



## Management Arts

*Elixir Mgmt. Arts* 41 (2011) 5871-5876

**Elixir**  
ISSN: 2229-712X

# Perceptions of authentic leadership and its impact on employee engagement: a case of Malaysia semiconductor manufacturing firm

Choo Ling Suan<sup>1</sup>, Norsiah Mat<sup>2</sup> and Jayanti A/P Kandayah<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Management, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800 Penang, Malaysia

<sup>2</sup>College of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06000 Kedah, Malaysia.

<sup>3</sup>College of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06000 Kedah, Malaysia.

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received: 6 October 2011;

Received in revised form:

25 November 2011;

Accepted: 10 December 2011;

### Keywords

Employee engagement,  
Authentic Leadership,  
Survey Instrument.

## ABSTRACT

The objective of this study is to examine the relationship between employees' perceptions of authentic leadership and employee engagement. Study was conducted in one of the multinational manufacturing companies that based in North Malaysia. A total of 118 employees working in the company provided responses to the scales to assess the perceptions of the authentic leadership and employee engagement. The result indicated a significant positive relationship between employees' perceptions of authentic leadership and employee engagement. Interventions in developing authentic leadership among supervisors and managers and limitations of the study are also being discussed in the study.

© 2011 Elixir All rights reserved.

## Introduction

The concept of engagement among employees has gained momentum because of its predictive value for job performance (Baker, 2009; Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007). In particular, employee engagement has been found to be contributed to job satisfaction, intention to quit, psychological well-being of employees (Burke, Singh, & Fiksenbaum, 2010); employee performance and customer loyalty (Salanova, Agut, & Peiro, 2005); and daily financial returns (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009b). Likewise, Rampersad (2008) postulated that lacking of employee engagement is one of the common cause of excess costs, under-perform on critical tasks and customer dissatisfaction that happens among organizations all over the world.

Despite the importance of employee engagement, some reports have exposed that employee engagements are in the declining stage and there is a deepening disengagement among employees in today's firms (Bates, 2004). Kahn (1990) described that disengaged employees are employees who separate their work roles from work and therefore they would not perform their job effectively. The disengagement among employee will eventually affect the company's profit in long run. Scholars and practitioners commented that there are insufficient academic and empirical research on this important topic (Robinson, Perryman, & Hayday, 2004; Saks, 2006). Furthermore, most of the empirical studies were conducted in western context, empirical study that conducted in Asian context is rather scanty (Aggarwal, Datta, & Bhargava, 2007; Bhatnagar, 2007; Koyuncu, Burke, & Fiksenbaum, 2006; Mohapatra & Sharma, 2010), particularly in the context of Malaysia. In short, there seems to be a gap of knowledge in the matter of employee engagement that needs to be addressed by researchers. Therefore, it is our goal to expand the employee engagement literature available in this area. Practically, this study is also aimed to provide an insight to the management on how to enhance employee engagement in achieving the organization's goals.

Many studies in the past on the antecedents of employee engagement are mainly focused on job resources such as autonomy (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004); social support (Hakanen, Bakker, & Demerouti, 2005) and personal resources such as optimism (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007) and self-efficacy (Karatepe & Olugbade, 2009). Scholars in leadership study particularly commented that relatively little attention has been devoted to the relationship between leadership and engagement (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004). In this light, the objective of the present study is designed to examine the relationship between employees' perception of authentic leadership and employee engagement using quantitative method. We conducted the survey in one of the United States (US) based multinational semiconductor company that is operating in Northern Malaysia. This paper is divided into six sections. The first section of this article is the discussion about the concept of employee engagement, its antecedent and consequences. This followed by a discussion on the concept of authentic leadership and its relationship with employee engagement. In the third section is the description of the methodology used in this study. The fourth section is the presentation of the analysis and empirical findings of this study. In the fifth section, presents the discussion of the findings, limitations and suggestions for future research. The last section of this article is the conclusion of the study.

## Review of Literature

### Concept of employee engagement, its antecedent and consequences

Employee engagement is a relatively new concept in the management studies introduced by Kahn in year 1990. To date, the concept of engagement is still undergoing some debates among scholars what has actually constituted engagement (Walumbwa, Wang, Wang, Schaubroeck, & Avolio, 2010). Some scholars treated engagement as a trait (such as proactive personality), or a state (such as commitment, mood), or a form of performance behavior (such as extra-role behavior) (Macey &

Schneider, 2008; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Schaufeli, Salanova, González-romá, & Bakker, 2002). On the contrary, this notion was not agreed by some scholars (Saks, 2008). In harmony with Harter, Schmidt and Hayes (2002) this study conceptualized employee engagement as a uni-dimension construct represents individual's involvement, satisfaction and enthusiasm in their work. This definition implies that engaged employees are connected cognitively, emotionally, physically and psychologically during the performance of work roles (Harter, et al., 2002). To illustrate further, The Gallup study has further categorized employees into three categories based on their responses in work: engaged employees, not engaged and actively disengaged.

From a careful examination on the antecedents of employee engagement in the literature, we found that most of the academic studies had employed the Conservation of Resources Theory (COR) (Hobfoll, 2001) as the theoretical foundation to underpin their study. The tenet of COR Theory (Hobfoll, 2001) advocates that resources are things that people valued. Hence it has motivational nature to drive an individual to protect it and accumulate it from losses. Based on this notion, past studies have consistently indicated that job resources (autonomy, social support, performance feedback) have a positive relationship with employee engagement (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007; Hakanen, et al., 2005; Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Job resources refers to those physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that may: (1) reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs; (2) be functional in achieving work goals; or (3) stimulate personal growth, learning, and development (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). For example, a survey on two independent samples in Spain (n = 386 technology employees) and the Netherlands (n = 338 telecom managers) ascertained that job resources (job control, feedback and job variety) were positively and significantly contributed to employee engagement in both samples (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008).

Aside from job resources, the roles of personal resources (optimism, self-efficacy, resilience, hope) in employee engagement have begun to receive attention (Karatepe & Olugbade, 2009; Xanthopoulou, et al., 2007; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009a). Personal resources have been defined as the positive self-evaluations that are linked to resiliency and individuals' sense of their ability to control and impact upon their environment successfully (Hobfoll, Johnson, Ennis, & Jackson, 2003). Karatepe and Olugbade (2009) suggested that personal resources such as trait competitiveness and self-efficacy were positively related to employee engagement in the sample (n = 130) of employees working in the five- and four-star hotels in the capital city of Nigeria.

It is important to study engagement because it is linked to positive individual and work related outcomes (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008; Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007). Past studies had produced evidence that employee engagement lead to a variety of positive organizational outcomes such as retention, customer satisfaction, in-role performance and extra-role behaviors and financial returns (Moliner, Martí'nez-Tur, Ramos, Peiro', & Cropanzano, 2008; Xanthopoulou, Baker, Heuven, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2008; Xanthopoulou, et al., 2009b).

#### **Authentic Leadership**

In harmony with the definition from Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, and May (2004), this study defined authentic leadership as "those individuals who are deeply aware

of how they think and behave; perceived by others as being aware of their own and others' values/moral perspective, knowledge, and strengths; aware of the context in which they operate; and who are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and high on moral character" (p. 4). Wildermuth and Pauken (2008) asserted that authentic leadership is a combination of ethical and transformational qualities. They contended that authentic leaders are inspiring, motivational, and visionary but also reliably moral, compassionate, and service oriented. Besides that George (2003) suggested that authentic leaders have genuine desire to serve others through their leadership, are more interested in empowering the people they lead to make a difference, and are as guided by the qualities of the heart, passion, and compassion. Luthans and Avolio (2003) distinguished that authentic leaders recognize and value individual differences and have the ability and motivation to identify people's talents and help them build those talents into strengths. Scholars in the leadership literatures have agreed that specific leadership characteristics encourage employee engagement (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Kouzes & Posner, 2002). More recently, the results from Babcock-Roberson and Oriel (2010) study indicated that employee engagement fully mediates the relationship between charismatic leadership's on OCB.

#### **The relationship between authentic leadership and employee engagement**

Leadership has been suggested as one of the single biggest factors contributing to employee engagement (Harter et al., 2002). Engagement particularly has been viewed as an important consequence of authentic leadership that mediates its effects on follower outcomes (Avolio, et al., 2004). May, Gilson, and Harter (2004) advocated that authentic leaders are capable in inspiring their followers to act authentically in the workplace because themselves are acting consistently with their moral principles. Field Theory developed by Lewin (1951) posited that human behavior is based on the individual perception towards their work environment. Based on this ground, it can be postulated that if individual has a positive perceptions with their work environment, they are likely to demonstrate positive behavior. Theoretically, it seems plausible employee's perceptions of the authentic leadership among their supervisors and managers will create a positive work environment and subsequently increase the likelihood of employee engagement. Apart from the authentic leadership values, authentic leaders possess some special personal qualities such confident, hopeful, optimistic and resilient (Avolio, et al., 2004). Researchers presumed that through the observation learning process (Bandura, 1977) employees would learn this personal qualities from their leader over their daily work interactions. Given the fact that previous studies have consistently reported the positive role of personal resources (optimism, self-efficacy, resilience, hope) in predicting employee engagement (Karatepe & Olugbade, 2009; Xanthopoulou, et al., 2007, 2009a), it is reasonable to think that through the observation learning process (Bandura, 1977), employee established their own personal resources and this personal resources in turn lead to enhance their engagement in work.

Theorist in leadership study suggested that authentic leaders have genuine desire to serve others through their leadership and interested in empowering their followers to make a difference (eg: George, 2003). In this vein, supports and empowerment from authentic leaders would serve as job resources that facilitate employees to achieve their work goals, stimulate their

personal growth and alleviate their job demands. From the lens of Conservation of Resources Theory (Hobfoll, et al., 2003), it is reasonable to expect that employee's perceptions of authentic leadership will lead to employee engagement since the supports from their leader has facilitated them to achieve their work goals as well as reduced their job demand. In particular, Avolio et al. (2004) have proposed a framework to illustrate the link between authentic leadership and followers' attitudes and behaviors. Abreast of Avolio et al. (2004) work, it is predicted that employee's perception of authentic leadership among their supervisors and managers will have a positive influence on employee engagement.

### Research Design

#### Survey Instrument

The questionnaire used in this study consisted of three sections as shown in Table I. Section A of the questionnaire is to gather information on the profile of respondents such as job category, length of service, gender, age, race and marital status. Section B of the questionnaire is to measure the perceptions of employees on the extent of their supervisors and managers are practicing authentic leadership style. Respondents are given five-point Likert scale with 1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Uncertain, 4= Agree and 5= Strongly Agree. The last section of the questionnaire measures employee's perception of their engagement level into their

#### Sample

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between employee's perceptions of authentic leadership practices and employee engagement in one of the Malaysia semiconductor manufacturing company therefore this study is correlational in nature.

The unit of analysis for this study is employees working in the selected manufacturing company. Researcher made the initial contact with the Human Resource Department to request for the permission to conduct the survey during official lunch hour at the company's in-house cafeteria.

Using the convenience sampling method, a total 125 questionnaires were distributed. The questionnaires were administered personally by the researchers through a direct contact procedure, on variables used in this study. To reduce evaluation apprehension, social desirability bias, leniency and acquiescence, researchers assured respondents complete anonymity. Besides that, researchers also made effort to assure respondents that there were no right or wrong answers; they should answer as honestly as possible (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Final useable responses were obtained from 118 participants, with a response rate of 94%.

This study is a quantitative study, conducted cross-sectionally in which all data was collected one point in time. This cross-sectional type of research is also consistent with previous studies on employee engagement and employee's perception of leadership behavior (Babcock-Roberson & Oriel, 2010).

#### Method of analysis

Frequency distribution was used to describe the profile of the sample. Next, reliability test was performed to measure the internal consistency of the scale. This was then followed by computation of means and standard deviation of all variables used in this study which is authentic leadership and employee engagement. Lastly, regression analysis was performed. To examine the predictive validity,  $R^2$  value was computed in order to predict for future behavior.

### Findings

Demographic of the respondents are summarized in table II. Majority of the respondents are executives (58.5%) and managers (39.8%). Only 1.7% of the respondents are non-executives. There is a good mix of length of service: 17.8% of the respondents have worked for less than five years, 29.7% for five to nine years, 32.2% for ten to 14 years, and 20.3% for 15 years and above. Almost half of the total respondents are from Production (52.5%) with the rest from Supply Chain (26.3%), Information Technology (7.6%) and Corporate Services (12.7%). 64.4% are females and 35.6% males. Majority are in the 35 to 44 years age group (50%), followed by 25 to 34 years age group (34.7%), 45 years and above age group (13.6%), and less than 25 years age group (1.7%). About two-thirds of the respondents are Chinese (68.6%) and the rest are Indians (18.6%), Malays (10.2%) and others (2.5%).

Next, reliability test was performed to measure the internal consistency of the scale used in this study. According to Nunnally (1978) the minimum requirement of Cronbach Alpha level of 0.70. Table III suggests that there are all two variables in this study; the numbers of items for each variable are indicated in the table below, Cronbach Alpha values of the study variables exceeds the recommended level of 0.7.

In the next section, a descriptive analysis was performed to analyze the perception of employees on the extent of authentic leadership practiced by their supervisors and managers in the company. As indicated in Table IV, the mean for authentic leadership is 4.01, indicating that respondents perceived a high level of authentic leadership style exhibited by their supervisors and managers. Pertaining to the level of employee engagement, respondents perceived themselves as moderately engaged (mean = 3.89, SD = 0.63).

Next, a regression analysis was conducted to examine the predictive power of authentic leadership on employee engagement. Table V shows that the employee's perceptions of authentic leadership are significantly related to employee engagement ( $\beta=0.337$ ;  $p<0.001$ ) supporting our hypothesis. Besides that, the R square value is 0.321, indicating that 32.1% of the variance in the employee engagement can be explained by employee's perception of authentic leadership style.

### Discussion of the findings

The objective of this study is to examine the relationship between employee's perception on authentic leadership and employee engagement. The results obtained showed that employees, who perceived their supervisors and managers as an authentic leader, were more engaged in their work. This finding is in accordance with the framework proposed by Avolio, et al. (2004) which suggested that authentic leadership will lead to employee engagement. As expected, employee's perceptions of authentic leadership play a crucial role on employee engagement because of the authentic leadership quality will create a positive environment in working place as postulated in Field Theory (Lewin, 1951); enhance follower's personal resources and job resources during their daily work interactions which is in unity with the concept in Conservation of Resources Theory (Hobfoll, et al., 2003).

Management should take into consideration of the importance of authentic leadership in work place since the results have indicated that employee's perceptions of authentic leadership among their supervisors and managers are positively related with employee engagement. Although authentic leadership is not like other areas of leadership which competency sets might be acquired via traditional training

programs (Cooper, Scandura, & Schriesheim, 2005), this does not mean the management should turn a blind eye to develop authentic leadership among supervisors and managers. Having effective programs such as training, rewards, performance appraisal from Human Resources Department to enhance authentic leadership should be integrated into top management strategic planning as having authentic leaders will definitely enforce employee engagement towards their work roles. Furthermore, management also can determine to trigger events which can be replicated during training. Trigger events can be the culmination of smaller events which accumulate overtime until a threshold level is reached which evokes behaviors that are characteristic of authentic leaders. In sum, authentic leadership is an evolutionary as well as revolutionary, but it is possible that these behaviors to be taught through a reinforcement process (Cooper, et al., 2005).

#### Limitations and future research

Although this study has shown that authentic leadership influences employee engagement, it does have some limitations. The first shortcoming is the used of sample in only one manufacturing firm could have affected the relationship obtained in this study. Second, the limitation from the survey setting also might limits the generalization in other settings. It would be interesting for future researchers to investigate employee engagement in other settings to generalize the findings. Besides that, it would be good for future study to include other variables such as organizational cultural, HR practices as possible antecedents to extend our knowledge in this field. In addition, further researchers may extend the model to examine the consequences of employee engagement empirically which could help to bridge the gap of knowledge in the context employee engagement. Wefald and Downey (2009) claimed that limited studies are looking at the consequences of the engagement. Therefore, future researchers might want to focus on how employee engagement can benefit managerial decisions and important outcomes.

#### Conclusion

This study attempts to explore the relationship between authentic leadership in predicting employee engagement in one of the semiconductor manufacturing firm in Malaysia. Interestingly, the finding shows that 32.1% of employee engagement is affected by the perceptions of employees on their supervisors and managers authentic leadership. Practically, top management needs to cooperate with the Human Resources Department to play its strategic role to develop authentic leadership among supervisors and managers such as conducting leadership training programs, aligning organization rewards and performance appraisal program effectively to further enhance the exhibition of authentic leadership among supervisors and managers. These would subsequently enhance employee engagement in the company in achieving the organization's goals.

#### References

Aggarwal, U., Datta, S., & Bhargava, S. (2007). The Relationship between Human Resource Practices, Psychological Contract and Employee Engagement -- Implications for Managing Talent. *IIMB Management Review (Indian Institute of Management Bangalore)*, 19(3), 313-325.

Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: a look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 801-823.

Babcock-Roberson, M. E., & Oriel, J. S. (2010). The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144(3), 313-326.

Baker, A. B. (2009). Buiding engagement in the workplace. In C. Cooper & R. Burke (Eds.), *The peak performing organization* (pp. 50-72). London: Routledge.

Bakker, A. B., Hakanen, J. J., Demerouti, E., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2007). Job resources boost work engagement, particularly when job demands are high. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2), 274-284.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.

Bates, S. (2004). Getting engaged. *HR Magazine*, 49, 44-51.

Bhatnagar, J. (2007). Talent management strategy of employee engagement in India ITES employees: Key to retention. *Employee Relations*, 29(6), 640-663.

Burke, R. J., Singh, P., & Fiksenbaum, L. (2010). Work intensity: potential antecedents and consequences. *Personnel Review*, 39(3), 347-360.

Cooper, C. D., Scandura, T. A., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2005). Looking forward but learning from our past: Potential challenges to developing authentic leadership theory and authentic leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 475-493.

George, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. B. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Demourouti, E. (2005). How dentist cope with their job demand and stay engaged: The moderating role of job resources. *European Journal of Oral Sciences*, 113, 487-497.

Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43, 495-513.

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.

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Review of General Psychology*, 50(3), 513-421.

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), 632-643.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal* 33(4), 692-724.

Karatepe, O. M., & Olugbade, O. A. (2009). The effect of job and personal resources on hotel employees' work engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28, 504-512.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Koyuncu, M., Burke, R. J., & Fiksenbaum, L. (2006). Work Engagement among women managers and professionals in Turkish bank. *Equal Opportunities International* 25(4), 299-310.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: selected theoretical papers (Edited by Dorwin Cartwright)*: Oxford, England: Harpers.

- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. (2003). Authentic leadership: A positive development approach. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The Meaning of Employee Engagement. *Industrial & Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 11-37.
- Mohapatra, M., & Sharma, B. R. (2010). Study of Employee Engagement and its Predictors in an Indian Public Sector Undertaking. *Global Business Review*, 11(2), 281-301.
- Moliner, C., Martí'nez-Tur, V., Ramos, J., Peiro', J. M., & Cropanzano, R. (2008). Organizational justice and extrarole customer service: The mediating role of well-being at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(3), 327-348.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*: McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- Rampersad, H. K. (2008). The way to a highly engaged and happy workforce based on the personal balanced scorecard. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 17(1), 11-27.
- Robinson, P., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). *The drivers of employee engagement*. Brinton: Institute for Employment Studies.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- Saks, A. M. (2008). The Meaning and Bleeding of Employee Engagement: How Muddy Is the Water? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 40-43.
- Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiro, J. M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied psychology* 90(6), 1217-1227.
- Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive behaviour. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(1), 116-131.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 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: Managing social and ethical issues in organizations* (pp. 135-177). Greenwich: CT: Information Age Publishers.
- 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.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Wang, P., Wang, H., Schaubroeck, J., & Avolio, B. J. (2010). Psychological processes linking authentic leadership to follower behaviors. [doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.07.015]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(5), 901-914.
- Wefald, A. J., & Downey, R. G. (2009). Job Engagement in organizations: fad, fashion or folderol. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 141-145.
- Wildermuth, C., & Pauken, P. D. (2008). A perfect match: decoding employee engagement – Part I: Engaging cultures and leaders. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 40(3), 122-128.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Baker, A. B., Heuven, E., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Working in the sky: A diary study on work engagement among flight attendants. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13(4), 345-356.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the Job Demands-Resource Model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(2), 121-141.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009a). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(3), 235-244.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009b). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *The British Psychological Society*, 82, 183-200.

**Table I: Measurement of the variable**

Section	Variable	No of Items	Scales	Source of Scale
A	Respondent Demographic (Job category, length of service, gender, age, ethic, marital status, department)	6	Nominal	
B	Authentic Leadership	5	5 point Likert scale with 1= Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3= Uncertain; 4= Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree	Avolio, Gardner & Walumbwa (2004)
C	Employee Engagement	12	5 point Likert scale with 1= Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3= Uncertain; 4= Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree	The Gallup Organization (2008)

**Table II: Profile of respondents**

		Frequency	Percentage
Job Category	Manager	47	39.8
	Executives	69	58.5
	Non- Executives	2	1.7
Length of Service	Less than 5 years	21	17.8
	5 to 9 years	35	29.7
	10 to 14 years	38	32.2
	15 years and above	24	20.3
Department	Production	62	52.5
	Supply Chain	31	26.3
	Information Technology	9	7.6
	Corporate Services	15	12.7
Gender	Male	42	35.6
	Female	76	64.4
Age Group	Less than 25 years	2	1.7
	25 to 34 years	41	34.7
	35 to 44 years	59	50
	45 years and above	16	13.6
Ethnicity	Malay	12	10.2
	Chinese	81	68.6
	Indian	22	18.6
	Others	3	2.5

**Table III: Reliability Analysis**

Variables	No. of Items	Cronbach Alpha
Authentic Leadership	7	0.87
Employee Engagement	12	0.90

**Table IV: Means, Standard Deviations**

Variable	Mean	SD
Authentic Leadership	4.01	0.59
Employee Engagement	3.89	0.63

**Table V: Regression result for independent variables and employee engagement**

Variables	Beta	Sig
Authentic Leadership	0.337**	.001
R <sup>2</sup>	0.321	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.314	

Significant at p&lt;.001\*\*