



The Study of Evolution of Employee Engagement Construct with Changing Generations

P. Bhuwaneshwari* and Dr. Anju Kumar**

*Research Scholar, CMR University, Kalyan Nagar, Bangalore, (Karnataka), INDIA

**Research Supervisor, CMR IT, Kundalahalli, Bangalore, (Karnataka), INDIA

(Corresponding author: P. Bhuwaneshwari)

(Received 22 October, 2017, Accepted 11 November, 2017)

(Published by Research Trend, Website: www.researchtrend.net)

ABSTRACT: Employee engagement construct is the featured topic discussed among HR circles and organizations for its positive consequences. The psychologists, academicians, practitioners and consultants have provided their different perspectives on employee engagement construct through many of their studies. The key theories and employee engagement scales which were developed by these researchers over the years has been studied, interpreted and summarized through content analysis methodology. The analysis of this study provides clarity on the origin of the employee engagement construct. The study discusses about the various scales that can be used to measure this construct and proposes few contemporary methods which can be adopted to engage the current workforce.

Keywords: Employee engagement theories, Employee engagement scales, Generations, Interlinked concepts.

I. INTRODUCTION

Right employees are irreplaceable resources and backbone of the organization. The technological developments has significantly influenced and increased these employee's work efficiency levels compared to yesteryear work environment with its better communication and collaboration models. However, the major breakthrough technologies such as artificial intelligence, machine learning, deep learning, virtual reality, augmented reality, automation has brought opportunities and threats to employees. In this technologically-driven uncertain business environment, employees should be supported, trained and their problems or wants should be heard and fulfilled. The employee engagement construct plays a fundamental role in such situations or with mergers or acquisitions or to any new changes in organizations. The employee engagement construct has many evolvments in the last three decades and is understood as a very popular and meaningful construct for its positive employee success and organization success. Many theories and scales were developed by the researchers to measure this construct and out of them, the key theories and the key employee engagement scales will be studied to understand the defining developments. The following 3 objectives have been identified for this study:

1. To explore the evolution of employee engagement construct over the years.
2. To identify the important theories and employee engagement scales used in employee engagement construct.
3. To distinguish the employee engagement construct from other interlinked concepts like flow, involvement, commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and job satisfaction.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Literature review is a method of collecting relevant information on the topic. Journals, articles, books, magazines pertaining to the topic were reviewed and the critical information's are summed up and communicated to the reader.

1. The psychologists, academicians, practitioners and consultant's perspectives and contribution on employee engagement construct is summarized in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1.

Personal engagement theory	
Author Name	Major contribution
Kahn (1990)[15]	Personal engagement theory states that employees engage at work physically, cognitively and emotionally only when they see meaning in their work, feel safe at work and have enough personal resources at work to carry out their tasks. Psychological meaningfulness in the job is defined to skill variety, task autonomy, role status, role influence, dignified work relations; psychological safety is linked to not facing any negative consequence to self-image, status or career; and psychological availability is associated to a sense of having the necessary physical, emotional or psychological resource at work. An interview was scheduled with 16 summer camp counsellors and 16 architecture firm members to understand their work experiences and moments of engagement at work and based on this underpinning, this theory was established.
May, Gilson & Harter (2004)[25]	A survey was done on 213 employees from insurance company to understand the aspects that contributed to psychological meaningfulness, safety and availability at work. The study found that Job enrichment like handling additional responsibilities and work role fit offered psychological meaning to employees, rewards and support from supervisor and co-workers made them to sense psychological safety and having enough personal resources kept them psychologically available for work. However adhering to too many norms of co-workers and too much participation in outside activities were found to disengage them from work.
Job burnout theory	
Maslach & Leiter (1997)[23]	Burnout is a psychological disorder caused by the job due to work overload or because of social conflicts or lack of relevant resources available at work resulting in energy turning to exhaustion, involvement to cynicism and efficacy to reduced professional efficacy.
Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter (2001)[24]	Burnout is a concept studied by psychologists mainly among human service workers and other occupations. Burnout is job-related and situation-specific. Situational factors like job demands, role clarity, role ambiguity, downsizing, merger, occupational characteristics, and individual factors like age, education, personality and work related attitudes causes burnout and the outcomes led to lower productivity, absenteeism, intention to leave the job, and actual turnover. Researchers wanted to alleviate burnout among employees and started visioning the positive psychology and this psychologist's transformation from studying negative to positive psychology took them to development of Job Engagement concept which is considered to be positive antithesis to Burnout.
Job demands-resources theory	
Demerouti <i>et al</i> (2001)[8]	The Job demand-resources (JD-R) model puts forward the concept that job demands (such as physical demands, time pressure, shift work) associates with exhaustion and lacking job resources (such as performance feedback, job control, participation in decision making, social support) associates with disengagement.
Schaufeli & Bakker (2004)[34]	A model of burnout and engagement with different predictors and possible consequences was developed and their relationships were tested on a sample of 1698 employees from different occupations such as insurance, pension funds, occupational health & safety services, and home-care institution through survey method. The results indicated that both burnout and engagement were negatively related. Burnout was predicted by job demands (such as work overload, emotional demands or lack of job resources at i. task level (performance feedback), ii. interpersonal-level (support from colleagues), or iii. organizational level (supervisory coaching)) and was found to mediate the relationship between job demands and health problems. Engagement was predicted mainly by available job resources and was also found to mediate the relationship between job resources and low turnover intention.
Bakker & Demerouti, (2014)[1]	JD-R model is used to predict work engagement, work enjoyment, organizational commitment, job burnout, connectedness, sickness absenteeism, job performance.

Work engagement theory	
Schaufeli <i>et al.</i> (2002)[33]	Work Engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor (high levels of energy and mental resilience), dedication (sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge), and absorption (fully concentrated and happily engrossed). The study considered burnout and engagement to be independent states which was contrary to Maslach and Leiter's perspectives. A study survey was carried on 314 Spanish undergraduate university students and 619 Spanish working employees to examine the relationship between burnout and engagement. The results confirmed that burnout and engagement constructs were moderately negatively related.
Social exchange theory	
Cropanzano & Mitchell (2005)[5]	Social Exchange Theory (SET) puts forward the reciprocal interdependence concept that when employees receive sufficient economic and socio-emotional resources from organization, they feel obliged to repay the organization by performing best at work.
Saks (2006)[32]	SET has provided a theoretical foundation to employee's engagement concept. The theory explains that employee's tend to exhibit positive behaviours and engage themselves more when they receive necessary resources and benefits from the organization. Saks two types of Employee Engagement (Job Engagement and Organization Engagement): Based on SET and using Kahn (1990) model, Maslach <i>et al.</i> (2001) model, May <i>et al.</i> (2004) model, Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) model findings majorly, Saks identified model of antecedents (Job characteristics, Perceived organizational support (POS), Perceived supervisor support (PSS), rewards and recognition, procedural justice, distributive justice) and consequences (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intention to quit, OCB) of two types of employee engagement (Job engagement and organizational engagement) and tested them on a sample of 102 employees from different jobs and organizations through survey method. The results indicated significant higher job engagement among respondents than organization engagement. POS predicted both job and organization engagement, job characteristics (enriched and challenging jobs) predicted job engagement, and procedural justice predicted organization engagement. Job and organization engagement were found significantly positively related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and OCB and they were negatively related to intention to quit. Rewards and recognition, distributive justice, PSS did not predict job or employee engagement.

Table 2.

Gallup's meta-analysis study	
Author Name	Major contribution
Harter, Schmidt & Hayes (2002)[11]	Employee engagement is individual's involvement, satisfaction and enthusiasm for work. Meta-analytic techniques pools studies together and explains the strength of their effect and generalizability where the business-unit level responses gets averaged across many individuals and the reliability of single items gets higher. 198,514 employee responses from 7,939 independent business units were studied. The business-unit-level observed correlation between overall satisfaction and employee engagement and both showed generalizability across companies in their correlation with customer satisfaction-loyalty, profitability, productivity, employee turnover, and safety outcomes. The study suggests that business unit outcomes can be increased by increasing employee satisfaction.
Perrin's biennial study	
Perrin (2003)[27]	Employee engagement is an emotional/rational duality of both "the will" and "the way" where employees need the will of mission, passion and pride as well they need the resources, support and tools as the way to accomplish their mission and passion. 86,400 employees from North America, US, Canada were surveyed to understand their engagement at work. The study found senior executives among other members and non-profit sectors among other industries to be highly engaged. The results indicated that responsibility, accountability, autonomy and high sense of mission and passion towards work associates them to more

	engagement at work. The overall findings revealed that employees look for a conducive working environment where learning, development, and advancement is achievable.
IES attitude survey study	
Robinson, Perryman & Hayday (2004)[30]	Employee engagement is defined as a positive attitude that the employee holds towards the organisation and organization values depending on the level of support they receive from the organization. 10,024 employees from 14 organisations within NHS was surveyed. The findings revealed that engagement levels varied with personal and job characteristics and with experiences at work. Managers, minority ethnic respondents, employees who underwent personal development plan and employees who received formal performance appraisal within the past year had displayed higher engagement whereas employees who experienced harassment, employees with increased length of service, older employees, or any accidents or injury at work had negative impact on engagement. Valuing employees, training and development opportunities, appraisals, proper communication, pay and benefits, health and safety, family friendliness, job satisfaction were few of identified drivers of engagement.
Lockwood's analysis study	
Lockwood (2007)[22]	Employee engagement is a complex concept about employee's commitment to something or someone in the organization and about how hard they work and how long they stay as a result of that commitment. Cognitive engagement is one of the three type of engagement which associates employees with beliefs about the company, its leaders and the workplace culture. The emotional engagement associates on how employees feel about the company and their leaders and colleagues. The behavioural engagement associates the amount of effort employees put into their work such as brainpower, extra time and energy. The drivers of employee engagement identified were manager-employee relationship, workplace culture, organizational communication, company reputation, access to training and career opportunities, empowerment to make decisions and work-life balance.
Aon Hewitt's Say, Stay, Strive model study	
Hewitt (2015) [12]	Employee engagement is the level of rational thought, emotions, behaviours, intentions invested by employees in the organization. The say, stay, strive model believes the employee to be engaged only when employee speaks positive about the organization to co-workers, potential employees, and customers; sense strong belonging and desire to be part of the organization; and exert full effort in their job for the success of the organization. The engagement drivers of this model are company practices (communication, customer focus, diversity and inclusion, enabling infrastructure, talent and staffing), the basics (benefits, job security, safety, work environment, work/life balance), brand (reputation, brand/employee value proposition, corporate responsibility), leadership (senior leadership, business unit leadership), performance (career opportunities, learning and development, performance management, people management, rewards and recognition), the work (collaboration, empowerment/autonomy, work tasks) which leads to business outcomes such as talent (retention, absenteeism, wellness), operational (productivity, safety), customer (satisfaction, net promoter score, retention), and financial (revenue/sales growth, operational income/margin, total shareholder return).
Hewitt, (2017)[13]	Two-point drop in recent employee engagement survey report: Employee engagement survey was done in 2015 and 2016 globally reaching 5 million employees from more than 1000 organizations across 60 plus industries. Hewitt Say, Stay, Strive model was used to measure engagement. The results found 24% were highly engaged and 39% moderately engaged. Overall 63% employees were found to be globally engaged in 2016 compared to 65% in 2015. The elements in the engagement index such as Say component dropped from 69% to 68%, Stay component from 60% to 59% and Strive component from 64% to 63%. India saw a 2 point decline and the study conveyed that addressing reward and recognition issues can improve engagement. Top engagement drivers identified globally were rewards and recognition, employee value proposition, senior leadership, career opportunities and enabling infrastructure. The study indicated that populist restrictions on the flow of labour between countries and major technology breakthroughs were the possible reasons for the decline in engagement.

2. The researchers developed various employee engagement scales and they are summarized in Table 3. The engagement scales which got shaped from burnout scales is also included to get a thorough understanding on the evolution of these scales.

Table 3.

MBI Scale	
Author Name	Scale description
Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter (2001)[24]	Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) scale was developed by a social psychologist Maslach along with Jackson to measure burnout. As stress levels were highly witnessed among the health service workers like nurses, Maslach studied their emotions and initially developed the MBI-Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS) to assess them. He then developed a second version to determine the teacher's burnout level in educational settings (MBI-Educators Survey, or MBI-ES) and further developed a general version (MBI-General Survey, or MBI-GS) for different occupations.
Poghosyan, Aiken & Sloane (2009)[28]	The MBI-HSS and MBI-ES scale are comprised of 22 items with subscales namely emotional exhaustion (9 items), depersonalization (5 items) and reduced personal accomplishment (8 items). These are scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (every day).
Bria <i>et al.</i> (2014)[4]	The MBI-GS contains 16 items with subscales namely exhaustion (5 items), cynicism ((a distant attitude toward the job) 5 items), and reduced professional efficacy (6 items) and all items are scored same on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (everyday).
Maslach & Leiter (1997)[23]	The burnout and engagement was considered to be the opposite poles of a continuum covered by MBI scale i.e. to measure job engagement, reverse scoring patterns on MBI-GS scale was used.
OLBI scale	
Demerouti <i>et al.</i> (2001)[8]	Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) scale was developed by Demerouti <i>et al</i> to measure burnout and engagement.
Reis, Xanthopoulou & Tsaousis(2015) [29]	The OLBI is comprised of 16 items with subscales namely exhaustion (8 items) and disengagement (8 items) and all items are scored on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree). This scale is considered better in terms of wordings of items as it included four positively worded items and four negatively worded items in both subscales which is contrary to MBI-GS items where each subscale were framed in same fashion.
UWES scale	
Schaufeli <i>et al.</i> (2002)[33]	The concept of engagement was not adequately measured by the opposite profile of MBI scores, hence Schaufeli and colleagues developed Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) to measure work engagement.
Schaufeli, Bakker, Salanova (2006)[35]	It originally comprised of 17 items with subscales namely vigor (6 items), dedication (5 items) absorption (6 items) and all items were scored on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (every day). The scales validity was tested and later 15 items was considered by getting 2 items removed from vigor and absorption. The scale was further shortened to 9 items with same subscales where vigor (3 items), dedication (3 items) and absorption (3 items) were tested again for its validity and it was found to have acceptable psychometric properties to measure the employee's work engagement level.
GWA scale	
Harter, Schmidt & Hayes (2002)[11]	Gallup Workplace Audit (GWA) scale was developed by Gallup organization to measure employee engagement. Gallup organization did rigorous study for about 30 years on managers and employees through qualitative focus groups and surveys across various industries and the results led them to develop Gallup Workplace Audit (GWA) scale. It contains 12 questions with a single overall satisfaction item in GWA and mean of GWA Items 1–12 to determine employee engagement. The single overall satisfaction item is scored on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (extremely dissatisfied) to 5 (extremely satisfied) and mean of GWA Items 1–12 are scored on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).
IES scale	
Robinson, Perryman & Hayday	Institute for Employment Studies (IES) (2003) attitude scale was developed by IES to measure employee engagement. It contains 12 items and the items were scored on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

(2004)[30]	
JD-R scale	
Bakker (2014)[1]	JD-R model 2014 was developed by Prof. Dr. Arnold Bakker to measure employee engagement. The model is comprised of 118 items with subscales namely work situation (11 items), collaboration (3 items), emotions at work (6 items), feedback (3 items), your supervisor (5 items), behaviour (31 items) all of which are scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). Conflicting expectations (4 items), Hassless (5 items), opportunities for development (3 items), your personality (4 items to understand optimism) all of which are scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Your way of working (9 items is scored on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 (almost never) to 6 (almost always)), well-being (9 items to predict engagement is scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (always)), well-being (4 items to predict burnout is scored on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree)), performance (6 items is scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (not at all characteristic) to 6 (totally characteristic)), your personality (4 items to understand self-efficacy is scored on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (absolutely wrong) to 4 (absolutely right)) and the demographic variables consisted of 11 items.
Say, Stay, Strive scale	
Hewitt (2015)[12]	The say, stay, strive model was developed by Aon Hewitt group. They derived the definition of say, stay, strive model by conducting thousands of managerial interviews and focus group discussions globally. It is composed of 3 facets namely Say, Stay, Strive with 2 items in each facets and they strongly believe that employees will be engaged at work only when they exhibit all three of these facets.

3. The interlinked concepts study: The distinction between the employee engagement construct and its interrelated concepts such as flow, involvement, commitment, OCB, and Job satisfaction is summarized.

(a). Flow: The distinction between the flow and employee engagement is that the flow construct refers to the cognitive state of the employee where he/she is completely immersed and carried in the job. The job and job challenges interests and motivates the individual to an extent where they almost forget themselves with environment and gets fully absorbed into the job (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975)[6]. Unlike the flow construct that takes only the cognitive aspect of the employee into consideration, the engagement theory considers all aspects of physical and emotional energies along with cognitive energies and states that an employee will get absorbed and engaged at work only when they find meaning in their work and when they feel safe and psychologically available for work (Kahn, 1990)[15].

(b). Involvement: Job involvement refers to the cognitive state of the employee where he/she gets engrossed in their job to the extent where job is found to be significant to their identity. Engagement refers to the cognitive, physical and emotional state of the employee where he/she is engaged in the performance of their job. Engagement can be seen as an antecedent to involvement (May, Gilson & Harter, 2004)[25].

(c). Commitment: Commitment refers to the employee's attitude and attachment on the organization which is expressed and reflected by performing and engaging well at work. The engagement construct is seen to be one step beyond commitment and attitude where the individual aspires to stay in the job, gets absorbed in the job to the level to improve the company's performance and profit ((Robinson, Perryman & Hayday, 2004)[30].

(d). OCB: OCB involves informal-voluntary behaviors exhibited by the employee to help co-workers and the organization out of their interest. Engagement construct does not include the voluntary behaviour or extra roles performed by employees in its definitions, instead it is more concerned about the formal work and tasks allotted to the employee and their engagement in it. (Robinson, Perryman & Hayday, 2004)[30].

(e). Job Satisfaction: Job satisfaction refers to employee's good feel about his or her job, about the work environment, pay, benefits, etc which makes them satisfied at work and which indeed is expected to engage them at work, whereas employee engagement is seen one step above this as a critical deciding factor to employees success and organizational success (Lockwood, 2007)[22].

4. Generational characteristics study to predict employee engagement.

The generation construct is defined as a distinct group that shares birth years, age, location and significant life events at critical developmental stages (Kupperschmidt, 2000)[20]. As generations grow from young to adulthood and from midlife to elderhood, their behaviour and attitudes are expected to mature and this pattern in future trends can be predicted with past observable historical patterns (Howe & Strauss, 2007)[14]. As generations and their

characteristics are specific to a given society; demographers or research experts propose their own definitions by exploring on significant political, socioeconomic, and cultural events of that society. Hence, there is no single definition or consensus on start or end of birth years to generation construct in the literature. The current workforce in the organizations is expected to have fewer of traditionalists and remaining with baby boomers, gen x and gen y. The generational classification and their key generational characteristics are studied to understand and connect their strengths, beliefs and wants to workplace to help predict employee engagement.

(a). Traditionalists: They are the generation born between 1922–1943/46 or 1940–1950. The key characteristics of this generation includes being loyal, belief in authority, social order and caste system.

(b). Baby boomers: They are the generation born between 1943–1960/1964 or 1946–1960/64 or 1947–1969 or 1948–1968 or 1940–1970. They are called by different names such as Conservatives or Midnight’s children. The key characteristics of this generation includes being goal-oriented, idealistic, obedient, shy, belief in social conformity and social acceptance, and technophobic.

(c). Gen X: They are the generation born between 1960/64–1980 or 1961/65–1979 or 1970–1984 or 1969–1980 or 1975–1980. They are named even as Integrators, Mid-way generation, Non-traditional generation or as Socialists. The key characteristics of this generation includes being ambitious, belief in hierarchy, less conservative, and tech savvy.

(d). Gen Y: They are the generation born between 1980–2000 or 1980–1995 or 1985–1995 or from 1981 or 1986 onwards. They are named even as Y2K or Liberalization generation. The key characteristics of this generation includes being ambitious, business savvy, entrepreneurial, tech savvy, work for recognition and financial reward and values work-life balance.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Qualitative content analysis methodology is used to understand, interpret, and discuss the employee engagement construct. The British council online library was used as a source to access Jstor and ProQuest Central journal papers and articles; IIMB Bangalore library was visited to access Ebsco journals, articles and books; and Google search engine was used to access business magazines and consulting reports.

IV. DISCUSSION

Based on the articles reviewed, a comprehensive understanding of the evolution of the employee engagement construct is discussed in first 2 points and contemporary method to engage the current workforce is suggested in the 3rd point.

1. Origin of employee engagement construct: Personal Engagement, Job Engagement, Work Engagement, and Organizational engagement are different names used by researchers to refer to employee engagement construct. Kahn has put forward his thoughts on employee engagement construct through his ‘personal engagement theory’ as early as 1990 and his theory has laid a strong foundation for today’s researchers to further study the relationship of different employee engagement variables. On the other end, Gallup consulting firm’s researchers from 1970 to about 30 years conducted lot of focus group discussions across various industries to understand mainly the characteristics of employees, managers and their influence on employees. They then through all these extensive studies developed a ‘Gallup work audit scale’ to measure employee engagement and the business outcomes. There is no clarity on who first originated this concept as there was simultaneous work by psychologists, academicians, practitioners and business consultants side by side. However the term ‘employee engagement’ as it is used today, is coined by Gallup organization. This term from then is widely used in organizations, management books, business press, researchers, business consultants and by HR’s.

2. Popular scales of employee engagement construct: The psychologists, academicians, practitioners and business consultants had their theories and perspectives behind choosing the engagement variables and developed the employee engagement scales. Of the many scales developed over years, the organization should decide which to choose depending on what they want to know in their output. If the organization wants to assess the positive behaviour of their employees in terms of how good they speak about the company or on how much they desire to stay or go that extra mile for the organization success, then Aon Hewitt say, stay, strive model can be used. If the organization wants to understand in deeper the supervisor or managerial influence and their support to employees in terms of defining goals, providing feedback, rewarding, recognizing and about creating a conducive work

environment for them to work, then these questions will be answered through Gallup GWA scale. The IES scale was tested within the NHS workers to measure their attitude, pride, belief in organization, about being a good team player, and about the 2 way relationship they expect from employer. Since the scale is not NHS-specific, it can be used in similar health care services or other occupations as well to measure the employee engagement. The UWES scale measures the vigor, dedication and absorption of the employee which helps in understanding the overall feelings of the employee; about their high energy levels and willingness to work, about their total involvement and attachment at work, however it doesn't take other job characteristics into consideration. Hence, if the organization wants to assess these feelings of the employee at work, then the UWES shortened version consisting of 9 items can be used. The JD-R model has incorporated UWES scale items in it along with other job resources, personal resources items and can be thought of as a good model to measure employee's holistic engagement.

3. Contemporary methods on employee engagement construct: Earlier days and even now many companies conduct the employee engagement survey just once in a year which is a slow process. Instead, frequent quarterly employee engagement surveys should be conducted to assess the employees better. Along with this survey, other surveys like pulse and emotional surveys using apps like Leo - the slackbot chat, Culture Amp, Talmatrix, TinyHR can be used to identify employee's sentiment and engagement level in real time. The businesses and current working generations are reliable on technology and even the older generations are learning and getting adopted to current technology, expects tools which are easy to interact and use. Hence, the new age communication tools to name few like Slack, Flock, Teamchat, HipChat, Redbooth can be used for better interaction and engagement. The younger generations are connected online mostly and for any training, modern learning such as online and mobile learning and learning through gamification method is thought to make it interesting for them to learn and use their learning skills at work. Recognizing employees through instant online gift cards, thank you notes or appreciating their work in their social network platforms or in their whatsapp group is as well expected to motivate and engage them at work along with other conventional methods.

V. CONCLUSION

Employee engagement is a unique, meaningful, challenging construct which is known to actuate positive business outcomes such as higher employee retention, greater productivity, maximized profit levels, higher customer satisfaction and loyalty, improved safety outcomes, lowered absenteeism and increased wellness in the organization. This construct is different from other important and overlapping constructs such as flow, involvement, commitment, OCB and job satisfaction. As employee engagement deals with people of different personality and organizations with different profile, no one size fits all approach is possible. The employee engagement drivers, its order of importance people hold may change depending on industry size, type, regional or country culture and keeping all these into consideration, HR needs to make policies that best suits their organization. The workplace scenarios are getting altered and influenced with the emerging technologies and growing generations. Interestingly and noticeably, the organizations too are seen to proactively design newer business model to gain advantage or cope disadvantage over others and this opportunity-cum-turbulence is likely to keep the employee engagement construct alive and emerging unless the workstation gets to run with machine or robots instead of humans.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I acknowledge my profound gratitude to my research supervisor Dr. Anju Kumar, Associate Professor of CMRIT for her continuous assistance in my research work which helped me in completing this article.

I am grateful to Dr. B.S. Patil, Director of School of Research and Innovation and other staff of CMR University, to my family members and friends for their valuable support.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). *Work and Wellbeing: Wellbeing: A Complete Reference Guide*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons. doi: 10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell019.
- [2]. Bersin, J. (2015). *Becoming irresistible: a new model for employee engagement*. *Deloitte Insights*. Retrieved from <https://dupress.deloitte.com>.
- [3]. Bijapurkar, R. (2007). *Winning in the Indian Market: Understanding the transformation of consumer India*. Clementi, Singapore: John Wiley & Sons.

- [4]. Bria, M., Spanu, F., Baban, A., & Dumitrascu, D. L. (2014). Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey: Factorial validity and invariance among Romanian healthcare professional [Website]. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2014.09.001>
- [5]. Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: an interdisciplinary review, *Journal of Management*, **31**(6), 874-900. <http://journals.sagepub.com/home/jom>
- [6]. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). *Beyond boredom and anxiety*. Retrieved from http://psy2.ucsd.edu/~nchristenfeld/Happiness_Readings_files/Class%207%20-%20Csikszentmihalyi%201975.pdf
- [7]. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. Retrieved from <http://www.bates.edu/purposeful-work/files/2015/03/Csikszentmihalyi-1990.pdf>
- [8]. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **86**(3), 499–512. <http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/apl>
- [9]. Erickson, T. (2009). Generational differences between India and the U.S [Website]. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org>
- [10]. Ghosh, R., & Chaudhuri, S. (2009). Intergenerational differences in Individualism/Collectivism Orientations: Implications for outlook towards HRD/HRM practices in India and the United States. *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource development*, **23**(4): 5–21. doi: 10.1002/nha3.10356
- [11]. 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: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.2.268
- [12]. Hewitt, A. (2015). Aon Hewitt's model of employee engagement [Website]. Retrieved from <http://www.aon.com/india>
- [13]. Hewitt, A. (2017). 2017 Trends in global employee engagement: global anxiety erodes employee engagement gains [Website]. Retrieved from <http://www.aon.com/india>
- [14]. Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2007). The next 20 years: How customers and workforce attitudes will evolve. *Harvard Business Review*, **85**(718): 41-52.
- [15]. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, **33**(4): 692-724. doi:10.2307/256287
- [16]. Kumar, A. (2016a). Talent retention through strategic creation of talent magnets- a case study approach. *International Journal of Engineering and Management*, **6**(2): 112-116. www.ijemr.net
- [17]. Kumar, A. (2016b). Green talent management initiatives. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, **4**(4): 1505-1507. <http://www.journalijar.com>
- [18]. Kumar, A. (2016c). Talent clusters and their contribution to business value creation- a conceptual paper. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, **4**(7), 131-133. doi: 10.21474/IJAR01/1032
- [19]. Kumar, A. (2017). Enhancing business performance through talent management systems and positive thought action, skills and knowledge: an empirical study in the Indian IT sector. *International Journal of Marketing and Technology*, **7**(3): 85-100. <http://www.ijmra.us>
- [20]. Kupperschmidt, B. R. (2000). Multigeneration employees: strategies for effective management. *The Health Care Manager*, **19**(1): 65–76. <http://journals.lww.com/healthcaremanagerjournal/Pages/default.aspx>
- [21]. Little, B., & Little, P. (2006). Employee engagement: conceptual issues. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, **10**(1), 111-120. <https://www.questia.com/library/p136797/journal-of-organizational-culture-communications>
- [22]. Lockwood, N. R. (2007). Leveraging employee engagement for competitive advantage: HR's strategic role. *Society for Human Resource Management Research Quarterly*, **1**, 1-12.
- [23]. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [24]. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, **52**(1): 397–422. <http://www.annualreviews.org>
- [25]. May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, **77**(1): 11-37. doi: 10.1348/096317904322915892
- [26]. Parameswaran, M.G. (2003). *Understanding Consumers: building powerful brands using consumer research*. Noida, New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.
- [27]. Perrin, T. (2003). Working today: understanding what drives employee engagement (The 2003 Towers Perrin Talent Report), Stamford, CT: Towers Perrin 2003. Retrieved from http://www.keepem.com/doc_files/Towers_Perrin_Talent_2003%28TheFinal%29.pdf
- [28]. Poghosyan, L., Aiken, L. H., & Sloane, D. M. (2009). Factor structure of the Maslach Burnout Inventory: An analysis of data from large scale cross-sectional surveys of nurses from eight countries. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, **46**(7): 894–902. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2009.03.004>
- [29]. Reis, D., Xanthopoulou, D., & Tsaousis, I. (2015). Measuring job and academic burnout with the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI): Factorial invariance across samples and countries [Website]. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2014.11.001>.

- [30]. Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). *The Drivers of Employee Engagement* (Report No. 408), Brighton, UK: Institute for Employment Studies. Retrieved from <http://www.employment-studies.co.uk/system/files/resources/files/408.pdf>.
- [31]. Roongrerngsuke, S. (2010). Attracting and retaining multigenerational workforce in China, India, and Thailand [Website]. Retrieved from <https://www.shrm.org>.
- [32]. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, **21**(7), 600-619. doi: 10.1108/02683940610690169.
- [33]. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-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. <https://link.springer.com/journal/10902>.
- [34]. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **25**(3): 293-315. doi: 10.1002/job.248.
- [35]. Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The Measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study [Website]. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>.
- [36]. Singh, N. (2017). 4 Go-to apps to boost your company's internal communication. *Entrepreneur India*. Retrieved from <https://www.entrepreneur.com>.
- [37]. Srinivasan, V., John, D. A., & Nirmala, M. C. (2014). Employee Generations in the Indian Workplace [Website]. Retrieved from <https://www.shrm.org>.