *Employee engagement, satisfaction, and business-unit-level outcomes: A meta-analysis*. Princeton: The Gallup Organization, pp. 1–53.

- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Killham, E. A., & Agrawal, S. (2009). The relationship between engagement at work and organizational outcomes. *Gallup Inc.* Retrieved 29 November 2009, 2012.
- Higgs, M. (2007). Building employee engagement. *Henley Manager Update*, 18(2), 31–42.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724.
- Kaliannan, M., & Adjovu, S. N. (2015). Effective employee engagement and organizational success: A case study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 172, 161–168.
- Krishnan, T. N. (2011). Understanding employment relationship in Indian organizations through the lens of psychological contracts. *Employee Relations*, 33(5), 551–569.
- Kular, S., Gatenby, M., Rees, C., Soane, E., & Truss, K. (2008). *Employee engagement: A literature review*. Kingston Business School, Kingston University Working Paper, No 19.
- Kwon, B., Farndale, E., & Park, J. G. (2016). Employee voice and work engagement: Macro, meso, and micro-level drivers of convergence? *Human Resource Management Review*, 26(4), 327–337.
- Lockwood, N. R. (2007). Leveraging employee engagement for competitive advantage. *SHRM Research Quarterly*, 53(3), 2–11.
- Loehr, J. (2005). Become fully engaged. *Leadership Excellence*, 22(2), 14.
- Macey, W. B., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 3–30.
- Mani, V. (2011). Analysis of employee engagement and its predictors. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 1(2), 15–26.
- Men, L. R. (2012). CEO credibility, perceived organizational reputation, and employee engagement. *Public Relations Review*, 38(1), 171–173.
- Menguc, B., Auh, S., Fisher, M., & Haddad, A. (2013). To be engaged or not to be engaged: The antecedents and consequences of service employee engagement. *Journal of Business Research*, 66, 2163–2170.
- Miller, S. L. (2008). *An Employee Engagement Assessment of XYZ Manufacturing Company*. PhD diss., University of Wisconsin.
- Nair, M. S., & Salleh, R. (2015). Linking performance appraisal justice, trust, and employee engagement: A conceptual framework. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 211, 1155–1162.
- Nazir, O., Nazir, O., Islam, J. U., & Islam, J. U. (2017). Enhancing organizational commitment and employee performance through employee engagement: An empirical check. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 6(1), 98–114.
- Park, S. M., & Rainey, H. G. (2008). Leadership and public service motivation in US federal agencies. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1), 109–142.
- Ramadevi, V. (2009). Employee engagement is a two-way street. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 17(2), 3–4.
- Rana, S., Ardichvili, A., & Tkachenko, O. (2014). A theoretical model of the antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: Dubin's method. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 26(3/4), 249–266.
- Robertson, I. T., Birch, A. J., & Cooper, C. L. (2012). Job and work attitudes, engagement and employee performance where does psychological well-being fit in? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 33(3), 224–232.
- Ruck, K., Welch, M., & Menara, B. (2017). Employee voice: An antecedent to organisational engagement? *Public Relations Review*, 43(5), 904–914.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619.
- Saks, A. M. (2017). Translating employee engagement research into practice. *Organizational Dynamics*, 46, 76–86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.04.003>
- Seijts, G. H., & Crim, D. (2007). What engages employees the most or, The Ten C's of employee Engagement. *Ivey Business Journal*, 1–6.
- Shuck, M. B., Rocco, T. S., & Albornoz, C. A. (2011). Exploring employee engagement from the employee perspective: Implications for HRD. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 35(4), 300–325.
- Sievert, H., & Scholz, C. (2017). Engaging employees in (at least partly) disengaged companies. Results of an interview survey within about 500 German corporations on the growing importance of digital engagement via internal social media. *Public Relations Review*, 43(5), 894–903.

- Simpson, M. R. (2009). Engagement at work: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 46, 1012–1024.
- Slatten, T., & Mehmetoglu, M. (2011). Antecedents and effects of engaged frontline employees a study from the hospitality industry. *Managing Service Quality*, 21(1), 88–107.
- Soldati, P. (2007). Employee Engagement: What exactly is it? *Management Issues*. Retrieved from <https://www.management-issues.com/opinion/4008/employee-engagement-what-exactly-is-it/>
- Southard, R. N. (2010). *Employee Engagement and Service Quality*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington State University.
- Srivastava, P., & Bhatnagar, J. (2008). Talent acquisition due diligence leading to high employee engagement: Case of Motorola India MDB. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 40(5), 253–260.
- Stairs, M., Galpin, M., Page, N., & Linley, A. (2006). Retention on a knife edge: The role of employee engagement in talent management. *Selection and Development Review*, 22(5), 19–23.
- Taneja, S., Sewell, S. S., & Odom, R. Y. (2015). A culture of employee engagement: A strategic perspective for global managers. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 36(3), 46–56.
- Tiwari, B., & Lenka, U. (2016). Building psychological safety for employee engagement in post-recession. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, 30(1), 19–22.
- Townsend, P., & Gebhardt, J. (2008). Employee engagement – completely. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 16(3), 22–24.
- Tymon, W. G., Stephen, J., Stumpf, S. A., Rechard, R., & Smith, R. R. (2011). Manager support predicts turnover of professionals in India. *Career Development International*, 16(3), 293–312.
- Whiteoak, J. W., & Mohamed, S. (2016). Employee engagement, boredom and frontline construction workers feeling safe in their workplace. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 93, 291–298.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 235–244.
- Xu, J., & Thomas, H. C. (2010). How can leaders achieve high employee engagement?, *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 32(4), 399–416.

Web Reference

- www.business.mapsofindia.com/india-industry/manufacturing.html
- www.cii.in/Sectors.aspx?SectorID
- www.gallup.com (Accessed 28th June 2011)
- www.haygroup.com/downloads/us/engaged_performance_120401.pdf
- www.isrsurvey.com
- www.iveybusinessjournal.com/topics/the-workplace/what-engages-employees-the-most-or-the-ten-cs-of-employee-engagement
- www.lawsociety.mb.ca/formscontinuing-professional-development
- www.machinemag.in/news/manufacturingtechnologies/india%E2%80%99s-growth-sto
- www.managementissues.com/2007/3/8/opinion/employee-engagement-what-exactly-is-it.asp (Retrieved on June 17, 2010)
- www.scotland.gov.uk/socialresearch
- www.thompsondunn.com/newsletter5/pdf/thompsondunn-6.pdf