



Self-efficacy, Quality of Work Life, and Organizational Commitment as Predictors for Work Engagement in Primary Healthcare Centers of Riyadh First Cluster, Saudi Arabia

Prof. Abdelmohsen A. Nassani

Professor in Business Administration College
King Saud University
Nassani@ksu.edu.sa

Abdulaziz A. Alkhulaifi

Human Resources Management Specialist
King Saud University
Abdulaziz.khlayfi@gmail.com

Muhammed K. Almuhawis

Human Resources Management Specialist
King Saud University
M-ipa@hotmail.com

Muhammad A. Alnujaidi

Human Resources Management Specialist
King Saud University
mohadnuj@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of self-efficacy, quality of work life, and organizational commitment as independent variables on work engagement. The study was conducted on employees of Primary Healthcare Centers of Riyadh first cluster in Saudi Arabia. The data was collected using electronic questionnaires and there were 222 respondents. The data was analyzed through descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviations, and correlation). Also, reliability analysis was applied to the data. Regression analysis was used to examine the influence of self-efficacy, quality of work life and organizational commitment on work engagement. The correlation between the quality of work life, organizational commitment, and work engagement was significantly high while it was moderately positive between self-efficacy and work engagement. This study is useful for top management and HR specialists. It demonstrates that in order to get employees engaged, it's necessary to provide them with high quality of work life, ensure they are committed to the organization and recruit employees with high self-efficacy.

Keywords: Quality of Work Life, Self-efficacy, Organizational Commitment, Work Engagement.

Introduction

Work engagement is the most critical factor for the success of any organization. When employees are engaged, they will exert the utmost effort to accomplish their jobs. According to Baumruk (2004) employee engagement is the first step toward the success of every organization and is the key to gain a competitive advantage. Employee engagement is the best tool to measure organizational performance. Employees are willing to work in an organization that has an engaged workforce and their participation in business decisions is encouraged (Hoffmeister, 2006). Employees need to have meaningful work so that they can practice their skills and feel that they contribute to the organization's success. In this way, organizations can attract and retain committed and engaged employees (Raynald, 2010). However, it's important to determine the factors that affect work engagement to establish an environment that leads to employee engagement (Heartfield, 2012). Maslach et al., (2001) suggested six elements of working life that lead to job burnout or engagement, they include "workload, rewards and recognition, community and social support, perceived justice, choice and control, and meaningfulness and value of work." These elements are the variables of QWL, and enhancing QWL can significantly affect work en-

* This article was submitted in May 2022, and accepted for publishing in July 2022.

© Arab Administrative Development Organization- League of Arab States, 2023, pp 375-386, DOI: 10.21608/AJA.2022.141043.1253



gement. Another factor that could directly enhance work engagement is self-efficacy, which is an individual's perception of his ability to accomplish work tasks, which can affect work engagement. Zeeshan (2021) stated that if employees have a high level of self-efficacy, they will be more engaged in their jobs. Moreover, organizational commitment has a significant effect on work engagement. Goutam (2004) suggested that commitment is the link between an employee and the organization. This is the first study in Saudi Arabia that examines the influence of independent variables combined together (self-efficacy, quality of work-life, and organizational commitment) on work engagement specifically in primary health care sector. Medical services are necessary for societies and by having engaged employees will contribute positively and sustain these services. this study will discover the variables that can lead to work engagement. Our present study on employees of Primary Healthcare Centers of Riyadh First Cluster, Saudi Arabia assumes that QWL, organizational commitment, and self-efficacy have a direct positive effect on work engagement, and with the support of other studies, we will try to prove our claims.

Theoretical Background and Hypothesis Development

The relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement

Self-efficacy can be defined as the belief of an individual that he or she can perform job tasks successfully based on his or her personal competencies (Bandura, 1997). In addition, Bandura (1997) stated that self-efficacy is related to one's beliefs about doing a given task successfully. Kreitner & Kinicki (2013) defined self-efficacy as the ability degree of perform the tasks completely in the thoughts of an individual. If people feel that they can do their work tasks as well as accomplishing their work goals, they will be more satisfied with their jobs (Lent et al., 2011). People with high levels of self-efficacy are expected to be better and more confident in dealing with demanding tasks and able to generate multiple solutions. If employees are empowered and given control over their tasks by their leaders, this will enforce their inner beliefs of themselves and will make them perform well on the tasks (Luthans et al., 2007). According to Bandura (1997), there are four primary sources that achieve self-efficacy: mastery experiences through performance accomplishment, vicarious expertise through social modeling, verbal persuasion through social encouragement, and emotional arousal through the management of one's physiological self. Using these four sources to increase self-efficacy will result in increasing of motivational, emotional, cognitive, and decision-making abilities (Bandura, 1997). People with a high level of self-efficacy are better at solving problems than those with a low level of efficacy (Heuven et al., 2006). Bakker and Demerouti (2007) suggested that the availability of job resources such as (supervisor support and feedback) and personal resources such as (self-efficacy and optimism) increase employee engagement. Personal resources refer to individual's belief about work tasks and the impact that he or she can create on the working environment (Hobfoll et al., 2003). Researchers started to study how personal resources affect employee engagement in the job demand resource model (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009). Self-efficacy is considered to be a psychological state of employees' well-being and has a relationship with employee engagement (Schaufeli, salanova, 2007; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). A recent study by Zeeshan (2021) stated that if employees have a high level of self-efficacy, they will be more engaged in their jobs. This study is consistent with the study of (Salanova et al., 2011; De Simon et al., 2018) who all reported that self-efficacious employees have high levels of engagement. With the support of previous studies, we will formulate the first hypothesis of this study:

H1: Self-efficacy has a positive effect on work engagement.

The relationship between quality of work life and work engagement

Quality of work life is a process that an organization takes to address the needs of its employees and to create a mechanism to make them fully involved in decisions making that forms their lives in the workplace (Robbin & Judge, 2017). QWL can be considered as a desired workplace, and through QWL programs organizations can make a healthy working environment that makes employees comfortable and involved in

their work. QWL includes aspects such as wages, working hours, work environment, and human relations, which are related to employees' satisfaction and motivation. According to Walton (1973), the QWL plays a significant role in contributing to the human values that have been neglected in favor of technological and economic growth. Mirvis and Lawler (1984) considered fair wages, opportunities for growth, and a safe working environment as the essentials of a good quality of work life. Klatt, Murdick, and Schuster (In Khera, 2015) stated eleven dimensions of QWL and they include (salary, work stress, organizational health programs, flexible working hours, participating in work management and control, complaints procedures, adequacy of resources, seniority and worth, permanent promotion, and development and employment). QWL incorporates two perspectives; the first one is work-related factors such as relationships with co-workers or monetary benefits. The second perspective is life-related factors such as satisfaction with life and a state of general well-being (Danna & Griffin, 1999; Tabassum et al., 2011). According to Wagner and Harter (2006), two factors determine the perception of QWL, and they are manageable and under the control of immediate supervisor. The first factor is feeling appreciated for performing meaningful work. The second factor, employees also want to feel like 'their work matters.' Besides QWL, work engagement is also an important element that contributes to organizational growth and effectiveness. Work engagement is a condition in which employees perceive that they get the attention and the welfare of the organization. Engaging in a work means that employees feel that their work is part of them, and will do their best to contribute to the success of their organization. Work engagement will lead to high productivity, less absenteeism, and turnover. Employees who are engaged in their work will have no thoughts to leave the organization (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Schaufeli et al. (2002, p. 74) defined work engagement as "a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption." Vigor is exerting a high level of performance even when the work is challenging. Dedication is insisting, inspiration, enthusiasm, and involvement in the work. Absorption is concentration and engrossing while doing the work. QWL could affect work engagement, and improvements in QWL practices will increase the engagement of employees. A study by (Kanten, Sadullah 2012) concluded that high levels of QWL will lead to an increase in work engagement as well as low levels of QWL will lead to a decrease in work engagement, thus QWL affects work engagement. Another study which was conducted by Semwal, Dhyan, and PS (2019) stated that there is a relationship between QWL and work engagement. The researchers reached that QWL has an impact on employee engagement variables. Therefore, we formulate the second hypothesis:

H2: Quality of work life has a positive effect on work engagement.

The relationship between organizational commitment and work engagement

Organizational commitment is developed by scholars and practitioners who are interested in the field of industrial and organizational psychology (Bolino, Klotz, Turnley, and Harvey, 2013). Organizational commitment can be defined as the intentions of an employee to stay with an organization, and support its goals (Mitonga-monga, Cilliers, 2016; Rafiee, Bahrami, and Entezarian, 2015). Employees who are committed to their organization consider themselves to be a part of it and thus will exert high performance in order to make an organization succeed. In addition, organizational commitment is considered to be a psychological bond with an organization and acting in manners that contribute to the organization's growth (Mitonga-Monga, Cilliers, 2016). Organizational commitment, which was developed by Meyer and Allen (1997), is considered to be an effective attachment of an employee towards his organization. Committed employees identify themselves with their organization, dedicate themselves to its successes, work on its behalf, and are loyal to their organizations (Mitonga-Monga & Cilliers, 2016; Nguyen, Felfe, and Fooker, 2014). Committed employees tend to be highly engaged in their work and thus satisfied with their jobs (Mitonga-Monga, Flotman and Cilliers, 2017). Organizational commitment can be linked to work engagement since engaged employees are psychologically, physically, and emotionally connected to their organization. Organizational commitment can reduce unde-

sirable behaviors such as absenteeism and turnover intentions (Al Sahi Al Zaabi, Ahmad, and Hossan 2016). According to Robyn and Mitonga-Monga (2017), engaged employees show a high degree of organizational loyalty. Employees with a high level of work engagement are seen as committed, loyal, productive, and excellent achievers of organizational goals (Choi et al., 2018). Managers play a critical role in enhancing employees' engagement by encouraging them to see a wider context and to create a positive relationship between employees and managers which leads to a better work place and thus increases the possibilities of organizational commitment (Harter et al., 2002). Also, leadership style can affect employees' commitment to an organization (Keskes, 2013). Other factors can increase work engagement. A good rewarding system, as well as working conditions, leads to more engaged and committed employees (Albrecht, 2010). Engaged employees are linked with their commitment toward their organizations and their intentions to stay with them (Abraham, 2012). According to Agyeman & Ofei (2013), there is a positive relationship between work engagement and organizational commitment. A study conducted by Khalid & Khalid (2015) suggested that organizational commitment positively correlated with employee engagement and career satisfaction. Thus, we will formulate the third hypothesis of this study:

H3: Organizational commitment has a positive effect on work engagement.

Methodology

Sample and data collection (questionnaire design)

This study's goal is to examine the relationship between self-efficacy, quality of work life and organizational commitment with work engagement employees of Primary Healthcare Centers of Riyadh's first cluster in Saudi Arabia.

Data was collected by using an internet-based questionnaire using Google Forms. The questionnaire consisted of two categories. The first category was related to the respondents' demographic information (gender, age, and years of experience) and the second category included 62 items associated with the research variables. 7 items to measure self-efficacy, 34 items to measure the quality of work life, 12 items to measure work engagement, and 9 items to measure organizational commitment. However, some items have been omitted from the scales, other items have been reversely coded for analysis to improve the instruments' quality. The useable responses received were 222 responses and the data was collected in approximately three weeks. Various authors support utilizing the five-point Likert scale because it is easy to understand and less confusing. Also, the five-point Likert scale helps to generate higher quality responses as well as higher response rates compared to other Likert scales (Babakus & Mangold, 1992; Bouranta, Chitiris, & Paravantis, 2009; Jenkins & Taber, 1977; Lissitz & Green, 1975; Saleh & Ryan, 1991). Thus, the components were measured on a five-point Likert type scale with respondents having the options to choose from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree.

Measures

Self-efficacy

The general self-efficacy scale of Ralf Schwarzer and Matthias Jerusalem (1995) was adopted to measure this construct. We conducted 7 items to evaluate self-efficacy. Examples of items are "If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution"; "I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events" and "I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough".

Quality of work life

The quality of work life scale developed by Marshall Sashkin and Joseph Lengermann (1984) was used to measure this variable. This scale includes two parts, the first one is quality of work life condition and the

second part is quality of work life feeling. 34 statements have been used to evaluate the quality of work life. Examples of these statements are “my job gives me a chance to do the things that I do best.”; “I like the sort of work that I am doing.”; “My job is a rewarding experience.” and “People in my position work alone, on their tasks, with little or no interpersonal contact”.

Organizational commitment

the shortened version of the organizational commitment scale was adopted, the scale was developed by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) which consisted of 9 items. These items included: “I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.”; “I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization”; and “I really care about the fate of this organization”.

Work engagement

We adopted Gallup Q12 which is also called Gallup Workplace Audit for measuring employee work engagement. It is considered a trusted scale to measure employee work engagement (Luthans and Peterson, 2002). the scale items included: “I know what is expected of me at work.”; “The mission or purpose of my company makes me feel my job is important.”; and “I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right”.

Data Analysis

SPSS Version 26 and Microsoft Excel 2016 were used to analyze the findings. Means and Standard Deviations were calculated, which provided us with a more extensive view of the data. Stepwise regression analysis was also used to examine the influence of independent variables on the dependent variable.

Results

Descriptive statistics

The participants’ demographic variables as shown in Table 1 determined that 51.4% (N=114) of employees were males, and 48.6% (N=108) were females. Additionally, their age ranged from 20 to 29 years old (6.8%), 30 to 39 years old (39.2%), 40 to 49 years old (38.7%), and more than 50 years old (15.3%). Finally, the respondents’ years of experience was as follows: less than 5 years (7.7%), from 5 to less than 10 years (16.7%), from 10 to less than 15 years (20.3%), and more than 15 years of experience (55.4%).

Means, Standard deviations, and correlation analysis of scales

Table 2 demonstrated the mean and standard deviation scores; it also shows the correlations among the study variables used. self-efficacy with the highest mean score of 3.96 (SD=0.63), quality of work life mean score was 3.73(SD=0.76), and organizational commitment with a mean score of 3.84(SD=0.88). Finally, work engagement mean score was 3.73(SD=0.83).

A Pearson correlation was conducted to examine the hypothesis regarding the relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement, quality of work life and work engagement, and organizational commitment and work engagement as demonstrated in Table 2.

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of respondents

| Variable | N (%) |
|-----------------------------------|------------|
| Gender | |
| Male | 114(51.4%) |
| Female | 108(48.6%) |
| Total | 222(100%) |
| Age | |
| From 20 to 29 years old | 15(6.8%) |
| From 30 to 39 years old | 87(39.2%) |
| From 40 to 49 years old | 86(38.7%) |
| More than 50 years old | 34(15.3%) |
| Total | 222(100%) |
| Experience | |
| Less than 5 years | 17(7.7%) |
| From 5 to less than 10 years | 37(16.7%) |
| From 10 to less than 15 years old | 45(20.3%) |
| More than 15 years | 123(55.4%) |
| Total | 222(100%) |

According to the findings, Pearson product correlation between Self-efficacy and work engagement was found to be moderately positive and statistically significant ($r=0.611$, $p<0.01$). Then, Pearson correlation between Quality of work life and work engagement was found to be highly positive and statistically significant ($r=0.738$, $p<0.01$). Also, the correlation between organizational commitment and work engagement was found to be highly positive and statistically significant ($r=0.851$, $p<0.01$).

Reliability analysis of the scales

Reliability is commonly known as the extent to which the scales used are error-free and thus, consistent (Nunnally et al., 1994). Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the reliability of the instrument and determine the consistency of the measurement based on the responses received. Nunnally et al. (1994) suggested that Cronbach's alpha value must be at least .60 and values above 0.70 are considered greatly reliable.

Table 3 demonstrates the reliability analysis of the scales. The Cronbach's alpha for the self-efficacy scale was 0.846, the reliability analysis of the quality of work life scale was 0.863. Finally, the Cronbach's Alpha for organizational commitment and work engagement scales was 0.929 and 0.925 respectively. The scales are considered acceptable and reliable based on these findings

Table 3: Cronbach's Alpha

| Variable | Cronbach's Alpha | No. of Items |
|---------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Self-efficacy | 0.846 | 7 |
| Quality of work life | 0.863 | 34 |
| Organizational commitment | 0.929 | 12 |
| Work engagement | 0.925 | 9 |

Regression analysis

Stepwise regression analysis was used to examine the influence of self-efficacy, quality of work life, and organizational commitment on work engagement as shown in table 4. Self-efficacy, Quality of work life, and Organizational commitment are used as the independent variables while Work engagement is taken as the dependent variable. The stepwise Regression analysis has been done on these variables.

As demonstrated in table 4, organizational commitment, quality of work life, and self-efficacy were entered for the stepwise multiple regression equation and the results showed that all independent variables (organizational commitment, quality of work life, and self-efficacy) were significant for the prediction of work engagement. Results demonstrated that 76.7% of the variance in work engagement was significantly predicted by organizational commitment ($\beta=0.54$; $p<0.01$), quality of work life ($\beta=0.27$; $p<0.01$), and self-efficacy ($\beta=0.20$; $p<0.01$). Thus, based on these findings we can conclude that H1, H2, and H3 are supported.

Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate the impact of self-efficacy, organizational commitment, and quality of work life on work engagement among employees of Primary Healthcare Centers of Riyadh first clus-

Table 2 Mean, standard deviation and correlation

| Variable | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|-------------------------------|------|------|--------|--------|--------|---|
| (1) Self-Efficacy | 3.96 | 0.63 | 1 | | | |
| (2) Quality of work life | 3.73 | 0.76 | .439** | 1 | | |
| (3) Organizational Commitment | 3.84 | 0.88 | .607** | .734** | 1 | |
| (4) Work Engagement | 3.73 | 0.83 | .611** | .738** | .851** | 1 |

Table 4: Stepwise Multiple Regression Predicting Work engagement

| Variables | R | R ² | Adj R ² | SEm | F-value | β |
|---------------------------|------|----------------|--------------------|------|---------|---------|
| Model 1: | | | | | | |
| Organizational Commitment | .851 | .725 | .724 | .441 | 579.6** | .803** |
| Model 2: | | | | | | |
| Organizational Commitment | .868 | .753 | .750 | .419 | 333.2** | .633** |
| Quality of work life | | | | | | .270** |
| Model 3: | | | | | | |
| Organizational Commitment | | | | | 239.3** | .545** |
| Quality of work life | .876 | .767 | .764 | .407 | | .272** |
| Self-efficacy | | | | | | .200** |

Note: ** significant at 0.01 level.

ter, Saudi Arabia. According to the results of this study, there is a moderate relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement. So, the first hypothesis is accepted. This result is in the line with other previous studies. According to an empirical study by (Na-Nan, Kanthong, and Joungtrakul; 2021) stated that self-efficacy influences employee engagement since an employee with high self-efficacy is confident, committed, motivated, and vigorous and that will lead him toward more work engagement. Yakin and Erdil (2012) found that self-efficacy influences employee engagement with a statistical significance of 0.05. In addition, Chaudhary, et al (2012) tested the impact of self-efficacy on employee engagement of middle management in public and private agencies and found that employees with high self-efficacy influence their engagement with a statistical significance of 0.05.

Quality of work life (QWL) has a high correlation with work engagement. This result is consistent with the findings of Nugroho, et.al (2018) and Kurniawati (2018) that proved that QWL has a significant influence on employee engagement. It also confirmed the results of Hakim and Bross (2016) who found that QWL directly influences 28% of employee engagement. Furthermore, empirical evidence from Alqarni (2016) stated that the dimensions of QWL are significantly correlated with work engagement. In addition, Irmawati and Wulandari (2017) suggested that QWL partially affects work engagement. Moreover, Rahmayuni and Ratnaningsish (2018) results confirmed that there is a positive relationship between QWL and work engagement. Hence, it's important to consider QWL as an important element that will lead to work engagement. Thus, to ensure that employees of Primary Healthcare Centers of Riyadh first cluster in Saudi Arabia are engaged, we need to provide them with a high level of QWL. So, the result of this study along with previous studies support the second hypothesis that QWL affects work engagement.

The third hypothesis is that organizational commitment has an effect on work engagement. The result of this study shows that there is a high positive correlation between organizational commitment and work engagement. This result is consistent with the findings of Beukes and Botha (2013) that suggested that there is a relationship between organizational commitment and work engagement. The more committed employee, the more involved he is in the work. Also, a study by Nugroho & Fithriana (2020) supports this correlation that organizational commitment has a relationship with work engagement that is positive and significant. By the support of the result of this study as well as the results of previous studies, the third hypothesis is accepted that organizational commitment has a significant influence on work engagement. Thus, if we reinforce employees of Primary Healthcare Centers of Riyadh first cluster to be committed, they will be also engaged.

Conclusion

Work engagement is so important for the success of every organization. Once employees get engaged with their organization, they will dedicate themselves to the organization's success and growth. This study was conducted on employees of Primary Healthcare Centers of Riyadh's first cluster, Saudi Arabia. We examined the impacts of self-efficacy, quality of work life, and organizational commitment on work engagement. Each one of the independent variables affects work engagement. QWL and organizational commitment have the most effects on work engagement, whereas the effect of self-efficacy on work engagement was moderate. These results are in a line with various previous studies on the same variables. Self-efficacy, which is an individual's thoughts about his ability to accomplish his job is crucial for an employee to be confident to perform tasks efficiently. QWL which is related to a positive work environment affect employees psychologically and makes them motivated to accomplish their work. Organizational commitment, which is the loyalty of an employee toward his organization, makes the employee committed and seeks to flourish and growth of his organization. Each of which has a relationship with work engagement. Organizations need to pay attention to these factors and work to enhance them among employees and consider them as a competitive advantage that will make them able to compete and stay in the market.

Practical implications

First, organizations can use the results of this study to foster self-efficacy among workers to improve their work engagement. According to the findings, self-efficacy positively influences the employees' engagement within the organization. When their engagement is improved, the quality of services or productivity improves within the organization. For example, organizations can implement this process by providing self-monitory tools to enable the workers to monitor their performances. Besides, they can use promotional activities to improve the need for self-efficacy and monitoring. Thus, they can use the findings of this study to improve self-efficacy among employees to maintain high productivity.

Second, the organization can improve the quality of work-life to improve engagement and productivity. The quality of work life is one of the reasons workers often provide high productivity within the organization. The high performance is attributed to the employee engagement and motivation provided through the quality of work life. For example, they can create an environment that promotes a better employee experience and provides incentives for high performance, hygiene, and reasonable workload. Hence, this study would enable them to adopt the quality of work-life to ensure that the employees are motivated to high performances.

finally, the findings provide a reliable strategy to ensure that employees in the organization are committed to the firm's performance, vision, and mission. The commitment ensures that they connect or bond with the employer and enjoy their work life. The primary method that the firms can use to promote such commitments is to adopt various strategies that improve the employees' commitment. For example, the discussed quality of work life, incentives, benefits and pay, team building activities, and reward schemes or programs can enable the firms to improve the employees' commitment within the firm. Consequently, the findings imply that the employees' engagement would improve.

Limitations and future research

This study was conducted on employees of Primary Healthcare Centers of Riyadh first cluster, Saudi Arabia. So, the findings are limited to employees of this center and cannot be generalized to all employees in Saudi Arabia. In addition to geographical limitations, the focus of the study was on three variables that affect work engagement which include self-efficacy, Quality of work life, organizational commitment. Other important variables haven't been investigated such as organization culture, job burnout, and compensation. All of which can lead to work engagement. We recommend future researchers to examine the effects of other variables (organization culture, job burnout, and compensation) along with the independent variables of this study on work engagement. Also, since this study investigated the direct relationships between variables, we suggested that future research to examine the mediating role of job satisfaction between the variables.

References

- Agyemang, C. B. & Ofei, S. B. (2013, December). "Employee Work Engagement And Organizational Commitment: A Comparative Study Of Private and Public Sector Organizations in Ghana", *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, 1 (4), 1-14.
- Alqarni, S. (2016). "Quality of Work Life as a Predictor of Work Engagement among the Teaching Faculty at King Abdulaziz University", *International Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 6, 118–135.
- Al Sahi Al Zaabi, M. S.; Ahmad, K. Z. & Hossan, C. (2016). "Authentic Leadership, Work Engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Petroleum Company", *International Journal of Productivity And Performance Management*, 65 (6), 811–830. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijppm-01-2016-0023>
- Adi, A. N. & Fithriana, N. (2020). "How the Workplace Spirituality Influences Work Engagement Through Organizational Commitment: Evidence From Banking Industry", *Management Science Letters*, 3375–3386. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.5.041>
- Abraham, S. (2012a). "Development of Employee Engagement Programme on the Basis of Employee Satisfaction Survey", *Journal of Economic Development, Management, it, Finance and Marketing*, Vol. 4, No. 1, Pp. 27-3
- Babakus, E. & Mangold, W. G. (1992). "Adapting the Servqual Scale to Hospital Services: An Empirical Investigation", *Health Services Research*, 26(6), 767–786.
- Baumruk, R. (2004). The Missing Link: The Role of Employee Engagement in Business Successes", *Workspan*, Vol. 47, Pp. 48-52.
- Bolino, M. C.; Klotz, A. C.; Turnley, W. H. & Harvey, J. (2012). "Exploring the Dark Side of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34 (4), 542–559. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1847>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands Resources Model: State Of The Art. *Journal Of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bandura, A. (1977). :Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change", *Psychological Review*, 84 (2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.84.2.191>
- Beukes, I. & Botha, E. (2013). "Organisational Commitment, Work Engagement and Meaning of Work of Nursing Staff In Hospitals", *Sa Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 39 (2), 10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v39i2.1144>
- Bouranta, N.; Chitiris, L. & Paravantis, J. (2009). "The Relationship between Internal and External Service Quality", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 21 (3), 275–293.
- Chaudhary, R.; Rangnekar, S.; Barua, M. K. (2012). Impact of Occupational Self-efficacy on Employee Engagement: An Indian Perspective", *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 38, 329–338.
- Danna, K. & Griffin, R. W. (1999). "Health and Well-being in the Workplace: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature", *Journal of Management*, 25 (3), 357-384
- De Simone, S.; Planta, A. & Cicotto, G. (2018). "The Role of Job Satisfaction, Work Engagement, Self-efficacy and Agentic Capacities on Nurse's Turnover Intention and Patient Satisfaction", *Applied Nursing Research*, 39, 130–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2017.11.004>
- Rafiee, N.; Bahrami, M. & Entezarian, S. (2015). "Demographic Determinants of Organizational Commitment of Health Managers in Yazd Province", *International Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics*, 2 (1), 91–100. https://doi.org/https://www.ijmae.com/article_115386_2f694d1affb979de8297eca06e05593a.pdf

- Gautam, T.; Van Dick, R. & Wagner, U. (2004). "Organizational Identification and Organizational Commitment: Distinct Aspects of Two Related Concepts", *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7, 301–315. [Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1111/J.1467-839x.2004.00150.X](http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1111/J.1467-839x.2004.00150.X)
- Hakim, Rahman Dan Bross, Noverdi. (2016). "Pengaruh Kualitas Kehidupan Kerja Dan Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Keterikatan Karyawan, Study Kasus Pt Sucofindo", *Jurnal Kesejahteraan Sosial*, Vol. 3, (1)
- Harter, J. K.; Schmidt, F. L. & Hayes, T. L. (2002). "Business-Unit-Level Relationship between Employee Satisfaction, Employee Engagement, and Business Outcomes: A Meta-analysis", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (2), 268-279.
- Heartfield. (2012). Path-goal Theory of Organizational Commitment", *Journal of Contemporary Business*. 81-88.
- Heuven, E.; Bakker, A. B.; Schaufeli, W. B. & Huisman, N. (2006). "The Role of Self-efficacy in Performing Emotion Work", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69 (2), 222–235. [Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Jvb.2006.03.002](https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Jvb.2006.03.002)
- Hobfoll, S. E.; Johnson, R. J.; Ennis, N., & Jackson, A. P. (2003). "Resource Loss, Resource Gain and Emotional Outcomes among Inner City Women", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84 (3), 632. [Https://Doi.Org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.3.632](https://Doi.Org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.3.632)
- Hoffmeister, K. (2006). *How Diversity and Engagement Drive Performance?*. Gallup Consulting.
- Jenkins, G. D. & Taber, T. D. (1977). "A Monte Carlo Study of Factors Affecting Three Indices of Composite Scale Reliability", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62 (4), 392–398.
- Kanten, S. & Sadullah, O. (2012). "An Empirical Research on Relationship Quality of Work Life and Work Engagement", *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 62, 360–366. [Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Sbspro.2012.09.057](https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Sbspro.2012.09.057)
- Khalid, A. & Khalid, S. (2015). "Relationship between Organizational Commitments, Employee Engagement and Career Satisfaction: A Case of University of Gujrat, Pakistan", *Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. 3 (3), 323-330.
- Khera, A. (2015). "Impact of Quality of Work Life on Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study on Nurses of Government Hospital in Chandigarh (India)", *The International Journal of Business & Management*, 3(8), 34-45.
- Kurniawati, C. E. (2018). "Pengaruh Quality of Work Life Terhadap Work Engagement Dan Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Pada Perusahaan Elektronik Di Surabaya", *Agora*, 6 (2): 1-6.
- Lissitz, R. W. & Green, S. B. (1975). "Effect of the Number of Scale Points on Reliability: A Monte Carlo Approach", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60 (1), 10–13.
- Luthans, F. & Peterson, S. J. (2002). "Employee Engagement and Manager Self Efficacy: Implications for Managerial Effectiveness and Development", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 21 No. 5, Pp. 376-87.
- Luthans, F.; Avolio, B. J.; Avey, J. B. & Norman, S. M. (2007). "Psychological Capital: Measurement And Relationship With Performance and Satisfaction", *Personnel Psychology*, 60 (3), 541–572. [Https://Doi.Org/10.1111/J.1744-6570.2007.00083.X](https://Doi.Org/10.1111/J.1744-6570.2007.00083.X)
- Maslach, C.; Schaufeli, W. B. & Leiter, M. P. (2001). "Job Burnout", *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, Pp. 397-422.

- Mitonga-Monga, J. & Cilliers, F. (2016). "Perceived Ethical Leadership in Relation to Employees' Organisational Commitment in an Organisation in the Democratic Republic of Congo", *African Journal of Business Ethics*, 10 (1). <https://doi.org/10.15249/10-1-122>
- Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Application*. Managing for Commitment, 66-90. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231556.N5>
- Mirvis, P. H. & Lawler Iii, E. E. (1984). "Accounting for the Quality of Work Life", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 5 (3), 197-212.
- Mowday, R. T.; Steers, R. M. & Porter, L. W. (1979). "The Measurement of Organizational Commitment", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224–247.
- Na-Nan, K.; Kanthong, S. & Amp; Joungrakul, J. (2021). "An Empirical Study on the Model of Self-efficacy and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Transmitted Through Employee Engagement, Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction in the Thai Automobile Parts Manufacturing Industry", *Journal of Open Innovation, Technology, Market, And Complexity*, 7 (3), 170. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7030170>
- Nguyen, P.; Felfe, J. & Fookien, I. (2013). "Antecedents of Commitment to a Parent Company and to a Local Operation: Empirical Evidence from Western Employees Working for Multinational Companies in Vietnam", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24 (7), 1346–1375. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.706820>
- Nugroho, A. R.; Budi, W. & Susanto, B. (2018). "Pengaruh Quality of Work Life Dan Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional Terhadap Employee Engagement Pada Karyawan Cv. X Cabang Kabupaten Tulungagung Dan Blitar", *Jurnal Psikologi Poseidon-Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi Kemaritiman*, 1 (1): 1-13.
- Mitonga-Monga, J.; Flotman, A. & Amp; Cilliers, F. V. N. (2017). "Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Railway Employees in a Developing Country: Effects of Age, Education and Tenure. *Southern African Business Review*, 21, 385–406.
- Robyn, C. M. & Amp; Mitonga-Monga, J. (2017). "Psychological Capital and Work Engagement in Relation to Employee Commitment in a South African Manufacturing Organization", *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 14, 702–730.
- Rahmayuni, T. D. & Ratnaningsih, I. Z. (2018). "Hubungan Antara Kualitas Kehidupan Kerja Dengan Keterikatan Kerja Pada Wartawan Tv X Jakarta", *Jurnal Empati*, 7 (1), 373- 380.
- Raynald. (2010). *Employee Engagement*. Diversity Inc.
- Robbins, S. P. & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational Behavior*. 17th Edition. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Salanova, M.; Lorente, L.; Chambel, M. J. & Martinez, 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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2011.05652.x>
- Saleh, F. & Ryan, C. (1991). "Analysing Service Quality in the Hospitality Industry Using the Servqual Model", *Service Industries Journal*, 11 (3), 324–345.
- Schaufeli, W. B. and Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job Demands, Job Resources and Their Relationship With Burnout and Engagement: A Multisample Study", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, Pp. 293-315.

- Schaufeli, W. B. & Salanova, M. (2007). "Work Engagement: An Emerging Psychological Concept and its Implications for Organizations", In: S. W. Gilliland; D. D. Steiner & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), ***Research in Social Issues in Management***, (Volume 5): Managing Social and Ethical Issues in Organizations, Pp. 135–177.
- 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.
- Semwal, M.; Dhyani, A. & Amp; Ps, V. (2019). "Quality of Work Life and its Influence on Employee Engagement Evidence from Selected Manufacturing Units in India", ***Nice Journal of Business***, 14 (1&2), 100–114.
- Tabassum, A.; Rahman, T. & Jahan, K. (2011). "A Comparative Analysis of Quality of Work Life Among the Employees of Local Private and Foreign Commercial Banks in Bangladesh", ***World Journal of Social Sciences***, 1 (1), 17-33.
- Wagner, R. & Harter, J. K. (2006). 12: ***The Elements of Great Managing***, Vol. 978, No. 1-59992.
- Walton, R. E. (1973). "Quality of Working Life: What is it?", ***Sloan Management Review***, 15 (1), 11- 21.
- Xanthopoulou, D.; Bakker, A. B.; Demerouti, E. & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). «The British Psychological Society Work Engagement and Financial Returns: A Diary Study on the Role of Job and Personal Resources», ***The British Psychological Society***, 82 (1), 183–200. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317908x285633>
- 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), 121–141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.14.2.121>
- Yakın, M. & Amp; Erdil, O. (2012). "Relationships between Self-efficacy and Work Engagement and the Effects on Job Satisfaction: A Survey on Certified Public Accountants", ***Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences***, 58, 370–378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.1013>
- Zeeshan, S.; Ng, S. I.; Ho, J. A. & Amp; Jantan, A. H. (2021). "Assessing the Impact of Servant Leadership on Employee Engagement Through the Mediating Role of Self-efficacy in the Pakistani Banking Sector", ***Cogent Business & Amp; Management***, 8 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1963029>