

WANT ENGAGED EMPLOYEES? ENCOURAGE HUMAN RESOURCE AND ENHANCE ORGANIZATIONAL CONNECTEDNESS**Abhishek Sharma¹****ABSTRACT**

Work engagement is not only a "nice-to-have" but has been shown to be linked to various positive outcomes of work, including its proven financial and behavioural gains. The concern regarding employee engagement is increasing, and organizations of the 21st century are looking for every possible way to develop the culture of employee engagement deliberately. In this context, this research introduces employee engagement as a viable method to encourage organizational productivity and examines how perceptions of specific human resource (HR) practices and organizational identification relate to experiences of employee's work engagement. The study data was collected using standard psychometric tools from 75 mid-level managers working in various organizations. Statistical analysis was performed to answer research questions. The results conveyed the significance of applying encouraging human resource practices and demonstrated the positive effect of organizational identification (OID) on work engagement. HR practices and OID were found instrumental in positively predicting the significant amount of work engagement. By discovering the relationship between HR practices (conditions that organizations can influence easily), organizational identification, and employee engagement, this study relates to the realistic implementation of measures to improve employee engagement and especially emphasises them. As most companies are searching for ways to promote employee engagement, the latest research results are of practical importance to HR executives.

Keywords: *Human resource practices, Trust, Feedback, Autonomy, Organizational Identification, Work Engagement*

I. INTRODUCTION

Organizations of the 21st century explicitly agree that the current business world demands more competence, productivity, and a sustainable corporate strategy than in the past. Policy and planning are essential for this. However, business leaders would explicitly agree that employees can make a significant change when it comes to providing excellent quality service with innovation and lasting impact on the organization's inclusive performance. It is the human factor, unambiguously positive ones, which explains the extraordinary performance of any organization. The quality every consumer desire to see in services and products cannot be accomplished without engaged employees. For that reason, to survive with a competitive edge in the business world, organizations need employees who are engaged means they take the initiative, vigorous, absorbed, and dedicated to their work (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008).

Human Resource Practices

Organizations essentially need to motivate employees to facilitate them to perform at their maximum potential to succeed in the contemporary world with a competitive edge. Therefore, they need to craft a proper work environment by implementing the best human resource (HR) practices that foster involvement and creativity. Positive and facilitative work practices can prepare a pool of engaged employees to produce highlights for the organizations.

The resource-based strategic management perspective which is opposite to the industry-based strategic management perspective, focuses on the company's internal environment (Putter, 2010). According to the resource-based view, human resource strategies (Practices, policies, procedures, & rewards) may be an essential source of constant competitive advantage (Lado & Wilson, 1994).

HR practices are generalized guidelines to regulate the day to day working behaviour of employees. HR Practices are part abstract, part enactment of HR strategies, systems, and beliefs that follow the typical way of doing work.

¹ The author(s) is Assistant Professor at Faculty of Management and Behavioural Sciences Sardar Patel University of Police, Security and Criminal Justice, Jodhpur, India and can be contacted at: abhishek@policeuniversity.ac.in

Perception of human resource practices are of more analytical value for organizational performance than human resource practices themselves. Wright and Nishii (2010) created a model in which they clarified that the intended HR practices of an organization vary from the perceived HR practices of employees and that these perceived HR practices have greater predictive value than the intended HR practices for organizational success.

After going through various articles about best HR practices, the researcher selected three indicators of encouraging human resource practices for the present study. These practices are:

- **Trust:** Trust is the reliability of departments and groups of staff to 'do' whatever they say they will do. Trust is reflected in how workers protect and do not abuse the confidentiality of information exchanged by other members. It is also expressed in the extent to which employees believe that their managers will treat them fairly.
- **Autonomy:** Autonomy is the ability to use power without apprehension and motivating others to do the same. Employees have some liberty to act independently within the limitations set by their job/role.
- **Feedback:** feedback is a communications process of giving constructive suggestions to the employees by their reporting managers, wherein the manager and the employee discuss expected outcomes, performance gaps, and possible ways to work together to achieve organizational goals effectively.

Organizational Identification

Organizational identification (OID) is a unique form of social identification built upon social identity theory. OID is an essential concept in explaining the behavioural and affective consequences among employees (Van Dick, 2004; Mael & Ashforth, 1992) and has gained attention in the research arena over the last two decades.

Mael and Ashforth (1992) defined OID as "the perception of belongingness to or oneness with an organization, where the employee defines himself in terms of the organization in which he or she is a member." OID works as a psychological connection between the person and the organization, which is why the individual feels a solid, cognitive and affective connection with the organization as a social entity (Edwards & Peccei, 2007).

Organizational identification is thought to have several potentially essential benefits both for organizations and for employees. As the organizational identification of an employee increases, the way of thinking and acting from the organization's perspective increases (Tüzün & Çağlar, 2008). The greater the association of an individual with their organization, the more likely it is to behave in compliance with the organization's objectives and expectations. (Dutton, Dukerich & Harquail, 1994)

Employee Engagement

Research has observed a focus shift to positive organizational scholarship in the previous decades, whereas past literature on corporate well-being research has predominantly focused on preventing adverse outcomes. Within this pattern, the concept of *work engagement* has emerged as one of the most critical job attitudes and linked to positive outcomes within the context of work on both the individual and organizational levels.

Employee engagement has most often been described as an emotional and intellectual contribution to the organization (Baumruk, 2004) or the degree of discretionary effort displayed in their job by employees (Frank, Finnegan, & Taylor, 2004). Employee engagement differs from and has a more substantial performance-enhancing effect than other, similar job-related constructs, such as intrinsic motivation, job involvement, and job satisfaction (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008).

For the present study, the researcher adopted the definition of work engagement postulated by Schaufeli *et al.* (2002, p. 74), referring to work engagement as:

"...a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigour, dedication, and absorption". "Engagement refers to a more permanent and systemic affective-cognitive state instead of a momentary and specific state, which is not based on any specific event, object, individual, or behaviour."

According to Schaufeli *et al.* (2002, p. 74), work engagement consists of:

- (1) "*Vigour*, which refers to an elevated degree of energy and mental stamina while working, the motivation to devote effort in one's work, and determination, even in the face of hardships."
- (2) "*Dedication* refers to being highly involved in one's work and experiencing a sense of meaning, eagerness, inspiration, pride, and challenge."
- (3) "*Absorption* is characterized by being totally concentrated on and contentedly immersed in one's work; time elapses swiftly, and one has difficulty disconnecting oneself from work."

The Rationale of the Study

Employee engagement cannot be overstated, because of its proven financial and behavioural gains, and therefore concern regarding employee engagement is increasing. So, from every perspective, if engaged employees bring prosperity to the workplace, why not deliberately develop the culture of employee engagement. With this motivation, organizations are always looking to find ways that inspire their workers to be more engaged in their jobs. (Avery, McKay & Wilson 2007; Cole & Bruch, 2006).

On the other hand, the sad fact for leadership is that global surveys reveal that a significant proportion of the workforce is disengaged, sceptical about corporate efforts, and more likely to indulge in infectious negativity (Dernovsek, 2008; Ellis & Sorensen, 2007). This fundamental reality poses a major challenge to improving employee engagement for both organizational researchers and practitioners, which, in turn, affects organizational performance results such as employee satisfaction, efficiency, profitability, customer loyalty and safety. (Ellis & Sorensen, 2007).

Review of the literature indicated that engaged employees are assets for any organization. However, understanding employee engagement is most valuable when understood within the context of HR Practices that regulates the day to day working experience of employees. Although significant HR practices are believed to influence organizational outcomes, research trying to categorise the employee attitudes affected by specific practices is limited.

Employee engagement is regarded by researchers as a primary pro-organization job attitude that can be extracted from OI. When workers feel a psychological bond and belong to the company, it is believed that they will also feel a widespread bond to their job (Giessner, 2011) and leads to engagement in their job and work role.

Although the researchers paid attention to organizational identification and job engagement separately, the relationship between the two is an untouched field and deserves consideration. Also, the research literature on work engagement calls for the examination of wider contextual factors (Alarcon et al., 2010; Bakker et al., 2011). Two complementary and simultaneous research avenues, therefore, warrant more attention.

The scenario mentioned above explains that a more detailed analysis of how Specific HR Practices and organizational identification influence work engagement and how executives in organizations might implement policy and practice is required.

The present study aims to address this need only, and therefore, the focus of the present study was to investigate the relationship between encouraging human resource practices, Organizational identification, and work engagement.

Research Questions

Keeping in view the above arguments and conceptualization of the study, the following research questions driven the research process:

RQ1: Whether there is a significant relationship between encouraging human resource practices and work engagement?

RQ2: Whether encouraging human resource practices are a significant predictor of work engagement?

RQ3: Whether there is a significant relationship between organizational identification and work engagement?

RQ4: Whether organizational identification is a significant predictor of work engagement?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

As the literature shows, precursors of work engagement may be found at the level of the organization (e.g., salary, career opportunities, and job security), interpersonal and social relations (e.g., supervisor and co-worker support and team climate), the organization of work (e.g., participation in decision-making and role clarity), and the level of the task (e.g., task identity, skill variety, task significance, autonomy and performance feedback) (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004).

Osborne and Hammoud (2017) conducted a study on Jackson, Mississippi's business leaders, and found three essential practices as the precursor of employee engagement. Empowering employees, recognition, and rewards, and building a relationship between employees and leaders were emerged as important antecedent factors. Osborne and Hammoud (2017) research have shown that it is important for organizational performance to adopt

effective employee engagement strategies. Leaders embarking on a plan for employee engagement need to learn effective listening skills, be fair, have and show respect, create trust, and consider their concerns.

Studies support the notion of the impact of HR practices that encourages employees' engagement and positive attitudes at work (Wagner & Harter, 2006; Chandani, Mehta, Mall & Khokhar, 2016). Employees who perceive a resource-rich environment through positive practices are more capable of sustaining their levels of job engagement (Gorgievski & Hofboll, 2008). Kataria, Garg, and Rastogi (2013) found that perceived organizational climate, characterized by a safe and meaningful working environment, is positively related to work engagement, which is positively associated with organizational effectiveness.

Earlier research has shown that OID is connected to numerous significant organizational consequences, such as high levels of job performance, job satisfaction (Van Dick et al., 2007), organizational citizenship behaviour (Dutton, Dukerich & Harquail, 1994; Sharma, 2019b), low turnover intentions (Cole & Bruch, 2006), and job attachment (Ashforth et al., 2008). OID positively influences pro-organization behaviour to preserve the organization's collective interests, such as improving organizational position and performance (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

Identification with the organization also stimulates a sense of solidarity, which prepares people to accept the values and priorities of the organization as their own. (Smith, Hogg, Martin & Terry, 2007). Therefore, workers who connect with their company are likely to perform their tasks better. It is believed that the motivation to perform tasks better would lead workers to invest in their jobs psychologically.

OID is placed to impact employee engagement because OID helps individuals to perceive and internalise the performance of a company as their success (Mael & Ashforth, 1992). Employees with a higher OID appear to be more active in their jobs because they see it as mutually beneficial (He & Brown, 2013).

Researchers found a direct link between work engagement and positive outcomes in organizations. Engagement is found to be positively linked to customer loyalty, service climate, and employee performance (Salanova, Agut, & Peiró, 2005). In forecasting performance ratings (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004) and daily financial returns (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009; Petra, Marie, & Kateřina, (2019) also, engagement is crucial.

In their systematic review paper, Sun and Bunchapattanasakda (2019) also reported empirical research showing a positive correlation between employee engagement and organizational performance. They mentioned the study conducted by Harter et al. (2002), saying employee engagement is a "soft index" that impacts the efficiency of organizations. Stoyanova and Iliev (2017) used the methodology adopted by Gallup HCM Advisory Group, Deloitte, and Aon Hewitt to study employee engagement and derive the factors influencing employee engagement in Bulgarian companies. Stoyanova and Iliev (2017) concluded that engaged employees are willing to contribute and know precisely how to work effectively because they clearly understand their employer's goals and strategy. Organizations with engaged employees have a higher level of employee retention due to reduced turnover and intention to leave the company, performance, gainfulness, customer satisfaction, and growth. Given the benefits mentioned earlier, one can conclude that engaged personnel are an admirable strength for any organization.

On the other side, disengagement is a significant contributor to the overall decrement of organizational efficacy. In researches by the Queen's School of Business and by the Gallup Organization, disengaged workers had 60% more errors and defects, 49% more accidents, and 37% higher absenteeism. Organizations with low employee engagement suffer from 65% lower share price over time, 37% lower job growth, 16% lower profitability, and 18% lower productivity (Seppälä & Cameron, 2015). On the other hand, companies with disengaged employees suffer from the waste of effort, earn less commitment from the workers, face raised absenteeism, and have less customer orientation, less labor productivity, and reduced operating and net profit margins (Stoyanova & Iliev (2017).

Theoretical Framework

There are three important theoretical perspectives to explain employee engagement.

The first theoretical base for explaining employee engagement is the social exchange theory (SET) proposed by Levinson (1965). Levinson presented that employment is a contractual transaction between labour, loyalty, and, and social rewards. The employee-employer partnership is apt for reciprocity. In response to the resources, they get from their company, workers will choose to engage themselves to varying degrees. (Armstrong & Taylor, 2017).

Kahn (1990) introduced the second theoretical perspective Needs-satisfaction framework. Kahn (1990) proposed that when three psychological needs are met, workers are more involved in their work: meaningfulness, stability, and availability of resources. If management fails to have these services, people are more likely to withdraw from their positions and protect themselves. (Sun & Bunchapattanasakda, 2019).

In the present study, the researcher is broadly testing the assumptions and applications of a relatively new theoretical perspective of employee engagement known as the Job Demands-Resources Model (Bakker et al., 2003).

Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model believes that different organizations may be confronted with various working environment characteristics. These environments' factors can always be classified into two general categories—job demands and job resources. Job demands refer to those psychological, physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and psychological (cognitive and emotional) effort. They are, therefore, associated with specific physiological and psychological costs. Examples are role overload, high work pressure, poor environmental conditions, and problems related to reorganization. Job resources refer to those psychological, physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that are: (1) functional in achieving work goals; (2) stimulate personal growth and development; (3) decrease job demands and the related physiological and psychological outlays (Bakker et al., 2003). The JD-R model may therefore explain the idea that when workers get work-related resources from the company, they are more likely to engage with their work. (Sun & Bunchapattanasakda, 2019).

Bakker, Albrecht, and Leiter (2011), using the Job Demands-Resource Model as a framework (developed from Conservation of Resources Theory) explained that an employees' favourable perception of a supportive, involving, and challenging organizational practice accommodates their psychological needs. As a result, employees become highly engaged in their job roles by investing time and energy. These findings are supported by several researchers (Christian, Garza & Slaughter, 2011; Nahgrang, Morgeson & Hoffmann, 2011). Studies also revealed that employees' job engagement levels are enhanced when they experience trust, respect, autonomy, collaboration, and mutual benefit (Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011; Sharma, 2016; Sharma, 2017; Sharma, 2019a). Subsequently, employees are likely to give more emotional and cognitive investment into their work roles, thereby feeling improved job engagement.

III. METHODOLOGY

Participants

The population of interest for the present study comprises individuals working for different organizations at the capacity of mid-level managers with a minimum of 3 years of work experience. The researcher utilized purposive sampling, and participants were selected based on convenience.

Participants included 75 managerial employees (response rate 75%), spanning the industries of manufacturing, services, education, retail, banking, and others. The average age of the participants was 37 years. Participants had an average of 12 years of work experience. The sample consisted of 7% first-line supervisors, 67% of managers, 23% of executive company officers, and 3% of other positions.

Measures

A *demographic questionnaire* was created to obtain information regarding employer organization, participants' tenure with the organization, total work experience, annual income, gender, age, marital status, and education level.

Work Engagement was measured using Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova's (2006) 17-item scale. The internal consistency reliability of this scale was $\alpha = 0.96$.

To measure *organizational identification*, the items in Heere and James' Group Identity scale (2007) were modified by Alfaro-Barrantes (2012). In the reliability analysis of the modified scale, Alfaro-Barrantes reported high internal consistency for various dimensions (α values ranging from .75 to .92). The researcher also used this modified version of the group identity scale to assess organizational identification in the present study.

To collect Trust and Autonomy responses, concerning items were selected from the OCTAPACE profile developed by Pareek (1973). The split-half reliability of OCTAPACE is .89. To collect responses for feedback,

concerning items were selected from the *Organizational climate survey* (OCS), developed by Vähälummukka (2012) and used in this study. The internal consistency of OCS is, $\alpha = 0.86$.

Procedure

The participants were assured and informed that the purpose of the study was purely academic. Informed consent of all the participants was achieved after explaining to them the study's idea, operation, and utility. The questionnaires were distributed anonymously.

Demographic items were included to gather information about participants' employer organization, participants' tenure with the organization, annual income, gender, age, marital status, and education level. All demographic questions were included at the starting of the questionnaire. In contrast, the questions related to interest variables were randomly distributed to avoid respondent's fatigue bias.

Data Analysis

At first, to test the appropriateness of data, reliability analysis was performed for the responses collected on individual items of different scales used in the study. Osterlind (2006) suggested that item-to-total correlation values above .50 can be regarded as evidence that the data collected on that particular item of the scale is reliable. The other way to establish the reliability of data is to calculate Split half or test-retest reliability for the scores obtained on all the items of the scale.

All the scales were shown, before administration, to three experts of the concerned research area, and highly ranked items/dimensions were selected. The final selection of items was made, keeping in mind that these items should cover the operational definition of variables to ensure face and content validity.

After collecting the final data and performing necessary checks, the researcher calculated the item-to-total correlation for all three HR practices: organizational identification and work engagement. Results indicated that all the items were significantly positively correlated with their respective scale's total score and having a correlation value of more than .50. For the second-level verification, the researcher calculated Cronbach's alpha (α) for all the variables under study and found satisfactory values (presented below) indicating the reliability of data. Cronbach's alpha ≥ 0.8 is considered as good internal consistency (DeVellis, 2012).

Table 1
Reliability of scales (based on data collected in the present study)

Variable	C- α	Internal consistency
Trust	0.83	Good
Autonomy	0.88	Good
Feedback	0.88	Good
Organizational Identification	0.92	Excellent
Work Engagement	0.86	Good

To explore answers for the research questions related to the patterns of relationship among variables under study, data were analysed with different quantitative procedures. The statistical package used for the data analysis was SPSS version 20. To test the research hypothesis, Pearson's correlation and stepwise multiple regression analysis were carried out.

I. RESULTS

The Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated to find out the answer to research questions regarding the relationship among variables under study. The correlation analysis results are presented in table one, which revealed that all three HR practices were significantly positively related to work engagement. Results also indicated that organizational identification is also significantly positively associated with work engagement.

Table 2
 Correlation among variables understudy

Predictor variables		Work Engagement
Encouraging human resource	Trust	.323**
	Autonomy	.311**
	Feedback	.279*
Organizational Identification		.357**

*p < .05; **p < .01.

Regression analysis was also performed to explore the specific contributions of various HR practices and organizational identification in work engagement among participants.

Table 3
 Stepwise regression analysis of the HR practices with work engagement among managerial employees

Predictor variables	R	R Square	R Square Change	F	Beta Coefficient	t ratio
Trust	.323	.104	.104	8.514**	.323	2.918**
Feedback	.391	.153	.048	4.106*	.224	2.026*
Autonomy	.455	.207	.054	4.868*	.254	2.206*

*p < .05; **p < .01.

Table 3 presents the results of stepwise regression analysis performed utilizing work engagement as the criterion and various *HR practices* as predictors. The analysis results were found to be statistically significant, indicating that trust, feedback, and autonomy are good predictors of work engagement (explained 10.4%, 4.8%, and 5.4 % of the total variance, respectively) indexed by the R² statistic.

Table 4
 Regression analysis of the Organizational identification with work engagement among managerial employees

Predictor Variable	R	R Square	R Square change	F	Beta Coefficient	t ratio
Organizational identification	.357	.128	.128	10.687**	.357	3.269**

*p < .05; **p < .01.

Table 4 presents the result of regression analysis performed utilizing work engagement as the criterion and organizational identification as the predictor. The result of the analysis was statistically significant, indicating that organizational identification is a good predictor of work engagement (explained 12.8% of total variance), as indexed by the R² statistic.

IV. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to *explore and understand the nature and extent of the relationship between different encouraging human resource practices, organizational identification, and work engagement among managerial employees.*

The present study investigated the relationship and specific contribution of various encouraging human resource practices in work engagement (RQ1 & RQ2). Results of correlation analysis and subsequently stepwise regression analysis indicated a significant causal relationship between human resource practices and work engagement. Present findings are as per the theoretical assumptions and similar to the findings of Greenidge (2010) and Alarcon et al. (2010).

Trust emerged as a most significant predictor of work engagement, and this finding is similar to a recent study conducted by Tabak and Hendy (2016), in which they also found a direct and strong link between trust and work engagement. Trust among employees brings a sense of assurance that others will not act opportunistically. It instils

the climate of mutual obligation and commitment. The extent to which employees trust that their managers will treat them honestly and reasonably may influence how employees engage in opportunistic behaviour or otherwise (Kurtulus, Kruse & Blasi, 2011). Employees will reciprocate trust relations communicated by management only if the organizational structures, roles, and climate reflect a trustworthy system. Previous studies have demonstrated that an increase in trust results directly or indirectly in more positive workplace behaviours and attitudes like organizational commitment and employee work engagement (Dirks, 2000; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002, Dirks & Skarlicki, 2004).

Results indicated that feedback also emerged as a significant predictor of work engagement, suggesting the influence and applicability of job characteristics theory (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Feedback is an indispensable part of human resource practices, management, and coaching. Effective feedback is to support employees "become more efficient," and managers are utilizing this metaphoric pat to make workplaces better. When workers can get honest feedback about how they are doing and how they can improve, they are less likely to feel demotivated. Providing regular feedback is the one-way managers can display to employees that they are appreciated and worthwhile. Even critical feedback can motivate employees to do better and perform with their best.

A study from McKinsey indicated that transparent communication between employees and managers could increase productivity and help enterprises engage with employees (Chui et al., 2012). Most employees want to succeed in their job, and as a result, are habitually very open to constructive feedback. According to research published in Harvard Business Review (2014), 72% of employees feel their performance would progress if their managers provided corrective feedback (Zenger & Folkman, 2014). A study by Officevibe (2014) also shows that 4 in 10 workers are actively disengaged when receiving little or no feedback. The research also highlighted how important it is for employees to receive regular feedback. 43% of highly engaged employees receive feedback at least once a week compared to only 18% of employees with low engagement.

Labelled as the "most ambitious generation," millennials and Gen Y are currently a substantial workforce. These growth-driven younger generations want to continually learn and do better; providing constructive and regular feedback is one important strategy to ensure their engagement in an informed way.

The emergence of autonomy as an essential predictor of work engagement supports the influence and applicability of the Job demand-resource (JD-R) model. Autonomy means respecting and encouraging individual and role independence. As a core job characteristic, autonomy causes individuals to feel responsible for achievements and failures, which fosters the feeling of accountability among the employees and finally can motivate him/her to work harder and invest more energy and interest in each project. Hackman and Oldham (1980) considered autonomy as a motivating resource, which is positively related to work engagement. Some other studies have also reported positive correlations between job autonomy and work engagement (Llorens, Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2007; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Saks, 2006).

The present study also examined the relationship and specific contribution of organizational identification in work engagement (RQ3 & RQ4). Results of correlation analysis and, subsequently, regression analysis found a significant causal relationship between organizational identification in work engagement. In understanding the connection between an employee and his organization, organizational identity is a real issue. The employee who has a strong psychological relationship with their company is likely to internalize the priorities and objectives of their organization and therefore be more interested in achieving these goals by engaging in their job. The more employees connect with their organizations, the more engaged they are to working. Employees become more engaged in their job when they are drawn to the ideals and priorities of the company, and when they feel a sense of solidarity with the organization.

This study's findings are consistent with those of Ashforth et al. (2008) and Okten and Erben (2010). These researchers conclude that an organization can serve as a central and influential social category with which workers can identify hence may form part of the identity-based motivation of employee engagement. Based on Social Identity Theory, and as previously discussed, it can be concluded that individuals with a deep psychological link with their organization will be expected to internalise the objectives and expectations of their organization and therefore be more involved in achieving these goals by engaging in their work.

V. CONCLUSION

It has been shown that job engagement leads to many positive work results and not just a "nice-to-have." Engagement is the heart of the workplace relationship between employee and employer, should be treated as a

key to unlocking productivity. In this context, this study presents employee engagement as a viable tool for promoting organizational effectiveness. The study results suggest that the management should integrate encouraging human resources policies and practices and ways to increase organizational identification to strengthen corporate identity feelings (Van Knippenberg, 2003).

Employee engagement is not a simple thing that just happens; it only develops in an organization that cares for employees and the work environment. It is crucial to identify which factors influence workers' engagement and what implementation can increase employee engagement. The present study results indicated that encouraging human resource practices (in terms of trusting employees, giving constructive feedback, and required autonomy to them) are likely to be related to higher levels of work engagement, which resembles the finds of Alarcon et al. (2010).

The essential contribution of organizational identification can be seen as cognitive and affective association between the company and the employee, where the identity of the worker requires membership in the organization, leading to a variety of favourable job attitudes and work behaviours. Creating and maintaining these necessary conditions will not ensure their work engagement only but also increase independent and fulfilling contribution to the achievement of broader organizational goals. Indirectly, findings also indicate that any organization's success and achievement of its specific goals depend on the employer's efficiency to create a positive culture conducive to effective human resources utilization.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Engagement is all about capturing the employees' hearts, heads, and hands (Flemming & Asplund, 2007). Managers should be aware that engagement has to be measured. The assessment results should be quickly integrated into the organization's management so that the increase in employee engagement would bring a competitive advantage (Horvathova & Mikusova, 2012). Therefore, organizations have to create a working environment where employees will experience the fostering factors of engagement. Four realistic measures are recommended based on the outcomes. The first endorsement is that managers should transfer a sense of trust to their employees. Trusted employees feel more valued, which will help to make them feel engaged. This can be done by removing micromanagement, showing faith, and making employees accountable for their work. To foster accountability within employees, managers should involve them in decision making, particularly if those decisions directly affect their work. The second recommendation is to use active and constructive contact as the capacity of management to maximize an organization's employee engagement strategies. The organization should promote openness via fostering frequent and easy communication among different levels/sections and effective informal feedback. The third recommendation is that the required role autonomy and possibilities to choose ways to perform their task should be given to employees to increase the sense of responsibility and ownership. The fourth and last endorsement is that corporate leaders could use the ways to improve the feeling of connectedness among employees that could raise employee engagement and job performance. Even small efforts to recognize and communicate about employee's contribution can positively affect engagement levels (Wollard & Shuck, 2011). It comes directly from the present study's findings that encouraging human resource practices and organizational identification is crucial in determining work engagement. The study can offer a framework to corporate leaders currently applying some of the established approaches but may lack strategies to increase employee engagement.

REFERENCES

1. Alarcon, G., Lyons, J. B., & Tartaglia, F. (2010). Understanding predictors of engagement within the military. *Military Psychology*, 22, 301-310.
2. Alfaro-Barrantes, P. (2012). Examining the Relationship Between Employees' Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward Corporate Social Responsibility and Organizational Identification. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, FL State University, FL.
3. Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2017). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice*. (14th ed.). London: Kogan Page.
4. Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20-39.
5. Ashforth, B., Harrison, S., & Corley, K. (2008). Identification in Organizations: An Examination of Four Fundamental Questions. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 325-374.
6. Avery, D.R., McKay, P.F., & Wilson, D.C. (2007). Engaging the aging workforce: The relationship between perceived age, similarity, satisfaction with co-workers, and employee engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (6), 1542-1556.

7. Bakker, A. B., & Bal, P. M. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 189-206.
8. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: state of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22 (3), 309-328.
9. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work Engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223.
10. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., Boer, E., & Schaufelia, W. B. (2003). Job demands and job resources as predictors of absence duration and frequency. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 62, 341-356. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(02\)00030-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00030-1)
11. Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Positive organizational behaviour: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 28, 147-154.
12. Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, S. L. & Leiter, M. P. (2011). Key questions regarding work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(1), 4-28.
13. Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands: Resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43, 83-104.
14. Baumruk, R. (2004). The missing link: the role of employee engagement in business success. *Work span*, 47, 48-52.
15. Chandani, A., Mehta, M., Mall, A. & Khokhar, V. (2016). Employee Engagement: A Review Paper on Factors Affecting Employee Engagement. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 9(15), 1-7.
16. Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S. & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64 (1), 89-136.
17. Chui, M., Manyika, J., Bughin, J., Dobbs, R., Roxburgh, C., Sarrazin, H., Sands, G., & Westergren, M. (2012). *The social economy: Unlocking value and productivity through social technologies*. Retrieved September 15, 2020, from https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/McKinsey/Industries/Technology%20Media%20and%20Telecom%20communications/High%20Tech/Our%20Insights/The%20social%20economy/MGI_The_social_economy_Full_report.pdf
18. Cole, M. S., & Bruch, H. (2006). Organizational identity strength, identification, and commitment and their relationships to turnover intention: Does organizational hierarchy matter? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 585-605.
19. Dernovsek, D. (2008). *Creating highly engaged and committed employee starts at the top and ends at the bottom line* Credit Union Magazine. Credit Union National Association, Inc.
20. DeVellis, R.F. (2012). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*. London: Sage Publication.
21. Dirks, K.T. & Ferrin, D.L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-Analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 611-628.
22. Dirks, K.T. & Skarlicki, D.P. (2004). Trust in leaders: Existing research and emerging issues. In Kramer, R.M. and Cook, K.S. (Eds.), *Trust and distrust in organizations: Dilemmas and approaches*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
23. Dirks, K.T. (2000). Trust in leadership and team performance: Evidence from NCCA Basketball. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 1004-1012.
24. Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M. & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 239-263.
25. Edwards, M.R. & Peccei, R. (2007). Organizational Identification: Development and Testing of a Conceptually Grounded Measure. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16 (1), 25-57.
26. Ellis, C. M., & Sorensen, A. (2007). Assessing Employee Engagement: The Key to Improving Productivity. *Segal Perspectives*, 15(1), 1-9.
27. Fleming, J. H., & Asplund, J. (2007). *Human sigma*. New York: Gallup Press.
28. Frank, F., Finnegan, R. P., & Taylor, C. R. (2004). The Race for Talent: Retaining and Engaging Workers in the 21st century. *Human Resource Planning*, 27(3), 12-2.
29. Giessner, S. R. (2011). Is the merger necessary? The interactive effect of perceived necessity and sense of continuity on post-merger identification. *Human Relations*, 64(8), 1079-1098.
30. Gorgievski, M. J. & Hobfoll, S. E. (2008). Work can burn us out or fire us up: Conservation of resources in burnout and engagement. *Handbook of stress and burnout in health care*, 7-22.
31. Greenidge, S. A. (2010). *Leadership communication, culture and employee engagement: A correlation study*. (Doctoral dissertation). Phoenix: University of Phoenix.
32. Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. (1976). Motivating through the design of work: test of a theory. *Organizational behavior and performance*, 16, 250-279.

33. Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1980). *Work redesign*, Reading, PA: Addison Wesley.
34. 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. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268>
35. He, H., & Brown, A. D. (2013). Organizational identity and organizational identification. A review of the literature and suggestions for future research. *Group & Organization Management*, 38(1), 3–35.
36. Heere, B., & James, J.D. (2007). Stepping outside the lines: Developing a multi-dimensional team identity scale based on Social Identity Theory. *Sport Management Review*, 10(1), 65–92.
37. Horvathova, P., & Mikusova, M. (2012). Use of talent management by organizations in one of the regions of Czech Republic. *Actual Problems of Economics*, 136, 526–535.
38. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
39. Kataria, A., Garg, P. & Rastogi, R. (2013). Psychological Climate and Organizational Effectiveness: Role of Work Engagement. *The IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12 (3), 33-46.
40. Kurtulus, F.A., Kruse, D. & Blasi, J. (2011). *Worker Attitudes towards Employee Ownership, Profit Sharing and Variable Pay* (UoM-Amherst working paper, 2011-15). Department of Economics, University of Massachusetts.
41. Lado, A. A. & Wilson, M. C. (1994). Human resource systems and sustained competitive advantage: A competency-based perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 19, 699-727
42. Levinson, H. (1965). Reciprocation: The relationship between man and organization. *Administrative science quarterly*, 9, 370-390. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391032>
43. Llorens, S., Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker A.B. & Salanova, M. (2007). Does a positive gain spiral of resources, efficacy beliefs and engagement exist? *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 23, 825-841.
44. Mael, F.A. & Ashfort, B.E. (1992). Alumni and Their Alma Mater: A Partial Test of a Reformulated Model of Organizational Identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 103 – 123.
45. Mikusova, M., & Copkova, A. (2016). What business owners expect from a crisis manager? A competency model: Survey results from Czech Businesses. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 24(3), 162–180.
46. Nahrgang, J. D., Morgeson, F. P. & Hofmann, D. A. (2011). Safety at work: a meta-analytic investigation of the link between job demands, job resources, burnout, engagement, and safety outcomes. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 71–94.
47. Officevibe Content Team (2014). *Statistics on the importance of employee feedback*. Retrieved September 15, 2020, from <https://officevibe.com/blog/infographic-employee-feedback>
48. Osborne, S., & Hammoud, M.S. (2017). Effective Employee Engagement in the Workplace. *International Journal of Applied Management and Technology*, 16 (1), 50–67. DOI: 10.5590/IJAMT.2017.16.1.04
49. Osterlind, S. J. (2006). *Modern measurement. Theory, principles, and applications of mental appraisal*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
50. Ötken, A.B., & Erben, G.S. (2010). Investigating the relationship between organizational identification and work engagement and the role of supervisor support. *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 12(2), 93-118.
51. Pareek, U. (1973). *Training Instruments for Human Resource Development*. McGraw-Hill, New Delhi.
52. Petra, H., Marie, M., & Kateřina, K. (2019). Evaluation of the employees' engagement factors importance methodology including generation Y. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 32 (1), 3895-3917. DOI: 10.1080/1331677X.2019.1679214
53. Putter, L. (2010). *Organizational Climate and Performance*. Retrieved September 15, 2020, from <http://repository.tudelft.nl/islandora/object/uuid:76a393e1-2528-46a7-838a-6e770d60b655/datastream/OBJ/download>.
54. Saks, A.M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(6), 600-619.
55. Salanova, M., Agut, S. & Peiro, J.M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediating role service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1217-1227.
56. 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.

57. Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a brief questionnaire: a cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 701-16.
58. Seppälä, E. & Cameron, K. (2015). *Proof That Positive Work Cultures Are More Productive*. Retrieved September 15, 2020, from <https://hbr.org/2015/12/proof-that-positive-work-cultures-are-more-productive>
59. Sharma, A. (2016). Job involvement: attitudinal outcome of organizational structural factors. *European Journal of Training and Development Studies*, 3(4), 17-28.
60. Sharma, A. (2017). Work Engagement: An Attitudinal Outcome of Organizational Climate and Identification. In J. K. Das, P. Bhatt, S. Verma, P. Jaiswal, & B. Majumdar (Eds.), *Riding the New Tides: Navigating the Future through Effective People Management*. Emerald Group Publishing Private Limited
61. Sharma, A. (2019a). Employee Empowerment Practices and Work Engagement. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*, 11 (8), 2615-2623.
62. Sharma, A. (2019b). Meaningfulness of Work and Perceived Organizational Prestige as Precursors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7 (1), 316-323. DOI: [dx.doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.7136](https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.7136)
63. Smith, J. R., Hogg, M. A., Martin, R. & Terry, D. J. (2007). Uncertainty and Influence of Group Norms in the Attitude-Behavior Relationship. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46 (4), 769-792.
64. Stoyanova, T., & Iliev, I. (2017). Employee engagement factor for organizational excellence. *International Journal of Business and Economic Sciences Applied Research*, 10 (1), 23-29.
65. Sun, L., & Bunchapattanasakda, C. (2019). Employee Engagement: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 9 (1), 63-80.
66. Tabak, F. & Hendy, N. T. (2016). Work Engagement: Trust as a Mediator of the Impact of Organizational Job Embeddedness and Perceived Organizational Support, *Organization Management Journal*, 13 (1), 21-31.
67. Tüzün, G.K. & Çağlar, G. (2008). Örgütsel Özdeğleme Kavramı ve Gelişim Etkinliği Üzerine. *Journal of Yaşar University*, 3 (9), 1011-1027.
68. Vähälummukka, T. (2012), *Organizational Climate Survey OP Services*. Retrieved September 15, 2020, from <https://www.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/46809/Organizational+Climate+Survey+OP-Services+Vahalummukka+final+version.pdf?sequence=1>.
69. Van Dick, R. (2004). My job is my castle: identification in organizational contexts, in Cooper, C.L. and Robertson, I.T. (Eds), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 19). Wiley, Chichester, 171-204.
70. Van Dick, R., Hirst, G., Grojean, M.W. & Wieseke, J. (2007). Relationships between Leader and Follower Identification and Implications for Follower Attitudes and Behaviors. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 80 (1), 133-150.
71. Van Knippenberg, D. & van Schie, E.C.M. (2000). Foci and correlates of organizational identification. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73 (3), 137-147.
72. Wagner, R. & Harter, J. K. (2006). *The great elements of managing*. Washington, DC: The Gallup Organization.
73. Wollard, K. K., & Shuck, B. (2011). Antecedents to employee engagement: A structured review of the literature. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(6), 429-446.
74. Wright, P.M. & Nishii, L.H. (2010). Strategic HRM and organizational behavior: Integrating multiple levels of analysis, In D.E., Guest, J., Paauwe & P.M., Wright (eds.) *Human resource management and performance: Progress and prospects*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
75. Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14 (2), 121-141.
76. Zenger, J. & Folkman, J. (2014). *Your Employees Want the Negative Feedback You Hate to Give*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2014/01/your-employees-want-the-negative-feedback-you-hate-to-give>