



Developing Customized Employee Engagement Measure in an Indonesian Large Company: Procedure, Validity, and Reliability

Henndy Ginting

School of Business and Management
Bandung Institute of Technology
E-mail: henndy.ginting@sbm-itb.ac.id
Indonesia

Yuni Ros Bangun

School of Business and Management
Bandung Institute of Technology
Indonesia

Hary Febriansyah

School of Business and Management
Bandung Institute of Technology
Indonesia

Bagus Setiawan

Perusahaan Listrik Negara, Jakarta, Bandung
Indonesia

Bonita Lee

PAIRs Consulting, Bandung

Gian Frissilia

PAIRs Consulting, Bandung

Abstract

Companies have been concerned on measurement and improvement of their employees' engagement using various conceptual models. Since every company has their own specific vision, mission, and values, customization is needed to measure employee engagement objectively. One of the biggest state-owned company in Indonesia develops a specific model of employee engagement, consisted of 12-dimensions. Those dimensions have been operationalized in order to build a set of questionnaire to measure employee engagement. This study elaborates the procedure taken to create, validate, and testing the reliability of the measure. We administered the newly designed questionnaire (38 items measuring 12-dimensions) as well as Gallup Employee Engagement and Aon Hewitt questionnaires to 869 employees of the company. Significant correlations between measures, significant item-total item correlations, factorial robustness, and discriminative power confirmed the validity of the measure. Internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and Cronbach Alpha confirmed the reliability of the measure. These multiple sources of evidence are discussed.

Keywords: employee engagement, customized measurement, procedure, validity, and reliability

As each business strives toward efficiency in order to increase its profitability, both scholars and practitioners have agreed that human capital is one of its major factors. Through the past few decades, there has been the significant paradigm shift in how companies see their employees. Not so long ago, human in the workplace was seen in such a mechanistic way, given little to none

regards on intrapersonal factors in term of their performance (see: Guest, 1987; Wright & McMahan, 1992; Legge, 1995; Cascio, 2018). However, nowadays, we have adopted a new perspective on the workforce that takes huge emphasis on individuals as an active force affecting company sustainability. Implied with that premise, individual's action can be beneficial or costly for the



company; hence the next question asked is when do employee behave beneficially and when they do the opposite.

There is a lot of factors studied trying to answer this particular question. One of those is employee engagement (Saks, 2006; Attridge, 2009; Tarique & Schuler, 2010; Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Shuck, 2011; Wollard & Shuck, 2011). Generally speaking, employee engagement refers to a worker's attitude that aims toward the betterment of some aspects of the company. This can refer to the company goals and value to the wellbeing of every stakeholder of the company. An engaged employee would be a great asset to the company as they would internalize the company's goals as their own (Meyer & Gagne, 2008). In conclusion, more engaged employees will have better performance than their less engaged counterpart (Christensen Hughes & Rog, 2008; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009; Rich et al, 2010; Gruman & Saks, 2011).

Given its significance, we would first need to elaborate the construct of employee engagement. Of course, there are many models of employee engagement currently available. Gallup Consulting founded by G. Gallup for example, defined employee engagement as a positive attitude, passion, and feeling of meaningfulness in regard to their relationship with the company; in which an engaged employee will feel satisfied in overall (Harter et al, 2003; Crabtree, 2004, 2005; Little & Little, 2006; Harter et al, 2013; Sorenson, 2013). In this model, there is twelve dimension of employee engagement including the feeling of support and care, understanding, opportunity and development, respect, as well as commitment and purpose. Another common model of employee engagement is Aon-Hewitt model with its emphasis on its six motivations such the work itself, basic needs fulfillment, company practices, leadership, brand, and performance (Hewitt, 2012a, 2012b, 2015). Deloitte signified the five elements of engagement motive those are meaningful work, management style, work environment, personal growth opportunity, and leadership (Bersin, 2015). Besides those three models we have just briefly introduced, there are many other models available to use at the moment.

With much available literature, we concluded that there are three components of employee engagement. Those three components are identity, emotional attachment, and behaviors. Identity here refers to the feelings of belongingness of an employee toward his/her

company (see: Tyler & Blader, 2003, 2013; Macey & Schneider, 2008; He et al, 2014; Haslam et al, 2014). They would feel that the company is a part of who they are and the other way around. That identity then followed by emotional attachment to the company. Emotional attachment is the result of reciprocal interaction between the individuals and the company along with all aspects associated with it (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007; Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2008; Lin, 2010; Christian et al, 2011). An engaged employee tends to believe that his/her well-being is closely related to that of the company's and everyone in it. In another word, this employee will feel that the company means a lot to oneself that he/she will be more willing to contribute toward the betterment of the company. These individual contributions are the behavioral aspect of the employee engagement (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Albrech, 2011; Welch, 2011). Each of these components will play its own part in the dynamic of employee engagement. However, in general, an engaged employee tends to feel belong in the company, has strong desire to contribute to the company's wellbeing, and taking behavioral actions to make it comes true.

As we can see from the three components of engagement above, more often than not, the existing models are insufficient in measuring the accurate level of employee engagement. This happens because every company is structurally different from each other (Gellerman, 1959; Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 20014). Hence, the available models can be unsuitable to use in every company. This discrepancy happens due to the variation of components of engagement between theories in a way that some functions of engagement are understated or overstated. This is the exact problem faced by this large company. They found that commonly used model is inadequate in measuring the level of employee engagement. The main problem here is the proportion of qualities associated with employee engagement. Hence, since 2011 they have been recreating a model fitting themselves. There are twelve dimensions of employee engagement found for this particular company, explained as follow:

Quality leadership refers to a certain attention given by the leader to make sure employee satisfaction related to their career and self-development. It is expected that this kind of care perceived by employees will increase their motivation to perform better (Ghafoor et al, 2011; Haryanto, 2011; Shuck & Herd, 2012; Soane, 2014). It happens through increasing trust between members of the



company resulting from a more open and honest communication (Andiyasari et al, 2010; Welch, 2011). In this company context, a good leader is expected to be responsible in improving the available systems while being their partners.

The second dimension of employee engagement is job demands. This particular dimension refers to how demanding the job is as perceived by the employee including physical and psychological aspects of the job itself (Karasek, 1979; Demerouti et al, 2001; Petrou et al, 2012). One thing we need to remember in measuring this is the fact that how demanding a job it will be significantly depended on employee's perception of one own capacity (Xanthopoulou et al, 2007). When the individual feels capable, his/her response will most likely be positive in a way that they will see such demands as a rewarding challenge they can conquer. On the other hand, when individuals feel incapable, these demands will be seen excessive and cause distress and burn-out, which eventually cause them to disregard their peers, consumers, and the company as well (Parker & Sprigg, 1999; Bakker et al, 2003).

Next, the third dimension employee engagement is social support. This dimension talks about how one's dissatisfactions heard by one's colleagues and leaders to the point they will help him/her to overcome it. The more support perceived by an individual, the more capable one believes oneself to be, in a sense that even if he/she alone cannot make it, others will help to make sure he/she can (House, 1981; Ray & Miller, 1994; Kim et al, 2013). Social support is a social resource available as a result of reciprocity (Halbesleben, 2006); which means, there should be an interdependence relationship between the members of the society or in this case, company and everyone in it (Wayne et al, 1997; Jones, 2010). There are multiple types of support will be essential in working life, those are: instrumental support such financial help when needed, emotional support such sympathy and cheers in stressful time, and finally informational support such information and advice (Shumaker & Brownell, 1984; Adelman, 1988; Kossek et al, 2011).

The fourth dimension of employee engagement is burnout. We need to remember that this particular dimension is a negative dimension, which will contribute negatively toward engagement. Burnout is something that is often found in work-life characterized by the feeling of emotional tiredness due to long-term stress causing low-

energy and ignorance toward one's responsibility and others. In another word, burnout is a state of emotional exhaustion that causes depersonalization toward one's accomplishments (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Schaufeli & Taris, 2005; Leiter et al, 2014). It is a crucial dimension of employee engagement, in a way that when an employee is in this state, he/she will be disengaged (Hakanen et al, 2006; Bakker et al, 2007; Crawford et al, 2010). On the other hand, the job itself and its working environment can also cause burnout that can be costly for both the company and the employee themselves.

Job satisfaction is the fifth dimension of employee engagement. Satisfaction is an overall attitude based on individual's perceptions toward certain aspects of their job for example, their working hour, task variation, workload (Saks, 2006; Kompas & Sridevi, 2010; Abraham, 2012). Generally speaking, the more satisfaction an individual perceived regarding his/her job, the more they are willing to give their best for the company. On the other hand, the better performance an individual is giving, the more satisfaction he/she usually feels as well (Shore & Martin, 1989). Despite being a crucial predictor of individual's performance, we need to remember that job-satisfaction alone is insufficient in measuring employee engagement as it is mostly focusing on the emotional component of employee engagement.

The sixth dimension of employee engagement is the organizational commitment that refers to how much an employee is loyal to the company best interest (Sulsky, 1999; Yousef, 2000; Lok & Crawford, 2001). In this dimension, the employee should feel that the company has provided them a lot that they need to do something back for the company. The seventh dimension of employee engagement is work engagement. Work engagement refers to individuals feeling of energized and joy toward the work one is doing (Nguni et al, 2006; Cartwright & Holmes, 2006; Schaufeli et al, 2006; Bakker et al, 2008). Both of these dimensions often associated with one's dedication toward the job. However, there is one significant difference between both of these dimensions, which is the object of one's dedication. In organizational commitment, individual dedicates oneself to the company, in many cases, regardless the work they are assigned to do. On the latter, individual dedicates oneself to the actual work that they are doing, regardless the company.

The eighth and ninth dimension of employee engagement is extra-role performance and in-role



performance. The previous dimension refers to employee willingness to do more for the company without getting rewards for the extra work he/she provided (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Salanova et al, 2011; Albrecht, 2012). On the other hand, the latter refers to one own capacity to manage his/her own work resulting a degree of performance that is expected from him/her (Williams & Anderson, 1991; Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2008). Both of those two dimensions will be enhanced by innovative work behavior as the tenth dimension. In this dimension, one is expected to be creative; that is to explore and implement new ways to increase efficiency (Moorman & Miner, 1998; Zhang & Bartol, 2010).

The eleventh dimension of employee engagement is the organizational memory. Organizational memory refers to employee memories related to the common

company norms. These norms are the result of all interactions in the company that in some ways will affect the way decisions are made in the company (Walsh & Ungson, 1991; Moorman & Miner, 1997; Rowlinson et al, 2010; Xu & Cooper Thomas, 2011) This dimension will be closely related to the twelfth dimension of employee engagement that is organizational identity. Organizational identity refers to employee perception of what differentiates this company from other companies (Scott & Lane, 2000; Anteby & Molnar, 2012). This dimension becomes crucial because the stability of such identity will significantly affect individual’s attachment to the company (Tsui et al, 1992; Dutton et al, 1994; Hogg & Terry, 2000).

According to this model, all of these twelve dimensions can be categorized into 5-domains. The summary for each domain can be seen in the figure 1.

Table 1 Employee Engagement Domains (PLN, 2016)

Domain	Dimensions
Leadership	Leadership Quality
Job Characteristic	Job Demands
	Social Support
	Job Satisfaction
Employee Psychological Wellbeing	Burnout
	Work Engagement
	Organizational Commitment
Employee Performance	In-Role Performance
	Extra-Role Performance
Output	Organizational Memory
	Organizational Identity
	Innovative Work Behaviour

With all information above, we would emphasize the goal and content of this paper. This paper aims to explain the procedure and result of a customized employee engagement measure. This measure is context specific, meaning that it would only be used to measure employee

engagement for this particular company. Following the result section, this paper will discuss the fitness of this model for the company and the role of cultural significance. We would also provide some arguments



regarding the cost and benefit of customizing such measure.

Method

Participants

Total participants of this study were 869 individuals. The sex ratio for these respondents was 80.01% male. The average age for these participants was 33.5 years old. Average tenure was 13.17 years, ranging from 6 months to 37 years. They were randomly assigned to represent each unit of the company.

Measure

Answering the needs of specific dimensions fitting for this company, there were 12-dimensions identified here. Those 12-dimensions of employee engagements are: Quality Leadership [QL], Job Demand [JD, a negative dimension], Social Support [SS], Burn Out [BO, a negative dimension], Job Satisfaction [JS], Organizational Commitment [OC], Work Engagement [WE], Extra Role Behaviour [ER], In-Role Behaviour [IR], Innovative Work Behaviour [IW], Organizational Memory [OM], and Organizational Identity [OI]. Each dimension consisted of 4 to 5 behavioral indicators, each of those indicators were translated into one statement. Total item for this questionnaire was 38-items with four possible rating using Likert-scale for each of those items. In addition, Gallup's Employee Engagement, as well as Aon-Hewitt questionnaires, was also administered in parallel with our construct along with demographical data as sex, age, educational level, and tenure.

Procedure

In general, there were two procedures to be outlined here. The first procedure would be aiming at elaborating the dimensions and indicators of employee engagement for the company. The second procedure focused on the data gathering as well as processing.

Construction Procedure

This procedure was started by operationalizing and assessing the fitness of the 12-dimension of employee engagement currently available. In order to do so, first, we defined each dimension to be more concrete and close to the employee's behavior. Second, we did the in-depth interview with some employees asking their attitude and

behaviors related to each of the dimensions. Coding was done on the interview data, resulting from a list of contextual behavioral indicators which then translated into 38-items.

Data Gathering and Processing Procedure

Data gathering was conducted using online survey administered by the company. Participants were first asked to fill in the demographic data, following a clear instruction to choose how well each of the item-statement fit them. They were also reminded to answer as truthfully as their responses would not be interpreted one by one.

The data collected from the survey then processed by finding the average score of each dimension. That averages then totaled in order to determine the total engagement score. At the end of this stage, we have a whole set of data consisting item score, dimension score, and total engagement score for each participant.

Result

Factorial Validity

Exploratory Factor analysis was conducted on all 38-items. The variance explains for the 12-dimension of employee engagement was 64.9%. Factor loading for each item varied between .378 to .745 for its supposed dimensions. We also found that some dimensions are confounded which resulting 6-domains, those were: 1) quality leadership and social support; 2) organizational commitment and organizational identity; 3) extra-role performance; 4) job satisfaction and work engagement; 5) intra-role performance, innovative work behavior, and organizational memory; 6) job demand and burn out.

Construct Validity and Discriminative Power

There is three validity measure used here, those are item-dimension correlation, construct validity, as well as discriminative power.

Item to Dimension Correlation

We found the correlation of .680 ($p=.000$) and higher for each item to the dimension it belongs to which confirmed internal construct validity of the measure. The detail of correlational index range for each dimension can be seen in Table 1.



Table 2 Item to Dimension Correlation

Dimension	r
Quality Leadership	0.782 – 0.860
Job Demand	0.644 – 0.736
Social Support	0.680 – 0.769
Burn Out	0.690 – 0.766
Job Satisfaction	0.773 – 0.813
Organizational Commitment	0.745 – 0.774
Work Engagement	0.744 – 0.786
Extra Role Performance	0.704 – 0.810
In Role Performance	0.763 – 0.824
Innovative Work Behaviour	0.815 – 0.869
Organizational Memory	0.733 – 0.764
Organizational Identity	0.722 – 0.805

Correlations between Measures

In testing the construct validity of this measure, we compared the total engagement of our measure with the existing models Gallup and Aon-Hewitt, two robust questionnaires in measuring employee’s engagement. The correlations were .809 and .603 for Gallup and Aon-Hewitt employee engagement survey respectively (p=.000, for both). On the other hand, the correlation between Gallup and Aon-Hewitt models is .650 (p=.000).

Discriminative Power

As employee engagement correlates positively with better performance, we tried to compare the total of score of engagement to participants’ performance. There was only two category of performance used in this particular company, those are high-performer and low-performer. Given that, we did mean comparison between the two

categories. We found that there was significant mean difference of .219 between the two groups (df = 842; SD=.018, p = .000). Using Gallup’s model resulted mean difference of .133, SD=.280 (df=854; p=.001).

Internal Consistency and Test-Retest Reliability

Reliability testing was first conducted using Cronbach Alpha. The result (table 2) showed the reliability score for each dimension of this employee engagement measure was at least .542 (p = .000).

A month after the first data gathering process, we re-administered the same questionnaire on some of the same participants (N=187). The correlational index varied for each dimension but not less than .426 (p = .000) showed the reliability of the measure.



Table 3 Reliability Analysis of Each Dimension

Dimension	Cronbach Alpha	r
Quality Leadership	0.846	0.626
Job Demand	0.665	0.523
Social Support	0.574	0.489
Burn Out	0.542	0.426
Job Satisfaction	0.708	0.574
Organizational Commitment	0.636	0.447
Work Engagement	0.639	0.489
Extra Role Performance	0.667	0.625
In Role Performance	0.714	0.565
Innovative Work Behaviour	0.790	0.658
Organizational Memory	0.601	0.504
Organizational Identity	0.652	0.455

Other Findings

Correlation index between dimensions were all significant (p=.000) and can be seen on table 3 showed internal consistency of the measure.

Table 4 Interdimensional Correlation

	QL	JD	SS	BO	JS	OC	WE	ER	IR	IWB	OM
JD	-0,327										
SS	0.580	-0.349									
BO	-0.269	0.636	-0.319								
JS	0.530	-0.364	0.622	-0.348							
OC	0.442	-0.267	0.532	-0.249	0.637						
WE	0.435	-0.269	0.540	-0.339	0.636	0.555					
ER	0.383	-0.267	0.440	-0.317	0.478	0.396	0.530				
IR	0.463	-0.262	0.535	-0.317	0.599	0.514	0.640	0.491			
IWB	0.399	-0.208	0.472	-0.329	0.574	0.450	0.608	0.536	0.641		
OM	0.467	-0.205	0.535	-0.253	0.562	0.503	0.579	0.498	0.614	0.664	
OI	0.522	-0.288	0.586	-0.267	0.652	0.668	0.621	0.491	0.640	0.599	0.647



Employee engagement score was also compared to demographic data we gathered. We found the mean difference between male and female employee engagement score ($p=.000$) with men being more engaged than their woman counterpart. The result is consistent with this customized measure, Gallup's, and Aon-Hewitt's model. However, despite men has higher engagement score, the performance difference between the two was found insignificant ($p=.553$). Age and tenure are also correlated positively with employee engagement, but only on this customized measure. The correlation between age and engagement score is $.079$ ($p=.02$), while tenure and engagement are $.091$ ($p=.009$).

Discussion

There are threesome points to discuss in this section related to the construct of engagement and the statistical results showed in the previous section. The first point of discussion will elaborate the statistical findings and its implications for future studies. The second point of discussion will elaborate this model of engagement in cultural context as well as its methodological issue. Lastly, the third point of discussion will try to argue when customized construct and measure of employee engagement is needed. Lastly, the third point of discussion

Statistical Findings and Its Implications

In conclusion to the results shown in the previous sections, we can see that the 12-dimensions of employee engagement scored quite high in factor analysis where each item belonged to its supposed dimension. In addition to that, both internal consistency and test-retest reliability showed the promising result as the significance level for all dimensions were $.000$. In the matter of validity, the item-to-dimension correlation was all-sufficient, it had significant correlations with other models, and this measure also had good predictive power in relation to performance ($p=.001$). However, there are 3 arguments related to these statistical results those are: 1) redundancy of this construct; 2) relation to performance measure; and 3) its dimensionality.

The high correlation between this customized construct and Gallup's model of employee engagement ($r=.803$; $p=.000$) would naturally cause a red-flag regarding its redundancy. In a lot of ways, inter-construct correlations are desirable in order to prove that a new construct is somewhat parallel with the others; meaning it measures most of the same variable (John & Benet-

Martinez, 2000). This, however, can backfire; for instance, when the correlation is as high as it is in our case. Typically, correlation index that is too high indicates identical construct (Morrow, 1983; Clark & Watson, 1995; Le et al, 2010). Identical constructs suggest a redundancy, that the latter is unnecessary due to the prior sufficiency. In another word, the new construct would offer no added value. Nevertheless, we would argue otherwise, at least for this case.

As the previous point stated, we suspected this 12-dimension construct used Gallup's construct a model. Despite the different labels for each dimension, the overlap between the two construct is undeniably a lot. However, this construct offers one major added value toward the engagement model of this particular company by its segmentation of dimensions. This measure asked employees about the perceived qualities of the leaders, qualities of the social interactions, qualities of the job, and so on. This would make better brackets in targeting area of development compared to simply asking whether or not employees feel heard, having best-friend, recognized for one's success. For instance, should this company use the current Gallup's model, they might found that employees feel that they do not have best-friend at work. However, having no best-friend at work can be interpreted in a lot of ways; it might be caused by lacking perceived social support related to the organizational value, or the leadership style is too rigid that friendship would seem to be impossible or any other factors. In this measure, we would know for sure why employees feel that way as we can answer that by looking at dimensions such leadership quality, social support, extra-role performance, and organizational memory.

That conclusion is supported by the significant mean difference of employee engagement score between the two groups of performance. Using this customized model, the mean difference significance was $.000$, while Gallup's $.001$. Of course, statistically speaking, the difference in significance level between those two might be insufficient after all. However, in addition to that discriminative power, we also found that only this particular construct is significantly correlated with age and tenure as postulated by other researchers (e.g: Avery et al, 2007; Pitt-Catsouphes & Matz-Costa, 2008). Hence, it can at least indicate the probability of better fitness of this customized construct.



Despite concluding this construct is better to measure employee engagement for this particular measure, we also found incongruence claimed previously made. Based on their original construct proposed on 2016, they concluded 5-domains, those are leadership [LQ], job characteristic [JD and SS], employee wellbeing [JS, BO, WE, and OC], performance [IR and ER], and output [OM, OI, and IW].

However, as stated in the result section, we found 6-domains instead (see: Table 5). Not only that, we also found that the confounded dimensions aren't the same with the previously proposed model. We also have reasons to believe that our 6-domains model makes better sense than the previous one.

Table 5 Employee Engagement Domains

Domain	Dimension
Social Interaction	Quality Leadership
	Social Support
Membership	Organizational Commitment
	Organizational Identity
Job-Meaningfulness	Job Satisfaction
	Work Engagement
Distress Factor	Job Demand
	Burn-Out
Dedication	Extra-Role Performance
Norms and Responsibility Factor	Intra-Role Performance
	Innovative Work Behaviour
	Organizational Memory

The first domain we introduce is social interaction; it refers to the quality of all social interactions both stratified and between peers (De Jaegher et al, 2010). There are two dimensions joining this domain, which is quality leadership and social support. As stated earlier, leadership in this company signifies partnership, meaning supervisors and supervisees both working together as equal. Leaders are expected to be open, to be able to teach and to listen to their staffs' concerns. This dimension is closely related to social support because these leaders are also one major agent of support in the company. In addition to that, these

kinds of expectation on leaders would increase the social-bound between peers as well (Popper et al, 2000).

Membership is the second domain found in our model. It represents two dimensions of employee engagement; those are organizational commitment and organizational identity. Membership itself refers to social belongingness, in which an individual feels and believes that he/she is a part of a collective, hence he/she will behave accordingly toward the community wellbeing of the group (Cheney, 1983; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Abrams et al, 1998). The same law applies here. As a part of the company, individual will constantly evaluate the



meaning of that membership. In many ways, he/she will justify their membership by enhancing some differentiating qualities of the company. Should the result of such justification process is positive enough; it would increase their feeling of membership and result in organizational commitment to increase the community wellbeing of the company.

The third domain refers to the dimensions of job satisfaction and works engagement. We took the liberty of naming this dimension job-meaningfulness due to the personal nature of the two dimensions belong here. Compared to any other dimensions, these two are the only ones expressing the job as it is disregarding all other factors associated with it. Job-satisfaction, for instance, focuses on how happy and satisfied individual is in doing one's job. On the other hand, work-engagement focuses on how much one is looking forward to doing or keeps doing it. Hence, it makes sense to call it job-meaningfulness as it represents the meaning of the job for the employee.

In opposite of job-meaningfulness, we found the fourth domain, that is distress factors. This domain refers to the feelings of excessive pressure might be experienced by the employee that would potentially threaten the employee wellbeing. Two dimensions joining this domain is job-demand and burn out as the only two negative dimensions.

On the fifth domain, we see extra-role performance as dedication domain. This is the only domain that has only one dimension. As the domain name suggests, this one refers to the extra-mile an employee is willing to go for the company. This one domain is closely related to the sixth domain, which is norms and responsibility factor referring to the standards and work requirements attached to the job and position. This domain consists of three dimensions; those are intra-role performance, innovative work behavior, and organizational memory. Regarding these two last domains, however, we need to keep one major aspect in mind, that employee is always expected to fulfill one's responsibility before he/she can do more than required.

Theoretical Construct and Methodological Issue in Cultural Context

Given the significance of culture in our everyday life, it wouldn't be surprising if it also affects industrial climates (Greenberg&Baron, 2003; Gelfand et al, 2007). Some of the most prominent factors affecting working behavior is cultural value (Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001; Smith et al, 2002; Tsui, 2007; Farh et al, 2007), collectivism

(Moorman & Blakely, 1995; McCarty & Shrum, 2001), and gender role (Deaux&Major, 1987; Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Ong & Peletz, 1995), among others. On the other hand, we also know that most psychological constructs in industrial settings tend to fit better in wester-cultured countries and companies. With that said, adapting those theories as they are can be quite costly toward the validity of the findings' interpretation. Hence, in this last point, we would be discussing how culture will play its role in employee engagement, both theoretically and methodologically.

As previously described, we can see how this customized construct can be quite different than the commonly available ones. Even compared to Gallup's, this model seems to highly emphasize the social relationship of employees due to Indonesian's collectivistic culture. For example, we can take a look at the quality leadership dimension signifying partnership equality instead of subordination. This kind of relationship is more suitable for Indonesian employee as Indonesian tend to be more willing to follow those socially closer to them (Irawanto, 2017). It implicates professional relationship, where leaders then expected to be more of a friend than a boss. In practice, behaviors such this can be seen from day to day interactions where leaders asking for help instead of ordering their subordinates as orders would be seen as an act of distancing.

Another interesting finding is regarding male and female differences in employee engagement. As shown in the result above, men are significantly more engaged than women. We suspect that it is highly affected by gender role in Indonesia. Most Indonesian is still holding onto traditional patriarchy values where they believe that men should prioritize work while women do families (Tjandraningtyas et al, 2017). Looking the age average of women employee for our sample (32-yo), it is safe to assume that most of these women have young dependants. Hence, it was expected that men would have higher engagement level despite the insignificant difference in performance. With that result, we suggest considering the possibility of using two different norms to measure engagement between the two groups.

Not only regarding norms, there are other methodological aspects that are affected by culture. In this particular case, we found the test-retest reliability is quite low, ranging from .426 to .658 ($p=.000$). There was the possibility that some respondents tend to not take the second time measure seriously. This conclusion is



supported by our incidental observation reports noting the participants' reluctance on re-answering the questions as they found it annoying, boring, and unnecessary. With that considered, we are confident that this scale is reliable in measuring employee engagement for the company.

Cost and Benefit of Customize Employee Engagement Construct

Despite stating that customizing employee engagement construct is important and useful for this particular company, the same is not generalized to every company there is. At the end of the day, to the very least, customization is not easy nor is it cheap. It usually takes quite a long time to study and validate it as well; hence it is not a sound choice for every company. Given those in mind, there are some factors we need to consider in making this decision.

The first factor to discuss is the size and type of the company. In this context, size refers to the actual number of individuals working in the company along with its market share. While type refers to the degree of uniqueness of the company. The more atypical a company is, the more likely it has unique values as well meaning they might signify some qualities most companies don't.

Second, even if a company is unique and it has a lot of personnel; it doesn't necessarily mean that it needs one, at least not immediately. As stated earlier, a customized measure such this one is needed to operationalize a general concept of engagement in a contextual setting. What this context represents is actual values of a certain company. With that consideration, a customized measure will only be relevant when there is a set of clear code of conducts or ideals (Van Riel & Balmer, 1997). In another word, if a company isn't so clear on the message they are trying to convey, then making a customized employee engagement measure will not benefit them a bit.

On our case, though, this company has been one of the longest running companies in Indonesia. They have a clear set of value and guidelines implemented in their operational and strategically decision making. Hence, these measures would add some value to the company's human resources dynamic. In practice, this particular measure would help them determine what aspects of a job perceived to be threats to both workers and the company well-being. In conclusion, if they want to make a set of the customized construct such this one, there will be some

more questions to ask: do we need this customized construct immediately? What benefit are we going to gain by investing in this? Despite so, how soon can we see the return on the investment?

Let's, for example, imagine a company that is in need of a customized construct. This hypothetical company is ideal in size; it also has a set of values that are already operational. Now that we want to create a customized employee engagement measure, along with its construct, for them. The next thing we need is to determine a theoretical construct and the methodological approach most suitable for this certain company. Not only that, we also need to consider the degree of customization this company actually needs.

Ideally, every theoretical construct is different despite being conceptually similar. For example, in our case, we found that Gallup and Aon-Hewitt models are statistically similar to each other. And yet, both of them are two different constructs. Based on our finding, the construct used by this company (PLN, 2016) could be based mostly on Gallup's model. We would have to suspect this to be the case as this information was not disclosed previously despite cited. Should this construct model Gallup's, then there seems to be extensive customization conducted here, as they introduced some dimensions that weren't originally there. More on this will be clarified further on the next point of discussion.

Nevertheless, using that construct, we did take methodological liberty in contextualizing our measurement's items. We also adjusted the scoring procedure accordingly by using the total average of each dimension instead of the total item to measure the actual level of employee engagement. This was done in order to equalize the uneven items between some dimensions.

In summary, we believe that customized employee engagement survey would be beneficial for the bigger company with more established values or ideals. However, that wouldn't mean that smaller companies would not need a customized measure at all. With taking all cost into consideration, we are suggesting small companies to do a simpler customization of measure instead. This would be done by contextualizing an available construct instead of reconstructing a new one from scratch as this particular company did.



References

- Abraham, S. (2012). Job Satisfaction as an Antecedent to Employee Engagement. *SIES Journal of Management*, 8(2).
- Adelman, M. B. (1988). Cross-cultural adjustment: A theoretical perspective on social support. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 12(3), 183-204.
- Albrech, S. L. (2011). Handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research and practice. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 19(7).
- Albrecht, S. L. (2012). The influence of job, team and organizational level resources on employee well-being, engagement, commitment and extra-role performance: Test of a model. *International Journal of Manpower*, 33(7), 840-853.
- Andiyasari, A., Si, M., Pitaloka, A., & Si, M. (2010). Persepsi Kepemimpinan Otentik dan Work Engagement pada Generasi X & Y di Indonesia. *Jurnal Universitas Paramadina* vol, 7.
- Attridge, M. (2009). Measuring and managing employee work engagement: A review of the research and business literature. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 24(4), 383-398.
- Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., & Wilson, D. C. (2007). Engaging the aging workforce: The relationship between perceived age similarity, satisfaction with coworkers, and employee engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1542.
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Demerouti, E., & Euwema, M. C. (2007). 14 An organisational and social psychological perspective on burnout and work engagement. *The Scope of Social Psychology: Theory and Applications (A Festschrift for Wolfgang Stroebe)*, 227.
- 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.
- Bakker, A., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. (2003). Dual processes at work in a call centre: An application of the job demands–resources model. *European Journal of work and organizational psychology*, 12(4), 393-417.
- Bersin, J. (2015). Becoming irresistible: A new model for employee engagement. *Deloitte Review*, 16, 146-163.
- Brotheridge, C. M., & Grandey, A. A. (2002). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of “people work”. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 60(1), 17-39.
- Cascio, W. (2018). *Managing human resources*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Chalofsky, N., & Krishna, V. (2009). Meaningfulness, commitment, and engagement: The intersection of a deeper level of intrinsic motivation. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 11(2), 189-203.
- Christensen Hughes, J., & Rog, E. (2008). Talent management: A strategy for improving employee recruitment, retention and engagement within hospitality organizations. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(7), 743-757.



- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel psychology*, 64(1), 89-136.
- Crabtree, S. (2004). Getting personal in the workplace: Are negative relationships squelching productivity in your company. *Gallup Management Journal*, 10, 208.
- Crabtree, S. (2005). Engagement keeps the doctor away. *Gallup Management Journal*, 13(January), 1-4.
- Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: a theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 834.
- De Jaegher, H., Di Paolo, E., & Gallagher, S. (2010). Can social interaction constitute social cognition?. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 14(10), 441-447.
- Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behavior. *Psychological review*, 94(3), 369.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 86(3), 499.
- Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative science quarterly*, 239-263.
- Farh, J. L., Hackett, R. D., & Liang, J. (2007). Individual-level cultural values as moderators of perceived organizational support-employee outcome relationships in China: Comparing the effects of power distance and traditionalism. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(3), 715-729.
- Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. (2007). Cross-cultural organizational behavior. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 58, 479-514.
- Gellerman, S. (1959). The company personality. *Management Review*, 48, 69-76.
- Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. A. (2003). *Behavior in organizations: Understanding and managing the human side of work*. Pearson College Division.
- Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(2), 123-136.
- Guest, D. E. (1987). Human resource management and industrial relations [1]. *Journal of management Studies*, 24(5), 503-521.
- Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of school psychology*, 43(6), 495-513.
- Halbesleben, J. R. (2006). Sources of social support and burnout: a meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources model. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 91(5), 1134.



- Halbesleben, J. R., & Wheeler, A. R. (2008). The relative roles of engagement and embeddedness in predicting job performance and intention to leave. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 242-256.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Keyes, C. L. (2003). Well-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes: A review of the Gallup studies. *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well-lived*, 2, 205-224.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Agrawal, S., & Plowman, S. K. (2013). The relationship between engagement at work and organizational outcomes. *Gallup Poll Consulting University Press, Washington*.
- Haryanto, S. (2011). *Persepsi santri terhadap perilaku Kepemimpinan Kiai di Pondok Pesantren: Studi Interaksionisme Simbolik di Pondok Pesantren Sidogiri-Pasuruan* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim).
- Haslam, S. A., Van Knippenberg, D., Platow, M. J., & Ellemers, N. (2014). *Social identity at work: Developing theory for organizational practice*. Psychology Press.
- He, H., Zhu, W., & Zheng, X. (2014). Procedural justice and employee engagement: Roles of organizational identification and moral identity centrality. *Journal of business ethics*, 122(4), 681-695.
- Hewitt, A. (2012). 2012 Trends in global employee Engagement. *Aon Corporation*. Retrieved August, 11, 2013.
- Hewitt, A. (2012). Making Employee Engagement Happen, Best Practices from Best Employees.
- Hewitt, A. (2015). Aon Hewitt's model of employee engagement.
- Higgins, C., Duxbury, L., & Lee, C. (1994). Impact of life-cycle stage and gender on the ability to balance work and family responsibilities. *Family relations*, 144-150.
- Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. I. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of management review*, 25(1), 121-140.
- House, J. S. (1981). Work stress and social support pdf.
- Irawanto, D. W. (2017). Mencari gaya kepemimpinan yang tepat untuk indonesia: perspektif budaya nasional, kepemimpinan transformasional dan kepemimpinan paternalistik. *Journal of Management and Business Review*, 13(2).
- John, O. P., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2000). Measurement: Reliability, construct validation, and scale construction. *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Karasek Jr, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative science quarterly*, 285-308.
- Kim, Y. J., Van Dyne, L., Kamdar, D., & Johnson, R. E. (2013). Why and when do motives matter? An integrative model of motives, role cognitions, and social support as predictors of OCB. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 121(2), 231-245.



- Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (2001). The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams: The mediating role of employee resistance. *Academy of Management journal*, 44(3), 557-569.
- Kompaso, S. M., & Sridevi, M. S. (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. *International journal of business and management*, 5(12), 89.
- Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). Workplace social support and work–family conflict: A meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general and work–family-specific supervisor and organizational support. *Personnel psychology*, 64(2), 289-313.
- Le, H., Schmidt, F. L., Harter, J. K., & Lauver, K. J. (2010). The problem of empirical redundancy of constructs in organizational research: An empirical investigation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 112(2), 112-125.
- Legge, K. (1995). What is human resource management?. In *Human resource management* (pp. 62-95). Palgrave, London.
- Leiter, M. P., Bakker, A. B., & Maslach, C. (Eds.). (2014). *Burnout at work: A psychological perspective*. Psychology Press.
- Lin, C. P. (2010). Modeling corporate citizenship, organizational trust, and work engagement based on attachment theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(4), 517-531.
- Little, B., & Little, P. (2006). Employee engagement: Conceptual issues. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 10(1), 111.
- Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2001). Antecedents of organizational commitment and the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 16(8), 594-613.
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.
- McCarty, J. A., & Shrum, L. J. (2001). The influence of individualism, collectivism, and locus of control on environmental beliefs and behavior. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 20(1), 93-104.
- Meyer, J. P., & Gagne, M. (2008). Employee engagement from a self-determination theory perspective. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 60-62.
- Moorman, C., & Miner, A. S. (1997). The impact of organizational memory on new product performance and creativity. *Journal of marketing research*, 91-106.
- Moorman, C., & Miner, A. S. (1998). Organizational improvisation and organizational memory. *Academy of management Review*, 23(4), 698-723.
- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 16(2), 127-142.



- Morrow, P. C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. *Academy of management Review*, 8(3), 486-500.
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 17(2), 145-177.
- Ong, A., & Peletz, M. G. (Eds.). (1995). *Bewitching women, pious men: Gender and body politics in Southeast Asia*. Univ of California Press.
- Parker, S. K., & Sprigg, C. A. (1999). Minimizing strain and maximizing learning: the role of job demands, job control, and proactive personality. *Journal of applied psychology*, 84(6), 925.
- Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., Peeters, M. C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Hetland, J. (2012). Crafting a job on a daily basis: Contextual correlates and the link to work engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(8), 1120-1141.
- Pitt-Catsoupes, M., & Matz-Costa, C. (2008). The multi-generational workforce: Workplace flexibility and engagement. *Community, work and Family*, 11(2), 215-229.
- PLN. (2016) Executive Summary Employee Engagement Survey 2016.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creating unique value with customers. *Strategy & leadership*, 32(3), 4-9.
- Ray, E. B., & Miller, K. I. (1994). Social support, home/work stress, and burnout: Who can help?. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 30(3), 357-373.
- 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.
- Rowlinson, M., Booth, C., Clark, P., Delahaye, A., & Procter, S. (2010). Social remembering and organizational memory. *Organization studies*, 31(1), 69-87.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- Salanova, M., Lorente, L., Chambel, M. J., & Martínez, I. M. (2011). Linking transformational leadership to nurses' extra-role performance: the mediating role of self-efficacy and work engagement. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 67(10), 2256-2266.
- Schaufeli, W. & Salanova, M. (2007). Work engagement. *Managing social and ethical issues in organizations*, 135, 177.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2005). The conceptualization and measurement of burnout: Common ground and worlds apart. *Work & Stress*, 19(3), 256-262.



- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 66(4), 701-716.
- Scott, S. G., & Lane, V. R. (2000). A stakeholder approach to organizational identity. *Academy of Management review*, 25(1), 43-62.
- Shore, L. M., & Martin, H. J. (1989). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in relation to work performance and turnover intentions. *Human relations*, 42(7), 625-638.
- Shuck, B. (2011). Integrative literature review: four emerging perspectives of employee engagement: an integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 10(3), 304-328.
- Shuck, B., & Herd, A. M. (2012). Employee engagement and leadership: Exploring the convergence of two frameworks and implications for leadership development in HRD. *Human resource development review*, 11(2), 156-181.
- Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(1), 89-110.
- Shumaker, S. A., & Brownell, A. (1984). Toward a theory of social support: Closing conceptual gaps. *Journal of social issues*, 40(4), 11-36.
- Soane, E. (2014). Leadership and employee engagement. *Employee engagement in theory and practice*, 149-162.
- Sorenson, S. (2013). How employee engagement drives growth. *Gallup business journal*, 1, 1-4.
- Sulsky, L. M. (1999). *Review of Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application* (Vol. 40, No. 4, p. 383). Canadian Psychological Association.
- Tarique, I., & Schuler, R. S. (2010). Global talent management: Literature review, integrative framework, and suggestions for further research. *Journal of world business*, 45(2), 122-133.
- Tjandraningtyas, J.M., Cornelia, A., Kosasih A.B.A., & Lee., B. (2017). Achievement Motive and Its Hindrances Related To Gender Role and Expectation toward Women. *The 6th Asian Psychological Association Convention Preceeding*, p92-98.
- Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly III, C. A. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative science quarterly*, 549-579.
- Tsui, A. S., Nifadkar, S. S., & Ou, A. Y. (2007). Cross-national, cross-cultural organizational behavior research: Advances, gaps, and recommendations. *Journal of management*, 33(3), 426-478.
- Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2003). The group engagement model: Procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior. *Personality and social psychology review*, 7(4), 349-361.
- Tyler, T., & Blader, S. (2013). *Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity, and behavioral engagement*. Routledge.



- Van Riel, C. B., & Balmer, J. M. (1997). Corporate identity: the concept, its measurement and management. *European journal of marketing*, 31(5/6), 340-355.
- Walsh, J. P., & Ungson, G. R. (1991). Organizational memory. *Academy of management review*, 16(1), 57-91.
- Welch, M. (2011). The evolution of the employee engagement concept: communication implications. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 16(4), 328-346.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of management*, 17(3), 601-617.
- Wollard, K. K., & Shuck, B. (2011). Antecedents to employee engagement: A structured review of the literature. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), 429-446.
- Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. (1992). Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. *Journal of management*, 18(2), 295-320.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International journal of stress management*, 14(2), 121.
- Xu, J., & Cooper Thomas, H. (2011). How can leaders achieve high employee engagement?. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 32(4), 399-416.
- Yousef, D. A. (2000). Organizational commitment: A mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(1), 6-24.