



“A Study on Employee Engagement and Its Impact On Business Performance”

1.MS.BALKI VANI

(ResearchScholar,HBS,GITAM, University,Hyderabad)

2.Dr. SUMAN BABU

(Asst.Prof, HBS,GITAM University,Hyderabad)

ABSTRACT

Organizational success depends on employee’s productivity which is accelerated through employee’s commitment towards his organisation. This paper is attempted to analyze the relevance of engaged employees for the growth and development of organisation and its success. Employee Engagement is the level of employee’s commitment and participation towards their organization and its values. With the Employee Engagement becoming an area of emergent concern in the literature, the purpose of the study is to have deep analysis of the relationship between Employee Engagement and Organizational Performance and its outcomes. All organizations want their employees to be engaged in their work. Employee engagement is linked to customer satisfaction which is linked to an organization's financial success. Engagement comes about when enough people care about doing a good job and care about what the organisation is trying to achieve and how it goes about doing it. This caring attitude and behaviour only comes about when people get satisfaction from the jobs they do believe that the organisation supports them and work with an effective HR manager. This paper makes an attempt to study the different dimensions of employee engagement with the help of review of literature. This can be used to provide an overview and references on some of the conceptual and practical work undertaken in the area of the employee engagement practices in India.

Methods/Statistical Analysis: For this study, researchers have used review method. Under the process of review around thirty academic and popular research papers/ literature in the area of employee engagement, researchers have come up with different factors which are mostly commonly mentioned in these research papers. The review process aims at strengthening existing literature. After studying all the factors in each research paper, authors have taken the findings.



Applications/Improvements: Study results has scope of future reference where by implementing various engagement factors for improved productivity and business performance.

Key Words: Employee Engagement, Organizational performance and outcomes

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Engagement is described in HR literature as: the enthusiasm that employees feel with regards to their work (1). Engagement is the degree to which employees are passionate about their work and devote themselves to their work. Engaged employees go the extra mile to contribute to the success of your organisation. In short, engagement means that employees work and express themselves in a physical, cognitive and emotional manner. The management is finding itself being tested every day on its capabilities to keep its employee engaged while also implementing the policies defined. Employee turnover has taken different sectors in the industry by a storm, as employees are found to be constantly switching jobs thus causing high attrition rates. Hence employee retention and engagement has become a daunting task in these unstable economic times. Many surveys and studies are being conducted all around the world by several HR professionals to derive at conclusions about the factors responsible for influencing the engagement. Today we are living in an era of globalization where change is certain and the management of human capital is important for the success of the organization. As the organizations are facing huge competitions have realized the importance of making their employees fully linked with the organizations and their job.

'Employee Engagement' is quite a new construct in HR literature. Engaging employees is a key to satisfy organization's customers. HR consultants consider that the engagement is how employee feels about the work and how he or she is treated in the organization. Employee engagement is rightly viewed as the main aspect of productivity. Organizations have an important role in our daily lives and therefore, successful organizations represent a key ingredient for developing nations. Continuous performance is the focus Determinants of organizational performance of any organization because only through performance organizations are able to grow and progress. Thus, organizational performance is one of the most important variables in the management research and arguably the most important indicator of the organizational performance. Managers began to understand that an organization is successful if it accomplishes its goals (effectiveness) using a minimum of resources (efficiency).



When companies start traveling the road map to engagement, the improvements along the way can seem abstract. But the outcomes of engagement initiatives are more than increased employee satisfaction. Increased engagement drives real, measurable business results. Engaged employee is almost three times more sincere toward his job in comparison to those employees who are actively disengaged (Kular, Gatenby, Rees, Soane, & Truss, 2008). Therefore the organization should focus on the aspect of employee engagement in order to improve organizational performance (Basbous, 2011; Sundaray, 2011). Employee engagement can be a deciding factor for organizational effectiveness. It does not only have the potential to significantly affect employee retention, productivity and loyalty, but also has a key link to customer satisfaction, company reputation and overall stakeholder value (Sundaray, 2011). Engaged employees provide a lot of benefits to the organization such as productivity, improved quality, customer care, cooperation among the employees, reduced employee turnover, reduced absenteeism and disputes (Wilson, 2009; Mortimer, 2010).. In the present business environment, organizations across the globe are enhancing the level of engagement of their employees in order to gain competitive advantage in the form of higher productivity, profitability, lower turnover and safety of the organization (Mani, 2011).

1.1 Types of Engaged Employees

According to the Gallup, the Consulting Organization, there are mainly three types of engagement that occur in the organization. All are different in terms of involvement and their role in the organization. Types of employee engagement are

1.1(a). Engaged Employees

An engaged employee is considered as the base of the organizational development. Such kind of employees carry the organization in positive direction. They not only perform their work but also play an important role in achieving the organizational goals and objectives. Engaged employees want to use their talent and strength at work every day. They perform with passion, drive innovation and move their organization forward through their performance (Vazirani, 2007).

1.1(b) Not Engaged

These kind of employees care only about their work not any other things like goals, objectives and development of the organization. They do not have energy and enthusiasm in their work (Reilly, 2014). These categories of employees do not have cooperative relationship with their colleagues as well as the employers also. Their contribution is little in the success and development of the organization.



1.1(c) Actively Disengaged

Actively disengaged employees do not perform their work in a proper manner and do not complete their work timely. Their contribution is almost negligible in the success and development of the organization. They are unhappy at work and look after the work of the other member of the organization. Such kind of employee carry the organization in the negative direction and organization suffers in achieving its goals and objectives (Vazirani, 2007).

1.1(d). Characteristics of Engaged Employees

According to Robinson, Perryman, and Hayday (as cited in IES, 2003) an engaged employee has the following characteristics:

1. Engaged employees have emotional attachment with their job as well as the organization.
2. They have trust in the employers of the organization.
3. Engaged employees are more committed towards their work as well as organization also.
4. Create healthy working environment and respect other employees of the organization.
5. Cooperate with their colleagues to perform effectively.
6. Engaged employees perform beyond the expectation of the employers.
7. Perform their work in view of goals and objectives of the organization.
8. Engaged employees make necessary change as per requirement and keep update with the knowledge in their field.

III. Literature Review

This literature review is examined peer-reviewed journal articles, working papers, textbooks, and other published resources relevant to employee engagement. Rothbard (2001) defines engagement as psychological presence and, furthermore, states that it involves two critical components: attention and absorption. Attention refers to cognitive availability and the amount of time one spends thinking about a role, while absorption means being engrossed in a role and refers to the intensity of one's focus on a role. According to Maslach et al. (2001), six areas of work-life lead to either burnout or engagement: workload, control, rewards and recognition, community and social support, perceived fairness and values. They argue that job engagement is associated with a sustainable workload, feelings of choice and control, appropriate recognition and reward, a supportive work community, fairness and justice, and meaningful and valued work. According to Holbeche and Springett (2003), people's perceptions of 'meaning' with regard to the workplace are clearly linked to their levels of engagement and, ultimately, their performance. They argue that employees actively seek meaning through their work



and, unless organisations try to provide a sense of meaning, employees are likely to quit. Robinson et al. (2004) define employee engagement as "a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its value. An engaged employee is aware of business context, and works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization. The organization must work to develop and nurture engagement, which requires a two-way relationship between employer and employee."

According to Pech and Slade (2006), globalization, speed, and ambiguity in the business landscape demand the highest levels of fitness to facilitate organizational survival. In such volatile environments, competitors with the correct combination of economic output, trust, innovation and leadership have the greatest prospects of survival. Penna (2007) researchers have also come up with a new model they called "Hierarchy of engagement" which resembles Maslow's need hierarchy model. In the bottom line there are basic needs of pay and benefits. Once an employee satisfied these needs, then the employee looks to development opportunities, the possibility for promotion and then leadership style will be introduced to the mix in the model. Finally, when all the above cited lower level aspirations have been satisfied the employee looks to an alignment of value-meaning, which is displayed by a true sense of connection, a common purpose and a shared sense of meaning at work. Mone and London (2010) defined employee engagement is "a condition of employee who feels involved, committed, passionate, and empowered and demonstrates those feelings in work behaviour". It is thus the level of commitment and involvement an employee has towards their organization and its values. The organization must work to develop and nurture engagement, which requires a two-way relationship between employer and employee. Thus, employee engagement is a barometer that determines the association of a person with the organization.

Practitioners and academics tend to agree that the consequences of employee engagement are positive (Saks 2006). There is a general belief that there is a connection between employee engagement and business results; a meta-analysis conducted by Harter et al (2002:272) confirms this connection. They concluded that, "...employee satisfaction and engagement are related to meaningful business outcomes at a magnitude that is important to many organisations". However, engagement is an individual-level construct and if it does lead to business results, it must first impact individual-level outcomes. Therefore, there is reason to

Practitioners and academics tend to agree that the consequences of employee engagement are positive (Saks 2006). There is a general belief that there is a connection between employee engagement and business results; a meta-analysis conducted by Harter et al (2002:272)



confirms this connection. They concluded that, "...employee satisfaction and engagement are related to meaningful business outcomes at a magnitude that is important to many organisations". However, engagement is an individual-level construct and if it does lead to business results, it must first impact individual-level outcomes. Therefore, there is reason to Practitioners and academics tend to agree that the consequences of employee engagement are positive (Saks 2006). There is a general belief that there is a connection between employee engagement and business results; a meta-analysis conducted by Harter et al (2002:272) confirms this connection. They concluded that, "...employee satisfaction and engagement are related to meaningful business outcomes at a magnitude that is important to many organisations". However, engagement is an individual-level construct and if it does lead to business results, it must first impact individual-level outcomes. Therefore, there is reason to Practitioners and academics tend to agree that the consequences of employee engagement are positive (Saks 2006). There is a general belief that there is a connection between employee engagement and business results; a meta-analysis conducted by Harter et al (2002:272) confirms this connection. They concluded that, "...employee satisfaction and engagement are related to meaningful business outcomes at a magnitude that is important to many organisations". However, engagement is an individual-level construct and if it does lead to business results, it must first impact individual-level outcomes. Therefore, there is reason to

Engagement Impact On Organization's Productivity: Employee's knowledge of how well an organization's assets are being managed has a positive impact on engagement. There is a strong link between productivity and engagement. Employees' knowledge of an organization's productivity levels also has positive impact on engagement. Employee Engagement depends on four major conditions in the workplace such as organization's culture, continuous reinforcement of people focused policies, meaningful metrics and organizational performance.

1. Corporate culture helps an organization to connect with the employees, gives them empowerment in decision making process and develops them to shoulder greater responsibilities.
2. Continuous reinforcement happens when an organization frames policies which act as facilitator towards accomplishment of goals by the employees and thereby the organization itself.
3. Meaningful metrics refers to devising performance measurement criterion in such a way that employees are clear about their goals.



4. Organizational performance leads to pride, job satisfaction, trust and a sense of belongingness to the organization.

Employees should have the feeling that they possess the right kind of physical, cognitive and emotional resources to perform their job at optimum level. An organization should also know how to project and communicate the success stories of the organization to the employees. Thus employees are able to relate their individual performances with the success and also understand how their performance has a direct impact on the performance of the organization as a whole. This contributes towards enhanced employee engagement. High engagement leads to higher financial performance, higher productivity, higher customer satisfaction and lower manpower turnover

Organisational Outcomes Of Employee Engagement: Employee engagement is a critical part of organizational success. Employee engagement predicts the employee outcomes, organizational success, and financial performance. The impact of engagement or disengagement can manifest itself through productivity and organizational performance, outcomes for customers of the organization, employee retention rates and organizational culture.

Practitioners and academics tend to agree that the consequences of employee engagement are positive (Saks 2006). There is a general belief that there is a connection between employee engagement and business results; a meta-analysis conducted by Harter et al (2002:272) confirms this connection. They concluded that, “...employee satisfaction and engagement are related to meaningful business outcomes at a magnitude that is important to many organisations”. However, engagement is an individual-level construct and if it does lead to business results, it must first impact individual-level outcomes. Therefore, there is reason to expect employee engagement is related to individuals’ attitudes, intentions, and behaviours.

Although neither Kahn (1990) nor May et al (2004) included outcomes in their studies, Kahn (1992) proposed that high levels of engagement lead to both positive outcomes for individuals, (eg quality of people’s work and their own experiences of doing that work), as well as positive organisational-level outcomes (eg the growth and productivity of organisations).

The Gallup Organisation (2004) found critical links between employee engagement, customer loyalty, business growth and profitability. They compared the scores of these variables among a sample of stores scoring in the top 25 per cent on employee engagement and customer loyalty with those in the bottom 25 per cent. Stores in the bottom 25 per cent significantly under-performed across three productivity measures: sales, customer complaints and turnover. Gallup cites numerous similar



examples. The International Survey Research (ISR) team has similarly found encouraging evidence that organisations can only reach their full potential through emotionally engaging employees and customers (ISR 2005).

In an extension of the Gallup findings, Ott (2007) cites Gallup research, which found that higher workplace engagement predicts higher earnings per share (EPS) among publicly-traded businesses. When compared with industry competitors at the company level, organisations with more than four engaged employees for every one actively disengaged, experienced 2.6 times more growth in EPS than did organisations with a ratio of slightly less than one engaged worker for every one actively disengaged employee.

The findings can be considered as reliable as the variability in differing industries was controlled by comparing each company to its competition, and the patterns across time for EPS were explored due to a ‘bouncing’ increase or decrease which is common in EPS (Ott 2007). Whilst this research does not show investors and business leaders exactly what organisations are doing on a day-to-day basis to develop engaged employees, the findings do demonstrate differences in overall performance between companies, and Gallup’s meta-analyses present strong evidence that highly engaged workgroups within companies outperform groups with lower employee engagement levels, and the recent findings reinforce these conclusions at the workgroup level. The meta-analysis study shows that top-quartile business units have 12 per cent higher customer advocacy, 18 per cent higher productivity, and 12 per cent higher profitability than bottom-quartile business units. In contrast, bottom-quartile business units experience 31 per cent to 51 per cent more employee turnover and 62 per cent more accidents than those in the top quartile of workplace engagement. This research into EPS provides a degree of proof that employee engagement correlates to crucial business outcomes.

IV. Employee Engagement & Business Results

Numerous studies show a direct correlation between employee engagement and business results:

1. A 2008 BlessingWhite study demonstrated a correlation between engagement and retention—85% of engaged employees planned to remain with their employer for ten or more months.
2. Towers Perrin discovered that high-engagement firms grow their earnings-per-share (EPS) at a faster rate (28%) while low-engagement firms experienced an average EPS growth rate decline of 11.2%.



3. The Center for Human Resource Strategy at Rutgers University found that highly engaged business units were on average 3.4 times more effective financially than units who were less engaged. This paper also found that when disengaged, workers can cost the company in lost productivity and negatively affect customer relationships.

4. A report by the Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM) estimates that by strengthening engagement, MolsonCoors saved more than \$1.7 million in one year—citing one example where the average cost of a “safety incident” for an engaged employee was \$63, compared with the average of \$392 for a disengaged employee.

5. Hewitt found that highly engaged firms had a total shareholder return that was 19% higher than average in 2009. In low-engagement organizations, total shareholder return was actually 44% below average.

Significant literature available indicates the positive impact of employee engagement on the financial performance of a firm (Harter et al., 2002; Towers Perrin, 2007; Walton, 2009). Empirical evidence exists that establishes a strong positive correlation between employee engagement and operating income, employee engagement and earnings per share, and employee engagement and shareholder value (Towers Perrin, 2007; Walton, 2009). Konrad (2006) believes that apart from the shareholders, employees also stand to gain when the profits of a firm increase due to employee engagement. The increased profits result in increased pay packages, resources, perks and promotions for the employees (Heger, 2007). Engaged employees display many behaviors aligned with organizational success.

Significant amount of research has been undertaken to further substantiate the linkage between people and an organizations financial performance. Tower Perrin Linkage Framework deconstructs the four core elements in the fundamental relationship between people and business (financial performance). When a company aligns its programs and practices within this framework to drive the right behavior from employees through to customers, it positions itself to realize an appropriate return on its people investment. By contrast, when a company builds its people programs in a strategic and operational vacuum — with no explicit or implicit links to behavior and performance — it will not only fail to achieve a return on investment but may, overtime, see a drop in customer retention, profitability and the like.



Impact of employee engagement on productivity



Employees who are engaged with their job and employer are more productive because they are motivated beyond personal factors. They are more focused and more motivated than their disengaged counterparts. This means they work more efficiently and with the success of the organisation in mind. In 2009, Harter et al. conducted a meta-analysis encompassing 199 research studies across 152 organisations in 44 industries and 26 countries. They statistically calculated the available data on business/work unit level relationship between [employee engagement](#) and performance outcomes within in each study. The studies covered 32,394 business/work units and 955,905 employees (Harter et al. 2009). Their findings quantified significant differences between business units ranking in the top and bottom 25% on engagement. They found an 18% drop in productivity between the top and bottom performers. Additionally, there was a 60% drop in quality (measured by defects in products).

In a similar study into Fortune 100 companies, it was found that there was a dramatic 1,000 percent increase in errors among disengaged versus engaged employee populations (Gonring, 2008). Research consistently shows that low levels of [employee engagement](#) are detrimental to performance. In fact, it has been found that employees that are highly engaged are twice as likely to be top performers (Taleo Research, 2009)

V.A close analysis of employee engagement on business outcomes

Employees are often considered the determining factor between booming and mediocre companies bound to remain in the shadow. The difference between the two types is that successful companies have engaged employees; they're admired by their competition and envied for their success. The connection between business performance and commitment at the workplace has been broadly talked about by academics, OD consultants, and HR professionals. Nonetheless, many line managers and C-level executives, who still think that employee engagement is a fuzzy, soft concept, and they can't



understand why it is so important to keep workers motivated. It is imperative for business owners of all types to grasp that engagement has a great impact on the financial outcomes of their companies.

VI. Employee engagement – an important contributor to a company’s success

How would you characterize success? For many CEOs, everything comes down to a single word: profit. To truly understand the most important aspect of success in business, it’s paramount to measure and examine your company’s most important assets: your employees. They’re the ones to help you thrive, so they must be treated right otherwise they will leave and search for another job that can satisfy their demands. Employees make the difference between a thriving and a dull company that will never reach the top of the pyramid. When everyone in your enterprise, micro-business, or non-profit organization works with pleasure, engagement, and determination, things will work to your advantage, and sooner or later, you’ll come out of the shadow and reap great benefits.

Money is great, yet its recognition and attention that your company needs to become well-known. When employees feel like they’re being part of a “family” they’ll be more willing to take chances and go to extreme lengths to help you accomplish success. Studies have proven over the years that widespread and frequent employee recognition, connected to corporate values, generate a constructive corporate culture and thus adds to future company sustainability. How can leaders measure the effectiveness of their enterprises? What does it take to achieve great performance? For starters, you can begin with paying more attention to employee engagement, because the people who work for you are vital for your company’s long-term achievements.

VII. Conclusion:

After reviewing the various research and survey findings of employee engagement, it can be certainly concluded that high levels of employee engagement will lead to improved employee commitment & involvement towards job and thus creating a motivated workforce, that will work together to achieve the common goals of the organization . Acquiring skilled workforce is just not enough in today's changing economy like ours; instead a lot needs to be done to retain, involve and make them committed to the organization and its goals. The organizations should not only provide their employees with great infrastructure and other facilities but also freedom to make their work exciting and also are providing them an environment wherein they can say good-bye to a monotonous work.



They should focus on retention as an outcome of three HR focus areas such as employee motivation, career growth & remuneration, and compensation.

In the present study, the researcher has tested the impact of employee engagement on organizational performance in terms of customer satisfaction and turnover intention and found that there was strong and positive relationship between employee engagement and customer satisfaction. The researcher has also reported that employee engagement was moderately and negatively related with turnover intention. Cattermole and Johnson, (2014) were also in the same opinion and reported that there is strong relationship between employee engagement and organizational performance. Ariani (2013) has reported that employee engagement is positively related with organizational performance. The organizations which have high level of employee engagement are having higher profitability, productivity and lower attrition rate. In a study conducted by Sreekanth and Aryasri, (2012) revealed that employee engagement improves organizational performance and guest satisfaction. Whereas Robertson (2012) has discussed that if employee engagement is high, definitely organizational performance is improved. All the researchers have pointed out that there is strong relationship between employee engagement and organizational performance. However, in last it can be said that employee engagement which is strongly related with organizational performance can be derived from a strong mutual relationship among the co-employees, their employer and the organization as a whole. Thus by increasing the level of employee engagement, the organizations can enhance organizational performance

REFERENCES:

1. Abraham. S. (2012) "Job Satisfaction as an Antecedent to Employee Engagement", SIES Journal of Management, 8(2), 27-36.
2. Adi. A.N. (2012) "Driving Performance and Retention to Employee Engagement: A Case Study in University of Brawijaya", Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research, 2(1), 338 – 350
3. Albdour. A. A. & Altarwneh. I.I. (2012) "Corporate Social Responsibility and Employee Engagement in Jordan", International Journal of Business and Management, 7(16), 89-105.
4. Allen. D. G., Shore. L. M. & Griffeth. R. W. (2003) "The Role of Perceived Organizational Support and Supportive Human Resource Practices in the Turnover Process", Journal of Management, 29(1), 99–118.
5. Allen. M. W. (1992) "Communication and organizational commitment: Perceived organizational support as a mediating factor", Communication Quarterly, 40 216



6. Ayache. Z. & Naima. G. (2014) "The Impact of Flexible Benefits Plan on Organization Commitment and Intention to Quit", *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(8), 136-145.
7. Bakker. A. B., Demerouti. E., Schaufeli. W.B. & Schreurs. P. (2003) "A multigroup analysis of the job demand-resources model in four home care organizations", *International Journal of Stress Management*, 10, 16–38.
8. Bakker. A. B., & Demerouti. E., (2008) "Toward a model of work engagement", *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223.
9. Balakrishnan. C., Masthan. D. & Chandra. V. (2013) "Employee Retention through Employee engagement – A study at an Indian International Airport", *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 2(8), 09-16.
10. Baldev S.R. & Anupama. R. (2010) "Determinants of Employee engagement in a Private Sector Organization: A Exploratory Study", *Advances in Management*, 3(10), 52-59.
11. Bardwick. J. M. (2008) "One Foot Out the Door", *American Management Association*
12. Bentler. P.M., & Bonett. D.G. (1980) "Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures", *Psychological Bulletin*, 88, 588–606.
13. Bernthal. P.R. (2005) "Measuring employee engagement", *Development Dimensions International. Inc.*, from
14. http://www.ddiworld.com/pdf/ddi_MeasuringEmployeeEngagement_wp.pdf
15. Berry. M. L. (2010) "Predicting Turnover Intent: Examining the Effects of Employee Engagement, Compensation Fairness, Job Satisfaction, and Age", PhD diss., University of Tennessee. http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/678
16. Beverly L. & Philip L. (2006) "Employee Engagement: Conceptual Issues, *Journal of Organizational Culture*", *Communications and Conflict*, 10(1), 111-120.
17. Bhat. Z. H. (2013) "Examining the Relationship between P-O fit and Turnover Intentions", *Paripex - Indian Journal of Research*, 3(5), 158-159.
18. Bhatnagar. Y. (2007) "Talent management strategy of employee engagement in Indian ITES employees: key to retention", *Employee Relations*, 29(6), 640–663.
19. Boxx. W. R., Odom. R. Y., & Dunn. M. G. (1991) "Organizational values and value congruency and their impact on satisfaction, commitment, and cohesion: An empirical examination within the public sector", *Public Personnel Management*, 20(1), 195-205.
20. Burke. R. I. & Deszca. E. (1982) "Preferred organizational climates of Type A individuals", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 21, 50-59.



21. Cable. D. M. & Judge. T. A. (1996) "Person–Organization Fit, Job Choice Decisions, and Organizational Entry", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67(3), 294–311.
22. Carrell. M., Elbert. N., & Hatfield. R. (1995) "Human Resource Management", Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
23. Catsouphs. M. P. & Matz-Costa. C., (2008) "The multi-generational workforce: Workplace flexibility and engagement, *Community*", *Work & Family*, 11(2), 215- 229.
24. Charles. C. A. and James O.L. (2009) "Linking Organizational Characteristics to Employee Attitudes and Behavior – A Look at the Downstream Effects on Market Response & Financial Performance", *Forum for People Performance Management & Measurement*, Northwestern University.
25. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development Report. (2006) "How Engaged are British Employees", *Annual Survey Report*, Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, 1-7. <http://www.cipd.co.uk/binaries/howengbritemps-sr.pdf>
26. D. A. (1987) "Utility of confirmatory factor analysis in test validation research", *Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology*, 55, 584-594
27. Das. B.L., & Baruah. M. (2013) "Employee Retention: A Review of Literature", *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 14(2), 08-16.
28. Desai. M., Majumdar. B. & Prabhu. G. P. (2010) "A Study on Employee Engagement in two Indian Businesses", *Asian Journal of Management Research*, 81-97.
29. Frank. A. D., & Brownell. J. L.(1989), *Organizational Communication and Behavior: Communicating to Improve Performance*, Harcourt School; 2 edition December 1989.
30. Gallup Organization (2004) Quoted in Crabtree, S (2004) Getting personnel in the work place – Are negative relationships squelching productivity in your company? *Gallup Management Journal*, June. Retrieved from
31. http://www.workliferesources.com/admin/pdf/Gallop_Committment_Results.pdf,
32. Gallup Study (2006) "Engaged employees inspire company innovation", *Gallup Management Journal*, <http://gmj.gallup.com/content/default.aspx?ci=24880&pg=1>.
33. Gopinath. C., & Becker. T. E. (2000) "Communication, procedural justice and employee attitudes: Relationships under conditions of divestiture", *Journal of Management*, 26, 63-83.
34. Goodman. S. A., & Svyantek. D. J. (1999) "Person organization fit and contextual performance: Do shared values matter?", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55, 254– 275.



35. Hackman. J. R. & Oldham. G. R. (1976) "Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.
36. Haid. H. & Sims. J. (2009) "Employee Engagement: Maximizing Organizational Performance, Leadership Insights", *Right Management (A manpower Company)*, 2009, 1-24.
37. Islam. T., Khan. S.R., Ahmad. U. N., Ali. G., Ahmed. I., & Bowra. Z. A., (2013) "Turnover Intentions: The influence of perceived organizational support and organizational commitment", *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 103, 1238 – 1242. 225 ISR (2003) "Engaged Employees Drive the Bottom Line", *Research Summary*. Chicago.
38. Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (1980) "Stress and work: A managerial perspective", In J. C. Quick, R. S. Bhagat, J. E. Dalton, & J. D. Quick (Eds.), *Work stress: Health care systems in the workplace*. 27-49, New York: Praeger.
39. James H.K., Frank S.L., Emily K.A., & Sangeeta. A. (2009) "Q12 Meta-Analysis: The Relationship between Engagement at Work and Organizational Outcomes", *The Gallup Organization. Research Report*. Omaha, Nebraska.
40. Kottke. J. L., & Sharafinski. C. E. (1988) "Measuring perceived supervisory and organizational support", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48, 1075– 1079.
41. Kristof. A. L. (1996) "Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications", *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1), 1-49.
42. Lawler, E. E. (1976) "Control systems in organizations", In M. Dunnette (ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, 1247-1292.
43. Lockwood. N. R. (2006) "Talent management: Driver for organizational success", *SHRM Research Quarterly*, Alexandria.
44. Lockwood. N. R. (2007) "Leveraging employee engagement for competitive advantage: HR strategic role", *HR Magazine*, 52(3), 2-13.
45. Mobley. W. H., Horner. S. O., & Hollingworth. A. T. (1978) "An evaluation of precursors of hospital employee turnover", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 408-414.
46. Mohamad. S. F. (2008) "Effects of communication on turnover intention: A case of hotel employees in Malaysia", *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. Iowa State University, Paper 11164, 1-79 .
47. Rappaport. A., Bancroft. G., & Okum. L. (2003) "The aging workforce raises new talent management issues for employers", *Journal of Organizational Excellence*, 23(4), 55-66.



48. Ravichandran. K., Arasu. R. & Kumar. A.S. (2011) “The Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Employee Work Engagement Behavior: An Empirical Study”, *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(11), 157-169. 232
49. Redman. J. (2011) “A Development Program to Improve Leadership Capability and Employee Engagement”, *Strategic Human Resource Review*, 10(6), 11-18.
50. Rhoades. L. & Eisenberger. R. (2002) “Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714 .
51. Salanova. M. & Agent. S. (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. 234.
52. Van Knippenberg. D., Van Knippenberg. B., De Cremer. D., & Hogg. M. A. (2004) “Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda”, *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 825–856.
53. Wellins, R. & J. Concelman. (2005) “Creating a culture for engagement”, *Workforce Performance Solutions*. Retrieved from www.WPSmag.com.
54. Welbourne. T. M. (2007) “Employee engagement: Beyond the Fad and into the Executive Suite”, *Leader to Leader*, Spring, 45-51. Weisberg, J. (1994) “Measuring workers’ burnout and intention to leave”, *International Journal of Manpower*, 15, 4–14.