



Employee Engagement and Factors that Influence: Experiences of Lecturers in Indonesia

¹Meily Margaretha, ²Ratna Widiastuti, ³Sri Zaniarti, ⁴Hendra Wijaya
^{1,2,3,4}Maranatha Christian University, Indonesia

Abstract: In this changing world, regarding global perspective and workforce changes, the involvement of employee is the most important feature for organization competitive. Employee engagement now is considered as a valuable indicator for organizational success, therefore, it needs to be studied in-depth by the organization, because through engaged employees the significant results can be achieved. Employee engagement has become an crucial issue in human resources management reviews, as it provides many benefits to the organization. However, much of what has written about employee engagement comes from practitioner literature and consulting firms. There is a scarcity of research on employee engagement in the academic literature, for academics, the concept remains new, and therefore, this concept still requires research that can support it. This study aimed to understand the factors that affect employee engagement of lecturers in Indonesia. Data collected and can be processed were 200 respondents. Based on the results it is known that job characteristic, reward, and recognition, perceived organizational and supervisor support affect employee engagement. Some managerial implications that can be applied based on the results of this study have been submitted in this research, one of it such as the organization should provide a challenging, safe and secure work environment for employees, in order to get proactive employees that will give a positive effect on overall organizational performance.

Keywords: Employee engagement, Job characteristics, Reward, Perceived organizational support, Organizational commitment, Turnover intention, Job satisfaction

1. Introduction

Employee engagement has gained much attention in the last decade in business media as well as among consulting firms and in the community practitioners of human resource management. This concept has been claimed as a new human resource practice whereby business organizations can cope with uncertain and volatile industrial conditions (Lee, 2012) and it is related to the manager's demand for solutions to problems related to motivation and performance in organization (Little & Little, 2006 in Endres & Mancheno-Smoak, 2008). However, much of what has written about employee engagement comes from practitioner literature and consulting firms. There is a dearth of research on employee engagement of employees in academic literature (Robinson et al., 2004). For academics, the concept remains new; therefore, this concept still requires other studies that can support it.

Employee engagement refers to the positive, affective psychological work-related state of mind that leads employees to actively express and invest themselves emotionally, cognitively, and physically in their role performance (Catlette & Hadden, 2001; Rurkkhum, 2010). Although there are slightly different views in defining employee engagement (Harter et al., 2002; Maslach et al., 2001; May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Sirota, Mischkind, & Meltzer, 2005), in the human resources literature, employee engagement is generally agreed to be a psychological facet that encompasses energy, enthusiasm, and engrossed effort (Gruman & Saks, 2010; Macey & Schneider, 2008). Researchers commonly describe engaged employees as individuals who are highly energized and resilient in performing their job; put their heart into their jobs with persistence and willingness to invest effort; exhibit strong work involvement along with experiencing feelings of significance, enthusiasm, passion, inspiration, pride, excitement, and challenge from their work; and fully concentrate and immerse themselves in their work without noticing that time passes (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Employee engagement differs from several concepts that exist in organizational

behavior such as organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and job involvement. Organizational commitment differs from the engagement that refers to attitudes and binds a person to their organization. Engagement is not an attitude, it is the degree to which a person is concerned and has an attachment to performance in their role. Engagement is also different from organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB involves volunteer and informal behaviors that can help colleagues and organizations, while engagement focuses on the role of a person's formal performance beyond extra-role and voluntary behavior. Engagement also differs from job involvement. According to May et al. (2004: in Saks, 2006), job involvement is the result of a cognitive decision about the ability to satisfy the needs of the job and tied to a person's self image.

Several studies have examined the antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Saks's research (2006) used a sample of 102 employees working in various types of occupations and organizations with an average working life of 5 years in the organization and four years in the work they were currently employed. Saks (2006) proposed the hypothesis that the characteristics of work, respect, and recognition, support of the organization and leader, distributive and procedural justice are the antecedents of employee engagement in the organization. Lee's (2012) study of 394 existing American employees and hotel managers have shown positive results from employee engagement. The research of Rasheed, Khan, and Ramzan (2013) found the same results that showed antecedents and consequences of employee engagement of 303 employees working in the private sector and government banking industries in Pakistan. Based on the previous section, some issues that want to be expressed through this research are:

- Are antecedents (job characteristics, perceived organizational and supervisor support, rewards and recognition) affecting employee engagement of lecturers in Indonesia?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Job Characteristics

Work with high levels of work characteristics equips individuals with space and incentives to bring themselves to work or become more engaged (Kahn, 1992; in Saks, 2006). Therefore, it can be formulated hypothesis 1 as follows:

H1: Job characteristics are positively related to employee engagement.

2.2 Rewards and Recognition

According to Maslach et al. (2001) when a person lacks respect and recognition can lead to burnout, awards and proper recognition for engagement, however, when employees receive recognition and recognition from the organization, they will feel obliged to reciprocate at a higher level. Therefore, it can be formulated hypothesis 2 as follows:

H2: Award and recognition positively related to employee engagement

2.3 Perceived Organizational Support and Perceived Supervisor Support

Perceived organization support (POS) and supervisor support (PSS) refer to a common belief that the values of their organizations contribute to and care for their well-being (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; in Saks, 2006). POS and PSS will encourage positive results through employee engagement because employees with high POS and PSS may be more engaged in their work and organization (Rhoades et al., 2001; in Saks, 2006). In other words, when employees believe their organizations are related to them and care about their well-being, they will react more by trying to fulfill their obligations to the organization by becoming more engaged. Also, because employees tend to view the orientation of their superiors to show support for the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; in Saks, 2006). Therefore it can be formulated hypothesis 3 as follows:




Figure 1. Employee Engagement and Factors that affected

H3a: Perceived Organizational Support (POS) positively related to employee engagement

H3b: Perceived Supervisor Support received (PSS) positively related to employee engagement

3. Methodology

The sample in this study was 200 lecturers in Indonesia from both state and private universities. The research instrument uses the five-point. Employee engagement was measured by instruments developed by Saks (2006). Job characteristic was measured by instruments developed by Hackman & Oldham (1980; in Saks, 2006). Perceived Organizational Support and Perceived Supervisor Support (POS dan PSS) was measured by instruments developed by Rhoades et al., (2001; in Saks, 2006). Rewards and recognition was measured by instruments developed by Saks (2006). The collected data were analyzed by testing the validity and reliability and the hypotheses were tested with simple regression analysis that used to test the relationship and influence between independents and dependent variables.

4. Result and Discussion

Table 1 and 2 explain the validity and reliability of the study.

Table 1: Validity Testing Results

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
EE6				.859				
EE7				.819				
EE9				.858				
EE10				.928				
EE11				.855				
PSS1	.899							
PSS2	.896							
PSS3	.910							
POS1					.814			
POS2					.843			
POS4					.827			
POS5					.863			
POS6					.898			
POS7					.687			
JC1		.747						
JC2		.768						
JC3		.710						
JC4		.735						
RR2						.608		
RR3						.752		
RR4						.784		
RR5						.714		
RR6						.724		
RR7						.830		
RR8						.837		

Table 2: Reliability Testing Results

Variable	Cronbach Alpha
Employee Engagement	0.914
Perceived Supervisor Support	0.885
Perceived Organizational Support	0.904
Job Characteristic	0.722
Reward and Recognition	0.870

4.1 Job characteristics – Employee Engagement

The results for the first hypothesis showed that job characteristics positively related to employee engagement by 22% with sig level. 0,000. The results have shown in table 3. The results of this study proved to support several previous studies such as those conducted by Saks (2006), May et al (2004), Sejati (2012), Santosa (2015), as well as Padmakumar & Gantasala (2011) found that job characteristics have a positive correlation with Employee Engagement. Work with a high level of work characteristics equips individuals with space and incentives to bring themselves to work or become more bound. Maslach et al. (2001) suggested the importance of job characteristics towards increasing employee engagement.

Table 3: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.469 ^a	.220	.216	2.87956

a. Predictors: (Constant), TKPB

Table 4: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	464.030	1	464.030	55.962	.000 ^a
	Residual	1641.790	198	8.292		
	Total	2105.820	199			

a. Predictors: (Constant), TKPB

b. Dependent Variable: TEEB

Table 5: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	8.905	1.501		5.932	.000
	TKPB	.703	.094	.469	7.481	.000

a. Dependent Variable: TEEB

4.2 Reward and Recognition – Employee Engagement

The results for the second hypothesis showed that reward and recognition are positively related to employee engagement by 28.6% with the level of Sig. 0.000 (table 4). The finding supports the previous research conducted by Jacobs et al. (2014) which stated that there is a significant positive relationship between intrinsic rewards and employee engagement in the retail industry in South Africa. Also, research conducted by Napitupulu and Irvianti (2012), Saks (2006) and Margaretha, Kartika and Widjaja (2015) which stated that rewards and recognition had a simultaneous and significant effect on employee engagement. Maslach et al. (2001) proposed that when a person lacks appreciation can cause burnout, therefore reward and recognition are for employee engagement.

Table 6: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.535 ^a	.286	.283	2.75479

a. Predictors: (Constant), TRRB

Table 7: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	603.227	1	603.227	79.489	.000 ^a
	Residual	1502.593	198	7.589		
	Total	2105.820	199			

a. Predictors: (Constant), TRRB

b. Dependent Variable: TEEB

Table 8: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	10.022	1.139		8.796	.000
	TRRB	.382	.043	.535	8.916	.000

a. Dependent Variable: TEEB

4.3 Perceived Organizational and Supervisor Support – Employee Engagement

The results for the third hypothesis indicated that perceived organization and supervisor support positively related to employee engagement. Organizational support affects employee engagement by 27.1% with the level of Sig. 0.000 (table 5), while the results for perceived supervisor support affected employee engagement by 25.1% with the level of Sig. 0.000 (table 6). This study supports previous studies conducted by Qomariyah et al. (2013), Mujasih (2015), Saks (2006) which proved that there are positive and significant result between perceived organizational and supervisor support with employee engagement. High organizational support will lead to positive results through employee engagement because employees become more engaged in their work and organization, therefore it will help the organization achieve its goals (Rhoades et al., 2001; in Saks, 2006). When employees believe that their organization is related to them and pay attention to their well-being, they will react more by trying to fulfill their obligations to the organization by becoming more engaged, and employees tend to view their supervisor's orientation as showing support for the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; in Saks, 2006).

Table 9: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.520 ^a	.271	.267	2.78534

a. Predictors: (Constant), TDOB

Table 10: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	569.708	1	569.708	73.434	.000 ^a
	Residual	1536.112	198	7.758		
	Total	2105.820	199			

a. Predictors: (Constant), TDOB

b. Dependent Variable: TEEB

Table 11: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	11.883	.971		12.238	.000
	TDOB	.397	.046	.520	8.569	.000

a. Dependent Variable: TEEB

Table 12: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.501 ^a	.251	.247	2.82306

a. Predictors: (Constant), TDPB

Table 13: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	527.830	1	527.830	66.230	.000 ^a
	Residual	1577.990	198	7.970		
	Total	2105.820	199			

a. Predictors: (Constant), TDPB

b. Dependent Variable: TEEB

Table 14: Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	13.356	.844		15.824	.000
TDPB	.653	.080	.501	8.138	.000

a. Dependent Variable: TEEB

5. Conclusion

This study aimed to understand the factors that influence employee engagement from lecturers in Indonesia. Sample of the study was 200 respondents of lecturers in Indonesia. From the analysis, this research concludes the research findings as below:

- Job characteristic affects employee engagement by 22%.
- Reward and recognition has effect to employee engagement by 28.6%.
- Perceived organization and supervisor support have impact on employee engagement. Organizational support affects employee engagement by 27.1% while the results for perceived supervisor support affected employee engagement by 25.1%.

This research expected to provide input for the University to develop their human resources, in this case for their lecturers. By continuing to do this research, it will give addition to references and inputs on employee engagement research. Based on the results it known that job characteristic, reward, and recognition, perceived organizational and supervisor support affect employee engagement. The implications of the research results recommend that organizations should develop programs that focus on needs and concerns of the employees and creating a challenging, safe and secure work environment. Hence the organization will get proactive employees which in turn will have a positive effect on overall organizational performance.

References

- Agoi, L. F. (2015). Effect of work engagement on employee turnover intention in public sector Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce And Management United Kingdom*, Vol. 3 (12).
- Albdour, A. A., & Altarawneh, I. I. (2014). Employee engagement and organizational commitment: evidence from Jordan. *International journal of business*, 19 (2), pg. 193-210.
- Angraini, L., Astuti, E. S., & Prasetya, A. (2016). Factors that influence *employee engagement* of Y generation: Study of employees in Unilever Indonesia-Surabaya. *Business Administration Journal*, Vol. 37 (2).
- Arun K, K., & Renugadevi, R. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement- A hypothetical approach. *Journal of Business and Management*. Vol. 9, (3), pp.52-57.
- Bates, S. (2004). Getting engaged. *HR Magazine*, Vol. 49(2), pp. 44-51.
- Baumruk, R. 2004. The missing link: the role of employee engagement in business success. *Workspan*, Vol. 47, pp. 8-52.
- Catlette, B., & Hadden, R. (2001). Contented Cows Give Better Milk: The Plain Truth About Employee Relations And Your Bottom Line. Germantown, Tn: Saltillo.
- Cheche, S. G., Muathe, S. M. A., & Maina, S. M. (2017). Employee engagement, Organizational commitment and performance of selected state corporations in Kenya. *European scientific journal*, Vol.13(31), pg.1857-7881 [Crossref](#)
- Das, S.P., & Mishra, P.S. (2014). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement: A critical analysis literature review. *International Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 3 (2).
- Endres, G. M. & Mancheno-Smoak, L. (2008). The Human Resource Craze: Human Performance Improvement and Employee Engagement. *Organization Development Journal*; spring 26 (1). pp. 69-78.

- Ghozali, I. (2011). *Multivariate analysis application with SPSS Program*. Semarang: BP Universitas Diponegoro.
- Gruman J. A., & Saks A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Hum. Res. Manag. Rev.* 21 123–136 10.1016/j.hrmmr.2010.09.004. [Crossref](#)
- Gupta, M., & Shaheen, M. (2017). Impact of work engagement on turnover intention: Moderation by psychological capital in India. *Verslas: Teorija ir praktika / Business: Theory and Practice*, 18, pg. 136-143. [Crossref](#)
- Hair, J. F., Black, W., Babin, J. B., & Anderson, R. A. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis. Seventh Edition*. Prentice-Hall International. INC, London.
- Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., & Hayes, T.L. (2002). Business unit level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.87, pp. 268-79. [Crossref](#)
- Jacobs, S., Renard, M., & Snelgar, R. J. (2014). Intrinsic rewards and work engagement in the South African retail industry. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40 (2). [Crossref](#)
- Jaiswal, G., Pathak, R., & Kumari, S. (2017). Impact of employee engagement on job satisfaction and motivation. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316662915>.
- Jogiyanto. (2004). *Business Research Methodology*. Yogyakarta: BPFE UGM.
- Kamalanabhan, T. J., & Sai, P. (2009). Employee engagement and job satisfaction in the information technology industry. Retrieved from Researchgate, DOI Number: 10.2466/pr.105.3.759-770. [Crossref](#)
- Kim-soon, N. (2015). *Employee engagement and job satisfaction*. Retrieved from Researchgate, DOI Number: 10.13140/rg.2.1.5050.6966.
- Lee, J. (2012). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement: Empirical study of hotel employees and managers. Dissertation of doctor of philosophy, Kansas State University.
- Macey W. H., & Schneider B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Ind. Organ. Psychol.* 1 3–30 10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002. [Crossref](#)
- Maslach, C., Schaufelli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 52, pp. 397-422.
- Margaretha, I., Kartika, D., & Widjaja, D. (2015). Analysis of the influence of internal communication, , intrinsic rewards and recognition toward employee engagement in Surabaya Suite Hotel. *Hospitality and Service Management Journal*, Vol. 3 (2).
- May, D.R. Gilson, R.L. & Harter, L.M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work “. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol 77, pp11-37. [Crossref](#)
- Mujiasih, E. (2015). The relationship between perceived organizational support with employee engagement. *UNDIP Psychology Journal*, Vol.14 (1), 40 – 51.
- Napitupulu, S. C. E., & Irvianti, L. S. D. (2012). Analysis of Influence of Job Characteristic and Reward System to Employee Engagement and the Impact on Employee Performance in Nalendra Hotel Bandung.
- Nugroho, A. 2006. *The right strategy to choose statistical research method with SPSS*, Andi: Yogyakarta.
- Padmakumar, R & Gantasala V. P. (2011). The role of Employee Engagement in work-related outcomes. *Proceedings*, pg. 1-6.
- Qomariyah, L., Nur'Aini, S., & Rahmawati, E. I. (2013). The influence of perceived organizational support toward employee engagement in Indonesian Railway Company DAOP 9 Jember, *INSIGHT*, Vol 9 (1).
- Rasheed, A., Khan, S., & Ramzan, M. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement: The case of Pakistan. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 4 (4).
- Richman, A. (2006). Everyone wants an engaged workforce how can you create it? *Workspan*, Vol. 49, pp. 36-9.
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). *The Drivers of Employee Engagement*. Institute for Employment Studies, Brighton.
- Rurkkhum, S. (2010). The Relationship between Employee Engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Thai Organizations. Diss. University of Minnesota, 2010.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 21 (7). pp. 600-619. [Crossref](#)
- Santosa, E. R. (2015). The relationship between dimensions of job characteristics and *Employee Engagement*. Thesis Undergraduate. Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta.

- Santosa, T.E.C. (2010). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, work involvement, managerial justice, trust in the organization and its impact on organizational citizenship behavior. Individual Research Reports. Management Department, Faculty of Economics, Maranatha Christian University, Bandung. Unpublished.
- 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*, Vol. 25, pp. 293-315. [Crossref](#)
- Sejati, A. (2012). The influence of job characteristics toward employee engagement in Wijaya Karya Beton Head Office Company. *Thesis Undergraduate*. Indonesia University.
- Sekaran, U. (2000). *Research Methods For Business: A Skill-Building Approach*. Third Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sirota, D., Mischkind, L. A., & Meltzer, M. I. (2006). Stop demotivating your employees! *Harvard Management Update*, 11(1), 3-6.
- Van der Westhuizen, N. (2014). Turnover intention and employee engagement: Exploring eliciting factors in South African audit firms. *Thesis for the degree of Master of Commerce in the Faculty of Economic and Management Sciences at Stellenbosch University*.