

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT TYPES

Swathi. S

Employee engagement, which has become the top 5 challenge of the many organizations. Engagement means the person who works with a passion and feel a profound connection to their company. There are many types of engagement which are being defined in the literature. Some of them are given by the practitioners, consultant, researcher, and academicians. So in this paper we are going to discuss the types of engagement. The described methodology will be used in the paper to describe the engagement types. The paper is based on secondary data from journals, articles, website. After reading the paper you are going to know about the types of engagement.

Key words: Engagement types, active engagement, customer engagement.

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT TYPES

Employee engagement has become a hot topic in recent years. Despite this, there remains a paucity of critical academic literature on the subject, and relatively little is known about how employee engagement can be influenced by management. Although there is a great deal of interest in engagement, there is also a good deal of confusion. Modern organizations need energetic and dedicated employees, people who engage with their work. These organizations expect productivity, initiative and responsibility for personal development of their employees. Overall, engaged employees are fully involved in, and enthusiastic about their work. Work engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Vigor is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one's work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties; dedication by being strongly involved in one's work, and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge; and absorption by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work

Definitions of employee engagement

William H. Kahn (1990) completed some of the earliest work on engagement and defined engagement as, "the harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances."

1. Sandeep Kular, Mark Gatenby, Chris Rees, Emma Soane, Katie Truss, 2008, Employee Engagement: A Literature Review, Kingston Business School, No 19 Working Paper Series.

The Gallup Organization, potentially the most widely recognized name associated with employee engagement due to their best selling book, *“First, Break All the Rules,”* defines engaged employees as those who, “work with a passion and feel a profound connection to their company” and “drive innovation and move the organization forward” (GMJ, 2006).

Melcrum Publishing recently produced a research report, “Employee Engagement: How to build a highperformanceworkforce” that provides a very comprehensive review on the current state of employee engagement (Shaw, 2005). The author of Melcrum’s report, Kieron Shaw (2005), highlights multiple definitions of employee engagement. For the purposes of his research, Shaw (2005) also created a definition of employee engagement, which is, “translating employee potential into employee performance and business success” and thus “changing the way employees perform by utilizing the tools in the armory of internal communication professionals.”

The International Survey Research (ISR) defines employee engagement as, “a process by which an organization increases commitment and continuation of its employees to the achievement of superior results.” The ISR separates commitment into three parts; cognitive commitment, affective commitment, and behavioral commitment or think, feel and act.

Dell Inc. defines employee engagement by stating, “To compete today, companies need to win over the minds (rational commitment) and the hearts (emotional commitment) of employees in ways that lead to extraordinary effort” (Vance, 2006).

In 2001, N.P. Rothbard’s definition described engagement as a psychological presence with two key mechanisms, attention and absorption. Attention is “cognitive ability and the amount of time one spends thinking about a role” and absorption is “being engrossed in a role and refers to the intensity of one’s focus on a role” (Saks, 2006).

2. Colin Dicke, Jake Holwerda, & Anne-Marie Kontakos, Employee Engagement: What Do We Really Know? What Do We Need to Know to Take Action 2007 CAHRS Graduate Research Assistants

According to the Gallup organization, there are other types of classifications on employee engagement but this one is based upon the level of commitment or engagement of employees. A brief description about the tree is given below:

- **Actively Disengaged:** This is the first category of people who are unhappy and they spread unhappiness in the organization. They are the disease centers in the company and spread the negative word, provoking and convincing people to leave their jobs. However they are the ones who stay the longest and removing the perceived people competition is their thought of getting to the top or the next level in the job.
- **Engaged:** The second category of people are those who can be identified by words like passion, alignment and innovation; which means that they are passionate, connected to the company and are innovative. They contribute new ideas and turn ideas into reality. These employees are positive in their outlook and they spread positivity. They are proactive; can anticipate the future market conditions are prepared well in advance.
- **Not Engaged:** The third type of employees is the large majority present in organizations almost 50% in number. These do what is told only and they like only one instruction at a time. They put in time but not energy and passion. They may be either positive or negative in their outlook and opinion about the organization. They are not proactive and fail to anticipate what might be required next or what the next step is? They wait for instruction from their superiors.

In a research conducted by Gallup in U.S.A, it was found out that 16% of the people working in organizations are actively disengaged, 28% are engaged and almost 56% are not engaged. Although these statistics cannot be generalized, they hold true for the majority of the cases and there may be deviation of 5% here and there in each category and not more.

3. Browsed on 1.9.2013 [Gallup Study: Engaged Employees Inspire Company Innovation
businessjournal.gallup.com/.../gallup-study-engaged-employees-inspire-co..](http://businessjournal.gallup.com/.../gallup-study-engaged-employees-inspire-co..)

The research therefore points out that people who are engaged are more efficient and deliver results optimally. They have a better understanding of the business, more client focussed and committed to make it big with the organization they work for.

Within an organization the percentage of people in these three brackets can help determine the health of the company. For example, a greater percentage of actively disengaged employees connote into even greater losses in productivity, erosion of employee morale and reduction in the bottom line.

According to Blessing White, the 5 levels of engagement are being classified:

- Engaged: These employees are contributing fully to the success of the organization and find great satisfaction in their work. They apply discretionary effort and take initiative.
- Almost Engaged: These employees are reasonably satisfied with their jobs and are among the highest performers.
- Honeymooners & Hamsters: Honeymooners are new to the organization or the role and have yet to become fully productive. Hamsters may be working hard but focused on the wrong things — or they may be hardly working. The outcome is the same: maximum satisfaction for them and minimum satisfaction for the organization.
- Crash & Burners: This group is the opposite of the one above. They are high performers, delivering what the organization needs, but disillusioned or not achieving their personal definition of success.
- Disengaged: Disengaged employees are the most disconnected from organizational priorities and are not getting what they want from their work.

4. Browsed on 31.8.2013 [BlessingWhite: *employee engagement, leadership development* ...](#)

www.blessingwhite.com/

Work Engagement.

Like employee engagement, work engagement is a relatively new concept coming from organizational psychology that only recently has been given theoretical definitions and instruments for assessment (Hallberg, 2005). One such instrument is the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), which is currently available in 20 languages and can be used freely for non-commercial purposes. In addition a short form and a student version are available. The reliability and validity of the UWES are documented as various studies. The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) is an alternative instrument for the assessment of work engagement. Which measures three dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Vigor is described as, "being fully charged with energy and resilient in one's work even during a regular 'dull' day when nothing particular happens." Dedication is, "being proud of one's work and convinced that what one performs is significant." Finally, absorption is the concept of, "being carried away by work, forgetting everything in one's surroundings, looking at your watch and finding that you have missed your coffee break without even noticing." The construct validity of UWES was established early on and has shown good factorial validity across occupational groups, countries, and cultures (Hallberg, 2005).

Task engagement

The task engagement has the three steps to be felled stable priority, Protection from interruption and the experience of flow. People felt less stress when they give priority, and they are able to focus on one thing. Treating in sequential steps, task engage is judged by the speed of the completion and the quality of the work done.

5. Browsed on 31.8.2013 [Work engagement - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Work_engagement)

JOB ENGAGEMENT

We define job engagement as a person's enthusiasm and involvement in his or her job.

People who are highly engaged in their jobs identify personally with the job and are motivated by the work itself. They tend to work Harder and more productive than others And are more likely to produce the results their customers and organizations want. Job engagement is related to organizational commitment, but the two have important differences. Organizational commitment is most commonly defined in terms of an individual's identification with the organization's goals and values, willingness to exert effort for the organization, and desire to continue as part of the organization.

Personal Engagement

Kahn was the first scholar to define "personal engagement" as the "harnessing of organization member's selves to their work roles: in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, emotionally and mentally during role performances" . Based on this definition a questionnaire was developed that assesses three dimensions: cognitive, emotional and physical engagement Personal engagement is the simultaneous employment and expression of a person's "preferred self" in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional), and active, full role performances. My premise is that people have dimensions of themselves that, given appropriate conditions, they prefer to use and express in the course of role performances. The combination of employing and expressing a person's preferred self yields behaviors that bring alive the relation of self to roll. People who are personally engaged keep their selves within the role without sacrificing one for another.

Customer engagement

The engagement of customers with one another, with a company or a brand. The initiative for engagement can be either consumer- or company-led and the medium of engagement can be on or offline.

6. Rondavison 2010 understanding task engagement,prochainsolutionINC

7. Darryl R. Roberts and Thomas O. Davenport, Job Engagement: Why It's Important and How to Improve It, 2002 Wiley Periodicals, Inc. Published online in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com).

8. William A Kahn psychological condition of personnel engagement and disengagement at work, academy of management journal 1990, vol33,,no4, 692-742

Customer engagement marketing places conversions into a longer term, more strategic context and is premised on the understanding that a simple focus on maximising conversions can, in some circumstances, decrease the likelihood of repeat conversions (Customer engagement interview with Richard Sedley). CE aims at long-term engagement, encouraging customer loyalty and advocacy through word-of-mouth.

Online customer engagement is qualitatively different from offline engagement as the nature of the customer's interactions with a brand, company and other customers differ on the internet. Discussion forums or blogs, for example, are spaces where people can communicate and socialize in ways that cannot be replicated by any offline interactive medium. Customer Engagement marketing efforts that aim to create, stimulate or influence customer behavior differ from the offline, one-way, marketing communications that marketers are familiar with. Although customer advocacy, for example, has always been a goal for marketers, the rise of online user generated content can take advocacy to another level.

The concept and practice of online customer engagement enables organizations to respond to the fundamental changes in customer behavior that the internet has brought about, as well as to the increasing ineffectiveness of the traditional 'interrupt and repeat', broadcast model of advertising. Due to the fragmentation and specialization of media and audiences, as well as the proliferation of community- and user generated content, businesses are increasingly losing the power to dictate the communications agenda. Simultaneously, lower switching costs, the geographical widening of the market and the vast choice of content, services and products available online have weakened customer loyalty.

9. Browsed on 31.8.2013 [Gallup *Customer Engagement* Knowledge Center](http://www.gallup.com/strategicconsulting/customerengagement.as)
www.gallup.com/strategicconsulting/customerengagement.as

The research, funded by the society for human resource management (SHRM) Foundation, and led by Professor Dr Veronica Hope Hailey by Cass Business School, Part of City University University London pinpointed the following dimensions of engagement:

❖ Employees with a high level of **job state engagement** are passionate and enthusiastic about their job and but don't necessarily work hard.

❖ Employees who exhibit **organization state engagement** loves their company and make great brand ambassadors but as above, this won't automatically lead to higher productivity.

❖ Employees with a high level of **job behavioral engagement** are motivated to develop themselves and take the initiative but don't necessarily feel loyal to their company.

❖ Employees showing **organization behavioral engagement** are proactive in highlighting problems and suggesting improvements in their company but again don't necessarily hold that company in high esteem or feel loyalty towards it. So what affects these different types of engagement the research found that employees who perceived the workload in their job to be high had lower levels of organizational state engagement. However, feeling a company-wide sense of high pressure to produce, or work which was perceived to demand a lot from an employee emotionally, was associated with higher levels of job and organizational behavioral engagement – Employees were more proactive, but did not necessarily feel more positive about their job or company. Employees perceiving high standards of justice and fairness in the performance management process were encouraged to greater job and organizational state engagement (they felt passionate and enthusiastic about their job and company), but not behavioral engagement i.e. they were no more proactive. Similarly in the performance management process, having a broad range of potential outcomes which are valued by the employee (e.g. Promotion, training, and reward) was associated with all dimensions of employee engagement except organizational behavioral engagement. Where employees were involved in target setting as part of this process, they showed improved job and organizational state engagement – this suggests employees will be more enthusiastic about their jobs and

companies if they are involved in setting their own target. In terms of work climate and job characteristics, providing increased levels of job Resources - more feedback, autonomy, training and development, and task variety – was linked with all dimensions of engagement. Providing high levels of organizational resources in the form of welfare support and support from line managers, colleagues, and senior managers are also associated with all aspects of employee engagement.

Limitation of the study

1. The paper is confined only to the types of employee engagement.
2. The paper tells only about the type but not how it has been developed.
3. It does not explain what are the pros and cons of employee engagement.
4. There may be many other types which are not mentioned in the paper.
5. The basis of the paper is only on secondary data.

Conclusion

The different types of employee engagement help us to understand the level of employee engagement in the organization. With the help of employee engagement type we can understand different level of employee engagement. It ensures that organization take proper corrective steps in the development of the employee engagement. proper measures can be taken. There is also a possibility of becoming 'over-engaged'. For example, it can distort the work-life balance when employees take work home. After-engagement may also lead to work holism. So balancing the employee becomes easy and types of engagement help to develop and increase more engaged employee in the organization.

Reference

1. Sandeep Kular, Mark Gatenby, Chris Rees, Emma Soane, Katie Truss, 2008, *Employee Engagement: A Literature Review*, Kingston Business School, No 19 Working Paper Series
2. Colin Dicke, Jake Holwerda, & Anne-Marie Kontakos, *Employee Engagement: What Do We Really Know? What Do We Need to Know to Take Action* 2007 CAHRS Graduate Research Assistants
3. [Gallup Study: Engaged Employees Inspire Company Innovation](#) [businessjournal.gallup.com/.../gallup-study-engaged-employees-inspire-co..](#) Browsed on 1.9.2013
4. [Blessing White: employee engagement, leadership development ...](#) [www.blessingwhite.com](#) Browsed on 31.8.2013
5. [Work engagement - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia](#) [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Work_engagemen](#) Browsed on 31.8.2013
6. Ron Davison 2010 *understanding task engagement*, prochainsolutionINC
7. Darryl R. Roberts and Thomas O. Davenport, *Job Engagement: Why It's Important and How to Improve It*, 2002 Wiley Periodicals, Inc. Published online in Wiley InterScience ([www.interscience.wiley.com](#)).
8. Willam A khan, *psychological condition of personal engagement and disengagement at work*, *academy of management journal* 1990, vol33, no4, 692-742
9. [Gallup Customer Engagement Knowledge Center](#) [www.gallup.com/strategicconsulting/customerengagement.as](#) Browsed on 31.8.2013
10. [www.shrm.org/about/foundation/research/Pages/SHRMFoundationFarndale.aspx](#)