

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2023, Vol. 4, No. 1, 136 – 155

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.01.14>

---

## Research Article

### Employees Work Engagement: Correlations with Employee Personal Characteristics, Organizational Commitment and Workplace Happiness

Guinevere Yvonne G. Tugade, Myla M. Arcinas\*

Department of Sociology and Behavioral Sciences, Dela Salle University, Philippines

---

#### Article history:

Submission January 2023

Revised January 2023

Accepted January 2023

#### \*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

[myla.arcinas@dlsu.edu.ph](mailto:myla.arcinas@dlsu.edu.ph)

#### ABSTRACT

Using data collected from 76 employees of a manufacturing company in Manila, Philippines, this study conducted a correlation analysis to determine the relationship between the level of their engagement at work and their personal characteristics, organizational commitment in the workplace, and job satisfaction. A self-administered structured survey questionnaire was used in the survey. The collected data was analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine the mean scores, frequencies, and percentages, and parametric inferential statistics were employed to examine the correlations between variables. The results indicate a high level of employee work engagement and job satisfaction, as well as a moderate level of employee organizational commitment. Employee age, position and monthly salary were significantly correlated with employee work engagement. The level of employee engagement increases with age, position and income. Results also revealed a significant and strong positive correlation between the level of employee engagement and employee happiness at work. Implications for practices are offered.

**Keywords:** *Affirmative commitment, Continuance commitment, Employee happiness, Normative commitment, Organizational commitment, Work engagement.*

---

#### Introduction

An organization's most essential and expensive asset is its employees (Huang, 2016). Without them, organizations would not be able to conduct their daily operations and would even cease to exist. Employees provide the organization with the structure to operate and yield profit. Nowadays, employees are much more competitive and seek more fulfillment and development than ever (Rego and Pina e

Cunha, 2008). Due to the increasing demands of the work environment and employees, a new branch of behavioral studies was born to study organizations.

Human resources departments and managers are constantly developing and introducing new practices that would help improve the skills of the employees and, at the same time, motivate them to accomplish the tasks set out for them. Regular evaluation of organizational

---

#### How to cite:

Tugade, G. Y. G. & Arcinas, M. M. (2023). Employees Work Engagement: Correlations with Employee Personal Characteristics, Organizational Commitment and Workplace Happiness. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 4(1), 136 – 155. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.04.01.14

commitment and work engagement levels should be mandatory in organizations in order for them to address issues of happiness among their employees (Field & Buitendach, 2011). Furthermore, regular evaluations help organizations monitor their employees' progress, enact appropriate practices, and put in place systems that would allow them to flourish within the organization.

### ***Employee Work Engagement and its Domains***

Wiley (2014) considered engagement as a state and behavioral due to the psychological and action-based definitions. He defined it as "the extent to which employees are motivated to contribute to organizational success and are willing to apply discretionary effort to accomplishing tasks important to the achievement of organizational goals." In another study by Vorina, Simonič, and Vlasova (2017), employee engagement is an organizational approach to guarantee the organization's prosperity by catering to its employees' development and motivational needs. Both definitions parallel the outlook of employee engagement as a method to make employees more productive and pliant for the organization's goals.

In a study by Kaur (2017), employee engagement can be seen on different levels as it is an individual-level, three-dimensional construct that includes behavioral, emotional, and cognitive components. Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement were looked into by Kaur (2017) and Rich, Lepine, and Crawford (2010). According to Kaur (2017), there are numerous antecedents of employee engagement but the most dominant ones are organizational communication, rewards and recognition, organizational culture, and workplace relationships. Rich, Lepine, and Crawford (2010) perceived and treated engagement as a mediating variable between value congruence and perceived organizational support, core self-evaluations, task performance, and organizational citizenship behavior.

The studies of Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, and Bakker (2002), Schaufeli, Taris, and van Rhenen (2008), Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, and Taris (2008), Xanthopoulos, Bak-

ker, Demerouti, and Schaufeli (2009), and Bakker and Demerouti (2014) made use of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) when measuring employee engagement. The three main components of work engagement include vigor, absorption, and dedication. Vigor was said to be defined by the high intensity of energy levels and mental resilience at work. Absorption was characterized by being completely focused and happily absorbed in one's work. Meanwhile, dedication is characterized by immense involvement and a feeling of significance, enthusiasm, and challenges from one's work. These three domains of engagement accurately encapsulate behavioral aspects of employee engagement.

### ***Determinants of Employee Engagement at Work***

#### *Personal Characteristics*

The personal characteristics of an employee are highly significant when examining their engagement at work because they can explain why certain employees engage more than others. In the study of Avery, McKay, and Wilson (2007) on the relationship between similarities of co-workers and employee engagement, it was stated that employees gravitate toward people who are similar to them in age, race, sex, education, and tenure. It creates groups that work well together and creates a harmonious work relationship between the employees. Also, race, sex, age, education, and tenure at work are important factors to consider when discussing employee engagement and happiness because these factors determine the 'in-groups' and 'out-groups' in the workplace. This may lead to feelings of alienation and disengagement at work.

In Schaufeli, Taris, and van Rhenen's (2008) study on workaholism, burnout, and work engagement, the personal characteristics included were civil status, educational background, sex, age, and years in the company. In another study by Prathiba (2016), sex, age, education, work designation, and years of experience were the characteristics taken into consideration. Meanwhile, the Northwestern Michigan College employee engagement survey (2012) used sex, age, longevity at the college,

job classification, department, and administrative area as the characteristics of respondents that should be taken into consideration.

Kaur (2017) conducted an integrative literature review on the antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Findings showed that organizational communication, rewards and recognition, organization culture, and workplace relationships were the most dominant factors studied. Among the demographic antecedents, age, experience, and designation were the most common ones used in the literature review.

**Age.** According to Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), age has a positive significant but weak relationship with employee engagement. In the study of Rotich, Cheruiyot, and Korir (2016), age was statistically significant in determining employee engagement. Koyuncu, Burke, and Fiksenbaum (2006) stated that personal demographics, such as age, were a significant predictor of engagement.

**Sex.** According to World Health Organization (WHO), sex is the biological characteristic that differentiates men and women. In this study, the term refers to the classification of humans, specifically, male and female. The study of Banihani, Lewis, and Syed (2013) sought to discover if work engagement is a gendered concept. The findings of this study showed that work engagement is a gendered concept because men find it easier to demonstrate employee engagement than their female peers. Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) stated that sex has a statistically significant relationship with engagement because of the considerable difference in mean engagement scores between men and women. In the study of James, McKechnie, and Swanberg (2011), employees were said to be more engaged if they were female.

**Position.** Reynolds (1986) defined position as the category of a person based on his or her type of work within the organization. Positions could be classified into managerial and non-managerial positions. In this study, position will be defined as the classification of the title given to the employee by the organization and these titles come with specific responsibilities. Different employees undertake different tasks and responsibilities to keep the organization running; these tasks and responsibilities lead

to the formation of different positions and varying assignments within the organization. According to Xu and Cooper Thomas (2011), the position was statistically significant when determining employee engagement.

**Monthly Income.** In the study of Ananth (2009), monthly Income was statistically significant in determining employee engagement. Ogbonnaya, Daniels, & Nielsen (2017) studied the relationship between performance at work and employees' payment and the results of the study showed a significant relationship between payment and performance. Scott and McMullen (2010) likewise studied the impact of rewards programs on employee engagement and findings revealed that rewarding incomes are significantly correlated with employee engagement.

### **Organizational Commitment**

#### *Definition of Organizational Commitment*

Definitions of commitment in the workplace come in different contexts and may be too complex to comprehend fully. As studies continue about organizational commitment to pour in, the concept takes on different meanings. Lee and Olshfski (2002) conducted a study on employee commitment. They defined it as a four-dimensional construct wherein employees are committed to their superiors, to their work group, to their organization, and their operational roles in the organization. Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) studied commitment in the workplace through an intensive literature review. The study argued that despite the different definitions and ways of measuring organizational commitment, a "core essence" remains throughout the different contexts in which it is studied. The study proposed that commitment is "a force that binds an individual to a course of action" essential in reaching a target. Commitment is laced with different mindsets that precede a person's actions and behavior toward committing to their organization.

The millennial generation is also a topic of interest for organizational development researchers since these are the people who are now pouring into various workplaces. The 2016 Deloitte Millennial Survey reported that millennial employees have a high turnover rate, and Millennials expressed that they only

have a small amount of loyalty toward their current employers. They are constantly planning their exit once they feel that they are underutilized and not developed to their full potential by their companies (Buckley, Viechnicki, & Barua, 2016). As can be said, age is an important factor when determining organizational commitment. Considering how generations have shared beliefs, it is important to consider age when looking at a workplace.

Organizational commitment can be seen through various theories and lenses, but most have examined it through the three-component model. The studies of Davis (2014) and Oza (2015) made use of the three-component model of organizational commitment to study the concept. Both studies share the definition of organizational commitment, which is a concept that is comprised of three coexisting dimensions: 1) attitudinal or affective commitment, this dimension is based on the positive experiences of an employee in their organization 2) continuance commitment, which arises from the personal investment of the employee in the organization and the cost of separating from it and lastly, 3) normative commitment, which is loyalty or an employee's perception of his or her obligation to stay with the organization. This model is simple and easy to understand, yet it also captures the essence of organizational commitment by clustering and classifying the different commitment factors into three components.

#### *Domains and Measures of Organizational Commitment*

According to Zimmer (2017), organizational commitment describes an employee's sense of connection with his or her organization. The article stated that committed employees were more productive, engaged, less prone to absences, and had longer organizational tenure. Zimmer (2017) also explained that the most widely adopted model of organizational commitment was the three-component model of commitment (TCM): affective, normative, and continuance. Zimmer (2017) stated that affective commitment was described as emotion-based. Employees with affective commitment feel a solid link to the organization because they desire this link to exist. The foundations of

this type of commitment come from the self-determined motivations of an individual to accomplish the goals of the organization they belong to (Johnson, Chang, and Yang, 2010). Affective commitment is the most desirable type because it lasts longer and is not likely to waver even if circumstances change, unlike normative or continuance. Normative commitment is based on an employee's sense of obligation or duty towards the organization (Zimmer, 2017). It follows the individual's need to reciprocate the organization with loyalty in exchange for the employment opportunities it provides them (Johnson, Chang, and Yang, 2010). The final form of commitment is continuance commitment which is based on a person's evaluation of how much they have invested in the company and the employment opportunities available to them (Johnson, Chang, and Yang, 2010). Zimmer (2017) stated that continuance is a practicality-based commitment since commitment arises from the need for salary, retirement benefits, and other benefits to be gained from the organization. Johnson, Chang, and Yang (2010) asserted that it is called continuance commitment because an individual chooses to continue their commitment based on the benefits they would reap from being a part of the organization. Due to the external motivations of continuance commitment, it is considered the weakest.

Commitment can be attributed to several motivations and factors, including external environments and workmates within that environment. Nevertheless, the three-component model (affective, normative, and continuance commitment) summarizes the motivations to commit: because employees want to, ought to, and need to.

#### *Relationship of Employee Engagement and Organizational Commitment*

In a study conducted on the impact of employee empowerment and employee engagement by Prathiba (2016), the effect of employee empowerment and engagement on organizational commitment was explored via the private sector banks in Chennai. The results revealed that organizational commitment boosts the engagement of the employees, and a correlational analysis revealed that engagement and

organizational commitment were positively related. Thus, a committed workforce can also equate to an engaged workforce.

A study on work engagement and organizational commitment was conducted by Field and Buitendach (2011). Results of the study show a significant and positive relationship between work engagement and affective commitment. A regression analysis was also conducted on the predictive value of work engagement on affective commitment. Results show that work engagement does have a significant predictive value on organizational commitment.

In the integrative literature review of Kaur (2017) on the antecedents and consequences of employee engagement, it was discovered that organizational citizenship behavior and retention were the most common consequences of employee engagement. Since the study was based on secondary data, the consequences of employee engagement were limited. Consequences may also vary from country to country or industry to industry based on the dominant antecedents in a country or industry.

The literature review conducted by Macey and Schneider (2008) established that employee engagement and profitability were related to higher productivity, sales, customer satisfaction, and employee retention. Commitment, specifically affective commitment (the most desirable type), was said to be a facet of state engagement. It is an important facet of state engagement because it represents positive attachment to the organization, such as exerting energy in supporting the organization, feeling pride to be a member and personal identification with the organization.

### ***Employee Happiness in the Workplace***

#### *Defining Employee Happiness in the Workplace*

Happiness can come from intrinsic and extrinsic sources, and it can come from places where a person frequently dwells, and the workplace is considered one of the most frequented places by people. A study on authenticzotic climates and employee happiness by Rego and Pina e Cunha (2008) explored the different factors that affected the employee's happiness within the workplace. Authentizotic climates have been said to best foster employee health in the workplace. These authentizotic

organizations are trustful, reliant, and vital to an employee's life because they can be a source of meaning and growth for them. According to Rego and Pina e Cunha (2008), scholars have defined happiness as psychological well-being with a three-dimensional construct consisting of life satisfaction, the presence of positive emotional experiences, and the absence of negative emotional experiences. Happiness is a product of one's environment and can also be nurtured through practices that encourage harmony and development within the workplace. If camaraderie is fostered and employees can keep up the harmonious culture within the office, it can be assumed that happiness will naturally be an outcome of the office climate.

#### *Domains and Measures of Employee Happiness in the Workplace*

Happiness can be measured by looking at the extrinsic factors that help in cultivating an employee's well-being. However, most importantly, it is also recognized that happiness comes from within an employee. Creating practices and systems that aid in nurturing an employee's well-being is essential when building workplace happiness. Rego and Pina e Cunha (2008) stated that companies must grow their employee's sense of purpose, self-determination, impact, competence, belonging, meaning, and enjoyment in the workplace. Authentizotic organizations are considered anchors for health and psychological well-being. These organizations can also be a way of developing positive self-esteem and a source of coping with stress. Peters' (2015) study entitled "Facing crucial career choices" explored which factors are significant in determining employee happiness. The study focused on bio/pharma professionals from all over the world and collected data through surveys. Results showed that the time spent at work, salary, and career advancement significantly contributed to an employee's happiness. Other factors were an intellectual challenge and job security.

Workplace happiness is also treated as a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Huang (2016) conducted a study on workplace happiness and looked into the several factors that affect an employee's happiness. It was stated that workplace happiness had three

main domains: organizational system, the meaning of work, and personal resources. An organizational system is defined by the policies and practices that foster happiness. Indicators of this domain include well-managed teams, well-managed organization, pleasant environment, open organization, and good organization to work for. Meaning of work is another domain of workplace happiness. This domain operates on the fact that employee happiness stems from the benefits it can give the employee and the organization's stakeholders. Lastly, the personal resource is another main domain under employee happiness. Personal resources are natural assets used by employees to attain happiness. The study revealed a significant association between the big five personality factors and employee happiness. This further supports the notion that workplace happiness is also a result of an employee's personality and abundance of personal resources.

It is also widely posited that workplace happiness is an outcome of the various interactions of employees at work. A study conducted on business teams by Losada and Fredrickson (2005) concluded that having positive workplace attitudes helped bolster employee productivity and efficiency. The results of this study showed that teams that made use of verbal interactions had an average performance. Meanwhile, teams that used negative verbal interactions had inferior performance. Teams with positive verbal interactions boasted a more comprehensive range of ideas and initiatives, while teams with mixed and negative verbal interactions had a constrained range of ideas and initiatives. The poorest performing teams were uncreative and had a negative outlook. This proves that positive interactions at work can also bring positive results in an employee's performance.

As previously stated, happiness is considered as an employee's well-being and it was also mentioned that workplace happiness is related to good performance. The review of Paauwe, Van De Voorde and Van Veldhoven (2012) focused on quantitative studies about employee well-being and the human resource management organizational performance relationship. Quantitative studies from the year

1995 to 2010 were reviewed. The review examined the different perspectives to describe employee well-being and discovered that employee well-being is encapsulated by three dimensions: happiness, health, and relationship. It was concluded that the dimensions of well-being (happiness and relationship) were positively correlated with organizational performance; meanwhile, the health dimension of well-being conflicted with organizational performance. This means that a person's physical health may be compromised by organizational performance, although this is not the only factor determining an employee's performance at work. Cropanzano, Bonnett, and Wright (2017) conducted a study entitled the moderating role of employee well-being on the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. This study provided additional knowledge on the popular "happy/productive worker" thesis. Results of the study showed that job satisfaction and psychological well-being were correlated with the performance ratings of supervisors. As previously mentioned, psychological well-being serves as a moderator between job satisfaction and job performance. Findings suggested that high employee performance scores were congruent with high scores on psychological well-being and job satisfaction.

Williams, Kern, and Waters conducted an intervention study on the role and reprocessing of attitudes in fostering employee work happiness (2017). It focused on the associations of positive employee attitude, perception of positive organizational culture, and work happiness. The findings of this study show that employee attitudes, perception of positive organizational culture, and work happiness were all associated with explicit and implicit attitudes. The research shed light on the significance of nurturing organizational culture and positive attitudes in fostering employee happiness.

Various organizations provide a product or a service to their customers. In the service industry, bonuses are usually provided to motivate employees to give their best effort. A study conducted by Silvestro (2002) dispelled the modern myth that service profitability drives employee satisfaction and loyalty. This study

was conducted on one of the major supermarket chains in the United Kingdom. Findings showed an inverse relationship between employee satisfaction and the domains of productivity, efficiency, and profitability. Empirical data suggested that the most profitable stores had the least satisfied employees. This dispels the belief that an organization doing well must also have happy employees. Different factors could explain an employee's dissatisfaction with their job, such as an employee's peers or managers. Silvestro (2002) suggested that managers should re-evaluate their behavior to improve the situation of employees. Having a boss one can get along with significantly affects an employee's happiness.

#### *Relationship between Employee Happiness and Employee Engagement*

Employee happiness and employee engagement are deeply connected. In Rego and Pina e Cunha's (2008) study on Authentic organizations, the different dimensions of psychological well-being and its effects on employee performance and stress were observed. The study results showed that happier employees also report higher performance at work. It was also suggested that happy employees stay more committed to their job, actively try to figure out solutions to problems, and have high perseverance at work. This shows that employee happiness and performance are positively related to each other.

Employee behavior, especially if positive, creates a happy work environment and positive interactions with peers, bosses, and clients. The article of Bakker and Schaufeli (2008) explores how positive organizational behavior produces engaged employees that contribute to the development and profit yielding of the company. Positive organizational behavior studies cognitive capacities such as general mental ability, emotional intelligence, creativity, wisdom, work engagement, humor, the role of self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and other states or personal resources used when coping with the demands of work or fostering performance. It also looks at the peak performance of an organization and examines the conditions where employees thrive. Employees with suffi-

cient experience, resilience-pleasing personalities, and technical and people skills exude positive organizational behavior.

Positive organizational behavior is often interconnected to happiness at work, other factors, such as work engagement, and employee commitment, are often linked to employee happiness as well. Field and Buitendach (2011) studied happiness, work engagement, and organizational commitment of support staff at a tertiary education institution in South Africa. Results of the study revealed that there is a significant and positive relationship between work engagement and happiness.

A happy worker is commonly believed to be productive because he is ideologically and aesthetically pleasing. It sounds like a grand theory because it sounds elegant, neat, and inclusive (Ledford, 1999). However, Ledford argued that happiness only sometimes results in productivity at work. Furthermore, it is argued that people are not productive during the happiest moments of their life, such as falling in love with someone, getting married, or giving birth to a child. It is posited that happiness should be studied further and use different domains and aspects concerning happiness and productivity. Although Ledford (1999) claimed that happiness does not necessarily influence employee engagement, the majority of the studies show that employee happiness and employee engagement have significant associations with one another [Rego and Pina e Cunha, (2008); Bakker and Schaufeli (2008); Field and Buitendach (2011)].

#### **Statement of the Problem**

This aimed to determine the correlation between the level of engagement of selected employees working for a manufacturing company in Metro Manila with their personal characteristics, the level of their organizational commitment, and the level of their happiness at work.

Specifically, this study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What are the personal characteristics of the employees of the manufacturing company based in Metro Manila?
2. What is the level of their organizational commitment?

3. What is the level of their engagement at work?
4. What is the level of their happiness in the workplace?
5. What is the correlation between the level of their engagement at work with their personal characteristics and their happiness in the workplace?

What is the correlation between the level of their engagement at work and the level of their organizational commitment?

## Methods

### *Research Design and Sample*

This study used a correlational research design and was conducted in a paper manufacturing company based in Metro Manila. The list of employees working for at least one year in the manufacturing company was obtained. Out of 95 employees, 76 were surveyed using simple random sampling with a 95% confidence interval and a 5% margin of error. Survey was used to gather the data for this study.

### *Data Collection Tool*

The research utilized a self-administered questionnaire. The instrument was a composite of the three scales used in prior research to measure employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and organizational commitment. This study adapted portions of the Employee Happiness scale used by Huang (2016) in their study on employee happiness to measure the level of employee satisfaction. The scale utilized a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7, and each item asked respondents to rate their degree of satisfaction based on the various dimensions and measurements of happiness, such as their relationship with coworkers, work environment, and the meaning of their work. It has a high degree of internal consistency, as indicated by its cronbach alpha rating of 0.83. The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) was developed by Schaufeli, Taris, and van Rhenen (2008) and Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Rodriguez, and Bakker (2009) to measure employee engagement (2002). The UWES employs a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 0 to 6, with 0 representing "Never" and 6 representing "Always." 1 - Few times annually or fewer 2 - Once per

month or fewer, 3 - Several times per month, 4 - Once per week, 5 - Several times per week, and 6 - Every day. The scale gauges a worker's vitality, commitment, and concentration. Internal consistency is high, as shown by a cronbach alpha range of 0.8 to 0.9 To quantify organizational commitment, Zimmer (2017) used Meyer and Allen's TCM (three component model) employee commitment survey for this study. The survey is a self-administered questionnaire measuring the three dimensions of commitment: affective, continuation, and normative, using a 7-point Likert scale. With a cronbach alpha score ranging from 0.82 to 0.93, the TCM employee engagement survey has a high degree of internal consistency.

### *Data Analysis*

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-IBM) trial version was used to analyze the data gathered. Descriptive statistics using frequencies, percentages, and mean scores were used to analyze the respondents' personal characteristics, the level of employee engagement, the level of organizational commitment and the level of employee happiness. The Pearson R correlation test was performed to see the correlation between the employee's level of organizational commitment with the level of employee's work engagement and the correlation between the level of the employee's work engagement and workplace happiness. Pearson R correlation test was used to see the correlation of employees' work engagement with their age and monthly income. On the other hand, the t-test was used to test the difference in employee engagement based on sex and position. The significance level for this study was set at 0.05 (5%).

## Results

### *Personal Characteristics of the Respondents*

The personal characteristics are presented through frequencies and percentages. The study surveyed 25 males (33%) and 51 females (67%). As can be seen, more females work for the company compared to males (Table 1). Moreover, the respondents' positions in the company were divided into two categories: non-managerial and managerial positions. Most of the respondents surveyed were non-



managerial employees, with over 60 (79%) respondents, while 16 managerial employees (21%) were surveyed. Regarding the age of the respondents, most or 63 (83%) of the employees surveyed were young professionals under the age of 35. Meanwhile, 13 (17%) respondents were middle-aged professionals over 35.

Lastly, for the monthly Income of the respondents, more than half of the employees, or 43 (57%) of the employees surveyed, were earning less than Php 22,000. Meanwhile, many respondents reported earning more than Php 22,000 a month.

Table 1. Personal Characteristics of Respondents

Personal Characteristics		Frequency (n=76)	Percentage (%)
Sex	Male	25	33.0
	Female	51	67.0
Position	Non-Managerial	60	79.0
	Managerial	16	21.0
Age	<35 (young professionals)	63	83.0
	>35 (middle age professionals)	13	17.0
Monthly Income	< Php 22,000 (low)	43	57.0
	>Php 22,00 (middle &high)	33	43.0

### Level of Organizational Commitment

The affective commitment had an overall mean score of 4.13 and the items under the affective commitment category had high and moderate mean scores. Continuance commitment also had a moderate mean score (= 4.28). The statements under continuance commitment had high and mostly moderate mean

scores. Normative commitment, like the categories mentioned above, also had a moderate mean score (= 4.64); most statements in this category garnered moderate and high mean scores. Overall, the level of organizational commitment had an average mean score (= 4.52) (see Table 2).

Table 2. Level of Organizational Commitment

Statement	Mean	Interpretation
<b>Normative Commitment</b>		
This organization deserves my loyalty.	5.03	High
I would not leave my organization right now because I feel obligated to the people in it.	4.96	High
I owe a great deal to my organization	4.68	High
Even if it were to my advantage, it would not be fitting to leave my organization now.	4.64	Moderate
I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.	4.59	Moderate
I feel obligated to remain with my current employer.	4.03	Moderate
Normative Commitment Total Mean	4.64	Moderate
<b>Continuance Commitment</b>		
Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.	4.91	High

Statement	Mean	Interpretation
It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.	4.71	High
If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere	4.20	Moderate
Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now	3.95	Moderate
I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization	3.78	Moderate
One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives	3.75	Moderate
<b>Continuance Commitment Total Mean</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>Moderate</b>
<b>Affective Commitment</b>		
I feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.	5.12	High
This organization's problems are my own.	4.91	High
I feel like a "part of the family" at my organization.	4.75	High
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	4.59	Moderate
I would be happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	4.50	Moderate
I feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization.	4.43	Moderate
<b>Affective Commitment Total Mean</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>Moderate</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>4.52</b>	<b>Moderate</b>

Legend: 1.00 to 2.33 for Low Commitment; 2.34 to 4.67 for Moderately Committed; 4.68 to 7.00 for Highly Committed

### Level of Employee Engagement

Vigor, the first domain of employee engagement, has a high mean score (= 5.07). Most statements under the domain of vigor obtained high mean scores. The following domain of employee engagement is dedication, which has a high mean score (= 5.34). All the statements under the dedication domain had high mean

scores. The last domain under employee engagement is absorption, with a high mean score (= 4.87). Most of the statements under the absorption domain also had high mean scores. The overall mean score for the level of employee engagement obtained a high mean score (= 5.07).

Table 3. Level of Employee Engagement

Statement	Mean (n = 76)	Interpretation
<b>Dedication</b>		
To me, my job is challenging	5.80	High
I am proud of the work that I do	5.49	High
I am enthusiastic about my job	5.18	High
My job inspires me	5.01	High
<b>Dedication Total Mean</b>	<b>5.34</b>	<b>High</b>
<b>Vigor</b>		
At my work, I always persevere, even when things do not go well	5.55	High
At my job, I am intense when finishing my tasks	5.36	High

Statement	Mean (n = 76)	Interpretation
At my job, I am very resilient, mentally	5.16	High
When I perform my work, I am full of energy	5.13	High
I can continue working for very long periods at a time	4.71	High
When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work	4.38	Moderate
<b>Vigor Total Mean</b>	<b>5.07</b>	<b>High</b>
<b>Absorption</b>		
Time flies when I am working	5.66	High
I am immersed in my work	5.05	High
I get carried away when I am working	4.71	High
When I am working, I forget everything else around me	4.68	High
It is difficult to detach myself from my job	4.17	Moderate
<b>Absorption Total Mean</b>	<b>4.87</b>	<b>High</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>5.07</b>	<b>High</b>

Legend: 1.00 to 2.33 for Low Engagement; 2.34 to 4.67 for Moderate Engagement; 4.68 to 7.00 for High Engagement

### Level of Employee Happiness

The first domain of employee happiness is the work environment. All the items in this domain obtained mean scores reflecting their happiness. This domain has a mean score of 4.80, which means that the employees are generally happy with their work environment. The following domain of employee happiness is the relationship with co-workers. The mean scores for the items under this domain reflect that the employees are either happy or very happy. This domain has a mean score of 5.43, which means

that the respondents are generally happy with their relationships with their co-workers. Meaning of work is the last domain of employee happiness. Most statements under this domain obtained mean scores which reflected that the respondents were primarily happy with the meaning of their work. The mean score for this domain which is 5.33, reflects that respondents generally find their work meaningful. Overall, the level of employee happiness has a mean score of 5.11. This reflects that the employees of the company are generally happy.

Table 4. Level of Employee Happiness

Statement	Mean (n = 76)	Interpretation
<b>Relationship with Co-workers</b>		
I have very good friends at work	5.89	High
I like the people on my team	5.64	High
I feel trusted by my manager	5.39	High
I get along well with my manager	5.34	High
In general, I feel that teams within the organization work well together	5.05	High
I feel that my team is well managed	5.04	High
<b>Relationship with Co-workers Total Mean</b>	<b>5.43</b>	<b>High</b>
<b>Meaning of Work</b>		
I am happy that the job I do has a beneficial impact on the lives of the customers	5.54	High
I feel delighted that the job I do is worthwhile	5.32	High

Statement	Mean (n = 76)	Interpretation
I feel pleased that the job I do is beneficial to society in general	5.28	High
I feel delighted that the job I do is fulfilling	5.24	High
Meaning of Work Total Mean	5.33	High
<b>Work Environment</b>		
I feel proud to work for my organization	5.16	High
I am delighted to get the chance to be creative in my job	5.07	High
I am pleased that my organization is an excellent organization to work for	4.99	High
I feel happy when I am at work	4.88	High
I am pleased to have control over the important elements of my job	4.86	High
I feel as if I can be myself at work	4.83	High
I have enough time to complete my job within my regular working hours.	4.51	Moderate
I am pleased that my organization is well managed	4.34	Moderate
I feel that the surroundings and physical conditions that your work in are pleasant	4.34	Moderate
Work Environment Total Mean	4.80	High
<b>Overall</b>	<b>5.11</b>	<b>High</b>

Legend: 1.00 to 2.33 for Low Happiness; 2.34 to 4.67 for Moderate Happiness; 4.68 to 7.00 for High Happiness

### **Correlations between Personal Characteristics and Employee Engagement**

The correlations of personal characteristics and employee engagement were analyzed using two statistical tests: a t-test for sex and position and a Pearson R correlation test for age and monthly Income. Employee engagement at work was said to be correlated to sex, position at work, age, and an employee's monthly Income. As shown in Table 5, there is no significant relationship between sex and employee engagement. However, a significant difference was found between position and employee engagement, which means that position is a determinant of employee work engagement. Also, age and monthly Income

have significant relationships with employee engagement. Both age and monthly income also have a moderate and positive correlation with employee engagement. This means that as the employee gets older, employee engagement increases; as income increases, employee engagement also increases.

Table 5 also presents the correlation between organizational commitment and employee engagement. The two variables have a significant correlation, and however, it has a moderate and positive correlation. This means that as the level of organizational commitment increases, employee engagement also increases.

Table 5. Correlation Scores of Determinant Variables and Employee Engagement

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)
<b>Personal Characteristics</b>		
Sex	---	0.642
Position	---	0.001***
Age	0.389	0.001**
Monthly Income	0.363	0.001***
<b>Organizational Commitment</b>		
Overall commitment score	0.472	0.000***

Legend:  $p < .05$ ;  $**p < .01$ ;  $***p < .001$

### **Correlation between Organizational Commitment and Employee Engagement**

Table 6 presents the correlation test results between organizational commitment and employee engagement. The findings show that two out of three of the domains of organizational commitment have a significant relationship with the domains of employee engagement (vigor, dedication, and absorption). These domains are affective commitment and

normative commitment. Most relationships between affective and normative commitment and vigor, dedication, and absorption have a moderate and positive correlation. This means that there is a directly proportional relationship between affective commitment, normative commitment, vigor, absorption and dedication. Meanwhile, continuance commitment does not have a significant relationship with any domains of employee engagement.

Table 6. Pearson R Correlation of Domains of Organizational Commitment and Domains of Employee Engagement

	Affirmative Commitment	Continuance Commitment	Normative Commitment
<b>Vigor</b>	0.538*** 0.000	0.134 0.250	0.378*** 0.001
<b>Dedication</b>	0.506*** 0.000	0.025 0.829	0.536*** 0.000
<b>Absorption</b>	0.545*** 0.000***	0.101 0.385	0.400*** 0.000

Legend: \*  $p < .05$ ;  $**p < .01$ ;  $***p < .001$

### **Correlation between Employee Engagement and Employee Happiness**

Findings show that all the domains of employee engagement and employee happiness significantly correlate, and most of these relationships have a moderate and positive

correlation. This means that as an employee's vigor, absorption, and dedication increase, so does their happiness with their work environment, relationships with co-workers, and the meaning of their work.

Table 7. Pearson R Correlation of Domains of Employee Engagement and Employee Happiness

	Work Environment	Relationship with co-workers	Meaning of work
Vigor	0.413*** 0.000	0.481*** 0.000	0.472*** 0.000
Dedication	0.572*** 0.000	0.382*** 0.000	0.628*** 0.000
Absorption	0.451*** 0.000	0.406*** 0.000	0.529*** 0.000

Legend: \*  $p < .05$ ;  $**p < .01$ ;  $***p < .001$

### **Correlation of Employee Engagement and Employee Happiness**

Findings show that there is a significant correlation between the two variables. There is also a positive and strong correlation between

employee engagement and employee happiness, which means that as the level of employee engagement increases, so does employee happiness.

Table 8. Overall Correlation of Employee Engagement and Employee Happiness

Variable	Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)
Employee Happiness	0.603	0.000***

Legend: \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

## Discussion

### *Employee Work Engagement and Its Significant Determinants*

The study's results have identified three personal characteristics which are significant determinants of employee engagement. These are age, position and monthly Income. These three have a directly proportional relationship with employee engagement. Therefore, as age, position, and monthly income increase, so does the level of employee engagement. This result is similar to the results of previous studies [(Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), (Rotich, Cheruiyot and Korir, 2016) (Koyuncu, Burke, and Fiksenbaum, 2006), (Xu & Cooper Thomas, 2011), (Ananth, 2009), (Ogbonnaya, Daniels, and Nielsen, 2017), and (Scott & McMullen, 2010) which claimed that age, position, and income are significant determinants of employee engagement.

As previously stated, age had a positive and significant relationship with the level of employee engagement. This refutes the studies of Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), Rotich, Cheruiyot, and Korir (2016), and Koyuncu, Burke, and Fiksenbaum (2006), which made use of statistical tests to prove that age has a significant correlation with employee engagement. Since most respondents were young professionals under 35 and employee engagement yielded a high mean score, young employees are very much engaged with their work. Youthfulness could also be attributed to engagement at work since young professionals must prove themselves at work and are more enthusiastic about opportunities in their budding careers (Rotich, Cheruiyot, and Korir, 2016).

The findings also show that position positively and significantly affects employee engagement. This supports the study of Xu and Cooper Thomas (2011), which revealed that employee engagement and an employee's position at work were correlated. Most respondents answered that they had a non-managerial

position and employee engagement had a high mean score. It can be inferred that non-managerial employees were engaged in their work. In the study on antecedents and consequences of employee engagement by Saks (2006), this correlation could also be ascribed to non-managerial employees vying for managerial positions, thus being more engaged at work to get a promotion.

Monthly Income was also positively and significantly related to employee engagement. Most respondents answered that they earn less than Php 22,000, but employee engagement levels are still high. These results resonate with the previous studies of Ananth (2009); Ogbonnaya, Daniels, and Nielsen (2017); and Scott and McMullen (2010), which all claimed that there was a positive and significant relationship between payment and performance at work. As an employee's salary rises, so does their engagement at work.

Meanwhile, the results also showed that there was no significant correlation between sex and the level of employee engagement, as opposed to the study of Schaufeli and Bakker (2014) and James, McKechnie, and Swanberg (2011), which quantified that sex had a statistically significant relationship with the level of employee engagement. These studies claimed that female employees were more engaged than their male counterparts. Simultaneously, the study of Banihani, Lewis, and Syed (2013) asserted that males have less difficulty in being engaged at work. This study disproves that employee engagement is not gendered, as the literature claims.

### *The Link between Organizational Commitment and Employee Engagement*

As stated by Zimmer (2017), organizational commitment is the worker's sense of connection to the organization that employs them. In this study, organizational commitment can be seen through three dimensions: affective,

continuance, and normative, all of which are based on Meyer and Allen's (2004) three-component organizational commitment questionnaire. Affective commitment has been defined as a commitment based on the employee's emotional attachment to the organization. It is also seen as the most vital type of commitment because people want to commit to the organization. On the other hand, continuance commitment is seen as the weakest type of commitment because it is based on the benefits an employee could receive from the organization employing them. Lastly, normative commitment is based on an employee's obligation to their employer. People commit to the organization because they feel like they ought to. Results indicate that the respondents have a moderate sense of organizational commitment to their employers. In relation to this, their affective, normative, and continuance commitment also showed intermediate results for all three dimensions of organizational commitment. This study supports the findings of Prathiba (2016), in which it was revealed that there is a significant relationship between employee engagement and organizational commitment. Prathiba's (2016) correlational analysis proved the significant correlation with an  $r$  score of 0.349, which is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Meanwhile, this study has proven that overall organizational commitment and employee engagement correlate significantly and positively. This only means that a highly committed employee is also highly engaged at work.

The three domains of employee engagement (vigor, absorption, and dedication) and the dimensions of organization commitment (affective, normative, and continuance) were examined and analyzed. Results show that the three domains of organizational commitment had moderate mean scores and the three domains of employee engagement obtained high mean scores. The study's findings also indicate that vigor, absorption, and dedication positively correlate significantly with affective commitment. This implies that high affective commitment leads to high employee engagement. This supports the studies of Albdour and Altarawneh (2014), Macey and Schneider (2008), and Field and Buitendach (2011),

which concluded that affective commitment and job engagement are correlated variables in the workplace. Employees with a positive attitude and attachment to their organization will likely show high levels of commitment and significant engagement. Employees with a positive and fulfilling work-related state of mind (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) are expected to report positive attitudes towards working and manifest higher affective commitment.

Another dimension of commitment is continuance commitment. The findings of this study display that the respondents have moderate continuance commitment. However, it is also revealed that there is no significant correlation between continuance commitment and the domains of employee engagement. This is contrary to the study of Albdour and Altarawneh (2014), which claimed that there is a negative correlation between continuance commitment and employee engagement. This means that the more an employee is engaged at work, the less is their continuance commitment and vice-versa. The results of this study could be explained by looking at the essence of continuance commitment. Johnson, Chang, and Yang (2010) specified that continuance commitment is the weakest and least desirable form of commitment because it is based on the superficial rewards that a person can gain from being employed in an organization. Results show that the respondents are highly engaged in their work and have moderate levels of affective commitment, which have significant relationships.

Normative commitment is another domain of organizational commitment that employers commonly desire because it represents an employee's willingness to fulfill their obligations toward their organization (Albdour & Altarawneh, 2014). The findings of the study show that employees have moderate levels of normative commitment. The domains of employee engagement and normative commitment also have a significant and positive relationship. Since normative commitment has been defined as a commitment based on feelings of obligation, due to employees' desire to fulfill their obligations towards their organization, they tend to engage more in their work. These results are concurrent with Albdour and Altarawneh's

(2014) study in which normative commitment and employee engagement were highly correlated due to the employees' positive attitudes towards their organization.

Given these results, it is without a doubt that employee engagement and organizational commitment are significantly related to one another. Although continuance commitment is not significantly related to employee engagement and its domains, as opposed to the study of Albdour and Altarawneh (2014), which stated that there is a negative correlation between the two variables. Meanwhile, affective commitment, which is based on emotional attachment, and normative commitment, which is based on obligation, are significantly and positively associated with employee engagement. These results resonate with previous studies [Field and Buitendach (2011), Albdour and Altarawneh (2014), Prathiba (2016), Kaur (2017), and Macey and Schneider (2008)], which stated that employee engagement and organizational commitment are interdependent and highly associated with one another.

### ***Examining the Correlations Between Employee Engagement and Employee Happiness***

The relationship between employee engagement and employee happiness was also examined. Employee happiness is identified as an outcome variable of employee engagement in this study. Results show a significant and direct proportional relationship between employee engagement and employee happiness. Hence, as the level of employee engagement so does the level of employee happiness. Rego and Pina e Cunha (2008) have said that employees' happiness and well-being come from an organization they are highly engaged in and happy to work for. This reinforces the results of Field and Buitendach (2011), in which it was asserted that an engaged employee is also a happy employee. The domains of employee happiness were also analyzed to see if there were significant relationships between the domains.

When examining employee happiness, it is important to look at the work environment, for it is highly indicative of the conduciveness of the workplace in fostering employee well-being. In this study, work environment refers to

the atmosphere at work that can be seen in the behaviors and practices of employees. The mean scores indicate that the respondents were happy with their work environment. Findings also revealed that the work environment was significantly and positively related to employee engagement. This means that the more engaged employees are, the happier they are at work. These results reflect the previous studies [Rego and Pina e Cunha (2008), Bakker and Schaufeli (2008), Field and Buitendach (2011)], which also discovered that employee happiness was significantly correlated to employee engagement. Williams, Kerns, and Waters (2017) claimed that a positive attitude toward work and a nurturing workplace is key to employee happiness.

Another key factor to happiness in the workplace is an employee's relationship with co-workers. Losada and Fredrickson (2005) discovered that having positive attitudes in the workplace increases employees' productivity and efficiency. Along with those discoveries, Losada and Fredrickson (2005) also revealed that employees with positive interactions, specifically verbal, perform the best at work. As seen in this study, employee engagement and co-worker relationships have a positive and significant relationship. These findings are synonymous with the findings of Losada and Fredrickson (2005), Bakker and Schaufeli (2008), and Field and Buitendach (2011), which revealed that positive relationships with co-workers and work performance were significantly and positively correlated.

Another important component of happiness is the meaning of work. It is a philosophical and subjective measure of well-being at work. However, it is also important to examine this component since it is heavily attached to finding happiness in someone's job (Goel & Singh, 2015). The results of this study revealed that there is a positive and significant association between the domains of employee engagement and the meaning of work for employees. The mean score for the meaning of work indicated that the respondents found significant meaning in their work and were happy with it. Huang (2016) stated that finding meaning at work gives employees a sense of purpose and fulfillment, and it helps boost their morale



since they know their work will benefit others. The findings of this study are similar to the findings of Rego and Pina e Cunha (2008), who claimed that employees who performed well also found meaning attached to their work.

These results affirm that the level of employee engagement and the level of employee happiness are significantly correlated. The results also presented a positive and strong correlation between the two variables, which means that the more engaged employees are at work, the happier they are with their job and workplace. These results are similar to previous studies [Rego and Pina e Cunha (2008), Bakker and Schaufeli (2008), Field and Buitendach (2011)], which also claimed that employee engagement positively affects employee happiness.

## Conclusion

The majority of the respondents in this study were young female professionals under the age of 35, with most of them in non-managerial positions and earning less than Php 22,000 a month. Findings show that employees have a moderate level of organizational commitment, a high level of work engagement, and a high level of happiness at work.

Results show that the level of employee organizational commitment positively and significantly correlates with employee engagement. This means that organizational commitment is directly proportional to employee engagement. Hence, as an employee's commitment to the organization increases, so does their engagement at work. Also, results showed that the level of employee engagement and happiness have strong significant correlations and are directly proportional. Therefore, as employees' engagement at work increases, their happiness at work increases

However, it is important to note that despite the high levels of engagement and happiness at work, the employee's overall organizational commitment obtained moderate mean scores. Both their normative and affective domains-commitment had significant correlations with their level of engagement. However, continuance commitment does not have significant correlations with employee engagement.

This can be attributed to the fact that continuance commitment is superficial since it is based on pragmatism and rewards given by the organization. They may be happy with their work, but they could still have moderate commitment because they still seek better jobs with better benefits. These employees are ritualistic, which means that they work because they are paid to do so. It is recommended that competitive benefits be set to obtain and ensure employees' commitment to the company.

## References

- Albdour, A. A., & Altarawneh, I. I. (2014). Employee engagement and organizational commitment: Evidence from Jordan. *International journal of business*, 19(2), 192–212. <https://www.craig.csu-fresno.edu/ijb/Volumes/Volume%2019/V192-5.pdf>
- Ananth, A. (2009). *Impact of demographic factors on employee engagement: a study with reference to vasan publications private limited, chennai*. University Library of Munich, Germany. <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/39768/>
- Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., & Wilson, D. C. (2007). Engaging the aging workforce: The relationship between perceived age similarity, satisfaction with co-workers, and employee engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1542. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1542>
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802393649>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Job demands–resources theory. *Well-being: A complete reference guide*, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell019>
- Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Positive organizational behavior: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 29(2), 147–154. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.515>
- Banihani, M., Lewis, P., & Syed, J. (2013). Is work engagement gendered? *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 28(7), 400–423. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-01-2013-0005>

- Buckley, P., Viechnicki, P., & Barua, A. (2016). The 2016 Deloitte Millennial Survey: Winning over the next generation of leaders. Retrieved from <https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/global/Documents/About-Deloitte/gx-millennial-survey-2016-exec-summary.pdf>
- Davis, B. J. (2014). University Commitment: Test of a Three-Component Model (Doctoral dissertation, Minnesota State University, Mankato). <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds/342/>
- Field, L. K., & Buitendach, J. H. (2011). Happiness, work engagement and organizational commitment of support staff at a tertiary education institution in South Africa. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 37(1), 01-10. <https://journals.co.za/content/psyc/37/1/EIC89246>
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Losada, M. F. (2005). Positive affect and the complex dynamics of human flourishing. *American Psychologist*, 60(7), 678-686. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0034435>
- Goel, D., & Singh, M. (2015). Personality and employee happiness: A study of working women in Delhi/NCR. *Indian Journal of Health & Wellbeing*, 6(2). Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebsco-host.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=5db9232b-d11f-49ba-b6cc-0e1f16ad8e7d%40sessionmgr120>
- Huang, H. (2016). Workplace happiness: Organizational role and the reliability of self-reporting (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park). <https://drum.lib.umd.edu/handle/1903/18191>
- James, J. B., McKechnie, S., & Swanberg, J. (2011). Predicting employee engagement in an age-diverse retail workforce. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(2), 173-196. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.681>
- Johnson, R. E., Chang, C. H., & Yang, L. Q. (2010). Commitment and motivation at work: The relevance of employee identity and regulatory focus. *Academy of management review*, 35(2), 226-245. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.35.2.zok226>
- Kaur, S. (2017). Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement: A Literature Review. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(3), 7-32. <https://www.ijtemas.in/DigitalLibrary/Vol.6Issue4/33-38.pdf>
- Koyuncu, M., Burke, R. J., & Fiksenbaum, L. (2006). Work engagement among women managers and professionals in a Turkish bank: Potential antecedents and consequences. *Equal Opportunities International*, 25(4), 299-310. <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/02610150610706276>
- Ledford, G. (1999). Comment: Happiness and Productivity Revisited. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(1), 25-30. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3100200>.
- Lee, S., & Olshfski, D. (2002). Employee Commitment and Firefighters: It's My Job. *Public Administration Review*, 62, 108-114. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3110180>.
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (2004). TCM employee commitment survey academic users guide 2004. London, Ontario, Canada: The University of Western Ontario, Department of Psychology. Retrieved from <http://employeecommitment.com/TCM-Employee-Commitment-Survey-Academic-Package-2004.pdf>
- Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human resource management review*, 11(3), 299-326. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(00\)00053-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(00)00053-X)
- Office of Research, Planning & Effectiveness (2012). Employee Engagement Survey. Northwestern Michigan College. Retrieved from <https://www.nmc.edu/departments/orpe/research-and-data/surveys/2012-employee-engagement-report.pdf>
- Ogbonnaya, C., Daniels, K., & Nielsen, K. (2017). Does contingent pay encourage positive employee attitudes and intensify work? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(1), 94-112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12130>
- Oza, H. S. (2015). Does all dimensions of organizational commitment affect job satisfaction and job performance? (a case study of higher educational organizations). *Clear international journal of research in commerce & management*, 6(9), 21-24. Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebsco-host.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=5&sid=be49d005-025e-4b14-99f9-3f814d7e63c0%40pdc-v-sessmgr02>
- Prathiba, S. (2016). A Study on the Impact of Employee Empowerment and Employee Engagement on Organizational Commitment. *SIES Journal Of Management*, 12(2), 45-54. <http://eds.b.ebsco-host.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=7&sid=>

- [0161406a-19e9-46be-a1f0-c07ad61d8dbb%40pdc-v-sessmgr01](https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248)
- Peters, R. (2015). Facing crucial career choices: intellectual challenge, job security, and opportunity for advancement contribute to employee happiness, but the ultimate prize may be a satisfactory salary. *Pharmaceutical Technology Europe*, (12), 18. Retrieved from [http://tiszatateritekek.hu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/PharmTech\\_Europe\\_2015-12.pdf](http://tiszatateritekek.hu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/PharmTech_Europe_2015-12.pdf)
- Rego, A., & e Cunha, M. P. (2008). Authentizotic climates and employee happiness: Pathways to individual performance? *Journal of Business Research*, 61(7), 739–752. [https://ac.els-cdn.com/S0148296307002585/1-s2.0-S0148296307002585-main.pdf?tid=dab03a7f-2cd2-49a8-a1ec-b0f680358017&ac-dnat=1548315997\\_22e600519cb240ba5dd384a528f20aa6](https://ac.els-cdn.com/S0148296307002585/1-s2.0-S0148296307002585-main.pdf?tid=dab03a7f-2cd2-49a8-a1ec-b0f680358017&ac-dnat=1548315997_22e600519cb240ba5dd384a528f20aa6)
- Reynolds, P. D. (1986). Organizational culture as related to industry, position and performance: a preliminary report [1]. *Journal of Management Studies*, 23(3), 333–345. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1986.tb00958.x>
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of management journal*, 53(3), 617–635. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.51468988>
- Rotich, R., Cheruiyot, T., & Korir, M. (2016). Effects of Demographics on the Relationship between Optimism and Work Engagement among Employees of State Agencies in Kenya. *Journal of Resources Development and Management*. 18, pp. 32–42. <https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JRDM/article/view/29350/30139>
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
- Scott, D., & McMullen, T. (2010). The Impact of Rewards Programs on Employee Engagement. <https://www.worldatwork.org/docs/research-and-surveys/survey-brief-the-impact-of-rewards-programs-on-employee-engagement.pdf>
- 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: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71–92. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Van Rhenen, W. (2008). Workaholism, burnout, and work engagement: Three of a kind or three different kinds of employee well-being? *Applied Psychology*, 57(2), 173–203. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00285.x>
- Silvestro, R. (2002). Dispelling the modern myth: Employee satisfaction and loyalty drive service profitability. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 22(1), 30–49. <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/full/10.1108/01443570210412060>
- Van De Voorde, K., Paauwe, J., & Van Veldhoven, M. (2012). Employee well-being and the HRM–organizational performance relationship: a review of quantitative studies. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14(4), 391–407. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00322.x>
- Vorina, A., Simonič, M., & Vlasova, M. (2017). An Analysis of the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement. *Economic Themes*, 55(2), 243–262. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ethemes-2017-0014>
- Wiley, J. W. (2014). Using Employee Opinions about Organizational Performance to Enhance Employee Engagement Surveys: Model Building And Validation. *People & Strategy*, 36(4), 38–49. <https://link.gale-group.com/apps/doc/A360357802/AONE?u=gogglescholar&sid=AONE&xid=53593782>
- Williams, P., Kern, M. L., & Waters, L. (2017). The Role and Reprocessing of Attitudes in Fostering Employee Work Happiness: An Intervention Study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 28. <http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00028>
- World Health Organization. (2010). Sex. Retrieved from [http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/topics/sexual\\_health/sh\\_definitions/en/](http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/topics/sexual_health/sh_definitions/en/)

- Wright, T. A., Cropanzano, R., & Bonett, D. G. (2007). The moderating role of positive employee well-being on the relation between job satisfaction and job performance. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 12(2), 93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.2.93>
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational behavior*, 74(3), 235-244. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.11.003>
- Xu, J., & Cooper Thomas, H. (2011). How can leaders achieve high employee engagement? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 32(4), 399-416. <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/full/10.1108/01437731111134661>
- Zimmer, S. (2017). Organizational Commitment. *Organizational Commitment -- Research Starters Business*, 1-5. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e6h&AN=121501357&site=ehost-live>