

## **INVESTIGATION OF EMPLOYEES MOTIVATION AND EMPLOYEES IN MANUFACTURING COMPANY IN SURABAYA**

Edith Primadiana Tedjokusumo  
Polytechnic, University of Surabaya, edith@ubaya.ac.id

### *Abstract*

Employee engagement has become a popular topic in Indonesia in the past decade. Based on surveys conducted by several survey institutes in 2012 and 2014, employee engagement has been revealed in Indonesia and shows surprising results over the period. The results of the survey were obtained from answers of various employees from various companies, which led to the possibility of differences in work motivation of each employee. So, this research appears by linking employee work motivation with employee engagement. This study aims to examine the relationship of work motivation with employee attachment to a large manufacturing company in Surabaya. The sample is taken from the total number of employees on a certain unit who is a permanent employee of the company. Measurement using questionnaires with Likert scale. Validity and reliability tests show good results. In addition, there are Test F, Test t and regression analysis. The result of the research shows that there is a correlation between work motivation and employee attachment in general, although in some variables show different result.

Keywords: Work motivation, Employee engagement

### *Abstrak*

Keterikatan karyawan telah menjadi sebuah topik populer di Indonesia pada satu dekade terakhir ini. Berdasarkan survei yang telah dilaksanakan oleh beberapa lembaga survei pada tahun 2012 dan 2014, telah terungkap adanya keterikatan karyawan di Indonesia dan menunjukkan hasil yang cukup mengejutkan dalam kurun waktu tersebut. Hasil survei tersebut diperoleh dari jawaban beragam karyawan dari berbagai macam perusahaan, yang memunculkan kemungkinan perbedaan motivasi kerja dari tiap karyawan tersebut. Maka penelitian ini muncul dengan mengaitkan motivasi kerja karyawan dengan keterikatan karyawan. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menelaah adanya keterkaitan motivasi kerja dengan keterikatan karyawan pada sebuah perusahaan manufaktur besar di Surabaya. Sampel diambil dari keseluruhan jumlah karyawan pada unit tertentu yang merupakan karyawan tetap pada perusahaan tersebut. Pengukuran menggunakan kuesioner dengan skala Likert. Uji validitas dan reliabilitas menunjukkan hasil yang baik. Selain itu ada Uji F, Uji t serta analisis regresi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan adanya keterkaitan motivasi kerja dan keterikatan karyawan secara umum, meski pada beberapa variabel menunjukkan hasil yang berbeda.

Kata Kunci: Motivasi kerja, Keterikatan karyawan

JEL Classification: M54

### **1. Research Background**

The existence of research in the field of Human Resources related employee engagement can not be separated from the survey conducted by Global Workforce Study 2012 (GWS 2012) in Indonesia. The study involved 1005 employees across the country suggesting that 27% of Indonesian employees think they will leave the job that is currently being cultivated within the next two years. While 42% of Indonesian employees have confidence that they must leave their current company to improve their career in the future. (<http://www.towerswatson.com/en->

*US/Press/2012/09/organisations-face-a-huge-retention-risk-with-nearly-two-thirds-of-the-indonesian-workforce)*

In 2014, AON Hewitt conducted a survey on employee engagement in Indonesia to prove that there is a tendency to increase employee engagement. Quoted from the Human Capital Journal of September 1, 2014 edition that Indonesia's engagement score reached the highest number of 89%, among 11 countries in Asia Pacific. (<http://humancapitaljournal.com/employee-engagement-indonesia-tertinggi/>). During that time periods of existing surveys proved that employee engagement experienced significant changes so that the topic was interesting for further investigation.

Employee engagement has many definitions based on previous studies. Kahn (1990) explains that when a person has been bound, that person will give all that is in him - both cognitively, emotionally and physically - in carrying out their work. Meanwhile, employee engagement also includes many things from the employees themselves. This is confirmed by Shuck and Wollard (2010, 103): "Employee attachment can be defined as a state in which the cognitive, emotional and behavior of an employee as an individual is directed to the expected organizational goals." The attachment will be seen from the way employees act in the work of the company Everyday, both to fellow employees, superiors - subordinates, as well as with the environment around the work. So, the employee's attachment becomes important to learn in order for the company to understand its employees and be able to solve problems related to those things.

Armstrong (2009) asserts that commitment has an orientation to the organization or company, while the employee's attachment is more directed to the work itself. Employees in a company may be tied to their work because they like the job, but the employee is not directly interested in achieving the company's goals.

As for anything else that attracts previous studies from employee engagement is not separated from the word "motivation". According to Wellins and Concelman (2005) states that employee engagement is an illusive force that motivates employees to achieve higher achievement. Research conducted by Ariani (2013) revealed that employee engagement includes a basic dimension of intrinsic motivation, which ensures goal-oriented behavior. Based on the research of Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), they stated that attachment as persistence and positive affective - the fulfillment of motivational circumstances in employees characterized by passion, dedication and focus. This shows that the motivation that employees have in working has a relationship with attachment.

Studies on the relationship of work motivation with employee engagement have also been disclosed. One of the researches in Pakistan by Shaheen and Farooqi (2014) targeting employees working in the field of education to know employee motivation there positively really has a relationship with employee engagement. This is where the research is grounded not only to deepen knowledge but to further understand whether employee motivation is really related to employee engagement in this case in the private sector.

Frank *et al.*, (2004) states that bound employees are one of the greatest challenges facing organizations in this decade and beyond. Therefore, research on the topic of employee engagement becomes important to be reviewed further.

## **1.1 Literature Review**

### **1.1.1 Work Motivation**

Motivation comes from the Latin word *movere* which has the meaning of encouragement or move (Steers and Porter, 1991). According to Dr. Nugroho J. Setiadi (2003) motivation is the thing that causes, channel and support human behavior.

Sheth and Mittal (2004) argue that motivation is what drives people and the driving force for all human behavior. Motivation can be interpreted as something that encourages people to behave certain. Motivation becomes something that is important for employees to get the desired

goal optimally. In other words, motivation affects employee behavior to implement and maintain certain activities.

Schultz and Schultz (1998) believe that motivation is ensured as a personal and workplace characteristic that explains why people act according to what they do to their work. Characteristics of the work in question refers to the specific characteristics of a person's work such as various tasks, in which the characteristics of a person including those determined by his personality examples of intrinsic needs for achievement.

Spector (2003) reveals that employee feelings and behavior toward their work are significantly influenced by the motivation and demotivation of these employees. Further, Spector (2003) also argues that motivation is an internal state that causes a person to be attached to a particular behavior.

Roos & Eeden (2008) states that employee motivation is a natural force that is shaped and managed by a set of individualistic factors that can change over time, depending on the specific needs and motives of an employee.

Based on Vroom's motivational theory (1964) (quoted from Eerde and Thierry (1996)) one's motivation depends on three things:

1. Expectancy or expectation: belief in action or effort leads to performance
2. Instrumentality or linkage: the relationship between performance and the right rewards is gained
3. Valence: the value of a person's perception or orientation towards the rewards obtained.

As for the above three things can be interpreted E for Expectancy, I for Instrumentality and V for Valence, which can describe the motivation as follows:

$$Motivation = (E \times I \times V)$$

If one of these things is empty or inadequate, then there is no motivation. The above theory is known as Expectancy Theory (Dessler, 2013).

With the use of Expectancy Theory in this study which covers the expectations of an employee, the relationship of performance with rewards that can be obtained significantly and the value of perceptions of employees, the expected results of research that can be obtained specific, clear and real express picture of employee work motivation in field.

### **1.1.2 Employee Engagement**

Briefly according to Armstrong (2009), engagement-oriented or engagement. According to Ariani (2013) attachment is a motivational concept that can also be shared by employees in the workplace. Dessler (2013) refers to the notion of attachment that a person is psychologically involved in, connected with, and committed to completing his work. Based on the Global Employment Engagement Index (2012) employee engagement is a combination of affective commitment and intrinsic motivation.

Employee engagement is the willingness and ability of employees to help the success of the company, by working voluntarily on a sustainable basis (Little & Little, 2006).

Meanwhile, according to Bevan *et al.*, (1997) quoted from Armstrong (2009) that the bound employee is someone who is aware of the business context, and works with colleagues to improve performance in his work for the benefit of the organization.

William Kahn (1990) states that engagement becomes a form of multidimensional motivation that is directly involved in a person completely into a performance role.

Based on his research, Kahn found there are three psychological conditions associated with attachment in the workplace that is significance (religious), security (safety) and traditional (availability). Here is a description of the meaning of the following three conditions:

1. Significance: employees find it useful and valuable in the workplace, whether it is the difference and what they have done is minimal.

2. Security: employees feel secure in openness, feeling awake, and organizations that have been known before.
3. Availability: employees feel they have the physical, emotional and psychological resources needed to perform their roles in the job.

This study uses three psychological aspects of employee engagement for further study.

### **1.1.3 Relationship Motivation Work with Employee Engagement**

According to Holton (2009), organizations need to help employees to be more accountable and should create strategies and processes that can help them understand that they are responsible for their personal development.

According to Vroom theory (<http://www.learnmanagement2.com/vroom.html>). Explained that when an employee is completing a task, his views are influenced by the possibility of completing the task, and the possible outcome or consequence of completing the task. So, employees can have a bond with his work due to one of the views or both views above.

Previous research by Abadi and Jalilvand (2011) on motivation using Vroom expectancy theory, reveals that intrinsic expectancy, instrumentality and valence are intrinsically positive in employee motivation. Meanwhile, according to Chiang and Jang (2008) motivational research with Vroom theory, showed a little difference that is extrinsic valence has a positive significance of work motivation.

Chalofsky and Krishna (2009) reveal that the significance, commitment and employee engagement as an intersection of intrinsic motivation. In the Csikszentmihalyi study mentioned in Chalofsky and Krishna (2009) shows that how motivated employees are driven by their work rather than achievement or achievement of their tasks.

Christian *et al.*, (2011) in his research on work attachment mentions that employee engagement is essentially a motivational concept that represents the active allocation of personal resources to tasks related to job roles.

This is reinforced through the research of Shaheen and Farooqi (2014) who tried to explore the relationship between work motivation and employee engagement at one of the universities in Pakistan. It turns out from the results of his findings found that employee motivation has a significant positive relationship with employee engagement.

With the existence of previous studies, it can be concluded that the actual work motivation associated with employee engagement. However, there is a need for further research on the topic to confirm whether employee motivation is related to employee engagement on different scopes. So, from the existing theoretical framework, obtained research hypothesis as follows:

H0: There is no link between work motivation and employee engagement.

H1: There is a link between work motivation and employee engagement.

## **2. Research Methods**

### **2.1 Sampel**

Samples are drawn from one department to one manufacturing company consisting of a full-time employee employee of 35 people. Data collection is conducted during working hours at work. The data collection is structured because it is obtained by way of survey. Questions that exist in the questionnaire is closed that is by providing an alternative answer to the respondent so that respondents simply choose the answer that is considered the most appropriate with his opinion. The questionnaire included a cover letter that informed the respondents of the research objectives and underwriting the identity of the respondents.

### **2.2 Validity and Reliability**

In order for the validity and reliability of the measurement maintained then the test validity and reliability test has been done before. The results of validity processing on each variable Expectancy, Instrumentality, Valence and Employee Attachment proved to have a smaller value

of 0.05 then all the variables can be used in further testing. Similarly, the value of Alpha Cronbach coefficient for each research variable is greater than 0.6 then the research variables are reliable for further analysis.

### **2.3 Data Analysis**

This study uses 4 points of Likert Scale so that the results obtained really represent the tendency to link between work motivation and employee engagement. Questionnaires based on variables that exist in work motivation in this case adopt the theory of Vroom expansion while in employee attachment refers to Kahn's theory. Data analysis performed, using multiple linear regression analysis, F test, t test. For data processing used Statistical Package Social Science computer program (SPSS).

## **3. Result and Discussion**

### **3.1 Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis**

Based on result of linear regression calculation with tool of statistic program of SPSS hence can compiled by equation of doubled linear regression as follows:

$$Y = 0,090 + 0,728 X_1 + 0,276 X_2 - 0,027 X_3$$

The purpose of the regression coefficient in the table above can be explained as follows:

1. Constants (a)

Value a = 0.090 indicates the amount of variable Employee engagement that is not affected by expectancy, instrumentality and valence variables.

2. Expectancy regression coefficient

B1 = 0.728 indicates an increase in expectancy variable which may result in increased employee attachment or in other words increase of expectancy of one unit will cause increase of employee attachment equal to 0,728 unit, with instrumentality and valence assumption in constant state.

3. The regression coefficient of Instrumentality

B2 = 0.276 indicates an increase in the variable instrumentality which may result in increased employee attachment or in other words an increase in the instrumentality of one unit will result in increased employee attachment of 0.276 units, assuming the expectancy and valence are in constant state.

4. Valence regression coefficient

B3 = - 0,027 indicates the increase of valence variable which can cause decrease of employee's attachment or in other words increase of valence of one unit will cause decrease of employee's attachment equal to 0,027 unit, assuming expectancy and instrumentality in constant state

### **3.2 Simultaneous Testing**

Based on calculation result by using SPSS program obtained Fcount equal to 22,094. As for understanding where  $F_{\text{arithmetical}} > F_{\text{table}} (= 2,91)$  with significance 0,000 ( $P < 0,05$ ), then  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_1$  accepted. Thus it is evident that the expectancy, instrumentality and valence are simultaneously significantly related to employee engagement in the manufacturing company.

### **3.3 Partial Testing**

In this test, expectancy variables show positive and significant results with employee engagement, with a significance value of 0,000 meaning Sig.  $< 0,05$  and regression coefficient value equal to 0,728. The positive regression coefficient signifies a unidirectional relationship, meaning that if the expectancy variable increases to a more positive one level then the employee's attachment to the firm will also increase by 0.728. Thus, expectancy partially has a

significant relationship to the employee's attachment to the manufacturing company. While the variable instrumentality despite the positive but the value.

Significance of 0.066 means Sig. > 0,05 and regression coefficient value equal to 0,276. Then the instrumentality is not related significantly to employee engagement. For valence variables shows a significance value of 0.788 means Sig. > 0,05 and regression coefficient value equal to -0,027. The negative valence regression coefficient signifies a non-directional relationship, meaning that if the valence variable increases to a more positive level then employee attachment will also decrease by 0.027. Thus, the valence variable is not significantly related to the employee's attachment to the manufacturing company.

### **3.4 Partial Determination**

From the output of SPSS known that the partial correlation of each independent variable is the expectancy variable has the highest coefficient of determination is 55.35%. While the variable instrumentality and valence variables each have a coefficient of determination of 10.43% and 0.24%. Therefore, expectancy variables are said to contribute the most from other variables. Then the expectancy variable that gives dominant influence to the employee's attachment in the related company.

### **3.5 Discussion**

Based on simultaneous test results related to work motivation through expectancy variable, instrumentality variable and valence variable to employee attachment can be expressed that  $F_{\text{count}}$  obtained is 22,094 with significance 0,000 ( $P < 0,05$ ), which concludes that  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_1$  accepted. So, on hypothesis testing that mentions the existence of the relationship between work motivation with employee attachment can be proven.

In addition, the correlation between work motivation and employee attachment is seen from the high average category of job likes (Mean = 3.29) with the high average also employee plan category to keep working in the same company. (Mean = 3.00). Employees feel comfortable so have not thought to stop working from the company. Employees plan to keep working in the company can also be caused by the work faced is in accordance with the competencies. The job according to competence as one of the indicators of work motivation (Mean = 3.09).

Therefore, work motivation with employee engagement has a correlation. Based on previous research by Shaheen and Farooqi (2014) that work motivation has a significant relationship to employee engagement. The results of this study also supports the results of the study will be the relationship between work motivation and employee engagement.

In expectancy variable has a significant relationship to the employee's attachment in the manufacturing company. The amount of regression coefficient obtained by the expectancy variable to the employee attachment is 0.728 (Sig = 0,000 → Significant). The contribution of expectancy variable to employee attachment can be seen from the coefficient of partial determination ( $r^2$ ) = 0,5535, so its contribution is 55,35%. While the relationship or correlation ( $r$ ) between expectancy variable with employee attachment is 0.744 with a significance of 0.000. Based on the value of this correlation shows the closeness of the relationship between expectancy with the existing employee's attachment to the manufacturing company is tight (very close when approaching 1). The results showed that expectancy was significantly related to employee engagement. This is in line with previous research by Chiang and Jang (2008), and Abadi and Jalilvand (2011) on Vroom's motivation that expectancy as one of the motivational criteria in work which concludes that Expectancy is significant if positive. According to Shaheen and Farooqi (2014) also shows work motivation - in this study Expectancy as a variable - related to the employee's attachment positively or significantly.

Variable instrumentality through this study found not significantly related to employee engagement. The regression coefficient of instrumentality variable to employee attachment is 0,276 (Sig = 0,066 → Not Significant) with the explanation that if the variable instrumentality

increased to a more positive 1 level then the employee's attachment to the company will also change by 0.276. The contribution of instrumentality variable to employee attachment can be seen from the coefficient of partial determination ( $r^2$ ) = 0,1043, So its contribution is 10.43%. While the relationship or correlation ( $r$ ) between instrumentality variable with employee attachment is equal to 0,320 with significance equal to 0,066. Based on the correlation value, the closeness of the relationship between instrumentality with employee attachment is quite close.

In this research, the valence variable has no significant correlation to the employee's attachment to the company. Based on the research that explains the magnitude of variable valence regression coefficients to the employee attachment is equal -0,027 (Sig = 0,788 Not Significant). Means if the valence variable changes (increases) to a more positive 1 level then the employee's attachment will also decrease by 0.027. The contribution of valence variable to employee attachment can be seen from partial determination coefficient value ( $r^2$ ) = 0,0024, thus contributing 0.24%. While the relationship or correlation ( $r$ ) between variable valence with employee attachment is equal to 0.049 with significance of 0.002. Based on the value of this correlation shows the closeness of the relationship between valence with the existing employee attachment to the manufacturing company is not close (very closely if close to 1).

Based on the results of the description of the valence variables indicate that the average valence is quite high, with a mean value (variable) valence of 2.68. This means that employees judge both things. The highest / best dimension or statement indicator rated by the respondent on the valence variable in the manufacturing company is that employees feel proud to work in this company. However, as for the indicator items of the valence with the average value is low is the appreciation in the form of money preferably employee only of 2.29. Therefore, it is not surprising that the results of the research on the valence variables have negative or unidirectional results, in accordance with the hypothesis of previous research results by Abadi and Jalilvand (2011) related to the valence variable against the motivation itself. Based on the results of research according to Shaheen and Farooqi (2014) which states a positive relationship between motivation to employee engagement is not proven through this research. This means that the findings do not match the field findings in this study with the valence variables that are part of the work motivation.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Based on the results of descriptive statistical processing, it is known that expectancy has an average value of 3.25, the instrumentality variable has an average value of 2.73, and the average value of valence 2.68 and the average value of employee interest of 3.14. This shows that respondents generally respond well / high over all research variables.

Alpha Cronbach coefficient value for each research variable is greater than 0.6 it can be concluded that the variables of the study are work motivation variables consisting of expectancy, instrumentality, valence and employee attachment that exist in the company as a reliable source of research data.

Based on the results of data analysis and discussion that has been described previously, then the results of this study can be drawn conclusion as follows:

1. The result of the overall calculation obtained through the F test obtained the value of 22.094 F with a probability value of 0.000 ( $P < 0.05$ ), meaning that the motivation of work consisting of expectancy, instrumentality and valence simultaneously significant relation to employee engagement. Thus, the hypothesis that the work motivation is significantly related to employee engagement in this study is acceptable or proven.
2. Partial test results, expectancy, instrumentality and valence relationship to employee engagement (5% level) obtained the following results:
  - a. Expectancy has a positive and significant relationship to the employee's engagement in the manufacturing company (t test = 6,204; prob. 0,000). This is because there is an

- indication (from the result of the average value) that the employee likes his job and still plans to work in the company so that with the expectancy the employee's attachment is more easily achieved.
- b. Instrumentality is not significantly related to employee engagement (t test = 1,903; prob 0.066). This is because there are indications that have obtained the results of average values that appear on the results of research where employees are not all convinced by the achievement of maximum results would be able to get the things they want.
  - c. Valence is not significantly related to employee inclusion (t test = -0,271; prob .788). This is because there is an indication of the result of the average value that the employees of the company have not received the appropriate rewards they expect which form of reward for each employee is not the same.
3. Variable expectancy has a coefficient of determination of 0.5535 indicates that the variation of employee attachment variables changes of 55.35% influenced by changes in expectancy variables and at the same time prove the expectancy is the variable that the greatest relation with employee engagement in the company.

#### 4.1 Limitations and Expectations of Further Study

This research can not be separated from the limitations. The limitation is the research is limited to the object of research employees of a company engaged in manufacturing, especially the production department, so that possible differences in results, discussion or conclusions for different research objects. In this study, the measurement of variables used is also limited to the relevance of work motivation variable according to Vroom's theory and employee engagement variables.

Expectations for further research is to pay attention to the object of research in several other companies both in manufacturing and services. In addition, the need for some independent variables in testing employee engagement models, and structural models so as to provide more comprehensive results.

#### References

- Ariani, D. W. (2013), The Relationship between Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *International Journal of Business Administration*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp 46 – 56.
- Armstrong, Michael. (2009), *Armstrong's Handbook of HRM Practice*. 11<sup>th</sup> edition. London Philadelphia, Kogan Page.
- Chalofsky, Neal and Vijay Krishna. (2009), Meaningfulness, Commitment and Engagement: The Intersection of a Deeper Level of Intrinsic Motivation. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, Vol. 11 No.2, pp.189 – 203.
- Christian, M.S., A.S. Garza and J.E. Slaughter. (2011), Work Engagement: A Quantitative Review a Test of Its Relations with Task and Contextual Performance. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 64 No.1, pp. 89-136.
- Cook, Sarah. (2008), *The Essential Guide to Employee Engagement: Better Business Performance through Staff Satisfaction*. Kogan Page Limited.
- Dessler, Gary. (2013), *Human Resource Management*. 13<sup>th</sup> edition. Pearson. England.
- Frank, F. D., R.P. Finnegan and C.R. Taylor. (2004), The Race for Talent: Retaining and Engaging Workers in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. *Human Resources Planning*. Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 12 – 25.
- Holton, V. (2009), Motivation & Employee Engagement in the 21st century. *Ashridge Business school*, 1-50.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990), Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 33, pp. 692 – 724.
- Little, B and P. Little. (2006), Employee Engagement: Conceptual Issues. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict*, Vol. 10 No.1, pp. 111 – 120.
- Schultz, D. and S.E. Schultz. (1998), *Psychology and Work Today: An Introduction to Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. 7th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.



- Shaheen, A. and Yasir Aftab Farooqi. (2014), Relationship among Employee Motivation, Employee Commitment, Job Involvement, Employee Engagement: A Case Study of University of Gujrat, Pakistan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Engineering*, Vol. 5 No. 9, pp. 12 – 18.
- Spector, P. E. (2003), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Research and Practice*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Roos, Wanda and René Van Eeden. (2008), The Relationship between Employee Motivation, Job Satisfaction and Corporate Culture. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp 54 – 63.
- Schaufeli, W.B., and Baker, A.B. (2004), Job Demands, Job Resources, and The Relationship with Burnout and Engagement: A Multi-Sample Studies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 25, pp. 293-315.
- Sheth, J. Dan B. Mittal. (2004), *Customer Behavior: Managerial Perspective*. Second edition. Singapore: Thompson.
- Shuck, B and K. K. Wollard. (2010), Employee Engagement and HRD: A Seminal Review of The Foundations. *Human Resource Development Review*, Vol. 9 No.1, pp. 89-110.
- Steers, Richard M. and Lyman W. Porter. (1991), *Motivation and Work Behavior*. Fifth edition. McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Van Eerde, Wendelin and Henk Thierry. (1996), Vroom's Expectancy Models and Work-Related Criteria: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81 No. 5, pp. 576-586.
- Wellins, R. dan J. Concelman. (2005), *Creating a Culture for Engagement*. Workforce Performance Solutions.
- <http://aon.mediaroom.com/Aon-Hewitt-Announces-the-Best-Employers-Indonesia-2015-Awards>
- <http://www.towerswatson.com/en-ID/Press/2012/09/organisations-face-a-huge-retention-risk-with-nearly-two-thirds-of-the-indonesian-workforce>
- <http://humancapitaljournal.com/employee-engagement-indonesia-tertinggi/>
- <http://www.learnmanagement2.com/vroom.html>