

Citing References in Text – some useful expressions

Introducing someone's ideas:

Bloggs (2002) suggests/argues/states/believes/concludes/proposes that ---
expresses/holds the view that ---

draws attention to ---

describes X as ---

describes how ---

refers to ---

takes the stance that ---

emphasises/stresses the need to/the importance of---

According to Bloggs (2002) ---

As stated/suggested/argued/proposed by Bloggs (2002) ---

There is a view/theory/argument that --- (Bloggs, 2002).

It has been suggested/stated/argued/proposed that --- (Bloggs, 2002)

One view/theory/argument/suggestion/proposal is that --- (Bloggs, 2002)

One view, expressed by Bloggs (2002) is that ---

Introducing an idea/theory that agrees with/has built on another:

This is supported by Smith (2003).

in line with the view/theory/suggestion of Smith (2003).

reflects the “ “ “

Smith (2003) accepts/supports/agrees with/concurs with this view/suggestion/theory.

A similar view is held by Smith (2003)

stance is taken by

This idea/theory has been extended/developed/taken further/built upon by Smith (2003).

Introducing an idea/theory that disagrees/contrasts with another:

This conflicts/contrasts with/is contrary to the view held by Smith (2003) that ---

This is not accepted by/has been challenged by Smith (2003), who argues that ---

Smith (2003), on the other hand/however/in contrast, suggests that ---

An alternative view/suggestion is that --- (Smith, 2003)

The opposite/a conflicting view is expressed by Smith (2003)

Activity – Based on the Outline Notes construct a Paragraph arguing the points

Concept	Notes	Source	Implications of your point of view
Defining Syllabus	"Description of the contents of a course of instruction and the order in which they are to be taught"	(Richards et al. 1992, p. 368).	A syllabus is useful because it specifies the content of the course to be taught.
	"syllabus is seen as being concerned essentially with the selection and grading of content, while methodology is concerned with the selection of learning tasks and activities".	Nunan (1988a)	
	defines syllabus as a general plan of activities that can be applied in a class to facilitate the learning process	Widdowson (1984, p. 26)	
	A syllabus is considered as an instrument by means of which the teacher can achieve a degree of accomplishment between needs and social or individual actions in the class.	Yalden (1984, p. 14)	

A second term of interest for this project is that of syllabus. Broadly, syllabus has been defined as the "description of the contents of a course of instruction and the order in which they are to be taught" (Richards et al. 1992, p. 368). Nunan (1988a) agrees with this view, stating that "syllabus is seen as being concerned essentially with the selection and grading of content, while methodology is concerned with the selection of learning tasks and activities". From these definitions, it is apparent that syllabus is the part of a curriculum that deals with the content and sequencing of the courses within the program. Thus, syllabus is subordinated to curriculum. On the other hand, according to Yalden (1984, p. 14), syllabus is considered as an instrument by means of which the teacher can achieve a degree of accomplishment between needs and social or individual actions in the class. In yet a further definition, Widdowson (1984, p. 26) defines syllabus as a general plan of activities that can be applied in a class to facilitate the learning process. In general, it can now be concluded that syllabus is a part of the curriculum that concerns the selection and sequencing of content to be taught in a language program.

While academic response to the popularity of employee engagement was initially slow, in the last 10 years academic research has also started validating and accepting the positive outcomes of employee engagement. According to Witemeyer (2013), engaged employees display a number of behaviours of potential benefit to their organizations including going the extra mile, speaking highly of the company, collaboration, proactive problem-solving, staying late, putting in extra hours, assisting colleagues, sharing knowledge, offering creativity and participating in organizational dialogue. Other researchers have provided evidence of positive association of engagement with productivity, performance, profitability, enhanced safety and customer loyalty and satisfaction (Coffman, 2000; Ellis & Sorensen, 2007; Gallup, 2008; Heintzman & Marson, 2005; Hewitt Associates LLC, 2004; Markos & Sridevi, 2010; Towers Perrin, 2003).

Various other documented benefits of employee engagement include reduced employee turnover, improved individual performance, increased advocacy of the organization, positive impacts on health and well-being, increased self-efficacy and receptivity to change initiatives (Bhattacharya, 2014; Blessing White 2008; Luthans & Peterson, 2002; Shaw, 2005; Truss et al., 2006). Empirical evidence suggests that the presence of high levels of employee engagement enhances job performance, task performance, organizational citizenship behaviours, productivity, discretionary effort, affective commitment, continuance commitment, levels of psychological climate and customer service (Christian, Garza & Slaughter, 2011; Rich, LePine & Crawford, 2010). Employee engagement has also been associated with higher levels of profit, overall revenue generation and growth (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2009).

There is thus enough research to claim that employee engagement has a strong positive relationship with business success, at both the individual and the firm levels, and it yields multiple positive outcomes including retention, productivity, profitability and customer loyalty and satisfaction.

Drivers of Employee Engagement

Having evidenced that engagement produces various positive individual-level outcomes and also impacts critical organizational outcomes, the next logical question is to explore the drivers of employee engagement. A review of literature provides several answers, noteworthy among them are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Saks (2006) while identifying employee engagement as a multidimensional construct specified perceived supervisor support, rewards and recognition, procedural justice, distributive justice and perceived organizational support as the predictors of employee engagement. Bakker and Demerouti (2008) in their model included job resources (e.g., autonomy and performance feedback) and personal resources (e.g., self-efficacy and optimism) as antecedents of work engagement, which lead to performance. Zhang (2010) extracted eight commonly cited positive predictors of employee engagement from the literature that included expansive communication, trust and integrity, rich and involving job, effective and supportive direct supervisors, career advancement opportunities, contribution to organizational success, pride in the organization and supportive colleagues/team members. Wollard and Shuck (2011) identified 42 antecedents of engagement through a structured literature review of which half were individual antecedents (e.g., optimism and self-esteem) and the other half were organizational antecedents (e.g., feedback and supportive organizational culture).

Other drivers of engagement cited in studies include management practices, immediate supervisor, career development opportunities, recognition, teamwork and supportive environment, pay rewards and benefits (Aon Hewitt, 2014; Branham & Hirschfield, 2010; Gallup, 2008; Gibbons, 2006; Hewitt Associates, 2008; Robinson, et al. 2004; SHRM/Globoforce, 2013; Vance, 2006). Additional drivers of

employee engagement include employee input in decision-making, constructive feedback, receiving formal appraisals and the implementation of performance development plans (Gallup, 2008; Robinson, Perryman & Hayday, 2004). A close analysis of these drivers indicates that conceptually leadership has a critical input in fostering employee engagement. Support for this argument comes from research by Wang and Walumbwa (2007) and Macey and Schneider (2008) that suggests leadership as being one of the single biggest factors affecting employee perceptions in the workplace and workforce engagement. Attridge (2009) asserted that leadership style, applying to leader–follower interactions, is critical for promoting employee engagement. Wellins et al. (2006) in their research for DDI suggested that organizations drive engagement by proactively leveraging three sources of influence for change, that is, employees, leaders and organizational systems and strategies. These three drivers need to work in concert to create an engaging work environment where leadership plays a critical role. Many of the ‘work environment factors’ in their model are directly affected by the quality of leadership. Additionally, the DDI studies show that changes in leader behaviours can have a real and significant impact on employee engagement. A study of pre- and post-training engagement scores showed that improvement in leadership skills through training led to higher employee engagement scores. In the light of the above, organizations in contemporary times are holding their leaders responsible for driving employee engagement.

Leadership Style and Employee Engagement

Aon Hewitt’s (2014) *Trends in Global Employee Engagement Report* suggests that leaders hold the key to employee engagement:

Leaders play an important role in employee engagement and becoming a best employer company. They do this in direct and indirect ways. First, leaders have an indirect ‘multiplier effect’ on all the top engagement drivers and other best employer indices. Ultimately, leaders make the decisions on brands, performance goals, pay and recognition, communication to employees, work process and innovation.

Most of the recent workforce and engagement reports from Gallup (2013), Aon Hewitt (2014) and SHRM (2014) have highlighted the role of effective leadership in building employee engagement.

In academic research, the impact of leadership on employee engagement is well documented. Kahn (1990) proposed that leadership has the greatest potential to influence follower feelings of psychological safety by providing a supportive environment in which one feels safe to fully engage in a task. Luthans and Peterson (2002, p. 376) in their study using a sample of 2,900 participants concluded that ‘the most profitable work units of companies have people doing what they do best, with people they like, and with a strong sense of psychological ownership’. Findings from their research extended the theory about a manager’s role in creating a supportive psychological climate (Brown & Leigh, 1996) and paralleled early theories of engagement (Kahn, 1990; Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001; Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Romá & Bakker, 2002) by suggesting that employees must have a supportive environment, job resources and support necessary to complete their work.

Hay (2002, p. 53) in the article ‘Strategies for Survival in the War for Talent’, based on results of survey data from 330 companies in 50 countries on employee perceptions and intentions towards their employers, quoted that many employees ‘leave their jobs because they are unhappy with their boss’. A leader’s behaviour is said to influence not only the overall organizational and customer outcomes but also employee attitudes, behaviours and various employee outcomes. Some researchers have suggested that leadership is one of the single biggest factors affecting employee perceptions in the workplace and workforce engagement (Attridge, 2009; Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002; May, Gibson & Harter, 2004; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Wang & Walumbwa, 2007; Xu & Thomas, 2011).

could be located in any of the *Academy*-sponsored journals that included both the key phrases *leadership* and *employee engagement*. As a result, HRD professionals are often unable to locate needed resources to guide the creation, development, and ultimately execution of interventions that support and enhance organizational performance through formalized leadership development programs.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this article is to examine the conceptual relation between leadership behavior and the development of employee engagement, specifically in the workplace. Two questions guided the search for literature and resulting conceptual framework: (a) How might employee engagement and leadership be related? and (b) What framework can be developed from their potential relation? To answer these two questions, this article first examines conceptual frameworks for both employee engagement and leadership. Next, a conceptual framework of leadership in the context of employee engagement is examined. Last, implications for HRD are discussed.

Conceptual Framework

Due to their popularity, the frameworks for both employee engagement and leadership are understandably moving targets in states of growth and development; both employee engagement and leadership have burgeoning bases of literature. The following sections synthesize conceptual frameworks for both employee engagement and leadership as separate areas. First engagement is discussed, followed by leadership.

Employee Engagement

While still an evolving construct, several contemporary frameworks for engagement have been proposed for research (Shuck, 2011). Examples include the Saks (2006) multidimensional approach, the Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001) burnout-antithesis framework, and the Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002) engagement-satisfaction approach. While these frameworks offer unique and differing perspectives, a fourth framework, Kahn's (1990) needs-satisfying approach offers an interesting framework reflecting interpretations of the latent conditions within an employee's experience of work under the purview of a leader's influence. Thus, this framework (i.e., Kahn, 1990) draws from an HRD-specific context highlighting the unique, individual experiences of being engaged. While Kahn outlines three conditions preceding the development of behavioral engagement (i.e., meaningfulness, safety, and availability), research by Rich et al. (2010) suggests a more interconnected model of engagement that parallels the current definition of engagement (Shuck & Wollard, 2010). Rich and colleagues (2010) suggest that engagement is the active full performance of a person's cognitive, emotional, and physical energies. The intensity in which these energies are applied give context to a person's level of engagement, highlighting the motivational

dimension of the engagement construct. Below, the three dimensions of engagement—cognitive, emotional, and behavioral—are discussed.

Cognitive engagement. As a first step in the engagement process, cognitive engagement builds from an employee's interpretation of whether their work is meaningful, safe (physically, emotionally, and psychologically), and whether they have adequate resources (tangible and intangible) to complete their work (Kahn, 1990; Rich et al., 2010). This process, a kind of cognitive appraisal intention (Shuck & Rocco, 2011), places a value on a given situation grounded in the unique interpretations of that time and place. As such, the heart of cognitive engagement is the interpretation of the question, "does it matter?" (Kahn, 2010). For example, Kahn (2010) suggested that employees express themselves when they feel like they can "make a difference, change minds and directions, add value" or join with something larger than themselves (pp. 22-23). Reciprocally, Kahn suggested, "deaf ears make us mute" (2010, p. 23); that is, when employees feel that they cannot add value, make a difference, change minds, or are simply ignored, they choose not to speak up—they hold their voice, which is the ultimate act of nonengagement. Cognitively, the engagement process never begins.

Emotional engagement. Emotional engagement revolves around the investment and willingness of an employee to involve personal resources. This stems from the emotional bond created when employees, on a very personal level, have made the decision to cognitively engage and are willing to give of themselves and thus identify emotionally with a task at that moment. The giving of resources can involve tangible and intangible items such as time, care, mental abilities, extra work, pride, ownership, and belief, as well as others. As such, employees who are emotionally engaged with their organization have "a sense of belonging and identification that increases . . . involvement in the organization's activities" (Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001, p. 825). At this engagement level, research might suggest that here is where employees become more productive, less physically absent, and less likely to turnover (Czarnowsky, 2008; Fleming & Asplund, 2007; Ketter, 2008; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Wagner & Harter, 2006), although engagement is not yet behaviorally manifested. From this framework, it is emotion that spurs action, built from a cognitive appraisal of the situation; but emotion does not equal action. As such, emotional engagement revolves around beliefs, which determine how behavioral engagement is formed, influenced, and directed outward.

Behavioral engagement. Behavioral engagement is the overt natural reaction to a positive cognitive appraisal (i.e., cognitive engagement) and a willingness to invest personal resources. Understood as the physical manifestation of cognitive and emotional engagement, behavioral engagement can be understood as what we actually *see* employees do. Engaged employees bring their full selves to work and allow "the full range of senses to inform their work" (Kahn, 2010, p. 21). Some researchers have linked what we see employees do to extra effort, in role performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, and intent to stay versus intent to turnover (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Discretionary effort, for example, is a multidimensional variable consisting of an employee's willingness to go above minimal job responsibilities (Christian et al.,

- ii. To examine the relationship between aspects of transformational leadership such as idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration and inspirational motivation with job satisfaction among employees in the public sector.

Literature Review

Example 3

2. Literature Review

2.1 Leadership

Leadership is a process of interaction between leaders and followers where the leader attempts to influence followers to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2010; Yukl, 2005). According to Chen and Chen (2008), previous studies on leadership have identified different types of leadership styles which leaders adopt in managing organizations (e.g., Davis, 2003; Spears & Lawrence, 2003; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004; Hirtz, Murray, & Riordam, 2007). Among the more prominent leadership styles are Burns' (1978) transactional and transformational leadership styles. Transformational leaders emphasise followers' intrinsic motivation and personal development. They seek to align followers' aspirations and needs with desired organisational outcomes. In so doing, transformational leaders are able to foster followers' commitment to the organisations and inspire them to exceed their expected performance (Sivanathan & Fekken, 2002; Miia, Nichole, Karlos, Jaakko, & Ali, 2006; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass, 1985, 1998). With regard to today's complex organisations and dynamic business environment, transformational leaders are often seen as ideal agents of change who could lead followers in times of uncertainties and high risk-taking. In contrast, transactional leaders gain legitimacy through the use of rewards, praises and promises that would satisfy followers' immediate needs (Northouse, 2010). They engage followers by offering rewards in exchange for the achievement of desired goals (Burns, 1978). Although transformational leadership is generally regarded as more desirable than transactional, Locke, Kirkpatrick, Wheeler, Schneider, Niles, Goldstein, Welsh, & Chah, (1999) pointed out that such contention is misleading. They argued that all leadership is in fact transactional, even though such transactions are not confined to only short-term rewards. An effective leader must appeal to the self-interest of followers and use a mixture of short-term and long-term rewards in order to lead followers towards achieving organisational goals.

2.1.1 Dimensions of Transformational leadership

Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1997) identified four dimensions of transformational leadership. These are idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration.

Idealised influence concerns the formulation and articulation of vision and challenging goals and motivating followers to work beyond their self-interest in order to achieve common goals (Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater & Spangler, 2004). In this dimension, leaders act as role models who are highly admired, respected and trusted by their followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006). According to Bass and Riggio (2006), leaders with great idealised influence are willing to take risks and are consistent rather than arbitrary by demonstrating high standards of ethical and moral conduct.

Inspirational motivation refers to the way leaders motivate and inspire their followers to commit to the vision of the organization. Leaders with inspirational motivation foster strong team spirit as a means for leading team members towards achieving desired goals (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasurbramaniam, 2003; Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Intellectual stimulation is concerned with the role of leaders in stimulating innovation and creativity in their followers by questioning assumptions and approaching old situations in new ways (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Nicholason, 2007). They always encourage their followers to try new approaches or methods to solve the old problems.

Individualized consideration refers to leaders paying special attention to each individual follower's need for achievement and growth by acting as a coach or mentor (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Nicholason, 2007).

2.1.2 Dimensions of Transactional leadership

Bass and Avolio (1995) proposed that transactional leadership consists of three dimensions, namely contingent rewards, management by exception (active) and management by exception (passive). *Contingent reward* refers to leaders clarifying the work that must be achieved and use rewards in exchange for good performance. *Management by exception (passive)* refers to leaders intervening only when problem arise whereas *management by exception (active)* refers to leaders actively monitoring the work of followers and make sure that standards are met (Antonakis et al., 2003).

2.2 Job Satisfaction

Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a positive or pleasing emotional state from the appraisal of one's job or experience. This definition suggests that employees form their attitude towards their jobs by taking into account their feelings, beliefs and behaviours (Robbins, 2005; Akehurst, Comeche, & Galindo, 2009). Spector (1985) found that if the employees find their job fulfilling and rewarding, they tend to be more satisfied with their jobs. Employees' satisfaction is generally regarded as an

important ingredient for organisational success. According to Galup, Klein, and Jiang (2008), successful organizations normally have satisfied employees while poor job satisfaction can cripple an organization. Job satisfaction consists of overall or general job satisfaction, as well as a variety of satisfaction facets (Cranny et al., 1992; Friday & Friday, 2003). It is influenced by various factors such as supervisors' displays of nonverbal immediacy (Madlock, 2006b; Richmond & McCroskey, 2000), humour (Avtgis & Taber, 2006), communication satisfaction (Hilgerman, 1998), effects of gender (Madlock, 2006a), and supervisors' communication style (Richmond, McCroskey, Davis, & Koontz, 1980). Lee and Ahmad (2009) found that job satisfaction affects levels of job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, grievance expression, tardiness, low morale, high turnover, quality improvement and participation in decision-making. These in turn affect the overall performance of the organization (Klein Hesselink, Kooij-de Bode, & Koppenrade, 2008; Page & Vella-Brodrick, 2008; Pitts, 2009; Riketta, 2008; Scroggins, 2008).

2.2.1 Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction

Kalleberg (1977) proposed that job satisfaction consists of two components. These are intrinsic (referring to the work itself) and extrinsic (representing facets of the job external to the task itself) job satisfaction. Hirschfield (2000) stated that intrinsic job satisfaction refers how people feel about the nature of the job tasks themselves whereas extrinsic job satisfaction refers how people feel about aspects of the work situation that are external to the job tasks or work itself (Shim, Lusch, & O'Brien, 2002). In this study, two dimensions of job satisfaction are examined, namely working condition (extrinsic) and working assignment (intrinsic). Working condition is the job environment which encompasses the relationship with management function, mentoring system, and others. Poor working conditions, inefficient work organization, inadequate staffing, and managerial practices will affect staff turnover and perceptions of the organisation and work (Banaszak-Holl & Hines, 1996; Cohen-Mansfield, 1989; Eaton, 2000; Harrington, 1996). Therefore, the good working condition as a key factor for workers to develop a value, improve job performance and increase staff retention in organization. As for the work assignment, it refers to the duty or job that are given to employees so that they should implement their job with a commitment and productive.

2.3 Research studies on leadership style and job satisfaction

Lashbrook (1997) stated that leadership style plays a vital role in influencing employees' job satisfaction. Some researchers discovered that different leadership styles will engender different working environment and directly affect the job satisfaction of the employees (Bogler, 2001, 2002; Heller, 1993; McKee, 1991; Timothy & Ronald, 2004). Bass (1985) proposed that transformational leadership might intrinsically foster more job satisfaction, given its ability to impart a sense of mission and intellectual stimulation. Transformational leaders tend to encourage and motivate their followers to take on more responsibility and autonomy (Emery & Barker, 2007) thereby enhancing employees' sense of accomplishment and satisfaction with their job. Transactional and transformational leadership have been widely linked to positive individual and organizational consequences (Bass, 1990). These leadership styles are found to correlate positively with employee perceptions of job, leader and organizational satisfaction (Felfe & Schyns, 2006; Bycio, Hackett & Allen, 1995; Niehoff, Enz & Grover, 1990). Castaneda and Nahavandi (1991) indicated that employees are most satisfied when they perceive their supervisors as exhibiting both relational and task-oriented behaviours.

Consistent with the objectives of the study, four hypotheses were developed for testing:

- H1: There is a positive relationship between the aspects of transactional leadership style such as contingent rewards, management by exception (active) and management by exception (passive) and working condition in the public sector.
- H2: There is a positive relationship between the aspects of transactional leadership style such as contingent rewards, management by exception (active) and management by exception (passive) and work assignment in the public sector.
- H3: There is a positive relationship between the aspects of transformational leadership style such as idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualised consideration and working condition in the public sector.
- H4: There is a positive relationship between the aspects of transformational leadership style such as idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualised consideration and work assignment in the public sector.

3. Research Design

Data was collected through survey questionnaires from targeted employees working in public sector in Selangor such as Ministry of Domestic Trade and Consumer Affairs, Council of trust for the Indigenous People, National Registration Department, Department of Social Welfare and Department of Immigrations. The respondents included employees from different levels in the company such as clerical, lower level of management, middle level of management and top level of management. A total of 300 questionnaires were distributed to selected public sectors using a convenient sampling method. However, only 200 employees responded to the survey, resulting in a 66.7 percent response rate. The measuring instrument for data collection from the employees is in the form of questionnaires which consists of close-ended questions and few open-ended questions and is divided