A Work Project, presented as part of the requirements for the Award of a Master Degree in

Management from the NOVA – School of Business and Economics.

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT: A KEY TO ORGANISATIONS' COMPETITIVE
ADVANTAGE AND SUCCESS

ALEXANDRE PREIN 3645

A Project carried out on the Master in Management Program, under the supervision of:

Professor Rita Cunha

January, 2018

ABSTRACT

Employee Engagement: A key to organisations' competitive advantage and success

This work project is a literature review, covering studies that have been conducted up until now on the topic of Employee Engagement, and discusses some antecedents and consequences of its use in organisations. Moreover, several recommendations to increase Employee Engagement are presented.

We conclude that organisations across the industries are not yet realizing the strong influence Employee Engagement has on their success, and that they should start implementing and giving a great deal of importance to Human Resources practices that foster engagement, such as training, if they want to keep their employees engaged in an uncertain world of work.

KEYWORDS: Employee Engagement, Engagement, Competitive advantage

1. INTRODUCTION

The world of work is altering faster than ever before and in an environment of ever-growing pressures and uncertainty, organisations really need to keep their employees fully engaged and dedicated to their jobs. Nevertheless, it has been recently reported that the level of disengagement at work has been increasing and that employee engagement at work is on the decline (Saks, 2006). This situation is problematic for organisations, especially knowing that the media, consultants and recent studies have recently asserted that fully engaged employees could help companies capture competitive advantage (Gruman & Saks, 2011). Yet, most content available today on the topic hails from consulting firms and the professional world, and there has only been a few studies conducted by scholars on Employee Engagement.

In the ensuing sections, the concept of Employee Engagement is first being defined and distinguished from other states of engagement like for instance Job Involvement or Work Engagement. Truly, Employee Engagement is often used interchangeably with these other states of engagement, even though distinguishing points exist between them. We then present a synthetic analysis of the antecedents of Employee Engagement, and demonstrate that the outcomes of the construct are very impactful for organisations as Employee Engagement enables them to perform better overall. Finally, we suggest some recommendations which aim to eventually increase Employee Engagement.

2. METHODOLOGY

For this work project, both theoretical and empirical studies on Employee Engagement, its antecedents and outcomes, were gathered. This literature was accessed by using key words such as Engagement, Employee Engagement, Antecedents of Employee Engagement,

Outcomes of Employee Engagement or Engagement, on many different online databases like for instance ScienceDirect, Google Scholar, Sage Journals or the Wiley Online Library.

Furthermore, the articles were selected from journals mostly ranked 4 or 4* (some of them ranked 3) in the Association of Business Schools (ABS) ranking, in order to narrow down the gargantuan number of articles available, and only keep the most germane to the topic. 50 articles published between 1990 and 2017 were used, in contemplation of having a superior overview of the evolution of engagement throughout the years. The journals, from which the papers were picked, mainly focused on the following disciplines: Human Resource Management, Psychology, Organisation Studies, and General Management and Social Responsibility.

The selected articles were then summarized in an excel spreadsheet to ease the synthetic analysis of the articles.

In the following sections, the main subjects of the reviewed articles are being synthetically analysed.

3. DEFINING EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND DISTINGUISHING IT FROM OTHER STATES OF ENGAGEMENT

3.1. Definition

Several conceptualizations of Employee Engagement can be found but the definition of engagement built by Kahn (1990) is the most commonly used one. Kahn (1990) originally defined Employee Engagement as "the level to which employees dedicate their selves to their work not only physically, but also cognitively and emotionally". On the contrary, he depicts disengaged employees as being physically, cognitively and emotionally absent and passive

during their role performances. (Kahn, 1990) He added that the specific realms of meaningfulness, safety and availability were essential in order to discern the reasons of an individual's full engagement or not.

Nevertheless, more recent definitions of Employee Engagement have emerged and in particular the one of the Utrecht Group led by Schaufeli. Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, and Bakker (2002, p. 74) indeed described Employee Engagement as a "positive, fulfilling, work related state of mind characterized by vigour, dedication, and absorption." Vigour characterizes the high levels of energy and mental resilience individuals invest in their work, the alacrity to put in the effort in one's work, and the persistence in difficult times. Dedication is represented by a sense of significance, inspiration, challenge, pride and enthusiasm. The last aspect of engagement, absorption, describes the concentration and deep engrossment of an individual in his/her work, through which time passes faster and one finds it difficult to detach himself/herself from work (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, and Bakker, 2002).

Finally, Harter and his colleagues' explanation of Employee engagement, is also commonly used (2002, p. 417). They explained that Employee Engagement refers not only to an employee's satisfaction and involvement, but also to his/her enthusiasm for the work itself. This definition changed the way people have been perceiving engagement previously, as it includes the expectation of a person's fulfilment level (Shuck & Wollard, 2009).

In other words, Employee Engagement is a psychological state, in which employees perceive a meaningful reason to invest all their energy towards an ultimate goal: the company's success. Engaged employees not only are enthusiastic and perform at very high standards, but they also often exceed the goals that were previously set for them by the organization.

3.2. Divergence from other states of engagement

Although Employee Engagement and other states of engagement such as Work Engagement, Job Involvement or Organisational Commitment are mainly used interchangeably in the literature, distinguishing points for each of them exist.

Work Engagement is the most commonly used construct confounded with Employee Engagement. The two concepts are nonetheless markedly different as Work Engagement is mainly grounded on work activity. In contrast, Employee Engagement is the reflection of a psychological state and it is a representation of the full work experience (i.e., the active experience of working, team, and work) (Shuck, Adelson & Reio, 2016). Another difference between the two concepts is that Employee Engagement, unlike Work Engagement, may refer to the relationship with the company as well.

Likely, Employee Engagement and Job Involvement are often confused because they share similar characteristics. However, Job Involvement is characterized by the level of significance of work in an individual's overall self image and hence related to ego involvement, while employee engagement is solely a motivational psychological state (Shuck, Adelson & Reio, 2016).

To continue, according to Shuck, Adelson, & Reio (2016), Organisational Commitment is often perceived as a part of Employee Engagement. As a matter of fact, engaged employees are in most cases organisationally committed as well. However, Organisational Commitment is something that happens to the employee and therefore it is not representative of the employee's sentiments toward the working experience itself, whereas Employee Engagement is an active motivational state, which encloses the complete working experience (Shuck, Adelson & Reio, 2016).

Finally, engaged employees are often wrongly compared to workaholics. However, there is a notable difference between the two states as engaged employees also enjoy doing other things when they leave work, unlike workaholics who feel guilty when they don't work because of a strong and irresistible inner feeling of fun while working (Schaufeli, Taris, & Van Rhenen, 2008). Many scholars agree on this distinction as they believe workaholism is bad by definition since it is an addiction. On the contrary, engaged employees are considered as work enthusiasts (positive state of mind) (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá & Bakker, 2002) and thus "good workaholics".

The following paper will focus on the most encountered concept, Employee Engagement with the aim of going deeper in the review and because the outcomes of it are not only more impactful for the employee, but also for the organizations.

4. ANTECEDENTS OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

4.1. Kahn's three psychological conditions

The first condition of personal engagement according to Kahn (1990) is psychological meaningfulness. In other words, how meaningful it is for an individual to perform at his/her best. Gruman & Saks (2011) and Bal & De Lange (2014) agree to say that psychological meaningfulness is attained when the employees feel that they bring value to the company and that they actually matter. On his side, Kahn (1990) identified three factors to be influencers of meaningfulness: task characteristics, role characteristics and work interactions.

The second condition of personal engagement according to Kahn (1990) is psychological safety. Psychological safety refers to the perception a worker has on how safe it is for him/her to perform without having to fear for negative consequences. Psychological safety is more

important than ever before because the insecurity in the workplace is growing, due to an increasing number of mergers, outsourcings and restructurings (Lu, C, Wang, Lu, J., Du & Bakker, 2014). As stated by Kahn (1990), there are four factors that are influencers of psychological safety: interpersonal relationships, group and intergroup dynamics, management style, and norms. Sacks (2006) later specified that gratifying co-workers and supportive manager relations are enablers of psychological safety. Moreover, norms within co-worker groups and organisations are crucial as they govern attitudes and behaviours of the workers (May, Gilson & Harter, 2004) and thus May et al. (2004) explain that those who stay within the norms and behave appropriately will feel safer at work.

The third and final condition of personal engagement as reported by Kahn (1990) is psychological availability. Gruman & Saks (2011) explain that psychological availability alludes to the perception of how available emotional, physical and psychological resources are to an individual in order for him/her to perform. As reported by Kahn (1990), four distractions can affect psychological availability: depletion of physical energy, depletion of emotional energy, insecurity, and outside lives. May, Gilson & Harter (2004) describe for instance outside activities such as other jobs, schools or volunteer activities as potential reasons to be less psychologically available.

4.2. Job resources

Throughout the years, many studies have been revealing that engagement among employees is strongly related to their working conditions, which can be divided in two groups (i.e., job demands and job resources) according to the Job demands-resources (JD-R) model cited by Bakker & Schaufeli (2008). Job demands, like for instance fatigue, work overload, or emotional and physical demands, are the requirements that can be related with both psychological and physiological costs, which can eventually lead to burnout and exhaustion

(Demerouti, Bakker, De Jonge, Janssen & Schaufeli, 2001). They are thus negatively linked with Employee Engagement (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Job resources on the contrary, such as autonomy (Albrecht, Bakker, Gruman, Macey & Saks, 2015), challenge (Crawford, LePine & Rich, 2010), social support (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2009), performance feedback (Bakker, Emmerik & Euwema, 2006) or coaching (Gruman & Saks, 2011), facilitate engagement (Sortheix, Dietrich, Chow & Salmela-Aro, 2013) and have the ability to motivate the employees as they raise their work meaningfulness, empower them for work operations and outcomes, and provide them with feedback about their actual achievements with regard to their work activities (Bakker, Emmerik & Euwema, 2006). Truly, Bakker & Schaufeli (2008) expound that autonomy for instance, gives the individual the liberty to manage his/her own time while responding to the job demands, and add that coaching sessions and social support from the leaders congruously constitute a bulwark against burnout, due to the instrumental help and emotional backing received. Finally, proper performance feedback is decisive (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008) because it provides the employees with the necessary information to maintain or improve their performances (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008). In conclusion, Weigl, Hornung, Parker, Petru, Glaser & Angerer (2010) depict three different features of job resources which are: the reduction of job demands, helping achieving work goals and stimulating employees' personal growth and continuous development.

4.2. Personal resources

As Albrecht, Bakker, Gruman, Macey & Saks (2015) suggest, research evidence clearly revealed that personality traits had an influence on the level of engagement. Personal resources like for instance self-efficacy (Tims, Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2011), optimism, resilience (Albrecht, Bakker, Gruman, Macey & Saks, 2015) or self-esteem (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2009), refer to positive within-person assessments related to

resiliency and to the capacity of people to control and influence their environment positively. (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2009). According to Sortheix, Dietrich, Chow, & Salmela-Aro (2013), these resources are predictors of engagement. De facto, self-efficacious and proactive employees will be more inclined to take initiatives, proactively solve problems and submit innovative ideas (Albrecht, Bakker, Gruman, Macey & Saks, 2015).

Nevertheless, possessing these personal resources is not enough as they also need to be ultimately allocated to the adequate goals. In order to do so, Zacher, Chan, Bakker & Demerouti (2015) suggest the use of SOC (Selection, optimization, and compensation) strategies, which leads to goal accomplishments and well-being. Selection is the process of selecting the goals that are the most important ones to achieve, while optimization is the process of investing additional resources in order to attain the goals that have been previously selected. Lastly, compensation refers to the process of replacing means which are secondary with regard to the attainment of the objective, with more efficient ones (Zacher, Chan, Bakker & Demerouti, 2015).

Finally, Salmela-Aro, Tolvanen & Nurmi (2009) showed that engagement was often related to the strategies young people made when they were still in university. As a matter of fact, students that presented an optimistic and task-focused behaviour in university often had higher levels of engagement later in their careers (Salmela-Aro, Tolvanen & Nurmi, 2011). Therefore, it is crucial for universities to promote optimistic strategies and to significantly reduce task-avoidance among students.

4.3. Transformational leadership

To continue, Tims, Bakker, and Xanthopoulou (2011) argue that the research results clearly display that the transformational leadership style is fostering engagement. Surely, studies have

demonstrated that the leader's daily behaviour strongly influences the availability of resources in the work environment, which consequently prompts Employee Engagement (Breevaart, Bakker & Demerouti, 2014). Nonetheless, transformational leaders not only inspire and motivate their employees by leading by example, but also pay attention to the special needs some employees might have. Furthermore, by inspiring and motivating their team, transformational leaders enhance employees' personal resources, which are predictors of employee engagement as depicted in the last part (Tims, Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2011). Also, transformational leaders directly affect trust levels and therefore behavioural engagement (Shuck & Wollard, 2009; Bailey, Madden, Alfes & Fletcher, 2015).

4.4. Other antecedents

Another antecedent of Employee Engagement is the capability for employees to control their schedule (flexibility), especially regarding the work-family brain-teaser (Swanberg, McKechnie, Ojha & James, 2011). In fact, Mauno, Kinnunen & Ruokolainen (2007) explain that this practice makes it possible for employees to address personal or family issues, and hence to decrease the work-to family conflict. Nevertheless, flexibility with regard to work schedules is not accessible to all employees and in particular to those with lower-wage hourly jobs. Truly, it is very complicated to arrange a schedule change for those who work on continuous shifts (Swanberg, McKechnie, Ojha & James, 2011).

In addition to flexibility with regard to work arrangements, respites/recovery (e.g. vacations, weekends etc.) are major contributors of Employee Engagement. Truly, as Kühnel, Sonnentag & Westman (2009) explain, psychological detachments from work during recovery are contributors to higher engagement, as the employees who experience it have more access to resources such as energy for instance, which are restored during the off-job experience.

Moreover, as reported by Leroy, H., Anseel, F., Dimitrova, N. G., & Sels, L. (2013), mindfulness is also highlighted as an antecedent of Employee Engagement, and according to these authors, it is possible to continue developing a person's mindfulness through mindfulness trainings. The use of mindfulness trainings not only promotes engagement among employees, but also has positive effects on the employees' well-being by reducing considerably illness symptoms and burnout for instance (Leroy, Anseel, Dimitrova & Sels, 2013).

Lastly, Gawke, Gorgievski & Bakker (2017) revealed that employee intrapreneurship is positively connected to Employee Engagement as it increases the employees' personal resources, and therefore ultimately engagement. In the literature, there are only a few definitions of employee intrapreneurship up to date; yet scholars define it as employees that take risks to come up with new initiatives and innovative ideas (Gawke, Gorgievski & Bakker, 2017).

5. OUTCOMES OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

5.1. Organisational Outcomes

Generally, employees that are engaged are particularly enthusiastic about their jobs (Gutermann, Lehmann-Willenbrock, Boer, Born & Voelpel, 2017), work harder and are willing to do more than what is expected from them (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). For instance, employees with high levels of engagement often take personal initiatives, which refer to an active and initiative-taking behaviour that goes beyond the formal work requirements that are given by the supervisory team (Hakanen, Perhoniemi & Toppinen-Tanner, 2008). Therefore, employees with high levels of engagement also perform better (Brown & Leigh, 1996) and hence increase the probability of meeting expectations. In fact, studies have shown that

workers who presented greater levels of engagement also obtained superior ratings of task performance from their supervisors (Rich, Lepine & Crawford, 2010).

Furthermore, Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli (2009) determined day-level engagement as a very strong predictor of day-level financial returns. As a matter of fact, study results revealed that higher objective financial returns were positively related with higher Employee Engagement (Bakker, 2011). Gruman & Saks (2011) go even one step further by arguing that high levels of engagement among employees can actually result in a competitive advantage gain for companies. They illustrate their remark by highlighting the fact that the highest performing companies on an engagement index were not only more profitable, but they also had greater returns in assets (ROA) and more than double the shareholder value in comparison to the lowest performing companies (Gruman & Saks, 2011).

Additionally, on average, employees with higher levels of engagement also score higher on customer satisfaction ratings (Shuck & Wollard, 2009; Bakker, Demerouti & Ten Brummelhuis, 2012). Bakker & Schaufeli (2008) indeed explain, based on Salanova et al.'s (2005) findings, that customer loyalty is a function of the employee's level of engagement. This is a positive outcome for companies, given the fact that customer loyalty is a paramount to the company's success.

5.2. Individual Outcomes

In addition of being positively related to organisational outcomes, Employee Engagement also promotes outcomes that are directly benefiting the employees themselves. These outcomes are for instance individual well-being outcomes (Albrecht, Bakker, Gruman, Macey & Saks, 2015) such as positive emotions at the workplace and better mental (Reis, Arndt, Lischetzke & Hoppe, 2016) and psychosomatic (Seppälä, Mauno, Feldt, Hakanen, Kinnunen, Tolvanen & Schaufeli, 2008) health. Truly, engaged employees are often experiencing positive affects,

which include more happiness, joy and enthusiasm (Lu, C., Wang, Lu, J., Du & Bakker, 2014), and as Cropanzano and Wright (2001) explain, happy employees tend to be more open to opportunities, optimistic, open-minded and helpful (Gutermann, Lehmann-Willenbrock, Boer, Born & Voelpel, 2017). All of these not only enable employees to work well, but it also enables them to create positive organizational citizenship behaviour and team climate, as engaged employees help their colleagues perform better (Bindl & Parker, 2010) by communicating their pro-active behaviours, positive attitudes and optimism with them (Bakker, Emmerik & Euwema, 2006).

Also, happy employees contribute to an overall low turnover intention rate (Kühnel, Sonnentag, & Westman, 2009) because they are more loyal and thus more willing to remain with the company on the long term (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Furthermore, happy employees are less subject to burnout, and reports show that the rate of sickness absenteeism (Salanova, Agut & Peiró, 2005; Albrecht, Bakker, Gruman, Macey & Saks, 2015) and health insurance costs (Meyer & Gagné, 2008) are much lower among workers with greater levels of engagement than among disengaged workers.

Finally, employees with high levels of engagement often create their own job and personal resources (Purcell, 2014). Undoubtedly, they start to change their work environment (job crafting) in order to fit their personal skills and abilities as much as possible, and hence develop a strong sense of person-job fit (Lu, C., Wang, Lu, J., Du & Bakker, 2014). Moreover, among the many different types of job crafting that exist, Harju, Hakanen & Schaufeli (2016) describe seeking for challenges as the strongest benefit for the employee's motivation in the future because it is often associated with stimulation, and it is regarded as an impetus for other crafting activities, which enable the workers to develop additional resources and perform better in their day-to-day tasks.

All in all, the outcomes of Employee Engagement are not only positive for the employee himself/herself but also for the organisations (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006). Companies should therefore try to maximize engagement among their employees to not only improve their well-being, but also to achieve better financial results on both short and longer term.

The following table summarizes the antecedents and outcomes of Employee Engagement which have been previously discussed:

Antecedents of Employee Engagement	Outcomes of Employee Engagement
Kahn's three psychological conditions: psychological meaningfulness, psychological safety and psychological availability	Organisational Outcomes: ➤ Higher employee performance ➤ Higher financial returns, greater returns in assets, higher shareholder value ➤ Higher customer satisfaction
Job resources: challenge, social support, coaching, performance feedback etc.	
Personal resources: optimism, self-efficacy, resilience, self-esteem etc.	
Transformational leadership	
Schedule flexibility	Individual Outcomes: ➤ Positive individual well-being outcomes: better mental health, happiness, joy, enthusiasm etc. ➤ Lower turnover intention rate ➤ Job crafting, new personal resources
Respites/recovery: vacations, weekends etc.	
Mindfulness	
Employee intrapreneurship	

6. RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE ENGAGEMENT

Considering all these benefits of having their employees highly engaged, a question remains: Why do organisations struggle so much to implement a culture of engagement? According to Purcell (2014), the central problem of engagement is the fact that fully engaged employees are very rare, and he explains that the companies are therefore reluctant to focus so much on something that is out of reach for most of their staff. De facto, many organisations don't include engagement in their overall strategy and hence don't provide their managers with the necessary skills trainings to be able to deal with the results of engagement measurements. Also, many companies measure either the wrong things or too many different things, which are not relevant for Employee Engagement and thence don't properly tackle the question of engagement. Ergo, where should companies start in order to increase overall levels of engagement among their employees?

First, both quantitative and qualitative data have shown that supervisors play a major role in the level of engagement of the employees (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002), and therefore companies should train their managers to be able to recognise signs of these phenomena. Despite the fact that training can't be described as a small investment, it will eventually pay off in the future because supervisors will have the necessary skills to engage their employees and therefore achieve higher objectives.

Then, as engagement has been proven to be contagious (Hakanen, Perhoniemi & Toppinen-Tanner, 2008), one recommendation would be to try to include new members with high levels of engagement into teams, instead of replacing the burned-out ones (Bakker, Emmerik & Euwema, 2006). By doing so, organisations would reinforce the feeling of psychological safety among their employees, which is a known antecedent of employee engagement as we saw earlier.

Another recommendation would be to carefully use job design, as it is a major key of occupational health. Indeed, even though job demands are inevitable, organisations should find the best balance possible between job demands and job resources such as autonomy at work or professional development opportunities. To do so, supervisors should offer employees adequate individual support in order to be able to design jobs and teams carefully (Bakker, Emmerik & Euwema, 2006). Additionally, Albrecht, Bakker, Gruman, Macey & Saks (2015) point out that companies should select the best candidates in the first place, by finding out who is going to fit the best to not only the job itself but also to the organisation's culture.

To continue, organisations should use the suitable leadership styles. Unequivocally, several researches have shown that leadership styles affect the vision employees have of the availability of work-related resources (Blomme, Kodden & Beasley-Suffolk, 2015). Moreover, Blomme, Kodden & Beasley-Suffolk (2015) explain, that the inclusive and rich leadership styles are the best to establish optimal conditions for engagement, and that leaders should adapt their leadership styles in a way that it offers their workers more and better resources for them to stay engaged. Also, managers should use more inner correspondence components such as feedback or informal communication for instance, in order to not only transfer the values of the company onto their employees but also implicate them in organisational goals (Tkalac Verčič & Pološki Vokić, 2017). Tkalac Verčič & Pološki Vokić (2017) indeed add that the communication between supervisors and employees and the sharing of information are major enablers of Employee Engagement.

Finally, managers should encourage their employees to regularly take satisfaction questionnaires like for instance the Gallup Workplace satisfaction questionnaire to get direct feedback from them. This questionnaire comprises elements such as the level to which the employee feels encouraged in his/her development and daily work, the frequency to which

feedback is given to the employee by his/her supervisor, or the level of recognition given by the supervisors to their employees for performing well, and employees have to assess each of these elements on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 meaning that he/she is extremely dissatisfied and 5 meaning that he/she is extremely satisfied (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002). These questionnaires are crucial in order to install a relationship of trust between the employees and their supervisors and thence foster Employee Engagement.

7. CONCLUSION

In this Work Project, the academic literature on Employee Engagement was reviewed to provide a systematic summary of its antecedents and outcomes.

The world of work has witnessed some unprecedented changes in the last decade, which led to extraordinary high levels of pressures and uncertainties. In these conditions, more than ever before, organisations need their employees to be fully committed to them, and highly engaged in their day-to-day jobs. Truly, Employee Engagement not only promotes positive outcomes for the employees such as individual well-being outcomes, but also for the organisations themselves. As a matter of fact, companies with highly engaged employees within their teams often exceed their goals and achieve higher financial returns than the companies who perform poorly with regard to engagement. Also, companies with highly engaged employees usually score higher in customer satisfaction ratings, which is vital for the organisation's success.

Yet, we highlight the fact that too many companies nowadays still don't include Employee Engagement to their overall strategy. Some of these companies are in fact reluctant to invest time and money on something that is only concerning a few of their employees. Others measure the wrong things and therefore end up with data that is not relevant for Employee Engagement.

Still, all companies will have to deal with the question of engagement at one point of their existence and thence we presented some recommendations, which aim to increase engagement among employees. For instance, we recommended companies to train their supervisors so that they are able to tackle the question of engagement, to carefully use job design in order to select the best fits for a certain job in the first place and to use more internal communication elements such as feedback. We conclude that the organisations who are making serious efforts to implement a culture of engagement within their staff, will ultimately achieve competitive advantage (Gruman & Saks, 2011).

REFERENCES

Albrecht, S. L., Bakker, A. B., Gruman, J. A., Macey, W. H., & Saks, A. M. 2015. "Employee engagement, human resource management practices and competitive advantage." *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness*: *People and Performance*, 2(1): 7-35.

Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. 2015. "The Meaning, Antecedents and Outcomes of Employee Engagement: A Narrative Synthesis." *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(1): 31-53.

Bakker, A. B., Emmerik, H. V., & Euwema, M. C. 2006. "Crossover of Burnout and Engagement in Work Teams." *Work and Occupations*, 33(4): 464-489.

Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. 2008. "Positive organizational behavior: engaged employees in flourishing organizations." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(2): 147-154.

Bakker, A. B. 2011. "An Evidence-Based Model of Work Engagement." *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(4): 265-269.

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Ten Brummelhuis, L. L. 2012. "Work engagement, performance, and active learning: The role of conscientiousness." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2): 555-564.

Bal, P. M., & De Lange, A. H. 2014. "From flexibility human resource management to employee engagement and perceived job performance across the lifespan: A multisample study." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(1): 126-154.

Bindl, U. K., & Parker, S. K. 2010. "Feeling Good and Performing Well? Psychological Engagement and Positive Behaviors at Work." In *Handbook of Employee Engagement,* ed. Simon L Albrecht, 385 –398. Cheltenham : Edward Elgar.

Blomme, R. J., Kodden, B., & Beasley-Suffolk, A. 2015. "Leadership theories and the concept of work engagement: Creating a conceptual framework for management implications and research." *Journal of Management & Organization*, 21(02): 125-144.

Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. 2014. "Daily self-management and employee work engagement." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 84(1): 31-38.

Brown, S. P., & Leigh, T. W. 1996. "A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4): 358-368.

Cartwright, S., & Holmes, N. 2006. "The meaning of work: The challenge of regaining employee engagement and reducing cynicism." *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2): 199-208.

Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. 2010. "Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5): 834-848.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., De Jonge, J., Janssen, P. P., & Schaufeli, W. B. 2001. "Burnout and engagement at work as a function of demands and control." *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 27(4): 279-286.

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.

Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. 2011. "Performance management and employee engagement." *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(2): 123-136.

Gutermann, D., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., Boer, D., Born, M., & Voelpel, S. C. 2017. "How Leaders Affect Followers' Work Engagement and Performance: Integrating Leader−Member Exchange and Crossover Theory." *British Journal of Management*, 28(2): 299-314.

Hakanen, J. J., Perhoniemi, R., & Toppinen-Tanner, S. 2008. "Positive gain spirals at work: From job resources to work engagement, personal initiative and work-unit innovativeness." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73(1): 78-91.

Harju, L. K., Hakanen, J. J., & Schaufeli, W. B. 2016. "Can job crafting reduce job boredom and increase work engagement? A three-year cross-lagged panel study." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 95-96: 11-20.

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.

Kahn, W. A. 1990. "Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work." *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4): 692-724.

Kühnel, J., Sonnentag, S., & Westman, M. 2009. "Does work engagement increase after a short respite? The role of job involvement as a double-edged sword." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(3): 575-594.

Leroy, H., Anseel, F., Dimitrova, N. G., & Sels, L. 2013. "Mindfulness, authentic functioning, and work engagement: A growth modeling approach." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82(3): 238-247.

Lu, C., Wang, H., Lu, J., Du, D., & Bakker, A. B. 2014. "Does work engagement increase person–job fit? The role of job crafting and job insecurity." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 84(2): 142-152.

May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. 2004. "The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(1): 11-37.

Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. 2008. "The Meaning of Employee Engagement." *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(01): 3-30.

Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., & Ruokolainen, M. 2007. "Job demands and resources as antecedents of work engagement: A longitudinal study." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(1): 149-171.

Meyer, J. P., & Gagnè, M. 2008. "Employee Engagement From a Self-Determination Theory Perspective." *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(01): 60-62.

Purcell, J. 2014. "Disengaging from engagement." *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24(3): 241-254.

Reis, D., Arndt, C., Lischetzke, T., & Hoppe, A. 2016. "State work engagement and state affect: Similar yet distinct concepts." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 93: 1-10.

Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. 2010. "Job Engagement: Antecedents and Effects on Job Performance." *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3): 617-635.

Saks, A. M. 2006. "Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement." *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7): 600-619.

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.

Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. 2008. "A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive behaviour." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(1): 116-131.

Salmela-Aro, K., Tolvanen, A., & Nurmi, J. 2009. "Achievement strategies during university studies predict early career burnout and engagement." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 75(2): 162-172.

Salmela-Aro, K., Tolvanen, A., & Nurmi, J. 2011. "Social strategies during university studies predict early career work burnout and engagement: 18-year longitudinal study." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(1): 145-157.

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.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. 2004. "Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3): 293-315.

Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Van Rhenen, W. 2008. "Workaholism, Burnout, and Work Engagement: Three of a Kind or Three Different Kinds of Employee Well-being? " *Applied Psychology*, 57(2): 173-203.

Seppälä, P., Mauno, S., Feldt, T., Hakanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Tolvanen, A., & Schaufeli, W. 2008. "The Construct Validity of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Multisample and Longitudinal Evidence." *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10(4): 459-481.

Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. 2009. "Employee Engagement and HRD: A Seminal Review of the Foundations." *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(1): 89-110.

Shuck, B., Adelson, J. L., & Reio, T. G. 2016. "The Employee Engagement Scale: Initial Evidence for Construct Validity and Implications for Theory and Practice." *Human Resource Management*, *56*(6): 953-977.

Swanberg, J. E., McKechnie, S. P., Ojha, M. U., & James, J. B. 2011. "Schedule control, supervisor support and work engagement: A winning combination for workers in hourly jobs?" *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(3): 613-624.

Sortheix, F. M., Dietrich, J., Chow, A., & Salmela-Aro, K. 2013. "The role of career values for work engagement during the transition to working life." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83(3): 466-475.

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Xanthopoulou, D. 2011. "Do transformational leaders enhance their followers' daily work engagement?" *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1): 121-131.

Tkalac Verčič, A., & Pološki Vokić, N. 2017. "Engaging employees through internal communication." *Public Relations Review*.

Weigl, M., Hornung, S., Parker, S. K., Petru, R., Glaser, J., & Angerer, P. 2010. "Work engagement accumulation of task, social, personal resources: A three-wave structural equation model." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(1): 140-153.

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.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. 2009. "Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(1): 183-200.

Zacher, H., Chan, F., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. 2015. "Selection, optimization, and compensation strategies: Interactive effects on daily work engagement." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 87: 101-107.