

UNDERSTANDING DIFFERENT MEASUREMENT SCALE OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT RELATIONSHIP

-R. Bharanitharan, Ph.D (PT) Scholar, PG and Research Department of Commerce, Salem Sowdeswari College, Affiliated to Periyar University, Salem

-V. Balaji, Principal, Salem Sowdeswari College, Affiliated to Periyar University Salem

-G. Sivanesan, Associate Professor, Jamal Institute of Management, Jamal Mohamed College (Autonomous), Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli

ABSTRACT

Employee engagement has become one of a hot topic in human resource management among the global workforce. The practitioners and academicians identified that employee engagement have a positive impact on individual and organization performance by adoption various scaling technique. The purpose of this research is to bring out the general discussion about the various measurements scaling adopted by researchers to measure employee engagement which is published in various reputed academic journals. The study discussed six measurement scales used by many researchers, and identified the scale which is widely used.

Keywords: Employee Engagement, Measurement, Scaling

INTRODUCTION

Researchers have characterized employee engagement in several unique manners. Kahn (1990) began with a definition including three

psychological states (availability, safety, and meaningfulness), and Bakker and Schaufeli (2003) extended the definition to how much dedication, absorption, and vigor that employees experience. Bakker and Schaufeli (2003) created the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) as an approach to quantify employee engagement. In particular, the UWES estimates employee engagement dependent on these three concepts: (a) dedication is how employees are involved in their work; (b) absorption refers to employees being so immersed in their work that they do not notice the progression of time; and (c) vigor is the amount of energy employees feels because of work (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2003). Part of the reasoning for the UWES was to recognize employee engagement as a concept separate from the burnout idea. Leiter and Maslach (2008) depicted a continuum of employee engagement, with parts of engagement, like energy, on one end, and parts of burnout, like exhaustion, on the other end. This made a paradigm by which engagement

was estimated by an absence of burnout. In any case, when Bakker and Schaufeli made the UWES, they discovered that some employees who experienced fatigue, which is a burnout component, were encountering a positive fatigue and were indeed profoundly engaged. By focusing on dedication, absorption, and vigor, the UWES creators were able to look at the experiences of employees from a positive perspective instead of assuming a negative outlook (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2003).

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Employee engagement tends to have a positive perspective on their work. They go to work enthusiasm, loaded with energy, happy, which eventually means a more significant level of achievement. Employee engagement creates positive feedback about their job and depicts a positive image about their works in terms of success, appreciation, and recognition (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2004). Even if they get drained from work, they depict their tiredness as a pleasant state, since it is the outcome of a positive achievement. The work for engaged employees is fun (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Gorgievski, 2010). The significance of this level of engagement in the work environment, however, has been at the focal point of many studies. An employee's job-related feel of their job, regardless of its inherent negative or positive factors, is essential to organizations since it could impact organization output, competitive advantage, and organizational efficiency in the market. Consequently, it is important to enable and inspire employees to consciously and actively improve their psychological connection with their

work. Thusly, the latter would undoubtedly support the goals of organization to contend viably and accomplish their ideal output. These organizations support since employees feel dedicated, energetic, and become engaged with their work (Leiter & Bakker, 2010). At the point when this connection exists, employees commit more effort and time to, have a meaningful and significant interest in, and completely engage in their work which supports competitive advantage of organization in the market (Schaufeli, Leiter, Bakker, & Taris, 2008).

Work engagement has obtained more consideration since the last decade of the 20th century. Practitioners and scholars, in particular, have shown interest in considering the significance of work engagement. Organizations expect their employees to show initiative, to be proactive, take responsibility, take part in collaboration with their peers, and focus on execution with high quality standards (Mayers, Rothwell, & Baumgardner, 2014). Schaufeli and Bakker (2008) added that organizations need employees who are dedicated, absorbed, and energetic in their work. Schaufeli and Bakker (2008) accepted that work engagement was one route for organizations to accomplish objectives such as increased profitability, high productivity, low turnover rates and low absenteeism.

Some of the literature has described work engagement with emotional (or affective), physical or behavioral, and cognitive components (Kahn, 1990; Saks, 2006; Kim, Kolb, & Kim, 2012; Schneider & Macey, 2008; Crawford, Lepine & Rich, 2010; Wollard & Shuck, 2010). The principal formal definition

of work engagement was presented in 1990 by William Kahn, and since its outset, researchers have been carefully researching the topic. Kahn (1990) presented the personal engagement idea, then characterized it as “the saddling of organization individuals’ selves to their roles of work” (1990, p. 694). Since then, practitioners and scholars have attempted to conceptualize the work engagement idea. Today, there is no universal agreement on the work engagement definition; rather, there is an agreement that two measurements - involvement and energy, contain work engagement (Bakker, Leiter & Albrecht, 2011). The work engagement concept is known by various terms, such as job engagement, employee engagement, active engagement and role engagement. The most important terms are work engagement and employee engagement (Leiter & Bakker, 2010; Kim, 2014; Wollard & Shuck, 2010).

IMPORTANCE OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

Organizations profit by having highly engaged employees because in general they will have higher rates of productivity, lower rates of turnover, lower rates of absenteeism and higher levels of performance (Sofian & Andrew, 2011; Chambel & Cesario, 2017; Hayes, Harter, & Schmidt, 2002; Kumar & Jha, 2016; Sridevi & Markos, 2010; Shuck & Wollard, 2011). Engaged employees produce higher revenue than average revenue in their industries (Kumar & Jha, 2016; Sridevi & Markos, 2010), have higher customer satisfaction results than their less engaged counterparts (Norton, Gill, & Dugger, 2014), and require fewer sick days each year than workers at non-engaged organizations

(Marrelli, 2011). These advantages incorporate increasing employee productivity (Chambel & Cesario, 2017; Barrick et al., 2015), and decreasing absenteeism and turnover (Sridevi & Markos, 2010; Chambel & Cesario, 2017; Sofian & Andrew, 2011). Alternatively, less engaged employees not only have lower employee productivity and higher absenteeism, but also they can have a less positive attitude (Gruman & Saks, 2011; Marrelli, 2011). In these circumstances, there is the risk that the lower levels of engagement and the employees resulting attitude can affect others around them at home and at work (Gruman & Saks, 2014). At the point when turnover is high, workers experience critical interruption that is caused by training new employees (Slack et al., 2015; Saks, 2006). In addition, the continuous absences of less engaged employees can result in extra workload for remaining staff (Slack et al., 2015; Saks, 2006).

Harter et al. (2002) further identified that when within an organization the business units had high engagement, all components tended to have positive outcomes. That is, not only would employees be less likely to leave and have less frequent absences, they would also have better safety records, higher customer satisfaction and loyalty. The authors exhibited that higher engagement in a business unit associated to overall better business results within that business unit. As communicated by the authors, this can give practical information that can be utilized to drive engagement inside a business (Harter et al., 2002, p. 275). The engagement at the organizational level, contending that engagement can be estimated across an organizational part as well as at the level of

individual, and that such commitment will create a positive value to the business studied by Barrick et al. (2015). In both cases, the outcomes of the studies supported the ideas that engagement can be estimated at a level higher than individuals, permitting organizations to utilize the data in various ways.

MODELS OF WORK ENGAGEMENT

As indicated by previous literature, there are two famous models utilized to depict work engagement. To start is the JD--R (Job Demand Resource) Model. This model outlines the connection between numerous components while work engagement is the arbiter. On the left side, precursors of work engagement consist of job demand and resources. On the right side of the work engagement, outcomes or consequences of work engagement are depicted. The second model that communicated work engagement is the SWE (State Work Engagement). Both the models JD--R and the SWE, address work engagement as a psychological state which impacts behavioral results. Moreover, personal resources, job demand and job resources are work engagement's antecedents in both models, JD--R and the SWE. Despite the fact that the JD--R model and the SWE model have similar antecedents, they are distinctive in that the JD--R model addresses work engagement as a quality that is known as an average over time evaluation of

involvement, while the SWE model addresses work engagement as a moment in (week level or day level) experience or state.

Another conceptualization of work engagement is PsyCap (Psychological Capital). This

construct alludes to: A person's positive psychological state of advancement that is characterized by: (1) making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (2) having confidence (self - efficacy) to put in and take on the essential effort to prevail at challenging tasks; (3) when beset by issues and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resiliency) to attain success; and (4) persevering toward goals, and when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed (Avey, Luthans, Combs, Norman, & Avolio, 2006, p. 388). This model has work engagement's antecedents same to the JD--R model's personal resources: optimism, efficacy, resiliency, and hope. This model also "plays in affecting work engagement indirectly through emotions of positive" (Luthans & Sweetman, 2010, p. 58).

MEASURING THE WORK ENGAGEMENT

Since work engagement benefits organizations by improving profitability, productivity, performance, and turnover, it is prescribed to organizations to measure their employees' engagement level continuously (Demerouti and Bakker, 2008). Estimating work engagement helps organizations discover which factors drive and impact employee engagement. In order to encourage the work engagement's measuring, there are a few assigned instruments intended to measure and evaluate the level of employee engagement. For example, UWES (the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale), SMVM (the Shirom Melamed Vigor Measure), EEI (Employee Engagement Interview), GWA (the Gallup Workplace Audit), and MBI (the Maslach

Burnout Inventory) and Job Engagement Scale (JES).

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES)

This instrument was created in 2003 at the Utrecht University in the Netherlands by Arnold Bakker and Wilmar Schaufeli. It quantifies the work engagement's three dimensions: absorption, vigor and dedication. At first, to measure these dimensions UWES tool had 17 items, which were then decreased to 9 items. These items estimated the dimensions utilizing a seven-point Likert scale, starting from 0 "never" and going up to 6 "every day or always". This tool shows variance, validity, stability, and consistency. Therefore, this tool is the most popular and broadly used globally to quantify work engagement.

The Shirom-Melamed Vigor Measure (SMVM)

This tool was created in 2005 by Shirom as a 12-item questionnaire with a seven-point scale differing from "almost never or never" to "almost always or always". These items measure feeling of employees in the past 30 working days. This tool covers three attributes of vigor that: emotional energy, cognitive liveliness and physical strength. SMVM can provide information on job commitment, satisfaction and employee engagement. It is effortless to apply, analyze, and interpret. One of its issues is that a few items may change inside a similar individual inside the time which raises a question about its accuracy.

Employee Engagement Interview (EEI)

EEI instrument is an interview-based process created to assess the level of employee engagement. This assessment tool determined

the items that develop work engagement of an employee. It has open ended questions integrated with 1-10 rating scale. This tool covers 17 various areas related to the engagement of employee. This instrument is easy to utilize and understand. It assesses personal experience, opinion, and feelings. It gives descriptive data which requires qualitative data analysis skills. It also needs an employee's absence from her/his work until the interview is over.

The Gallup Workplace Audit (GWA)

This instrument measures the workplace characteristics and employees' engagement. It is intended to examine the employee engagement relative to desirable outcomes of organization (Harter et al., 2002). This tool is also called as Q12 because it incorporates 12 items that measure the quality of management in their organizations and the perceptions of employee of their work environment (Harter et al., 2002). This instrument has 12 survey questions with a five-point Likert scale differing from 5 "strongly agree" to 1 "strongly disagree" in addition to a sixth response, "doesn't apply/don't know," that is unscored. It is short, simple and easy to utilize. It has a high validity and reliability. In any case, it doesn't address the cultural issue since it is expected that engagement is the equivalent in each country. It is also not allowed for academic purposes.

The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI)

Burnout addresses the contrary to the work engagement. Consequently, the early trials estimated the work engagement dependent on the job burnout. The Job burnout is characterized by cynicism (a negative attitude towards work, not really with others), reduced

professional efficacy (the conviction that one is no longer effective in satisfying one's job responsibilities) and exhaustion (depleting of mental energy) (Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2001). Work engagement and Burnout are independent states (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2004; Bakker, Demerouti, De Jonge, Schaufeli & Janssen, 2001). Work engagement is adversely connected with burnout. Subsequently, the two core symptoms of burnout, cynicism and exhaustion, are viewed as direct opposites of dedication and vigor (Taris & Schaufeli, 2005). The mainstream instrument to quantify burnout and its dimensions is MBI (the Maslach Burnout Inventory). MBI overview comprises of 22 items to quantify the three dimensions of the burnout: cynicism, reduced professional efficacy and exhaustion. This study utilizes a seven-point Likert scale from 0 "never" to 6 "consistently". This apparatus is accessible in many languages however there is no Arabic translation accessible for this instrument. Also, estimating the work engagement using this instrument may prompt the presumption that having a low burnout level would correlate to a high work engagement as per Bakker and Schaufeli (2003). However, incorrect assumptions would prompt incorrect work engagement outcomes.

Job Engagement Scale (JES)

Specifically, the JES depended on Kahn's (1990) engagement definition, which is contained three segments: cognitive, affective, and physical, and grounded in speculations of individuals' expression of themselves in their roles of work. Rich (2010) builds up the scale JES (job engagement scale) with 18 – items. The scale comprises of core dimensions like cognitive, emotional, and physical energies

in holistic and simultaneous manner. As per Kahn, cognitive engagement is the employee's mental and mindfulness attention towards with work; emotional engagement is the feelings and emotional involvement which the employees have about their work; and physical engagement indicates to the extent of effort employees put in while playing out their work roles.

CONCLUSION

The existing literature shows that UWES (Utrecht Work Engagement Scale) was generally utilized by numerous researchers to quantify work engagement of employee. The reason why many researchers acquired UWES technique may be the utilization of appropriate likert scale like (a few times a week, a everyday), where as many other employee engagement scaling strategy utilized (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree). Generally, these various response scales catch various ideas of what it means to be engaged. Especially, there is a distinction in language and words utilized among UWES and other scaling technique. For instance, the JES has the item, "I feel energetic about my work," while the UWES has the item, "at my work, I feel overflowing with energy." Though the items catch a similar sentiment, the item language for the UWES is expressive and more direct. As a result, the respondents might more emphatically embrace the UWES item over other scaling technique.

References

1. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209--223.
2. 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.
3. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2003). Dual processes at work in a call center: An application of the job demands--resources model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 393--417.
4. Barrick, M. R., Thurgood, G. R., Smith, T. A., & Courtright, S. H. (2015). Collective organizational engagement: Linking motivational antecedents, strategic implementation, and firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(1), 111-135.
5. Cesario, F., & Chambel, M. J. (2017). Linking organizational commitment and work engagement to employee performance. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 24(2), 152-158.
6. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., De Jonge, J., Janssen, P. P., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). Burnout and engagement at work as a function of demands and control. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 279--286.
7. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., De Jonge, J., Janssen, P. P., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). Burnout and engagement at work as a function of demands and control. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 279--286.
8. Gill, P. S., Dugger, J., III, & Norton, F. (2014). The relationship between compensation and selected dimensions of employee engagement in a mid-sized engineering services firm. *Journal of Technology, Management & Applied Engineering*, 30(1), 2-12.
9. Gill, P. S., Dugger, J., III, & Norton, F. (2014). The relationship between compensation and selected dimensions of employee engagement in a mid-sized engineering services firm. *Journal of Technology, Management & Applied Engineering*, 30(1), 2-12.
10. 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.
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.
12. Jha, B., & Kumar, A. (2016). Employee engagement: A strategic tool to enhance performance. *Journal for Contemporary Research in Management*, 3(2), 21-29.
13. Kahn, W.A. (1990), "Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 692-724.
14. Kim, W. (2014). An Examination of Work Engagement in Selected Major Organizations in Korea: Its Role as a Mediator Between Antecedents and Consequences (Pennsylvania (Doctoral dissertation)).

15. Kim, W., Kolb, J. A., & Kim, T. (2012). The relationship between work engagement and performance: A review of empirical literature and a proposed research agenda. *Human Resource Development Review*, 12(3), 248--276.
16. Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., Norman, S. M., & Combs, G. M. (2006). Psychological capital development: Toward a micro--intervention. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(3), 397--393.
17. Markos, S., & Sridevi, M. S. (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 89-96.
18. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual review of psychology*, 52(1), 397--422.
19. Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617--635.
20. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600--619.
21. Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2005). The conceptualization and measurement of burnout: Common ground and worlds apart the views expressed in *Work & Stress Commentaries* are those of the author (s), and do not necessarily represent those of any other person or organization, or of the journal. *Work & Stress*, 19(3), 256--262.
22. Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187--200.
23. Schaufeli, W.B. and Bakker, A.B. (2003), "Test manual for the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale", unpublished manuscript, Utrecht University, available at: www.schaufeli.com (accessed November 10, 2017).
24. Schneider, B. (2008)& Macey, W. H. The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3--30.
25. Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(1), 89--110.