

THE CONCEPT OF JOB ENGAGEMENT IN THE WORKPLACE

Author's Name: ¹Dipankar Patra, ²Dr. R Neelakandan, ³Dr. Suchismita Sinha

Affiliation: ¹Research Scholar, Annamalai University

²Professor Psychology Department, Annamalai University

³Professor Psychology Department, Sarojini Naidu College for Women

Email: dipankarpatra@gmail.com

DOI No. – 08.2020-25662434

Abstract

Job engagement has been one of the principal drivers of Indians in the IT sector and qualities of engaged employees have been discussed along with the role of an organization who promote highly engaged employees.

This document outlines various facets of Job engagement including definitions, drivers, sub-concepts, models based on available literature. Job engagement has also been studied in relation to related concepts like Job satisfaction, Organizational commitment, Job involvement, Job burnout, Job performance and Job engagement. Various theories of job engagement have been discussed and Job engagement has also been studied with reference to Maslow's Need theory. Special emphasis has been provided in the document to understand Kahn's model and the measurement of Job involvement using the JES scale. Finally, although India has demonstrated capabilities in Job engagement both as an organized service sector, especially in the IT industry and as individual engaged employees, there is lot of scope of future research in this direction.

Keywords: *Job engagement, Job satisfaction, Organizational commitment, Job involvement, Job burnout*

THE CONCEPT OF JOB ENGAGEMENT IN THE WORK PLACE

INTRODUCTION

What Is Job Engagement?

Job engagement is interchangeably used as employee engagement which describes the level of enthusiasm and dedication a worker feels toward his job. In layman's terms it is the extent to which employees feel passionate about their jobs, are committed to the organization, and put discretionary effort into their work. The concept of job engagement was first introduced by Kahn (1990). However, researchers like Shuck, (2013) and Shuck & Wollard, (2010) cited lack of concrete conceptualization of job engagement. Engagement is however, a new concept compared to motivational studies and empirical studies on job engagement started around the early 2000s. The early practitioners who mostly were engaged in consulting firms like **Gallup, SHRM, and Towers Perrin** focused on job satisfaction and involvement (Shuck & Wollard, 2010).

DEFINITION OF JOB ENGAGEMENT

In spite of considerable research, there is a lack of a commonality of working definition. However, researcher Omar Mohammad Ali Ababneh (2015) provided a working definition of Job engagement as "a multidimensional construct that refers to passionate, inspired, energetic, persistent, focused and emotionally positive individuals who harness their positive attributes along with their cognitive and affective evaluations of the job and organizational situations to direct their task performance towards achieving organizational objectives". He felt that such a definition could enable the emergence of a consensus as to how the engagement construct should be measured in an organization (Albrecht,

2010; Saks and Gruman, 2014). His research provides empirical evidence demonstrating that employee engagement reflects a two-way relationship (Robinson, et al., 2004) and is the outcome of person-organization interaction (Saks, 2006). Researcher Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002) looked upon job engagement as “an individual’s involvement and satisfaction with as well as enthusiasm for work”.

MAJOR ASPECTS OF JOB ENGAGEMENT

The three aspects of job engagement as per Kahn (1990) are cognitive, emotional and physical engagement. Support for this tripartite conceptualization of engagement is also found in work of Kelman (1958), who posited three levels of investment of personal energies into role performance, physical, cognitive, and emotional.

There are some antecedents of job engagement like Job characteristics, Job demands, Job resources, interpersonal relationships, organizational support, HR practices, etc. In addition, the personal resources include core self-evaluations, physical, emotional and cognitive resources and psychological conditions. Research also needs to be focused on a host of factors that have not been identified yet and thus there is a need to have a strong theoretical framework.

DRIVERS OF JOB ENGAGEMENT

There are two variables which drive job engagement. They are job resources and personal resources. While job resources comprise of social support from colleagues, performance feedback, coaching and mentoring, facilities for learning and growth, task variety, job control, training, etc., personal resources include qualities such as optimism, self-reliance, self-efficacy, etc. Also, certain personality variables like as extraversion, conscientiousness and emotional stability do contribute to the level of engagement. Psychological capital also seems to be related to work engagement. Engaged workers have low levels of burnout and neuroticism while simultaneously demonstrates high levels of extraversion and good mental and physical health.

SUB CONCEPTS OF JOB ENGAGEMENT

Wollard and Shuck (2011) had identified 4 four main sub-concepts of Job engagement.

- They are the **needs satisfying approach** in which engagement is the expression of one’s preferred self in task behaviours;
- the **burn out antithesis approach** in which energy involvement, efficacy is presented as opposites of established burnout constructions, exhaustion, cynicism and lack of accomplishment;
- the **satisfaction- engagement approach**, in which engagement is viewed as a technical version of job satisfaction and finally
- the **multidimensional approach**, in which a clear distinction is maintained between job and organizational engagement.

QUALITIES OF AN ENGAGED EMPLOYEE

Contributors of job engagement are involvement, commitment and productivity. The personal factors of engaged employees include unique personal needs, motives, interest, goals and dreams. Employees’ personal resources, like strength and ability to perform a job and his perception of the importance of a job is of crucial significance. Career advancement opportunities, feedback from superiors, perception of ethos and value of the organization and good communication system are

all key to active job engagement.

Engaged employees are considered true assets to their organization and have been linked to contributing to commitment, dedication, productivity, professionalism, collaborative behaviour, customer centric attitude, higher energy involvement and efficacy, emotional attachment and loyalty also add to the company's profitability (Abraham, 2012b; Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008; Catteeuw et al., 2007; Doherty, 2010; Gable et al., 2010; Granatino et al., 2013; Lowe, 2012; Rich et al., 2010; Robison, 2012; Serrano & Reichard, 2011; Shuck & Reio, 2011).

JOB ENGAGEMENT AND THE ORGANIZATION

Barbars (2019) has additionally shown the importance of organizational culture with respect to work engagement in an organization. Faiza et al. (2017), had stressed on the cultural context and mentioned that *centrality* and *influence* were two concepts used to help inform employers about the individual cultural needs of employees. While the concept of Centrality referred to an organization's understanding the social and environmental domain in which it was operating in, the concept of influence regarded how an organization could adapt policies to meet employee's needs.

Job engagement can be critical to a company's success, given its links to job satisfaction and employee morale as engaged employees are more likely to be productive and higher performing. At the organizational level having effective strategies in-place helps create a better work culture, reduce staff turnover, increase productivity, build better work and customer relationships, and impact company profits. It requires the effective and balanced use of helping skills and protective authority to produce an ongoing worker/client relationship that results in the pursuit and accomplishment of agreed upon goals.

Sometimes engagement interventions are not successful due to variety of reasons, like lack of clear objectives, overlooking of organizational culture or laying less stress on intrinsic motivational factors. Most organizations who take preemptive measures succeed in retaining and engaging employees.

JOB ENGAGEMENT AND RELATED CONCEPTS

Job engagement is associated with numerous factors, such as job performance (Inamizu & Makishima, 2018), service climate (Salanova, Agut, & Peiró, 2005), job resources, and personal resources (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009).

Researchers Gillet et al. (2021) further extended the concept of job engagement to include facets of engagement like – global levels of job engagement and specific nature of job engagement over and above the specific nature of physical, emotional and cognitive facets of job engagement over this global engagement. Newman, Joseph, Sparkman, and Carpenter (2011) had mentioned that job engagement as a blend of other job attitude constructs, such as job satisfaction, work satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. Variables such as burnout and performance are also discussed.

a. Job engagement and Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction refers to an automatic, emotional reaction to a job based on a person's perception of whether he or she has achieved or can achieve his or her values or needs through

a job (Locke, 1969). Several similarities and differences exist between these two concepts as both include positive emotional constructs towards job. However, while job engagement involves a high level of activation or energy, job satisfaction involves happiness, pleasantness, or cheerfulness, (Macey & Schneider, 2008).

Job satisfaction is the foundation without which employee engagement cannot be sustained. Rather, an engaged employee is one that feels emotionally connected to the company's mission, is committed to shared company goals, and is motivated by delivering their individual metrics. While satisfaction may be enough to sustain an employee in a job for several years, it is engagement in the job that will help employees reach their full potential and subsequently enable the growth of the organization.

Factors affecting job satisfaction are issues like compensation, benefits, work-life balance and recognition whereas factors important for job engagement are inspiring leadership, career development opportunities and a culture of diversity. Thus, job engagement is one of the most important indicators in gauging work satisfaction. Engagement is a dynamic concept (Kahn, 1990) whereas job satisfaction involves a general, global perception of the job (Heger, 2007) and is more inclusive in nature.

Some researchers use the term work satisfaction instead of job satisfaction. Job engagement is different from work satisfaction and does not necessarily mean how happy an employee is at work.

b. Job Engagement and Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment refers to “the strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974). Both these concepts, job engagement and organizational commitment involve behavioral aspects and organizational outcome and demonstrate a form of attachment. While, job engagement as proposed by Kahn (1990) involve a person’s attachment to the role or task, organizational commitment relates to an individual’s attachment to and attitude towards the organization (Shuck et al., 2013).

There are also differences in construct and intentions. Organizational commitment is a relatively stable construct while engagement is dependent on an employee’s interpretation of work and the job conditions. Employees who have high job engagement focuses on the investment of personal resources whereas employees who have a higher degree of organizational commitment make an effort to achieve an organizational goal (Porter et al., 1974). Although organizational commitment, similar to engagement at work, has also behavioral implications, organizational commitment accounts for a narrower aspect of job performance than job engagement. In their research, Harrison et al. (2006) implied that organizational commitment is not sufficient to explain employee behavior at work and organizational or job performance (Brown, 1996).

c. Job engagement and Job involvement

Job involvement connotes the relationship between a person’s job and his or her self-concept (Pinder, 2008). In terms of outcomes, job involvement had weak relationships and a small effect on work-family conflict, job stress, anxiety and life satisfaction.

Both these concepts have similarities with respect to psychological relationship between an employee with his job. While job engagement involves cognition, behaviour and emotion, job

involvement incorporates the cognitive state in related to one's psychological identification with the job (Kanungo, 1982). Thus, involvement is just a facet or a subset of job engagement.

In terms of outcomes while job engagement was associated with psychological health (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006) job involvement, on the contrary, was not related to mental or physical health outcomes (Brown, 1996; Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006). Thus, compared to job satisfaction and job involvement, Job engagement more directly predicts work outcomes (e.g., job performance), because it implies behavioral aspects and engagement can be considered as the construct that better predicts an employee's performance.

d. Job engagement and job burnout

Researchers Maslow and Leiter (1997) views them as unreconcilable and extremely polar while Bakker (2007) feels job engagement to be a positive antithesis of burnout.

e. Job engagement and performance

There is a direct correlation between job engagement and performance and there are some possible correlates. Engaged people experience positive emotions and better emotional and physical health. They often create their own job and personal resources and they are able to transfer their engagement to others. Lepine, and Crawford (2010) showed the positive relationships between job engagement and task performance. Eschenfelder (2012) argued that emotions are not only a key ingredient in connecting people; but emotions are also a key ingredient in connecting people to their organization. Therefore, emotions also play an important role in employee engagement. The emotional well-being of employees has been identified as a significant factor in employee engagement (Sahoo & Mishra, 2012). Mitchell (2015) studied the emotional aspect of job engagement in the nursing industry and feels that while emotions play a key role in engagement, the suppression of emotions in order to perform work-related duties may impact an employee's desired level of organizational engagement. The only flip side of over engagement at work is that employees can disrupt their normal work-life balance when the work moves into the home. Workaholism has also its inherent shortcomings.

f. Employee engagement and work engagement

Some researchers like, Kosaka and Sato (2020) feel that employee engagement and work engagement are distinct concepts due to their distinct origins and content they measure. The term employee engagement is used in non-academic sources. One definitive difference between the two is that employee engagement refers to an employee's feelings about the work and organization and is also evident in the comparison of the scales as well.

MODELS OF JOB ENGAGEMENT

There are 3 major theoretical approaches with respect to conceptualization and research in job engagement which are worth consideration. Some of them are:

a. Kahn's theory of engagement

Kahn's perspective on job engagement as often been cited by scholars as a sound conceptual basis for research (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzales-Roma, & Bakker, 2002) and has been found to be more comprehensive understanding of job performance.

Job engagement theory proposed by Kahn (1990) presupposes that in an organization the staff members are fully committed, in the same way entrepreneurs care for their businesses or people in general look after their own household. This theory aims to bring about a situation in which the

employee by free choice has an intrinsic desire to work on behalf of the organization. This is in contrast to commitment theory which relies more on organizations creating conditions for individuals to remain engaged with their job. Thus, job engagement is literally treating your employees like you want your employees to treat your customers.

Kahn challenged the popular notion that employees needed to be a good fit and be financially rewarded, and top-down approaches to motivation; at the time, what employees thought about their workplace was believed to be more important than what they felt (Rheem, 2018).

Kahn stressed that engagement was primarily manifest in three ways:

- affective (making connections with supervisors and co-workers),
- cognitive (pursuing information, questioning, problem-solving), and
- physical (demonstrating active physical movement in the workplace).

Kahn's grounded theory of personal engagement at work can roughly be divided into environmental factors and psychological states. The environmental factors of job engagement included job autonomy, financial rewards, learning culture and procedural justice and the psychological states included psychological meaningfulness which according to Kahn was a feeling that one is receiving a return on investments of one's self in a currency of physical, cognitive, or emotional energy.

Kahn's (1990) work was based on motivational theories, especially needs satisfaction theories (Shuck, 2011). He argued that environmental and personal factors influence a person's engagement level at work, and importantly, the relationships between influencing factors and engagement are mediated by psychological conditions.

Kahn's theory of engagement reflected more prominently in the work of Rich et al. (2010) on 3 levels:

- First, Rich's work reported on the measurement and validation of job engagement that integrates research on attitudes that can be used as basis for future research.
- Secondly, it implied that employees who were more engaged with their work exhibited higher levels of task and contextual performance.
- Lastly, it threw important light in providing distinction between related attributes like job engagement, job satisfaction, job involvement, and intrinsic motivation.

Some of the empirical studies on antecedents of engagement employing Kahn's theory of personal engagement at work aimed to test Kahn's theory was by prominent researchers, like May et al. (2004), Anitha (2014), Shuck, Reio, and Rocco (2011), Fairlie (2011), etc. These researchers tested the effects of three antecedents (value congruence, perceived organizational support, and core self-evaluations) on engagement, chosen from the factors affecting each psychological condition suggested by Kahn. Even Sung, M in her seminal work summarized the findings of research as an empirical support of Kahn's theory of engagement and noted a congruency between conceptualization and measurement and employment of a rigorous guiding framework.

Kahn's work emphasized the role of psychological states in the relationships between organizational interventions and engagement. His work is influenced by the work of motivation theorists, Alderfer (1972) and Maslow (1970) and the job characteristics model of Hackman &

Oldham (1980). Distinct roles of environmental factors like job elements and work contents, which were considered to be driving factors for psychological meaningfulness was also found in Kahn's study of engagement. Christian et al. (2011) who was influenced by Kahn's work defined engagement as "a relatively enduring state of mind referring to the simultaneous investment of personal energies in the experience or performance of work".

Kahn defined psychological safety as "feeling able to show and employ one's self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status, or career" (Kahn, 1990). The psychological states include the experienced meaningfulness of the work, experienced responsibility for outcomes of the work, and knowledge of the actual results of the work activities. According to Rich et al. (2010) the other antecedents of job engagement according to Kahn are personality, conscientiousness, core self-evaluations and perceived organizational support. Task characteristics, role characteristics and work interactions were considered to be factors of job engagement that influence psychological meaningfulness. He also mentioned about psychological safety and psychological states. Kahn's (1990) conceptualization of engagement relates more to a psychological connection between self and role, focusing on role performance. Engagement fluctuates according to one's experience facilitated by organizational variables and personal characteristics. Kahn's conceptualization is grounded on human needs satisfaction along with social interaction, adapted to fit an organizational context.

This combination of behaviors is dependent on the conditions of psychological availability, meaningfulness, and psychological safety. In other words, discretionary effort involves believing that one can invest oneself physically, cognitively, and psychologically on the job; contributing meaningfully to the success of the organization; having rewarding relationships with associates at work; and being assured of the resources required to accomplish one's responsibilities.

Kahn (1990) emphasized the integration of work and relationships, which he posited to result in the investment of self to the betterment of the organization. The idea behind Kahn's theory is that employers should partner with employees to design roles and tasks and pursue needed organizational change. Employees should feel safe to have an open dialogue with their employers.

Kahn's conceptualization of employee engagement has influenced a number of motivation theories and their applications. His work is related to that of Herzberg (Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg, 1965), which focused on what satisfies and dissatisfies employees. Herzberg's research demonstrated that factors that satisfy, called hygiene factors, (e.g., work policies, conditions, salary, safety, security) are unrelated to those that satisfy or motivate (achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement, growth). However, the theory has been subject to much criticism (Cummings & Elsalmi, 1968; House & Wigdor, 1967).

b. Job Demands and Resources (JD-R) Model

Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, and Schaufeli's (2001) proposed this model to study both job stressors and motivators (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008) by classifying organizational environment into job demands and job resources.

Here, job demands are related to burnout and job stress whereas job resources relate to work engagement and employee well-being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). The importance of this model is that it provides an efficient framework for engagement research that

provides various potential drivers.

c. Social Exchange Theory (SET)

SET as a unified theoretical framework was first employed by Saks (2006). According to this Job engagement is perceived to be exchanges for socio-economic resources between an employee and his organization where the governing rules of exchange are reciprocity or repayment rules. Here reciprocity implies fairness in transaction – organizational support or interventions as antecedents of engagement (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

With reference to **social exchange theory**, employees feel obliged to return favour to employers in the way of hard work and dedication when compensated with additional benefits like parental support.

d. Job engagement as an antithesis of Burnout

Apart from Kahn the other researcher who wielded considerable influence in this topic was Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter's (2001) who looked at job engagement as the antithesis of job burnout and perceived job engagement as the psychological states of energy, involvement, and efficacy.

Maslach et al.'s (2001) Foundation of Job Engagement was perceived to be directly opposite dimensions to those of burnout which consisted of exhaustion, cynicism and ineffectiveness in contrast to job engagement which is composed of energy, involvement, and efficacy (Maslach & Leiter, 1997; Maslach et al., 2001). Maslach et al. argued that chronic mismatches cause burnout and proposed six factors that lead to burnout:

- workload (e.g., excessive overload, lack of skills for a job, and emotional work),
- control (e.g., the level of responsibility),
- reward (e.g., financial rewards and recognition),
- community (e.g., interpersonal relationships at work),
- fairness (e.g., inequity of workload or pay), and
- values (e.g., conflicts in the values of a person and the organization).

Meyer and Gagne's (2008) focused on the need for unifying theory on engagement and stressed that **Self-determination theory (SDT)** can be employed as a guiding framework for engagement research. They stressed that engagement can be grounded in motivation theory by using SDT as a guiding framework.

e. Motivational theories

The guiding framework for job engagement of researchers were viewed from a motivational concept. Shuck and Wollard (2010) stressed the importance of underlying psychological processes of motivation as a means to address the complexity of the ways that engagement develops. The most important of the motivational theorists was of course Maslow's hierarchy of needs.

JOB ENGAGEMENT EXPLAINED WITH REFERENCE TO MASLOW'S HIERARCHY OF NEEDS

Maslow's (1943, 1970) hierarchy of needs has classification of needs starting with physiological needs, to safety, belongingness, esteem and self-actualization. The bottom three layers primarily deal with job satisfaction drivers and the top drivers relate to job engagement. At the physiological

level, employees look for tools and resources to equip them to perform better. They also look for a safe work place, short commutes to work, sufficient pay to meet immediate needs of survival. The physiological esteem of an employee is determined by the levels of compensation, salary and other perks at the work place. In the next level, safety needs are determined by the levels of security one feels with the company. Thus, issues like job security, insurance, benefits, regular training for meeting long term employability and sufficient pay to meet long term goals determine the safety needs. The safety esteems are met when an employee can fearlessly bring up ideas and concerns to seniors of the company. Belongingness is determined by diversity and inclusion, support from colleagues and superiors and social interactions in the work place. This sense of belonging is felt when the employee feels well informed about the functioning of the company. The company adequately recognizes and rewards employees who feels further engaged at their work. At the next level, esteem needs are met by regular recognition, two-way feedback, culture of appreciation and personal growth through learning and development. The actualization need is felt when an employee can alignment of professional and personal goals, a spirit of entrepreneurship, creative, rewarding work, work life balance, etc. These drives of engagement obviously differ between companies depending on factors like staff demographics, fluctuations in the economy, and company policies, etc.

OTHER MOTIVATIONAL THEORISTS

The next motivational theorist worth mentioning was Deci's (1971) Intrinsic Motivation. Deci had expanded De charms (1968) concept of external and internal locus of causality in terms of human motivation. According to Deci (1971), the concepts and studies on intrinsic motivation can be categorized into three types of approaches: optimal incongruity, reduction of uncertainty and competence and self-determination.

Another important contribution to the motivation theory was from Porter and Lawler's (1968) Expectancy Theory of Motivation which focuses on the role of extrinsic rewards in improving job performance. This theory suggests that these rewards based on performance need to be satisfy high-order needs, such as autonomy and self-actualization.

Prosocial motivation is a concept that explores employee's feelings, thoughts and actions which emerge as the desire to benefit others and is more altruistic than self-motivation. In the doctoral research work, Svandova (2015) demonstrated that employee work engagement showed a positive connection to the 2 prosocial job characteristics (perceived impact on beneficiaries and affective commitment to beneficiaries), but not a direct relation with prosocial motivation.

THE NEED FOR MEASURING JOB ENGAGEMENT

There is a general consensus amongst researchers that measuring engagement is the first step towards improving job engagement. Employee engagement metrics can help many of the intangible motivators of performance success and make them tangible, visible, and trackable. It is necessary as it directly correlates with performance and business results which every organization would be interested in. Employee engagement ensures that there is an attraction of high talent pool and reduction in attrition as it drives performance. Fundamental issues regarding meaning, measuring and key antecedents still require further research attention (Saks and Gruman, 2014).

Employee engagement is generally measured through employee pulse surveys, detailed employee satisfaction surveys, direct feedback, group discussions and even exit interviews of employees leaving the organization. These measurements are done to measure performance, strategic alignment, competency and satisfaction of contributors. These surveys are to be statistically validated and benchmarked against other in the same industry. From the organizational level, developing programs to raise level of employee engagement must be intentional and purposive based on the survey results.

Most organizations relegate the task of employee or job engagement to the HR department whereas it should be ideally embraced by the entire organization. Effective communication at all levels in the organization would ensure proper job engagement.

The most common means of measuring employee engagement are the UWES (Schaufeli, Salanova, et al., 2002), and the Job Engagement Scale (JES) (Rich et al., 2010). The validity of the UWES has been challenged in spite of its wide use (Newman & Harrison, 2008; Wefald et al., 2011) while the JES has stronger support in this regard (Alfes et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2014; He et al., 2014; Rich et al., 2010; Shuck et al., 2014). A comparison study was done Travis R Drake (2012) between the two scales UWES and JES and the results showed significant differences between construct and criterion validity evidence. Their study concluded that although the UWES has less psychometric strength than the JES, it is more strongly related to stress-related criterion than the JES.

Our study will utilize the Job Engagement Scale developed by Rich, Lepine, and Crawford (2010) who had reviewed the existing literature, compiled a list of items, and then modified the items to reflect Kahn's concept of engagement. They identified job engagement as a higher-order factor that consisted of three first-order dimensions (cognitive, emotional, and physical engagement). Rich et al. assessed the discriminant validity of the JES using CFA and revealed that the scale is distinct from other variables, including job involvement, job satisfaction, intrinsic motivation, and organizational citizenship behavior. The reliability coefficient of the instrument indicated that the measure established a strong reliability ($\alpha = .95$).

JOB ENGAGEMENT SCALE (JES)

Rich et al. (2010) justifies the reasons for basing a new scale based on Kahn's (1990) definition of engagement, which had three dimensions – physical, cognitive and emotional. It also addresses the actual 6 attitudes, behaviors, and cognitions that individuals demonstrate when they are engaged in their role. Kahn conceptualized and developed engagement as a distinct construct. Kahn conceptualized his work based on Kelman (1958)'s and Campbell's (1963) who focused on physical, cognitive and emotional aspects of engagement and for all the three items, Rich et al. (2010) relied on existing theorists. For instance, for cognitive, they drew from the in Rothbard's (2001) measure, including those identified as either attention (level of focus) or absorption (level of intensity).

The JES uses 18-items which consist of a three-factor scale: cognitive, emotional, and physical engagement using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' = 1 to 'strongly agree' = 5. Shuck et al. (2013) found an internal consistency reliability estimates for each subscale as the following: .94 for cognitive engagement, .93 for emotional engagement, and .90 for physical

engagement.

Rich et al. (2010) conceived the JES as they felt that the existing UWES included “items that confound engagement with the antecedent conditions suggested by Kahn”. A part of the UWES is designed to look at the participants’ perceptions of the level of meaningfulness and challenge of work, which Rich et al. argued did not align completely with Kahn’s conceptualization. Normally, JES is chosen for eliminating the measurement of the ‘perceptions of the level of meaningfulness’ within the concept of employee engagement.

Researcher, Hayden, Colleen Marie (2019) while studying the EES based on Kahn’s work, found that it lacked measurement of the leader’s own level of engagement. Basit and Chauhan (2017) was probably the first research work conducted on Asian studies that focused on the psychometric properties of JES.

The JES, however, is not the most popular measure of employee engagement and the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) was the most utilized scale in literature to measure employee engagement. Comparisons of the UWES and JES have determined that they are correlated but not interchangeable (Byrne et al., 2016).

THE UTRECHT WORK ENGAGEMENT SCALE (UWES)

This scale developed by Schaufeli et al. (2002) originated as the opposite of MBI (Maslach et al., 1997) and measures three dimensions: vigour, dedication and absorption. This demonstrates that job engagement can be differentiated from similar constructs such as job involvement and organizational commitment, in-role and extra-role behaviour, personal initiative, Type A personality, workaholism, etc.

The validity of the UWES has been challenged in spite of its wide use (Newman & Harrison, 2008; Wefald et al., 2011) while the JES has stronger support in this regard (Alfes et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2014; He et al., 2014; Rich et al., 2010; Shuck et al., 2014). The UWES conceptualizes employee engagement as being the opposite of burn-out and focuses on measuring general work attitudes (Schaufeli et al. 2002) whereas the JES may be more appropriate for research purposes in order to distinguish among constructs.

OTHER SCALES

The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) is an alternative instrument for the assessment of work engagement. It consists of two dimensions: exhaustion-vigor and cynicism-dedication.

Andrade et.al (2021) studied the **Arbinger 360 scale** and found it to have future practical applications in the workplace and future research compared to the JES and UWES.

Some other important scales measuring job engagement and worth mentioning are: **The Shirom Melamed Vigor Measure (SMVM)** was developed by Shirom (2004) and Sak’s (2006) two – 6 item questionnaire scale, IES 16-item measure developed by **Robinson et al. (2004)** and the **9-item ISA engagement measure developed by Soane et al. (2012)**.

CONCLUSION

The Relevance Of Job Engagement In The Indian Context

Finally, a word about Job engagement with reference to the Indian context. The impact of Job

engagement and organizational commitment in Indian context in the IT industry was studied by Vandana Singh. Her research indicated that job engagement and organizational commitment significantly correlated with IT organizational performance and significantly impact the organizational performance of IT. Needless to say, that the Indian IT industry has revolutionized global sourcing and has emerged as one of the sunrise sectors for the country. This sector is one of the fastest growing sectors in the country and its dimensions predicting of growth and globalization has reached new milestones over the last decade.

Job engagement has demonstrated its capabilities most vibrant in the IT sector in India. This is primarily because Indian have excelled in the IT service sector as an organisation. At an individual level Indians have demonstrated deep levels of engagement as employees. Indian IT companies established globally their superiority in terms of cost advantage available of quality services and skilled manpower. They have enhanced their global delivery capabilities through a combination of inorganic growth initiatives and organic.

National Association of Software & Services Companies (NASSCOM) has also envisaged the Indian IT/ITES industry to achieve a revenue target of USD billion by 2025 for which the industry needs to grow by about 13.7% in the next six years. Despite headwinds in 2020, Indian tech contributed 8% relative share to the national GDP, with 52% relative share in services exports, and 50% share in total FDI (Based on FDI inflows for the period April to September 2020).

Resonating with the overarching call-to-action for Atmanirbhar Bharat (Self Reliant India), domestic digital adoption intensified in 2020. The Indian domestic market, driven by hardware led demand continued to show resilience, growing at 3.4% in the year. Interestingly, COVID -19 has accelerated digital adoption across industries and technology service providers are witnessing a sharp growth in digital deals.

Available research on the Indian experience on job engagement is scant and a lot of scholarly research is required to study in depth about the success story of Job engagement, especially in the IT sector.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ababneh, O. M. A, (2015). Conceptualizing and measuring employee engagement and examining the antecedents of leadership styles and personality attributes. *Auckland University of Technology*.
- Abdullah. (2011). Evaluation of Allen and Meyer's organizational commitment scale: A cross-cultural application in Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Vocational Research*, 1(3), 80-86.
- Abraham, S. (2012a). Development of employee engagement programme on the basis of employee satisfaction. *Journal of Economic Development, Management, IT, Finance and Marketing*, 4(1), 27-37. Retrieved from Walden Library databases.
- Albrecht, S. L. (2010). Employee Engagement: 10 questions for research and practice. In S.L Albrecht (Eds.). *Handbook of employee engagement: perspective, issues, research and practice* (pp-319). Retrieved from <http://books.google.co.nz>
- Alderfer, C. P. (1972). *Human needs in Organizational Settings*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Alfes, K., Shantz, A. D., Truss, C., & Soane, E. C. (2013). The link between perceived human resource management practices, engagement and employee behaviour: A moderated mediation model. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24, 330-351.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.679950> Brass, D. J. (1985).

- Ali, Faiza; Malik, Ashish; Pereira, Vijay; Ariss, Akram Al (2017-04-28). "A relational understanding of work-life balance of Muslim migrant women in the west: future research agenda" (PDF). The International Journal of Human Resource Management. 28 (8): 1163–1181.
- Andrade, M.S., Miller, R.M. & Siwachok, E (2021). A new measure of employee engagement: a comparative study. Amity Journal of Management. Vol. IX, No. 1, January – June 2021.
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. (2007). Vol. IX, No. 1, Human Resource Management, 43, 83-104.
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work and Stress*, 22, 187-200.
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187-200. doi: 10.1080/02678370802393649
- Barbars, A. (2019). Interactions between organizational culture and work engagement in the Information and communication technology sector in Latvia. *Journal of Business Management*. Vol 5, No 2.
- Brown, S. P. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 235–255. 178
- Byrne, Z. S., Peters, J. M., & Weston, J. W. (2016). The struggle with employee engagement: Measures and construct clarification using five samples. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(9), 1201–1227.
- Catteeuw, F., Flynn, E., & Vonderhorst, J. (2007). Employee engagement: Boosting productivity in turbulent times. *Organization Development Journal*, 25(2), 151-157. Retrieved from Walden Library databases.
- Chen, C., Yen, C., & Tsai, F. C. (2014). Job crafting and job engagement: The mediating role of person-job fit. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 37, 21–28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.10.006>
- Christian, M., Garza, A., & Slaughter, J. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64 (1), 89-136.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31, 874-900. Dale Carnegie Training (2014). Engaged employee's infographic.
- Cummings, L. L., & Elsalmi, A. M. (1968). Empirical research on the bases and correlates of managerial motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 70, 127–144. Custom Insight. (2019).
- Deci, E. L. (1971). The effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18, 105-115.
- Doherty, R. (2010). Making employee engagement an end-to-end practice. *Strategic HR Review*, 9(3), 32-37. doi: 10.1108/14754391011040055
- Drake, T. J. (2012). Assessing Employment Engagement: A comparison of the job engagement scale and the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. *Colorado State University*.
- Eschenfelder, B. (2012). Exploring the nature of nonprofit work through emotional labor. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 26(1), 173-178. doi: 10.1177/0893318911424373
- Gable, S. A., Chyung, S. Y., Marker, A., & Winiecki, D. (2010). How should Organizational leaders use employee engagement survey data? *Performance Improvement*, 49(4), 17-25. doi: 10.1002/pfi.20140

- Nicolas Gillet, N et.al (2020). A Person-Centered Perspective on the Combined Effects of Global and Specific Levels of Job Engagement. *Group and Organization Management*, SAGE Publications, 2020, 45 (4), pp.556-594. [ff10.1177/1059601119899182](https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601119899182). [ff.fhal-03142256f](https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601119899182)
- Granatino, R., Verkamp, J., & Parker, R. S. (2013). The use of secret shopping as a method of increasing engagement in the healthcare industry: A case study. *International Journal of Healthcare Management*, 6(2), 114-121. doi: 10.1179/2047971913Y.0000000039
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- 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, 268-279.
- Hayden, C. M. (2011). Measuring leader level engagement: addressing the gaps in employee engagement research. *Wright State University*.
- He, H., Zhu, W., & Zheng, X. (2014). Procedural justice and employee engagement: Roles of organizational identification and moral identity centrality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122, 681–695. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1774-3>
- Heger, B. K. (2007). Linking the employee value proposition to employee engagement and business outcomes: Preliminary findings for a linkage research pilot study. *Organizational Development Journal*, 25, 121-133.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley.
- Herzberg, F. (1965). The motivation to work among Finnish supervisors. *Personnel Psychology*, 18, 393–402.
- House, R. J., & Wigdor, L. A. (1967). Herzberg's dual-factor theory of job satisfaction and motivation: A review of the evidence and a criticism. *Personnel Psychology*, 20, 369–389.
- Inamizu, N., & Makishima, M. (2018). Job performance explains work engagement: Curvilinear relations between the two. *Annals of Business Administrative Science*, 17, 159– 169. doi:10.7880/abas.0180712a
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692–724. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256287>
- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 309-336.
- Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, identification and internalization: Three processes of attitude change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2, 51-61
- Kosaka, D. & Sato, H. (2020). Employee engagement and work engagement: Same wine different bottles? *Annals of business administrative science* 19(2020), 227-239. <http://doi.org.10.7880.abas.0200911a>
- Lowe, G. (2012). How employee engagement matters for hospital performance. *Healthcare Quarterly*, 15(2), 29-39. Retrieved from Walden Library databases.
- Macey, W.H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 3-30
- Maslach, C., Schaufelli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- Maheshwari, S., Bhat, R., & Saha, S. (2008). Commitment among State Health Officials & its Implications for Health Sector Reform: Lessons from Gujarat. *The Indian Journal of Medical Research*, 127, 148–153. PMID:1840379.

- Maslach, C., Jackson, S.E., & Leiter, M. (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and Personality* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Mitchell, M.L. (2015). Emotional Labour and employee engagement within a pediatric hospital. *Walden dissertation and doctoral studies*. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>.
- Newman, D. A., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Been there, bottled that: Are state and behavioral work engagement new and useful construct –wines||? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1, 31–35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.00003.x>
- Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1968). *Managerial attitudes and performance*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Porter, L., Steers, R., Mowday, R., & Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Rheem, D. (2018). *William Kahn: Father of employee engagement*. <https://donrheem.com/william-kahn-father-of-employeeengagement/>
- Rich, B. L., LePine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 617–635. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2010.5146898>
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). The drivers of employee engagement.
- Robinson, D., Hooker, H., & Hayday, S. (2007) *Engagement: The continuing story*. Brighton, UK: Institute for Employment Studies
- Robison, J. (2012). Leading the way to better patient care: How Cleveland clinic took caregiving to a higher level with a focus on engaging employees. *Gallup Business Journal*: businessjournal.gallup.com.
- Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or depleting: The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 655-684. doi: 10.2307/3094827
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- Saks, A. M., and Gruman, J.A. (2014). *What do we really know about employee engagement?* *Human Resource Development Quarterly*. 25(2), 155-182. Doi. 10.1002.job.248
- Sahoo, C. K., & Mishra, S. (2012). A framework towards employee engagement: The PSU experience. *ASCI Journal of Management*, 42(1), 94-112. Retrieved from Walden Library databases.
- Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiró, J. M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1217–1227.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). *The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach*. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71–92.
- Serrano, S. A., & Reichard, R. J. (2011). Leadership strategies for an engaged workforce. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 63(3), 176-189. doi: 10.1037/a0025621
- Shirom, A. (2004). “Feeling vigorous at work? The construct of vigor and the study of positive

affect in organizations” in D. Ganster and P.L. Perrewe (eds.) *Research in Organizational Stress and Well-being* Vol. 3, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp. 135-165.

- Shuck, B. (2013). Invited Reaction: Further Observations on the Relationship Between Work Engagement and Performance: A Review of Empirical Literature and a Proposed Research Agenda. *Human Resource Development Review*, 12(3), 277-283.
- Shuck, Brad; Wollard, Karen K. (2011). "Antecedents to Employee Engagement: A Structured Review of the Literature". *Advances in Developing Human Resources*. 13 (4): 429 - 446. doi:[10.1177/1523422311431220](https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422311431220).
- Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(1), 89-110.
- Shuck, B., Reio, T. G., & Rocco, T. S. (2011). Employee engagement: An examination of antecedent and outcome variables. *Human Resource Development International*, 14(4), 427-445. doi: 10.1080/13678868.2011.601587
- Shuck, B., Twyford, D., Reio, T. J., Jr., & Shuck, A. (2014). Human resource development practices and employee engagement: Examining the connection with employee turnover intentions. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 25, 239–270.
- Singh, V. (2019). The impact of job engagement and organizational commitment on organizational performance. In *Management Techniques for employee engagement in contemporary organizations*. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-7799-7.ch013
- Soane, E., Truss, C., Alfes, K., Shantz, A., Rees, C. and Gatenby, M., 2012. Development and application of a new measure of employee engagement: The ISA Engagement Scale. *Human Resource Development International*, 15(5), pp. 529-547.
- Suliman, A. M., & Iles, P. A. (2000). Is continuance commitment beneficial to organizations? Commitment–performance relationship: A New Look. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(5), 407–422. doi:10.1108/02683940010337158
- Sung, M. (2017). *Antecedents of Job engagement: the mediating role of psychological states*. University of Georgia.
- Svandova, J. (2015). *The role of prosocial job characteristics and prosocial motivation in facilitating employee motivation*. University of Ljubljana.
- Wefald, A. J., Reichard, R. J., & Serrano, S. A. (2011). Fitting engagement into a nomological network: The relationship of engagement to leadership and personality. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 18, 522–537.
- 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(3), 235–244. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2008.11.003