

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT ANALYSIS EVALUATION – APPROACHES, RESULTS AND CHALLENGES¹

LAURA KERŠULE

Abstract

The rapid development of modern telecommunication technologies in the world, as well as in Latvia has led to struggle and close contest for skilled personnel in today's telecommunication industry. Telecommunication companies demand that their staff would be professionally well educated, creative, efficient, motivated and loyal. Preparation of good practitioners able to perform activities for creation of competitive products and services takes time and huge effort. Companies in the conditions of intensive competition are interested to keep their professional staff for company development. Recent scientific findings are that it is important to engage employees to keep them satisfied with their work and be loyal to the company. Research methods used: scientific literature review, survey of employees (608 responses). For survey a 7-point scale, which is ranging from 1 – strongly disagree and 7 – strongly agree is used to indicate which engagement instruments are applied in current working place. For data analysis the main indicators of descriptive statistics: indicators of central tendency or location and indicators of variability were used, as well as cross-tabulations. For deeper analysis of the survey results statistical hypothesis testing with t-test for checking differences in answers of male and female respondents was used. Multivariate analysis: factor analysis for dimension reduction, regression, correlation analysis, and variance analysis for checking differences in answers of respondents by age group, by education level, by work experience and by time worked in respective company.

Key words: Latvia, employee engagement, motivation, management, human capital, commitment in the work place

JEL code: M54, M52, M50

INTRODUCTION

Recent economic development has generated new requirements for the management of companies and organisations to keep skilled personnel in the company. Researchers of company management have found it important to pay attention to company management for the development of human resources and engagement. In recent scientific publications by many company management researchers (Cameron, Dutton, Quinn, 2003), particular attention has been paid

¹ The article is prepared within the National Research Program 5.2. EKOSOC-LV

to the aspect that company human capital is an important long-term advantage in competition as this kind of capital – human capital – is more and more difficult to copy by competitors in other companies and organisations. Thus recognising that company human resources are a sustainable competitive advantage (Macey, Schneider, 2008). These aspects are of research interest for researchers worldwide.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Taking into account that employees spend a significant part of their lifetime at their workplace it is increasingly understood by organisation leaders of the role of human factors for sustainable development of the company in the aspect of excellence (Caza, Cameron, 2008). Several researchers have confirmed a logical connection – if human capital is well and professionally on a high level managed (Swart, 2007) that it influences positively the results of the work of the organisation (Foster, 2010; Peterson, Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, Zhang, 2011). This is the way in which human capital in organisations is becoming more and more important as it is important to do the work with less human resources and companies, as well as several organisations, need motivated employees (Bal, Jansen, Velde, Lange, Rousseau, 2010) who are able and willing to involve their resources such as time and energy in their work. Taking into account the above, it is important for the organisation management to adapt in new conditions. It is important to revise processes, structure and the system of entrepreneurship, but the most important is to change the working style, as well as attitude and behaviour.

One of those new attitudes is *employee engagement*, which has become among the most important aspects in company management together with keeping employees in the company and their loyalty and has become among the biggest challenges organisations (Aithal, Kumar, 2015) are facing in this decade. In a practical sense, it means that *employee engagement* (Albrecht, Bakker, Gruman, Macey, Saks, 2015; Woerkom, Oerlemans, Bakker, 2016) is closely related with company performance indicators, but in theoretical prospective researchers have taken this concept as one of those factors, which helps to develop new view on theories of effective management. In scientific publications, there exist numerous definitions of *employee engagement* (Lodahl, Kejner, 1965); the important part of this concept is employee feelings, psychological presence at work and close involvement and connection with the organisation. Psychological presence is defined as an *employee engagement* condition (Kumar, Pansari, 2014), demonstrating engaged behaviour, for example, performing and doing more, as well as fulfilling tasks with enthusiasm and without the stress (Kahn, 1990). Psychological presence in to a large extent is influenced by employee role models, which involves also a feeling of security – to do at all and to what extent an employee feels secure (Cropanzano, Wright, 2001) by realising himself/herself and showing strength and to what extent an employee devotes

himself/herself to work and identifies with the working role (Kahn, 1990; Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, Bakker, 2002).

In general, changes in the external environment has created new approaches for the management of employees, which researchers have characterised as *psychologization of the workplace* (Schaufeli, 2013; Meyer, Allen, 1997). It means – to be able to manage ongoing changes in the organisation; to be able to develop and survive it is important to have ability and will of employees for psychological adaption for new conditions, as well as motivation (Cerasoli, Nicklin, Ford, 2014) and ongoing *employee engagement*. For example, changes require elasticity of employees, self-control, emotional intelligence. Request for excellence (Gordon, Demerouti, Bipp, Le Blanc, 2015) is in great extent related to personal initiative and different approaches for making management decisions it is required thinking on perspective (Peale, 1956), good teamwork and good and well-developed communication skills. Therefore, the essence and meaning of *employee engagement* it is possible to formulate as internal interest of employee to put in work additional care and contribution devoting more time, more intellectual potential and more energy (Frank, Finnegan, Taylor, 2004).

The research results (Frank, Finnegan, Taylor, 2004; Rana, Chhabra, 2011) indicate that the overall situation in economy is directly related with keeping of employees, but is not taken into account level of *employee engagement*. In the growing economic situation as we face right now it is possible to notice relatively low level of keeping of employees at the respective work place, but *employee engagement* differs in different organisations and employee segments. Taking into account forecasts on development of global and Latvia's economy it is noticeable that the demand for employees will increase and during the next years, it is expected a high level of employee rotation. Main reason, which could assist employers to keep their employees, will be abilities and skills in creation and increase of *employee engagement*, as well as strengthen loyalty to the respective company. In most of the research results come to similar conclusions – *engaged employees* are a significant source for company competitiveness.

Employee engagement as a social definition as well as a measurement concept has given a significant contribution on aspects assisting in the improvement of organisation performance indicators, as well as productivity of employees (Katou, Budhwar, 2015; Sumanth, 1998; Tarafdar, Tu, Ragu-Nathan, Ragu-Nathan, 2007), satisfaction with work (Boselie, DerWiele, 2002; Rayton, Yalabik, 2014), loyalty and motivation (Schaufeli, 2013; Vroom, 1964). Most of the research confirm a positive influence of *employee engagement* on productivity (Koutroumpis, 2009), rentability, attraction and keeping of employees, as well as client satisfaction and service quality (Zigarmi, Nimon, Houson, Witt, Diehl, 2009; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, Schaufeli, 2009). Besides that in accordance with the findings of researchers Baker and Demerouti (Bakker, Demerouti, 2008), there are at least four reasons why *employee engagement* is very important and necessary for employees themselves. Firstly *engaged employees*

often feel positive emotions (for example, happiness, fulfilment and enthusiasm); secondly, *engaged employees* have better health; thirdly, *engaged employees* create their work resources and personal resources; and fourthly, *engaged employees* transfer their *engagement* to others.

In general, *engagement* in scientific publications there are used four *engagement* conceptual approaches and each of them stresses a different aspect of *engagement*: 1) *engagement* as an approach to satisfaction of needs and is related to performance of work role (Kahn, 1990); 2) *engagement* as the opposite situation of burnout (Bakker, Van Emmerik, Van Riet, 2008) where it is stressed positive side of *engagement* in relation to well-being of employee (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, Bakker, 2002); 3) *engagement* as an effect on satisfaction with work and it's relation with findings and approaches of Harter (Harter, Schmidt, Agrawal, Plowman, 2013); and 4) *engagement* as a multidimensional phenomenon and it's relation with work, as well as with the organisation (Saks, 2006). The author in this research has used the multidimensional approach of *engagement* as this approach defines *engagement* wider than the other approaches and is more related with management praxis of organisations and not with psychology branch. The multidimensional approach together with an attitude (Yalabik, Popaitoon, Chowne, Rayton, 2013) component in the *engagement* conception integrates also a behaviour dimension. Researchers Newman and Herrison (Newman, Harrison, 2008) have differentiated also the terms *work engagement* and *employee engagement* especially stressing that the first mentioned is related with psychological experience performing work, as well as attitude and characteristics of personality, but the second means an approach of the organisation to manage its employees.

Although in the world *employee engagement* is topical for organisations, the surveys conducted by research agencies indicate that level of *employee engagement* is low (Kaliannan, Adjovu, 2015). There are many discussions (Kersule, 2011) and even confusions in this field possibly caused by misunderstandings of confirmation of *engagement* and the preconditions and results of *engagement*. Still, there does not exist a common understanding and confirmation for *engagement* definition and its dimensions as there are views that there are differences between practical and theoretical definitions of *engagement* and that could be the reason for problems in comparisons of research results.

EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

In Latvia, personnel managers in organisations have also started serious work on the evaluation of personnel or *employee engagement*. Serious evaluation of *employee engagement* as praxis for organisation management, strategy of personnel management and instrument of internal communication as one of indicators characterising organisation performance level and quality and the next critical step in deeper understanding on relationships between influencing and depending factors of *engagement*, as well as the choice of reasonable instruments to measure

this influence. The author believes that a significant precondition in choice of measurement scale is to consider *engagement* as an activity or *active behaviour of engagement* not only the feeling to be *engaged*. Research on *employee engagement* is becoming wider and deeper where several and very different approaches are used, which are based on different branches, cases and even small samples are used and therefore the author considers in giving her own contribution in additional evaluation of *employee engagement*. For the survey conducted by the author, a 7-point scale which is ranging from 1 – strongly disagree and 7 – strongly agree is used to indicate which engagement instruments are applied in the current working place. The survey resulted in 608 respondents. The respondents were personally invited and then reminded three times to those who have not responded. The response rate was 67%.

Table 1

Main indicators of descriptive statistics of evaluations by respondents for aspects related to engagement

		I know what is expected from me in my work	My opinion and ideas are important for my company	From management I receive evaluation on my done job	I feel care on my professional development from the management	I see possibilities for my professional development in this company	I always receive recognition from my management for well-done job	I enjoy what I do in my job and want to do my best in my work
N	Valid	608	608	608	608	608	608	608
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		6.02	5.07	5.10	5.09	4.94	4.98	5.86
Std. Error of Mean		0.039	0.053	0.061	0.056	0.062	0.061	0.044
Median		6	5	5	5	5	5	6
Mode		6	5; 6	5	5	5	6	6
Std. Deviation		0.951	1.305	1.512	1.382	1.517	1.502	1.084
Variance		0.904	1.703	2.287	1.911	2.301	2.255	1.175
Range		6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		7	7	7	7	7	7	7

Source: Author's conducted survey in 2017 of employees in telecommunication sector, n = 608, Evaluation scale 1–7, where 1 – fully disagree; 7 – fully agree

As the data of responses indicate – although there is covered a full range of the evaluation scale, the evaluations of respondents are very high: the arithmetic means are around 5 and 6 with highest average evaluation (6.02) is for statement “I know what is expected from me in my work” with mode (most often given evaluation by respondents) 6 and median 6 (half of respondents gave evaluation 6 or less and half of respondents gave evaluation 6 or more). For evaluations of respondents for this statement there is the smallest variability – smallest standard

deviation, standard error of mean and smallest variance. Very high evaluations are also for statement “I enjoy what I do in my job and want to do my best in my work” with arithmetic mean 5.86 and mode 6 and median 6. The relative lower evaluations of respondents are for the statement “I see possibilities for my professional development in this company” with arithmetic mean 4.94, mode 5 and median 5: they are also high taking into account that evaluations are from 1 to 7 and respondents use all possible evaluations. The evaluations of male and female respondents do differ for several analysed aspects – see Table 2.

Table 2

Main statistical indicators on evaluations by respondents in the group (female and male) statistics

Evaluated Statements in Survey	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
I know what is expected from me in my work	Female	289	6.00	0.991	0.058
	Male	319	6.04	0.914	0.051
My opinion and ideas are important for my company	Female	289	4.94	1.348	0.079
	Male	319	5.19	1.256	0.070
From management I receive evaluation on my done job	Female	289	5.20	1.525	0.090
	Male	319	5.01	1.497	0.084
I feel care on my professional development from the management	Female	289	5.09	1.430	0.084
	Male	319	5.09	1.340	0.075
I see possibilities for my professional development in this company	Female	289	4.76	1.544	0.091
	Male	319	5.09	1.476	0.083
I always receive recognition from my management for well-done job	Female	289	4.98	1.566	0.092
	Male	319	4.98	1.444	0.081
I love what I do and want to do my best in my work	Female	289	5.85	1.091	0.064
	Male	319	5.87	1.079	0.060

Source: Author's conducted survey in 2017 of employees in telecommunication sector, $n = 608$, Evaluation scale 1–7, where 1 – fully disagree; 7 – fully agree

The results of the analysis indicate that in most of the evaluated aspects the male average evaluations are higher except “From management I receive evaluation on my done job” where the average valuations by female persons are bigger. For several aspects, average evaluations by male and female respondents are the same (“I feel care on my professional development from the management” and “I always receive recognition from my management for well-done job”). Although the differences in averages of evaluations by male and female respondents for some aspects are the same or alike, but testing the statistical hypothesis on differences in evaluations by male and female respondents with results included in Table 3 indicate that the average evaluations by male and female respondents does not differ statistically significant with level of significance 0.007 for analysed

statement “I see possibilities for my professional development in this company” and with level of significance 0.020 for analysed statement “My opinion and ideas are important for my company”.

Table 3

Main results on testing hypothesis on differences in evaluations by female and male respondents

Statements	Variances	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
I know what is expected from me in my work	Equal variances assumed	2.186	0.140	-0.442	606	0.659	-0.034	0.077
	Equal variances not assumed		-0.440	587.037	0.660	-0.034	0.078	
My opinion and ideas are important for my company	Equal variances assumed	0.102	0.749	-2.335	606	0.020	-0.247	0.106
	Equal variances not assumed		-2.327	589.109	0.020	-0.247	0.106	
From management I receive evaluation on my done job	Equal variances assumed	1.570	0.211	1.531	606	0.126	0.188	0.123
	Equal variances not assumed		1.530	597.787	0.127	0.188	0.123	
I feel care on my professional development from the management	Equal variances assumed	3.468	.063	-0.067	606	0.947	-0.008	0.112
	Equal variances not assumed		-0.067	590.248	0.947	-0.008	0.113	
I see possibilities for my professional development in this company	Equal variances assumed	2.095	.148	-2.716	606	0.007	-0.333	0.123
	Equal variances not assumed		-2.710	593.771	0.007	-0.333	0.123	
I always receive recognition from my management for well-done job	Equal variances assumed	3.649	0.057	-0.042	606	0.967	-0.005	0.122
	Equal variances not assumed		-0.042	587.123	0.967	-0.005	0.123	
I love what I do and want to do my best in my work	Equal variances assumed	0.069	0.793	-0.194	606	0.846	-0.017	0.088
	Equal variances not assumed		-0.194	598.834	0.846	-0.017	0.088	

Source: Author's conducted survey in 2017 of employees in telecommunication sector, n=608, Evaluation scale 1 – 7, where 1 – fully disagree; 7 – fully agree

Results on testing statistical hypotheses on differences in evaluations of respondents by age groups are included in Table 4.

Table 4

Main results on testing hypothesis evaluation differences of respondents by age groups with analysis of variance – ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I know what is expected from me in my work	Between Groups	6.563	4	1.641	1.825	0.122
	Within Groups	542.159	603	0.899		
	Total	548.722	607			
My opinion and ideas are important for my company	Between Groups	18.940	4	4.735	2.814	0.025
	Within Groups	1014.729	603	1.683		
	Total	1033.669	607			
From management I receive evaluation on my done job	Between Groups	21.537	4	5.384	2.376	0.051
	Within Groups	1366.542	603	2.266		
	Total	1388.079	607			
I feel care on my professional development from the management	Between Groups	17.462	4	4.366	2.304	0.057
	Within Groups	1142.562	603	1.895		
	Total	1160.025	607			
I see possibilities for my professional development in this company	Between Groups	14.492	4	3.623	1.581	0.178
	Within Groups	1382.006	603	2.292		
	Total	1396.498	607			
I always receive recognition from my management for well-done job	Between Groups	2.347	4	0.587	0.259	0.904
	Within Groups	1366.454	603	2.266		
	Total	1368.801	607			
I love what I do and want to do my best in my work	Between Groups	22.538	4	5.634	4.920	0.001
	Within Groups	690.579	603	1.145		
	Total	713.117	607			

Source: Author's conducted survey in 2017 of employees in telecommunication sector, $n = 608$, Evaluation scale 1–7, where 1 – fully disagree; 7 – fully agree

The results indicate that only statement where the evaluations of respondents by age groups do not differ significantly with level of significance 0,001 is only for the statement, “I love what I do and want to do my best in my work”.

Results on testing statistical hypotheses on differences in averages of evaluations on analysed statements of respondents by specialities groups are included in Table 5.

Table 5

Main results on testing hypothesis on differences in evaluations of respondents by speciality with analysis of variance – ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I know what is expected from me in my work	Between Groups	21.862	6	3.644	4.156	0.000
	Within Groups	526.860	601	.877		
	Total	548.722	607			
My opinion and ideas are important for my company	Between Groups	27.468	6	4.578	2.734	0.013
	Within Groups	1006.202	601	1.674		
	Total	1033.669	607			
From management I receive evaluation on my done job	Between Groups	110.909	6	18.485	8.698	0.000
	Within Groups	1277.170	601	2.125		
	Total	1388.079	607			
I feel care on my professional development from the management	Between Groups	35.309	6	5.885	3.145	0.005
	Within Groups	1124.716	601	1.871		
	Total	1160.025	607			
I see possibilities for my professional development in this company	Between Groups	36.656	6	6.109	2.700	0.014
	Within Groups	1359.843	601	2.263		
	Total	1396.498	607			
I always receive recognition from my management for well-done job	Between Groups	36.899	6	6.150	2.775	0.011
	Within Groups	1331.902	601	2.216		
	Total	1368.801	607			
I love what I do and want to do my best in my work	Between Groups	16.535	6	2.756	2.378	0.028
	Within Groups	696.581	601	1.159		
	Total	713.117	607			

Source: Author's conducted survey in 2017 of employees in telecommunication sector, $n = 608$, Evaluation scale 1–7, where 1 – fully disagree; 7 – fully agree

The results of analysis of survey data indicate that the statements where the averages of evaluations by respondents by specialities groups do not differ significantly with level of significance 0.000 re for the statements “I know what is expected from me in my work” and “From management I receive evaluation on my done job”. Averages of evaluations by respondents also for other statements do not differ statistically significant with high probability (where the lowest probability is 0.986).

Results on testing statistical hypotheses on differences in averages of evaluations on analysed statements of respondents by work experience groups are included in Table 6.

Table 6

Main results on testing hypothesis on differences in evaluations of respondents by work experience with analysis of variance – ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I know what is expected from me in my work	Between Groups	6.206	5	1.241	1.377	0.231
	Within Groups	542.516	602	.901		
	Total	548.722	607			
My opinion and ideas are important for my company	Between Groups	17.731	5	3.546	2.101	0.064
	Within Groups	1015.939	602	1.688		
	Total	1033.669	607			
From management I receive evaluation on my done job	Between Groups	9.695	5	1.939	.847	0.517
	Within Groups	1378.384	602	2.290		
	Total	1388.079	607			
I feel care on my professional development from the management	Between Groups	14.180	5	2.836	1.490	0.191
	Within Groups	1145.844	602	1.903		
	Total	1160.025	607			
I see possibilities for my professional development in this company	Between Groups	16.031	5	3.206	1.398	0.223
	Within Groups	1380.467	602	2.293		
	Total	1396.498	607			
I always receive recognition from my management for well-done job	Between Groups	7.418	5	1.484	0.656	0.657
	Within Groups	1361.383	602	2.261		
	Total	1368.801	607			
I love what I do and want to do my best in my work	Between Groups	26.440	5	5.288	4.636	0.000
	Within Groups	686.677	602	1.141		
	Total	713.117	607			

Source: Author's conducted survey in 2017 of employees in telecommunication sector, $n = 608$, Evaluation scale 1–7, where 1 – fully disagree; 7 – fully agree

The results of analysis of survey data indicate that the only statement where the averages of evaluations by respondents by work experience groups do not differ significantly with level of significance 0,000 are for the statement “I love what I do and want to do my best in my work”. For other analysed statements, averages of evaluations by respondents do differ statistically significant with rather high probabilities. The biggest differences in average evaluations by respondents by work experience groups are for the statement, “I always receive recognition from my management for well-done job”.

Results on testing statistical hypotheses on differences in averages of evaluations on analysed statements of respondents by length of work in the company groups are included in Table 7.

Table 7

Main results on testing hypothesis on differences in evaluation of respondents by length of work in the company with analysis of variance – ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I know what is expected from me in my work	Between Groups	4.354	5	0.871	0.963	0.440
	Within Groups	544.368	602	0.904		
	Total	548.722	607			
My opinion and ideas are important for my company	Between Groups	17.271	5	3.454	2.046	0.071
	Within Groups	1016.398	602	1.688		
	Total	1033.669	607			
From management I receive evaluation on my done job	Between Groups	9.419	5	1.884	0.823	0.534
	Within Groups	1378.660	602	2.290		
	Total	1388.079	607			
I feel care on my professional development from the management	Between Groups	17.621	5	3.524	1.857	0.100
	Within Groups	1142.404	602	1.898		
	Total	1160.025	607			
I see possibilities for my professional development in this company	Between Groups	49.916	5	9.983	4.463	0.001
	Within Groups	1346.582	602	2.237		
	Total	1396.498	607			
I always receive recognition from my management for well-done job	Between Groups	7.040	5	1.408	0.622	0.683
	Within Groups	1361.761	602	2.262		
	Total	1368.801	607			
I love what I do and want to do my best in my work	Between Groups	10.807	5	2.161	1.853	0.101
	Within Groups	702.309	602	1.167		
	Total	713.117	607			

Source: Author's conducted survey in 2017 of employees in telecommunication sector, $n = 608$, Evaluation scale 1–7, where 1 – fully disagree; 7 – fully agree

The results of analysis of survey data indicate that the only statement where the averages of evaluations by respondents by work experience groups do not differ significantly with level of significance 0.001 are for the statement “I see possibilities for my professional development in this company” and do not differ significantly with level of significance 0.100 are for the statement “I feel care on my professional development from the management”. For other analysed statements, averages of evaluations by respondents do differ statistically significant with rather high probabilities. The biggest differences in average evaluations by respondents by length of work in the company groups are for the statement, “I always receive recognition from my management for well-done job”.

Results on testing statistical hypotheses on differences in averages of evaluations on analysed statements of respondents by education level groups are included in Table 8.

Table 8

Main results on testing hypothesis on differences in evaluations of respondent education level groups with analysis of variance – ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I know what is expected from me in my work	Between Groups	4.432	1	4.432	4.935	0.027
	Within Groups	544.290	606	0.898		
	Total	548.722	607			
My opinion and ideas are important for my company	Between Groups	3.148	1	3.148	1.851	0.174
	Within Groups	1030.521	606	1.701		
	Total	1033.669	607			
From management I receive evaluation on my done job	Between Groups	25.797	1	25.797	11.475	0.001
	Within Groups	1362.282	606	2.248		
	Total	1388.079	607			
I feel care on my professional development from the management	Between Groups	2.704	1	2.704	1.416	0.235
	Within Groups	1157.321	606	1.910		
	Total	1160.025	607			
I see possibilities for my professional development in this company	Between Groups	1.829	1	1.829	0.795	0.373
	Within Groups	1394.669	606	2.301		
	Total	1396.498	607			
I always receive recognition from my management for well-done job	Between Groups	2.227	1	2.227	0.988	0.321
	Within Groups	1366.574	606	2.255		
	Total	1368.801	607			
I love what I do and want to do my best in my work	Between Groups	3.730	1	3.730	3.186	0.075
	Within Groups	709.387	606	1.171		
	Total	713.117	607			

Source: Author's conducted survey in 2017 of employees in telecommunication sector, $n = 608$, Evaluation scale 1–7, where 1 – fully disagree; 7 – fully agree

The results of analysis of survey data indicate that the only statement where the averages of evaluations by respondents by work experience groups do not differ significantly with level of significance 0.001 are for the statement “From management I receive evaluation on my done job” and do not differ significantly with level of significance 0.027 are for the statement “I know what is expected from me in my work”. The biggest differences in average evaluations by respondents by level of education groups are for the statement, “I see possibilities for my professional development in this company”.

The study confirmed the hypothesis that engagement clearly explains the motivating psychological state and behaviour of employee. As engagement is associated with a positive emotional experience, which is often regarded as a fulfilling satisfaction, it is thereby giving an intrinsically motivating value. Results of analysis of regression with engagement as dependent variable are included in Table 9. The engagement in the regression model is explained by almost 65% in the variation of the organisational citizenship behaviour that characterises motivation and organisational support staff behaviour ($R = 0.805$; $R^2 = 0.648$; $Adj R^2 = 0.648$; Table 9). As results indicate by improving respondents' assessment of the engagement per unit, the behavioural activity assessment is expected to increase on average by 0.8 units.

Table 9

Results of Analysis of Regression with Engagement as Dependent variable

Dependent variable	Independent Variable in Regression Equation	
	Plans to Stay within the Organisation	
	$Adj R^2$	0.191
Engagement	β	0.438
	Management evaluation of Employee's performance	
	$Adj R^2$	0.071
Engagement	β	0.269
	Motivating and Supporting Behaviour (OCB)	
	$Adj R^2$	0.648
Engagement	β	0.805
	Tolerance T	1
	VIF	1

$p < 0.001$, β – Standardised coefficients of regression, $Adj R^2$ – Coefficient of Determination Adjusted
 Source: Author's conducted survey in 2017 of employees in telecommunication sector, $n = 608$,
 Evaluation scale 1–7, where 1 – fully disagree; 7 – fully agree

The organisational citizenship behaviour in the author's model is characterised by six mutually correlated variables – commitment of organization, organizational supportive behaviour, and extra-role behavioural variables (Table 10). Thus, the management of the organisation, by stimulating one of them (for example, inspiring ones to work with full rewards), will promote as well a non-direct extra-role factors such as recommending a company as a good job or a company volunteering to enhance its reputation. The study confirmed the hypothesis that the engagement affects the employee's intent not to stay within the organisation, but according to this study, the author acknowledges that involvement is a rather weak predictor of intent ($adj R^2 = 0.191$). However, the regression coefficient of the intent variable is sufficiently high ($\beta = 0.438$).

Table 10

Results on Factor analysis on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

	Component Matrix	Organizational citizenship behaviour
1	This company inspires me to use my skills to their fullest potential	0.852
2	I recommend this company to others without hesitation	0.817
3	I feel motivated to do more than is required of me.	0.765
4	I truly care about this company, its future and the goals we are working towards	0.747
5	I see opportunities for professional advancement in this company	0.688
6	I tell others about the great things in this company	0.480
	Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis	a 1 components extracted
	KMO and Bartlett's Test	
	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	0.842
	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	1298.918
	df	15
	Sig.	0.000
	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	0.822

Source: Author's conducted survey in 2017 of employees in telecommunication sector, $n = 608$, Evaluation scale 1–7, where 1 – fully disagree; 7 – fully agree

As would be expected, engagement is related significantly and in meaningful ways to job related attitudes, behaviour and intentions on the job. These results testify that engagement is related to, but can be discriminated from behavioural intentions and actual behaviour that reflects an employee's commitment to the organisation and its goals.

CONCLUSIONS

The study revealed that levels of engagement are positively related to indicators of employee loyalty, commitment and turnover. The study confirms the hypothesis that the high levels of engagement can lead over time to more organisational commitment, more personal initiative, better role performance and less frequent leaving the company. This means that engagement must be the subject of a management whose purpose is to focus on achieving or exceeding the organisation's results. As mentioned earlier, employee engagement is the most critical factor in the process of enhancing the business performance. Employees basically are the real representatives and brand bearers of any organisation. Engagement may be described as a two way process between employees and an organisation. Engagement must be a strategy to enhance the productivity and performance of an employee; it is also a process to ensure the commitment,

motivation and contribution of an employee towards achieving the goals and values; needless to add, it also goes with enhancing their own wellbeing.

REFERENCES

- Aithal, P. S., Kumar, P. M. (2015). Black Ocean Strategy – A Probe into a New type of Strategy used for Organizational Success. *GE International Journal of Management Research*, 3 (8), 45–65.
- Albrecht, S. L., Bakker, A. B., Gruman, J. A., Macey, W. H., Saks, A. (2015). Employee engagement, human resource management practices and competitive advantage: An integrated approach. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 2 (1), 7–35.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13 (3), 209–223.
- Bakker, A. B., Van Emmerik, H., Van Riet, P. (2008). How job demands, resources, and burnout predict objective performance: A constructive replication. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 21 (3), 309–324.
- Bal, P. M., Jansen, P. G. W., Velde, E. G. van der, Lange, A. H. de, Rousseau, D. M. (2010). The role of future time perspective in psychological contracts. A study among older workers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76, 474–486.
- Boselie, P., DerWiele, T. (2002). Employee perceptions of HRM and TQM and the effects on satisfaction and intention to leave. *Management Service Quality*, 12 (3), 165–172.
- Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., Quinn, R. E. (2003). *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of New Discipline*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, 309–327.
- Caza, A., Cameron, K. (2008). Positive Organizational Scholarship: What Does It Achieve? *Handbook of Macro-Organizational Behavior*. New York: Sage.
- Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: a 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychology Bulletin*, 140 (4), 980–1008.
- Cropanzano, R., Wright, T. A. (2001). When a “happy” worker is a “productive” worker: A review and further refinement of the happy-productive worker thesis. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 53, 182–199.
- Foster, R. (2010). Resistance, Justice and Commitment to Change. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21 (1), 3–39.
- Frank, F. D., Finnegan, R. P., Taylor, C. R. (2004). The race for talent: retaining and engaging workers in the 21st century’. *Human Resource Planning*, 27 (3), 12–25.
- Gordon, H. J., Demerouti, E., Bipp, T., Le Blanc, P. M. (2015). The job demands and resources decision making (JD-RDM) model. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 24 (1), 44–58.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Agrawal, S., Plowman, S. K. (2013). *The relationship between engagement at work and organizational outcomes: 2012 Q12 meta analysis*. Washington, DC: Gallup.
- Kahn, W. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33 (4). 692–724.
- Kaliannan, M., Adjovu, S. N. (2015). Effective employee engagement and organizational success: a case study. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 172, 161–168.

- Katou, A. A., Budhwar, P. (2015). Human resource management and organisational productivity: A systems approach based empirical analysis. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 2 (3), 244–266.
- Kersule, L. (2011). Personnel Motivation Problems in a Big Company in World Economic Crisis Situation. International Conference on *Current Issues in Management of Business and Society Development Proceedings*. University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia, May 7–9, 2009, 162–166.
- Koutroumpis, P. (2009). The economic impact of broadband on growth: a simultaneous approach. *Telecommunications Policy*, 33, 471–485.
- Kumar, V., Pansari, A. (2014). The Construct, Measurement, and Impact of Employee Engagement: a Marketing Perspective. *Customer Needs and Solutions*, 1, 52–67.
- Lodahl, T. M., Kejner, M. (1965). The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49 (1), 24–33.
- Macey, W., Schneider, B. (2008). The Meaning of Employee Engagement, *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 3–30.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Application*. Sage Publications.
- Newman, D. A., Harrison, D. A. (2008), “Been there, bottled that: are state and behavioral work engagement new and useful construct ‘wines’?”. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 31–35.
- Peale, N. V. (1956). *The Power of Positive Thinking*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Peterson, S., Luthans, F., Avolio, B., Walumbwa, F., Zhang, Z. (2011). Psychological capital and employee performance: A latent growth modelling approach. *Personnel Psychology*, 64 (2), 427–450.
- Rana, N., Chhabra, N. L. (2011). Employee Engagement: A primer for strategic human resource management. *Asian Journal of Research in Business, Economics and Management*, 1 (2), 16–27.
- Rayton, B. A., Yalabik, Z. Y. (2014). Work engagement, psychological contract breach and job satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25 (17), 2382–2400.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21 (7), 600–619.
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2013). What is engagement? In Truss, C., Alfes, K., Delbridge, R., Shantz, A., Soane, E. (Eds.). *Employee Engagement in Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, pp. 14.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3 (1), 71–92.
- Sumanth, D. (1998). *Total productivity management: A Systemic and Quantitative Approach to Compete in Quality, Price and Time*. USA: CRC Press LLC.
- Swart, J. (2007). Whose Human Capital? The Challenge of Value Capture When Capital Is Embedded. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44 (4), 488–505.
- Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2007). The impact of technostress on role stress and productivity. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24, 301–328.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- 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.

- Yalabik, Z. Y., Popaitoon, P., Chowne, J. A., Rayton, B. A. (2013). Work Engagement as a Mediator between Employee Attitudes and Outcomes. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24, 2799–2823.
- Zigarmi, D., Nimon, K., Houson, D., Witt, D., Diehl, J. (2009). Beyond engagement: toward a framework and operational definition for employee work passion. *Human Resource Development Review*, 8 (3), 300–326.
- Woerkom, M. van, Oerlemans, M. Bakker, A. B. (2016). Strengths use and work engagement: a weekly diary study. *European Journal of Work and Organizations Psychology*, 25 (3), 384–397.