

The Influence of Drivers of Employee Engagement on Employee Work Outcomes in Hotel Industry – The Case Of Sarajevo

¹,Aida Akagic Hodzic, ²,Amina Ibisevic, ³,Senad Busatlic, ⁴,Semsudin Plojovic²
^{1,2,3,4},Department of FBA, International University of Sarajevo

ABSTRACT : The research study identifies and analyzes the drivers and outcomes of employee engagement among hotel employees in Sarajevo City, the capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina. There are six potential drivers and three potential outcomes of employee engagement proposed by Aon Hewitt Model of Employee Engagement and modified by the authors to the certain degree. For the simplicity, the authors divided the analysis into two models. In the first model, the influence of job characteristics (JC), work-life balance (WLB), internal communication (IC), brand/corporate image (BCI), empowering leadership (EL), and rewards and recognition (RR) on the level of employee engagement was examined. The second model tends to examine the influence of employee engagement on employee work outcomes: employee work performance (EWP), affective organizational commitment (AOC), and turnover intention (TI). These employee work outcomes are indeed representing the overall business outcomes. The study is conveyed via a questionnaire including responses of 135 hotel employees in Sarajevo City. Multiple Regression Analysis was performed in order to test the hypotheses. The findings of the study suggest that there is a significant and positive relationship between JC, IC, EL, RR and employee engagement itself. In addition, the positive and significant relationship was found between employee engagement, EWC, and AOC, while the link between employee engagement and TI turned out to be significant and negative

KEYWORDS: employees, motivation, satisfaction, engagement, hotels, Sarajevo.

I. INTRODUCTION

Today's successful organizations have a difficult task to do in order to satisfy customer needs, wants, and demands. This is the case because globalization has a tremendous effect on businesses and customers as well. From one perspective, businesses face a huge competition with the people, companies, and nations integrating with each other at a rapid rate. On the other hand, customers are the heart of any business; they are a crucial element for organizations striving to succeed. An ongoing complex and dynamic business environment imposes immense challenges in front of the organizations. Since every organization is exposed to significant pressures to survive, gain, and maintain a competitive advantage over its rivals, sometimes these organizations face huge difficulties to achieve their fundamental objectives. It is widely known that the ultimate aim of any organization is to maximize its profit, but there is something more valuable that should be treated in a proper manner. This is called human capital. If this segment is properly managed, then the level of motivation, satisfaction, and engagement of employees towards the organization will be higher leading to the superior overall organizational performance.

The concept of hospitality industry includes a broad range of business activities providing a unique experience in terms of customer service. Several research studies have shown that a great number of managers working in the hospitality industry recognized the importance of investment in high-performance work practices. These practices involve training, empowerment, well-conducted appraisal and reward system, encouraging team building and stimulating effective and efficient self as well as teamwork. When applied appropriately, these practices result in a high level of motivation for employees and their significantly superior job outcomes in addition to the lower rate of turnovers. Moreover, high-performance work practices imply strong organizational support making the employees feel highly valued. Supportive organization and work environment help employees in strengthening their personal resources which eventually contribute positively to psychological and organizational outcomes (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). The research study presents a form of qualitative and quantitative research approach. Since the concepts of employee motivation, satisfaction, and engagement are tightly related, the first two concepts will be briefly explained by their nature and importance, while the concept of employee engagement will be quantitatively examined in addition to revising the already existing literature.

II. PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

is to primary answer on the questions: What is the relationship between the given set of drivers of employee engagement and overall employee engagement among hotel industry employees in Sarajevo City? and What is the relationship between overall employee engagement and the given set of employee work outcomes among hotel industry employees in Sarajevo City? Recognizing the topic importance itself and the importance of human capital, this study covers two main objectives: 1: To discover the fundamental triggers of engagement among hotel industry employees in Sarajevo City and 2: to investigate the potential benefits of highly engaged labor force at the workplace among hotel industry employees in Sarajevo City.

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Methods used in this research are qualitative and quantitative. The research comprised the 10 hotels with the four and five-star hotels in Sarajevo. However, in an absence of prior literature on the research topic in Bosnia and Herzegovina and more precisely Sarajevo City, this research study used a mixed-method approach and is relatively new in practice. Researchers use it to appoint the weaknesses and strengths of both. This research study used two models; the first model aims to analyze the impact of (1) job characteristics, (2) work-life balance, (3) internal communication, (4) brand/corporate image, (5) empowering leadership, and (6) rewards and recognition on employee engagement and the second model seeks to analyze the influence of employee engagement on (1) employee work performance, (2) affective organizational commitment, and (3) turnover intention.

IV. RESULTS

The results are presented in the table below with explanations:

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std.Deviation	Variance
Overall Employee Engagement	135	1	5	3.5	1.37	1.87
Drivers of Employee Engagement						
Job Characteristics	135	1	7	4.67	1.81	3.31
Work Life Balance	135	1	5	3.44	1.24	1.55
Internal Communication	135	1	4.8	3.04	1.22	1.49
Brand/Corporate Image	135	1.33	5	3.81	1.06	1.14
Empowering Leadership	135	1	5	3.5	1.25	1.58
Rewards and Recognition	135	1	5	3.02	1.23	1.52
Employee Work Outcomes						
Employee Work Performance	135	1	5	3.66	1.09	1.21
Affective Organizational Commitment	135	1	5	3.13	1.28	1.64
Turnover Intention	135	1	5	2.52	1.29	1.67

Pursuant to the **Error! Reference source not found.**, we can see that responses did not lack on any of the scales, because each of the questions in the scales representing specific variable count 135 (N) answers. All ten variables employed in this study are measured based on a 5-point Likert scale with the exception of job characteristics measured on a 7-point Likert scale. Almost all answers on questions provided were ranging from 1 to 5 or 1 to 7 including all potential answers from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”. However, in terms of internal communication, the maximum value recorded is 4.8 meaning that none of the participants circled the extreme of 5 on the particular question (See Appendix B). In the same manner, regarding the brand/corporate image, the minimum value recorded is 1.33 indicating that none of the participants circled the extreme of 1 on the particular question (See Appendix B). The low mean score less than 3.39 is noted in case of four variables: the lowest turnover intention (2.52), rewards and recognition (3.02), internal communication (3.04), and affective organizational commitment (3.13). The moderate mean score varying from 3.40 to 3.79 is noted in the case of four variables: work-life balance (3.47), overall employee engagement (3.5), empowering leadership (3.5), and employee work performance (3.66), whereas the high mean score above 3.8 is identified in case of two variables: brand/corporate image (3.81), and job characteristics (4.67). Based on this, it can be concluded that

employees in the hotel industry in Sarajevo are relatively engaged in their work and organization. In regard to the drivers of employee engagement, employees believe that rewards and recognition, and internal communication are the least used ways of enhancing the overall employee engagement. The rest four drivers of employee engagement are relatively well used in order to improve the level of employee engagement with the focus on job characteristics as the highest ranked one. In terms of employee work outcomes, employees reported having fairly good overall performance. Nevertheless, employees reported low score in their affective organizational commitment level identifying themselves as not committed to their organization to the high degree. Employees reported low score on turnover intention too which can be caused by potential fear of losing job although responses are kept confidential. Besides, having in mind that the unemployment rate in Bosnia and Herzegovina is high, a lot of people do not care about working conditions, but rather keep quiet and “happy” with what they have.

Lastly, from the column representing scores on standard deviation, the responses varied the most on job characteristic scale (1.81), then overall employee engagement (1.37), turnover intention (1.29), affective organizational commitment (1.28), empowering leadership (1.25), work-life balance (1.24), rewards and recognition (1.23), internal communication (1.22), while the lowest standard deviation is noted in the brand/corporate image scale (1.06), and employee work performance (1.09). The wider results are presented in the discussions -next section as it follows.

V. DISCUSSIONS

After the introduction in the problem statement of the research study, providing the insight into the existing literature on the main and related topics, developed and discussed model to be used for the analysis, methodology, and results of the entire analysis, we are coming to the sixth section of the study, which will focus on discussion of the obtained results. To the extent of the author’s knowledge, the research on drivers and outcomes of employee engagement is barely conducted in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and particularly in Sarajevo City focusing on hotel industry employees. That is, actually, one of the major motivating force for conveying this research study. As explained in the previous sections, the model to be examined in this study is based on Aon Hewitt Model of Employee Engagement covering the 6 drivers of employee engagement divided into two subgroups: foundation drivers and differentiator drivers counting 3 drivers per each group. Foundation drivers include (1) job characteristics representing the work itself, (2) work-life balance representing the basics of any job a person is engaged in, and (3) internal communication representing company practices. Foundation group of drivers tend to reveal the influence of elementary conditions offered by the organization, or hotel in this particular study. On the other side, differentiators are drivers that might significantly vary among organizations, and among employees in terms of their perception. Differentiator drivers include (4) brand/corporate image representing the brand, (5) empowering leadership representing leadership, and (6) rewards and recognition representing performance section.

Differentiator drivers tend to reveal the influence of additional factors that have the potential to create a source of differentiation for employees on the level of employee engagement. Once the influence of several drivers of employee engagement on the level of employee engagement itself is disclosed, the author proceeded to disclosing the influence of employee engagement on employee work outcomes: (1) employee work performance, (2) affective organizational commitment, and (3) turnover intention which are eventually representing what are the all-embracing business outcomes resulting from employee engagement. In total, this research proposed five hypotheses: two regarding the drivers of employee engagement, and three considering the employee work outcomes. The first two hypotheses are classified into the three sub-hypotheses per each. If two or three out of three sub-hypotheses ended up to be supported, the entire main hypothesis is said to be partially supported. In accordance with the final results of the analysis, it can be said that two hypotheses (H1 and H2) are partially supported, while the rest three hypotheses (H3, H4, and H5) are supported.

A. 6.1. Model I – Drivers of Employee Engagement - *The Model I tends to examine the influence of 6 drivers of employee engagement on the employee engagement. It is consisting of two main hypotheses divided into fundamental and differentiator engagement drivers. The results are discussed below.*

The relationship between all fundamental engagement drivers and employee engagement was expected to be significant and positive. **Hypothesis 1:** There is a significant and positive relationship between each fundamental

engagement driver (job characteristics, work-life balance, and internal communication) and employee engagement.

The findings reported that job characteristics and organizational internal communication are significantly and positively related to the level of employee engagement. This means that these two fundamental drivers considerably lead to the enhanced level of employee engagement. As long as there are improvements in skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback representing the core job characteristics, the level of employee engagement will rise without any doubt. That is what employees truly need from their jobs. Correspondingly, if managers invest in developing and improving the channels of communication within the organization, and if employees feel that they are sufficiently included in what is going on at the workplace, having the same amount of information as everyone else in the organization, they tend to feel more engaged with the organization. In line with Kahn's (1992) findings, employees who rank high on five fundamental job features are likely to be more engaged than those lacking skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback. Just as Saks (2006) addresses, workers disposing of with a variety of challenging tasks which they perceive as important, feel that the minimum they can do for an organization is to be engaged. As reported by Sundaray (2011), if the job is designed in a way that is preferable by an individual, employees tend to engage more with their jobs generating better eventual results. Finally, Swathi (2013) concluded that job characteristics including challenge, self-government, and diversity give an employee sense of meaning and likewise, these jobs become appealing to the employees impacting their level of engagement. Conclusively, the influence of job characteristics on employee engagement seems to be confirmed by the current study as suggested from previous studies.

As stated in Parsley (2006), effective communication within the organization is an important determinant of employee engagement. One of the crucial aspects of effective communication is the communication skills of managers because everything starts from them. Communication in an organization should be open and forthright, while supervisors should ensure that the information is passed equally among all employees. Also, employees should feel free to express their attitudes on how things should be done and management should take into consideration all suggestions or complaints by employees. Conforming to Shaffer (2004), organizations are able to intensify overall organizational performance through employee engagement using the cautiously managing communication. Wyatt (2008) has figured out that communication is a key determinant of the overall engagement level of employees. Evidence suggests that supremely engaged employees communicate more often with their supervisors and managers than low engaged employees. Organizations should keep labor force informed about the issues going on in an organization so that all organization members tend to work for the same outcomes. If certain alterations are going to happen in an organization, employees should be informed in a timely manner to respond as good as possible to these changes. Krishnan and Wesley (2013) confirmed the positive and significant relationship between internal communication and employee engagement, suggesting that communication within the organization is a strong predictor of employee engagement. Therefore, managers should concentrate on developing effective communication channels and ensure a smooth flow of information throughout the organization for the purpose of attaining ultimate organizational goals (Krishnan & Wesley, 2013). Conforming to all these findings, it can be said that the current study managed to find the same results. Yet, work-life balance part of this hypothesis is not supported meaning that in case of hotel employees in Sarajevo, work-life balance does not play a highly important role in driving the level of their engagement. A research study conducted by Wang (2016) states that there is a strong positive relationship between WLB and employee engagement. This means that those employees who manage to create a balance between personal and professional life tend to be more engaged than those failing to balance these two aspects. However, the final results of the current research study failed to confirm earlier findings. The relationship between all differentiator engagement drivers and employee engagement was expected to be significant and positive.

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant and positive relationship between each differentiator engagement driver (brand/corporate image, empowering leadership, and rewards and recognition) and employee engagement. The analysis found out that empowering leadership and rewards and recognition are significantly and positively related to the employee engagement. This means that having a supportive and encouraging leadership which tends to involve employees in decision making, while at the same time provides useful feedback to employees will indeed be resulting in high levels of employee engagement. Following the same direction, rewards and recognition contribute to the employee engagement when provided to employees based on their performance at least. It should be kind of unwritten rule that employees who are recognized and appreciated for high performance, while also awarded through financial and nonfinancial incentives will be appreciating and highly valuing the organization they are working for. Consequently, they will compensate by high levels of engagement.

In wide literature, leadership is recognized as one of the pivotal determinants of employee engagement (Anitha, 2014; Carasco – Saul, Kim, & Kim, 2015). The theoretical foundation supports different types of leadership. Having this in mind, transformational leadership was identified as factor emphasizing employee engagement (Zhu, Avolio, & Walumbwa, 2009; Aryee et al., 2012). In similar fashion, authentic leadership (Walumbwa et al., 2008), charismatic leadership (Babcock-Roberson & Strickland, 2010), and empowering leadership (Tuckey, Bakker, & Dollard, 2012) turned out to be strong determinants of employee engagement (as cited in Cai et al., 2018). Empowering leadership is particularly important because it is capable of enhancing autonomy among employees which is extremely valuable for labor force (Zhang & Bartol, 2010; Tuckey, Bakker, & Dollard, 2012). Empowering leadership is narrowed shape of relational leadership including dividing control over activities that can considerably encourage employees' motivation, participation, and engagement (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). In their study about leadership and engagement, Wallace and Trinkka (2009) evinced that employee engagement is an expected outcome of inspiring and empowering leadership. Leaders are held liable to enhance the importance of employee performance on general business favorable outcomes. Taking this into account, employees will perceive their job as significant and worthwhile which will foster their engagement (Wallace & Trinkka, 2009).

In line with the prior findings, the present study discovered the significant and positive relationship between EL and EE. Scott and McMullen (2010) were examining the impact of rewards programs on employee engagement where they supported earlier findings that employee engagement is significantly determined by rewards and recognition structure, programs, and policies. Organizations fostering engaging employees through rewards and recognition incentives are likely to strengthen motivation and engagement levels of employees than organizations which do not use such programs. Evidence suggests that rewards and recognition have a huge significance in determining the level of employee engagement. Employees who are awarded, appreciated and recognized for performing well consider engagement towards organization as an obligation (Saks & Rotman, 2006). Another finding by Kahn (1990) argues that the extent of employee engagement is a result of employees' observation of what they gain for high performance. It is not always important what the reward for high performance is, but also how employees perceive these rewards. Anitha (2014) concluded that if an organization wants to benefit from the highly engaged labor force, it should set sustainable standards of rewards and recognition for its employees (Anitha, 2014). It can be concluded that the significant and positive relationship between RR and EE which is found in this study consistently reflect the formerly derived results.

However, brand/corporate image sub-hypothesis is not supported meaning that this element is not driving the level of employee engagement significantly among hotel employees in Sarajevo. In the study conducted by Ambler and Barrow (1996) was discovered that powerful marketing of an appealing brand image has an ability to yield benefits for organizational performance through organizational trust and commitment, while the powerful brand equity might generate a higher return on human resources. Organizations with a strong brand or corporate image perceived by employees tend to entice highly skilled labor force, improve the relationship between organization and employees, and ultimately decrease the rate of turnovers among employees (Berthon et al., 2005). Based on interviews conducted in Finland, Japan, and Korea among employees working in different industries, Wang (2016) found out that employees are willing to "say", "stay", and "strive" if they perceive their corporation as a valuable and prestigious, providing the quality to customers. If the brand or corporate image is viewed as positive in the eyes of customers, employees feel proud and inspired to work hard (Wang, 2016). The final results of the current study failed to support the prior results when it comes to the relationship between BCI and EE.

B. 6.2. Model II – Employee Work Outcomes

Going back to 1990, Kahn was the initiator of the idea that employee engagement is positively associated with various organizational outcomes. The argument for this idea suggests that employees who find justified reason for performing specific tasks will strive for organizational success instead of performing tasks just because they are paid for it (Kahn, 1990). In line with Saks' (2006) findings, impacts of the engaged labor force are tremendous. In general, engaged employees are prone to express positive attitudes towards the organization and exercise desirable behaviors, while they are less likely to quit the current job. In consistency with Kompasso and Sridevi (2010), employee engagement plays a crucial role in enhancing the relationships between employers and employees. Strong interpersonal relationships lead to profound emotional attachment towards the organization. In addition to strong attachment, employee engagement contributes to higher efficiency and high retention rates.

Model II tends to examine the influence of employee engagement on the employee work outcomes, which are simultaneously the business outcomes.

It is consisting of three hypotheses. The results are discussed below. The relationship between employee engagement and employee work performance was expected to be significant and positive.

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant and positive relationship between employee engagement and employee work performance. The statistical analysis showed that there is a significant and positive relationship between employee engagement and employee work performance. This tells us that hotel employees in Sarajevo who are engaged with their current organizations have a tendency to exercise better performance, focusing on their tasks, and giving their best to achieve personal, but also organizational goals. From this, we can also conclude that, conversely, employees who are not engaged with their current employer are more likely to perform low. As stated by Robertson-Smith and Markwick (2009), engagement gives employees a chance to dedicate themselves to the work and enhance their confidence and productivity. It also may contribute to developing positive attitudes towards work and organization. Benefits of engagement are immense, starting from higher efforts, improved psychological state of an individual, and enhanced creativity, to desirable individual behaviors. At the end of the day, these factors lead to a happier and more efficient labor force (as cited in Bedarkar & Pandita, 2014). In addition, a number of researchers (Gonring, 2008; Harter et al., 2009; Nahrgang, Morgeson, & Hofman, 2011) support the claim that there is a significant and positive relationship between EE and EWP which is in consistence with the results of the present research. The relationship between employee engagement and affective organizational commitment was expected to be significant and positive.

Hypothesis 4: There is a significant and positive relationship between employee engagement and affective organizational commitment. The results indicated that the relationship between employee engagement and affective organizational commitment is significant and positive. When employees are highly engaged, they feel the organizational problems as their own; feel the strong sense of commitment, belonging, and affection towards the organization. They believe that they fit the best with the current organization. The more engaged employees, the more committed labor force is. Concerning the effects of employee engagement on organizational commitment, it was figured out that as the level of employee engagement improves; organizational commitment does the same providing greater job satisfaction, enhanced performance, creativity, lower absenteeism, and reduced intention to quit the job (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007). Meaningful and psychologically sound environment, as well as climate at the workplace, adds to the extent of employee involvement and commitment of time and efforts into the organizational activities (Brown & Leigh, 1996). Widely known research by Saks (2006) about determinants and outcomes of employee engagement disclosed that engagement is actually mediator between determinants such as job characteristics, rewards and recognition, procedural and distributive justice, perceived organizational and supervisor support, and corresponding outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and organizational citizenship and behavior. The field investigated by Maslach, Schaufelli, and Leiter (2001), discovered six aspects (workload, control, rewards and recognition, community and social support, perceived fairness, and values) of work and life contributing to engagement and results have shown that all of these six factors are positively related to the engagement. Similar to the findings of other authors (Saks, 2006), employee engagement serves as a mediator between antecedents and consequences of employee engagement such as performance, commitment, satisfaction, and job incumbency (Saks, 2006). Respectively, it can be said that the current study succeeded to be in line with the earlier studies when it comes to the relationship between EE and AOC. Finally, the relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention is the only one expected to be significant and negative.

Hypothesis 5: There is a significant and negative relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention. The final hypothesis is also supported backed up with the statistical results. This result indicates that the high level of engagement among employees will result in lower intention to leave the current organization. The descriptive statistics of the data provide evidence that employees in hotel industry, with the focus on 4 and 5 star hotels in Sarajevo City are relatively engaged to their work and organization, which means that a considerable number of them out of 135 included in the analysis score relatively high on say, stay, and strive facets. However, among these three facets, the smallest mean is noted in "stay" facet. This can be related to their scores on turnover intention scale, where a huge number of respondents reported not having an intention to leave the organization in the following short term period. However, in long term, the respondents reported intention to look for other job opportunities. In general, engaged employees do not have the intention to quit the job easily. When employees are not emotionally attached to the organization, it is more likely that they will seek better

working conditions (i.e. higher salary, higher flexibility) somewhere else. Primarily, higher engagement causes commitment by employees towards the organization, which then leads to lower voluntary turnover, and eventually increased retention (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Haidt & Sims, 2009). Employees with a high level of engagement are recognizable for their energy, dedication, and involvement. As argued earlier in this work, positive attitudes and overall bright work experience generate high levels of organizational commitment. High levels of organizational commitment drive employees' desire to remain with the current organization with insignificant levels of intention to quit (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). The theory developed by Hobfoll about the conservation of resources states that employees enrich work environment by resources, they invest their knowledge, skills, abilities, and personal and interpersonal traits (Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2008). A decline of these resources resulting from job shifting makes employees less likely to leave the current organization. Rather, these employees strongly devote themselves to the work (De Lange, De Witte, & Notelaers, 2008). The same results are provided in a survey conveyed among hospital employees who stated to be intensely committed to their work. They reported being more loyal to present organization instead of looking for alternatives (Michell et al., 2001). These findings are supported by Towers Perrin European Talent Survey (2004) too, which recorded 66% of supremely engaged labor force with no intention of leaving the present work in comparison with 12% of disengaged labor force. Additionally, a very small percentage of the engaged labor force (3%) reported looking for another employer. Moreover, Westhuizen (2014) analyzed the intention of audit firm employees in South Africa to leave their organization based on their level of engagement. The final results have shown that the more employees are engaged, the lower their tendency to quit the current job is. This study concluded that engaged and committed labor force is less disposed to turnovers (Westhuizen, 2014). Having these findings in mind, it can be inferred that the results of the current study are in agreement with the previously done studies, which is the significant and negative relationship between the EE and TI.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Employee engagement is without any doubt the management topic which takes huge attention in last decades all around the world. It is recognized as highly important concept to be measured and managed in any type of the organization. A number of scholars worldwide investigated this topic to the single details in order to identify the major determinants of employee engagement, due to their awareness of benefits associated with the high level of employee engagement. Similarly, this research study focuses on the analysis of employee engagement, together with its drivers and potential outcomes. Recognizing the importance of employee engagement, and reviewing from the literature that the least engaged labor force might be found in the Balkans, the researcher intended to analyze the situation in the capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo City. For the keeping the simplicity and clarity of the work, the author decided to divide the analysis into two models.

The first model concentrates on the factors driving the level of employee engagement among hotel industry employees in Sarajevo City. The empirical results of the first model help us to provide the answer on the first research question, accomplishing the first research objective as well. The relationship between job characteristics, internal communication, empowering leadership, and rewards and recognition, as proposed drivers of employee engagement, turned out to be positively significant. This tells us that these four factors are the major triggers of employee engagement among hotel industry employees in Sarajevo City. However, work-life balance, and brand/corporate image are the factors that do not play an important role in driving the level of employee engagement within the given sample.

The second model concentrates on the potential employee work outcomes that arise as a result of the level of employee engagement among hotel industry employees in Sarajevo City. The final results of the second model suggest the response on the second research question, attaining the second research objective consistently. The relationship between employee engagement, employee work performance, and affective organizational commitment turned out to be positively significant, whereas the relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention came out to be negatively significant, as expected. This means that enhanced employee work performance, stronger affective organizational commitment, and lower turnover intention, are the potential outcomes of having the engaged labor force. Taking into consideration all the facts and elements proposed by Aon Hewitt Model of Employee Engagement, the following conclusions can be drawn. Employees who „say“ are those speaking positively about the organization, work, co-workers, potential labor force, and eventually customers, using all potential opportunities to express their pride with the organization. Employees who „stay“ are those having a strong sense of commitment, belonging, contribution, and desire to be the part of the current organization. Employees who „strive“ are those highly motivated and encouraged to pursue additional efforts

and engage in activities leading to the organizational superior outcomes. Very often, managers tend to improve one of these outcomes such as concentrating their efforts to keep talent (make them stay), while neglecting other outcomes (i.e. make them strive). In this sense, it is undeniably needed to identify the critical points in all of these facets if the win-win situation is the ultimate target. Tourism is one of the fastest growing sectors that contribute to a large extent to the overall economy of any country. A trend of consistent growth in tourism in many states around the world is expected to continue in the future (World Tourism Organization, 2017). This is the reason why particular segments of the hospitality industry such as accommodation (hotels, motels, apartments...), and the food industry (restaurants and coffee shops) should be subject to deeper analysis. It is of great importance to attract as many as possible people coming from different parts of the world, making their journeys a pleasant and unforgettable experience. This is one of the feasible ways to promote our country in the best possible way. That is why focus should be put on employees because if they are motivated, satisfied, and engaged to the organization to the full potential, an organization is able to accomplish its goals, while at the same time, the purpose is going much more beyond the profit maximization, and is working in favor of well-being of a whole society. As it is widely well known, human capital is the only asset of an organization that cannot be copied. In order to make your employees loyal and for the purpose of retaining them as such, the most fundamental task is to make and keep them motivated, satisfied, and engaged. They will know how to compensate and make you satisfied as well.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special acknowledgment goes to Ms. Amina Ibisevic who has submitted her research so far in order to prepare this Article. A special thanks was given to Professor Senad Busatlic and Professor Semsudin Plojovic who mentored the work, especially for their valuable and constructive suggestions during the planning and development of this work. Their willingness to give their time and resources so generously has been very much appreciated. Finally, a special thanks goes to those who participated in the research in order to realize the work according to the highest methodological principles.

REFERENCES

1. AbuKhalifeh, A. A. N., & Som, A. P. M. (2013). The antecedents affecting employee engagement and organizational performance. *Asian Social Science*,9(7), 41.
2. Agarwal, M. (2017). How brands can create a sustainable image - Re-Tales by Manu Agarwal-ET Retail. Retrieved from: <https://retail.economicstimes.indiatimes.com/re-tales/how-brands-can-create-a-sustainable-image/2748>
3. Ahearne, M., Mathieu, J., & Rapp, A. (2005). To Empower or Not to Empower Your Sale Force? An Empirical Examination of the Influence of Leadership Empowerment Behavior on Customer Satisfaction and Performance. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 945-955. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.945.
4. Aktouf, O. (1992) Management and Theories of Organizations in the 1990s: Toward a Critical Radical Humanism. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 17, 407-43
5. Albdour, A., & Altarawneh, I. (2014). Employee Engagement and Organizational Commitment: Evidence from Jordan. *International Journal Of Business*, 19(2).Retrieved from: <https://www.craig.csufresno.edu/ijb/Volumes/Volume%2019/V192-5.pdf>
6. Alderfer, C. P. (1972). Existence, relatedness and growth: human needs in organizational settings. New York: Free Press.
7. Allen, D., Shore, L., & Griffeth, R. (2003). The Role of Perceived Organizational Support and Supportive Human Resource Practices in the Turnover Process. *Journal Of Management*, 29(1), 99-118. doi: 10.1177/014920630302900107
8. Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal Of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x
9. Alqusayer, A. (2016). Drivers of Hotel Employee Motivation, Satisfaction and Engagement in Riyadh, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Hospitality-Tourism Management (Master Studies)*. Rochester Institute of Technology.
10. Ambler, T., & Barrow, S. (1996). The employer brand. *Journal Of Brand Management*, 4(3), pp 185–206. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/bm.1996.42>

11. Andrew, O., & Sofian, S. (2012). Individual Factors and Work Outcomes of Employee Engagement. *Procedia - Social And Behavioral Sciences*, 40, 498-508. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.222
12. Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal Of Productivity And Performance Management*, 63(3), 308-323. doi: 10.1108/ijppm-01-2013-0008
13. Anseel, F., & Lievens, F. (2007). The Long-Term Impact of the Feedback Environment on Job Satisfaction: A Field Study in a Belgian Context. Retrieved from: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6567&context=lkcsb_research
14. Antonius, R. (2003). *Interpreting Quantitative Data with SPSS*. Sage Publications Ltd.
15. Aon Hewitt Company. (2014). 2014 Trends in Global Employee Engagement. © 2014 Aon plc. Retrieved from <https://www.aon.com/attachments/human-capital-consulting/2014-trends-in-global-employee-engagement-report.pdf>
16. Aon Hewitt Company. (2015). Say, Stay, or Strive? Unleash the Engagement Outcome You Need (pp. 1-5). Copyright 2015 Aon Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.aon.com/attachments/human-capital-consulting/2015-Drivers-of-Say-Stay-Strive.pdf>
17. Aon Hewitt, C. (2015). Aon Hewitt's Model of Employee Engagement. Aon Inc. Retrieved from: <https://www.aonhewitt.co.nz/getattachment/77046028-9992-4d77-868a-32fbf622fec6/file.aspx?disposition=inline>
18. Aon Hewitt, C. (2015). Trends in Global Employee Engagement. Aon Inc. Retrieved from: <http://www.aon.com/attachments/human-capital-consulting/2015-Trends-in-Global-Employee-Engagement-Report.pdf>
19. Archdeacon, T. (1994). *Correlation and Regression Analysis: A Historian's Guide* (1st ed.). The United States of America: University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI.
20. Aryee, S., Walumbwa, F., Zhou, Q., & Hartnell, C. (2012). Transformational Leadership, Innovative Behavior, and Task Performance: Test of Mediation and Moderation Processes. *Human Performance*, 25(1), 1-25. doi: 10.1080/08959285.2011.631648.
21. Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20.
22. Babcock-Roberson, M., & Strickland, O. (2010). The Relationship Between Charismatic Leadership, Work Engagement, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *The Journal Of Psychology*, 144(3), 313-326. doi: 10.1080/00223981003648336.
23. Bakker, A.B., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2008). Positive organizational behavior: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 147-154.
24. Bedarkar, M., & Pandita, D. (2014). A Study on the Drivers of Employee Engagement Impacting Employee Performance. *Procedia - Social And Behavioral Sciences*, 133, 106-115. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.174
25. Bekele, A., Shigutu, A., & Tensay, A. (2014). The Effect of Employee's Perception of Performance Appraisal on Their Work Outcomes. *International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations*, 2(1), 136-173.
26. Bernthal, P. (2004). *Employee Engagement: The Key To Realizing Competitive Advantage*. Development Dimensions International, Inc., 2005-2015. All rights reserved.
27. Berthon, P., Ewing, M., & Hah, L. L. (2005). Captivating company: dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. *International Journal of Advertising*, 24(2), 151-172.
28. Bhatla, N. (2011). To study the employee engagement practices and its effects on employee performance with special reference to ICICI and HDFC bank in Lucknow. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 2(8), 1-7.
29. Black, T.R., (1999). *Doing Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences An Integrated Approach to Research Design, Measurement and Statistics*. Sage Publications Ltd.
30. Bosnić, A., Kljuić, S., & Milić, G. (2004). *Bosna & Hercegovina* (1st ed.). Sarajevo: SAK Trade d.o.o. Sarajevo.
31. Bowerman, B.L., & O'Connell, R.T. (1990). *Linear Statistical Models: An applied approach* (2 ed.). Duxbury, CA: Belmont.
32. Briner, R.B. (2012). Systematic review and evidence synthesis as a practice and scholarship tool. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 112-129.

33. Brown, S.P., & Leigh, T.W. (1996). A Lew look at Psychological Climate and Its Relationship to Job Involvement, Effort, and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81. 358-368
34. Cai, D., Cai, Y., Sun, Y., & Ma, J. (2018). Linking Empowering Leadership and Employee Work Engagement: The Effects of Person-Job Fit, Person-Group Fit, and Proactive Personality. *Frontiers In Psychology*, 9. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01304.
35. Carasco-Saul, M., Kim, W., & Kim, T. (2015). Leadership and Employee Engagement. *Human Resource Development Review*, 14(1), 38-63. doi: 10.1177/1534484314560406.
36. Carr, L. (1994). The strengths and weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative research: what method for nursing?. *Journal Of Advanced Nursing*, 20(4), 716-721. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2648.1994.20040716.x
37. Chanania, P. (2012). Reaching out to employees' families. *Opportunities, The Hindu*. 1-4.
38. Chi, C., & Gursoy, D. (2009). Employee satisfaction, customer satisfaction, and financial performance: An empirical examination. *International Journal Of Hospitality Management*, 28(2), 245-253. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.08.003
39. Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747-770.
40. Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. (1988). The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice. *Academy Of Management Review*, 13(3), 471-482. doi: 10.5465/amr.1988.4306983. Connelly, C. (2005). The new siege of Sarajevo. "The Times. UK. Retrieved from:
41. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siege_of_Sarajevo
42. Cook, S. (2008). *The essential guide to employee engagement better business performance*. Great Britain: Kogan Page Limited.
43. Corporate executive board, CLC. (2004). *Driving performance and retention through employee engagement*. Corporate leadership council 2004 engagement survey, London, UK
44. Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of applied psychology*, 78(1), 98.
45. Council of Ministers of Bosnia and Herzegovina. (2011). *Decision on Adoption BaselineQualifications Framework in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Službeni Glasnik Bosne i Hercegovine, no.31. Retrieved from <http://sllist.ba/glasnik/2011/broj31/Broj031.pdf>
46. Cramer, D. (1998). *Fundamental statistics for social research: Step by step calculations and computer techniques using SPSS for Windows*. New York, NY: Routledge.
47. Craney, T., & Surlis, J. (2002). Model-Dependent Variance Inflation Factor Cutoff Values. *Quality Engineering*, 14(3), 391-403. doi: 10.1081/qen-120001878
48. Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qulitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches*. Sage Publications Ltd.
49. Cretu, A. E., & Brodie, R. J. (2007). The influence of brand image and company reputation where manufacturers market to small firms: A customer value perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36(2), 230-240.
50. Crossman, A. (2018). *What Is Qualitative Research?*. Retrieved from
51. <https://www.thoughtco.com/qualitative-research-methods-3026555>
52. Curtis, A. (2018). *What Is Turnover Intention?*. Retrieved from
53. <https://smallbusiness.chron.com/turnover-intention-12753.html>
54. Customs Insight Team. (2018). *What Is Employee Engagement?* Custominsight.com. Web. 23 May 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.custominsight.com/employee-engagement-survey/what-is-employee-engagement.asp>
55. Daft, R. (2008). *Management (8th ed.)*. The United States of America: Thomson Higher Education.
56. Dan, N. (2015). *7 Tips for Keeping Restaurant Employees Happy and Motivated | NetWaiter*. Retrieved from <https://www.netwaiter.net/articles/keeping-restaurant-employees-happy-and-motivated/>
57. David, F. (2011). *Strategic management (13th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
58. De Lange, A., De Witte, H., & Notelaers, G. (2008). Should I stay or should I go? Examining longitudinal relations among job resources and work engagement for stayers versus movers. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 201-223. doi: 10.1080/02678370802390132
59. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). The support of autonomy and the control of behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 53(6), 1024.

60. Delecta, P (2011). "Work Life Balance". International Journal of Current Research. Vol.3, Issue, 4: 186–189. Available online at <http://www.journalcra.com>
61. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499-512. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499
62. Development Planning Institute of Canton Sarajevo. (2018). Turizam na području Kantona Sarajevo u periodu od 2012. do 2017. godine. Sarajevo: Development Planning Institute of Canton Sarajevo. Retrieved from: https://zpr.ks.gov.ba/sites/zpr.ks.gov.ba/files/turizam_ks_2012-2017.pdf
63. Duduković, P., & Martić, M. (2015). Growth of labor productivity – the precondition for the increase of wages and stable economic development. Banja Luka: GEA – Center for Research and Studies.
64. Economic Institute Sarajevo. (2016). Procjena pozicije Kantona Sarajevo u raspodjeli prihoda od indirektnih poreza u BiH. Sarajevo: Economic Institute Sarajevo.
65. Eikhof, R.D., Warhurst, C., & Haunschild, A. (2007). Introduction: What work? What life? What balance? Critical reflections on the work-life balance debate. *Employee Relations*, 29 (4), 325-333.
66. Ference, G. (2009). Employee engagement in hypercompetitive times. Retrieved from:
67. <http://www.hospitalitynet.org/news/4039731.html>
68. Field, A. (2005) Reliability analysis. Reliability analysis. In: Field, A., Ed., *Discovering Statistics Using spss*. 2nd Edition, Sage, London, Chapter 15.
69. Field, A. (2013). *Discovering Statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4 ed.). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
70. Fletcher, L., & Robinson, D. (2013). *Measuring and understanding employee engagement*. London (UK): Routledge
71. Foley. (2018). What is SPSS and How Does it Benefit Survey Data Analysis?. Retrieved from: <https://www.surveygizmo.com/resources/blog/what-is-spss/>
72. Foreign Investment Promotion Agency. (2013). Bosnia and Herzegovina: The Automotive Industry. Sarajevo: Foreign Investment Promotion Agency. Retrieved from:
73. <https://www.deik.org.tr/uploads/automotive-industry-bosnia-and-herzegovina.pdf>
74. Gatenby, M., Soanne, E., Rees, C., & Bailey, C. (2009). *Employee Engagement in Context*. Institute for Employment Studies. Retrieved from:
75. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/253277979_Employee_Engagement_in_Context_CIPD_Research_Insight
76. Glissmeyer, M., Bishop J. W., & Fass, R. D. (2008). Role conflict, role ambiguity and intention to quit the organization: The case of law enforcement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 82-111.
77. Gonring, M. (2008). Customer loyalty and employee engagement: an alignment for value. *Journal Of Business Strategy*, 29(4), 29-40. doi: 10.1108/02756660810887060
78. Gregory, K. (2011). *Employee Satisfaction*. Neumann.edu. Retrieved from
79. <http://www.neumann.edu/about/publications/NeumannBusinessReview/journal/Review2011/Gregory.pdf>
80. Grimsley, S. (2015). *Internal Communication in an Organization: Definition, Strategies & Examples*. Presentation, <https://study.com/academy/lesson/internal-communication-in-an-organization-definition-strategies-examples.html>.
81. Grimsley, S. (2018). *What is Human Capital? Importance to an Organization*. Presentation, <https://study.com/academy/lesson/what-is-human-capital-importance-to-an-organization.html>
82. Gujarati, D.N. and Porter, D.C. (2009). *Basic Econometrics*. 5th ed. Mc Graw-Hill, New York. Pp 320-351 Haitovsky (1969), "Multicollinearity in Regression analysis Comment," *review of economics and statistics*, 50, pp. 486-489.
83. Haar, J. M. (2013). Testing a new measure of WLB: A study of parent and non-parent employees from New Zealand. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(17/18), 3305–3324
84. Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1980). *Work Redesign*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
85. Haid, M., & Sims, J. (2008). Employee engagement maximizing organizational performance. Retrieved from: <https://www.right.com/thoughtleadership/research/employee-engagement-maximizing-organizationalperformance.pdf>
86. Haid, M., & Sims, J. (2009). *Employee Engagement: Maximizing Organizational Performance*. Philadelphia: Right Management Inc: A MANPOWER COMPANY.
87. Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43(6), 495-513.

88. Halbesleben, J., & Wheeler, A. (2008). The relative roles of engagement and embeddedness in predicting job performance and intention to leave. *Work and Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health, and Organizations*, 22(3), 242-256.
89. Halbesleben, J.R. (2010). *A Meta-Analysis of Work Engagement: Relationships with Burnout, Demands, Resources, and Consequences*. Psychology Press, New York, 102-117.
90. Hamid, S., & Farooqi, A. R. (2014). Taj group of hotels as brand employer: A selective study of students as job aspirants at Aligarh, India. *International Journal of Tourism and Travel*, 7(1 & 2), 23-30.
91. 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.
92. Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., Kilham, E.A., and Agrawal, S., (2009). Q12®Meta-Analysis: The Relationship Between Engagement at Work and Organizational Outcomes. Gallup, Inc.
93. Hartman, C. C. (2000). Organizational commitment: method scale analysis and test of effects, *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 8, 89-109.
94. Helmenstine, K. (2017). Independent Variable Definition and Examples. Retrieved from <https://www.thoughtco.com/definition-of-independent-variable-605238>
95. Heryati, R. (2018). Why Employee Motivation Is Important - The 6Q Blog. The 6Q Blog. Retrieved from <https://inside.6q.io/employee-motivation-important/>
96. Hochschild, A. (1979). Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85, pp. 551-575.
97. Holbeche, L., & Springett, N. (2003). *In Search of Meaning in the Workplace*. Horsham, Roffey Park.
98. Homburg, C., & Stock, R. (2005). Exploring the conditions under which salesperson work satisfaction can lead to customer satisfaction. *Psychology And Marketing*, 22(5), 393-420. doi: 10.1002/mar.20065
99. Huffington, A. (2014). Human Capital Is the Most Valuable Asset. Retrieved from: <https://www.inc.com/arianna-huffington/founders-forum-human-capital-is-most-valuable.html>
100. Human Resource Dictionary. (2018). 9 Advantages and Disadvantages of Questionnaires – Survey Anyplace. Retrieved from <https://surveyanyplace.com/questionnaire-pros-and-cons/>
101. IBM, n.d. IBM Knowledge Center. Retrieved from
102. https://www.ibm.com/support/knowledgecenter/en/SSLVMB_24.0.0/spss/tutorials/fac_telco_kmo_01.html
103. Institute for Statistics of FB&H. (2018). TOURISM STATISTICS. Sarajevo: Institute for Statistics of FB&H. Retrieved from http://www.bhas.ba/saopstenja/2018/TUR_02_2017_12_0_EN.pdf
104. InSync Surveys. (2015). The impact of employee engagement on performance. Insync Surveys Pty Ltd. Retrieved from:
105. http://www.insyncsurveys.com.au/media/92145/impact_of_employee_engagement_on_performance.pdf
106. Investopedia. (2018). Sampling. Retrieved from <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/sampling.asp>
107. Investopedia. (2018). What Is Organizational Behavior (OB)?. Retrieved from:
108. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/o/organizational-behavior.asp>
109. Jones, G., & George, J. (2016). *Contemporary Management (9th ed.)*. The United States of America: McGraw-Hill Education.
110. Jose, G., & Mampilly, S. R. (2012). Satisfaction with hr practices and employee engagement: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 4(9), 423-430.
111. Juneja, B. (2018). Importance of Interpersonal Relationship at Workplace. Management Study Guide. Retrieved from: <https://www.managementstudyguide.com/interpersonal-relationship-workplace-importance.htm>
112. Juneja, B. (2018). Training of Employees - Need and Importance of Training. Management Study Guide. Retrieved from <https://www.managementstudyguide.com/training-of-employees.htm>
113. Juneja, B. Reinforcement Theory of Motivation. Management Study Guide. Retrieved from <https://www.managementstudyguide.com/reinforcement-theory-motivation.htm>
114. Kahn, W. A. (1992). To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. *Human Relations*, 45(4), 321-349. doi:10.1177/001872679204500402.
115. Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological condition of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol 33, pp 692-724

116. Kang, M. (2014). Understanding Public Engagement: Conceptualizing and Measuring its Influence on Supportive Behavioral Intentions. *Journal Of Public Relations Research*, 26(5), 399-416. doi: 10.1080/1062726x.2014.956107
117. Karatepe, O. (2010). Role Stress, Emotional Exhaustion, and Job Satisfaction in the Hotel Industry: The Moderating Role of Supervisory Support. Copyright © 2010 Florida International University. All rights reserved. Retrieved from:
118. <https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.ba/&httpsredir=1&article=1487&context=hospitalityreview>
119. Kelley, S. (2006). Rising Sarajevo finds hope again". *The Seattle Times*.
120. <https://ipfs.io/ipfs/QmXoyvizjW3WknFiJnKLwHCnL72vedxjQkDDP1mXWo6uco/wiki/Sarajevo.html>
121. Kenton. (2018). Descriptive Statistics. Retrieved from
122. https://www.investopedia.com/terms/d/descriptive_statistics.asp
123. Khan, N. (2013). Human resource policies and practices in hospitality industry in India: A case study of selected hotels. (Doctoral dissertation). Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh.
124. Kim, M., Suh, H., Cho, E., & Buratowski, S. (2009). Phosphorylation of the Yeast Rpb1 C-terminal Domain at Serines 2, 5, and 7. *Journal Of Biological Chemistry*, 284(39), 26421-26426. doi: 10.1074/jbc.m109.028993
125. Koigi. (2011). Validity and Reliability in Social Science Research. *Education Research And Perspectives*, 38(1), 105-123.
126. Kompas, S., & Sridevi, M. (2010). Employee Engagement: The Key to Improving Performance. *International Journal Of Business And Management*, 5(12). doi: 10.5539/ijbm.v5n12p89
127. Koyuncu, M., Burke, R. J., Fiksenbaum, L. (2006). Work engagement among women managers and professionals in a Turkish bank: Potential antecedents and consequences. *Equal Opportunities International*, Vol. 25 Issue: 4, pp.299-310, <https://doi.org/10.1108/02610150610706276>
128. Krishnan, S., & Wesley, J. (2013). A Study on Impact of Employee Communication on Employee Engagement Level. *International Research Journal Of Business And Management*, 6. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2733994
129. Kumar, R. (2005). *Research methodology: A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
130. Lance, P. & Hattori, A. (2016). *Sampling and evaluation: A guide to sampling for program impact evaluation*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: MEASURE Evaluation, University of North Carolina.
131. Larkin, E. (2009). The challenge of employee engagement. Retrieved from
132. <http://www.hospitalitynet.org/news/4044076.html>
133. Lazar, I., Osoian, C., & Ratiu, P. (2010). The role of work-life balance practices in order to improve organizational performance. *European Research Studies*, 13(1), 201.
134. Leekha Chhabra, N., & Sharma, S. (2014). Employer branding: strategy for improving employer attractiveness. *International Journal Of Organizational Analysis*, 22(1), 48-60. doi: 10.1108/ijoa-09-2011-0513
135. Little, P., & Little, B. (2006). Employee engagement: conceptual issues. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 10(1), 111-120.
136. Liu, Y. (2015). The Review of Empowerment Leadership. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 3(1), 476-482.
137. Llorens, S., Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. (2006). Testing the robustness of the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13(3), 378-391. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.13.3.378>
138. Locke, E. A., & Taylor, M. S. (1990). *Stress, coping, and the meaning of work*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
139. Lonely Planet (2006). *The Cities Book: A Journey Through The Best Cities In The World*. Lonely Planet Publications, ISBN 1-74104-731-5.
140. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.
141. Mani, V. (2011). Analysis of Employee Engagement and its Predictors. *International Journal Of Human Resource Studies*, 1(2). doi: 10.5296 / ijhrs . v 1 i 2 . 955
142. Manz, C., & Sims, H. (1987). Leading Workers to Lead Themselves: The External Leadership of Self-Managing Work Teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32(1), 106. doi: 10.2307/2392745

143. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W., & Leiter, M. (2001). Job Burnout. *Annual Review Of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397
144. May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 11-37.
145. McFarlin, G. (2018). Importance of Relationships in the Workplace. Retrieved from
146. <https://smallbusiness.chron.com/importance-relationships-workplace-10380.html>
147. McLeod, A. (2017). Types of Research Approaches. Retrieved from
148. https://www.google.ba/search?source=hp&ei=u8tAXJLhDMWhsAH63qn4CA&q=mcleod+2017+types+of+research&btnK=Google+Search&oq=mcleod+2017+types+of+research&gs_l=psy-ab.3...100743.111005..111230...14.0..0.379.5175.0j37j1j1.....0....1..gws-wiz.....6..35i39j0i67j0i10j0i22i30j33i160j33i13i21j33i21j33i22i29i30.4Fn15Zq2BB0
149. *Mediterranea News*. (2011). Sarajevo: The economic, administrative, cultural and educational center of Bosnia and Herzegovina". Retrieved from <https://archive.li/g4xXE>
150. Menard, S. (1995). *Applied Logistic Regression Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
151. Merchant, P. (n.d.). Workplace Diversity in Hospitality & Tourism. Retrieved from:
152. <https://smallbusiness.chron.com/workplace-diversity-hospitality-tourism-15436.html>
153. Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1991). A Three-component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
154. Mitchell, T., Holtom, B., Lee, T., Sablinski, C., & Erez, M. (2001). Why People Stay: Using Job Embeddedness To Predict Voluntary Turnover. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 44(6), 1102-1121. doi: 10.2307/3069391
155. Money Zine. (2018). Work Environment. Retrieved from:
156. <https://www.money-zine.com/definitions/career-dictionary/work-environment/>
157. Money Zine. (2018). Employee Engagement (Worker Engagement). Retrieved from:
158. <https://www.money-zine.com/definitions/career-dictionary/employee-engagement/>
159. Moore, G. (2017). Employee Performance Definition. Retrieved from:
160. <https://bizfluent.com/facts-7218608-employee-performance-definition.html>
161. Morison. (2013). Eventful past of Sarajevo's historic hotel. Retrieved from:
162. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-24730400>
163. Murphy, D. (2009). Corporate Identity, Brand Identity or Brand Image * Masterful Marketing. Retrieved from: <https://masterful-marketing.com/corporate-identity-brand-identity-or-brand-image/>
164. Mutunga, C. (2009). Factors that Contribute to the Level of Employee Engagement in the Telecommunication Industry in Kenya: A Case Study of Zain Kenya. (Master of Business and Administration (MBA), School of Business). University Of Nairobi.
165. Nahrgang, J., Morgeson, F., & Hofmann, D. (2011). Safety at work: A meta-analytic investigation of the link between job demands, job resources, burnout, engagement, and safety outcomes. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 71-94. doi: 10.1037/a0021484
166. O'brien, R. (2007). A Caution Regarding Rules of Thumb for Variance Inflation Factors. *Quality & Quantity*, 41(5), 673-690. doi: 10.1007/s11135-006-9018-6
167. Ojo, I., Salau, O., & Falola, H. (2014). Work-Life Balance Practices in Nigeria: A Comparison of Three Sectors. *Journal Of Competitiveness*, 6(2), 3-14. doi: 10.7441/joc.2014.02.01
168. Olivier, A., & Rothmann, S. (2007). Antecedents of work engagement in a multinational oil company. *SA Journal Of Industrial Psychology*, 33(3). doi: 10.4102/sajip.v33i3.396
169. Online Business Dictionary. (2018). Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement, Rewards and Recognition, Human Capital, Organizational performance, Organizational Behavior, organizational Culture, Work Performance, Affective Organizational Commitment, Globalization. Retrieved from:
170. <http://www.businessdictionary.com>
171. Online Cambridge Dictionary. (2018). Hospitality Industry. Retrieved from:
172. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>
173. Parsley, A. (2006). A roadmap for employee engagement. Retrieved from:
174. <https://www.management-issues.com/2006/5/25/opinion/a-road-map-foremployeeengagement.asp>

175. Patro, C. (2013). *The Impact of Employee Engagement on Organization's Productivity*. Visakhapatnam: SDM Institute for Management Development. Retrieved from:
176. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281967834_The_Impact_of_Employee_Engagement_on_Organization's_Productivity
177. Paul, E. (2017). *Effective Ways to Improve Employee Engagement*. Retrieved from:
178. <http://www.emptrust.com/blog/employee-engagement-a-key-hr-strategy>
179. Pavle L. (2007). *Disintegration in Frames: Aesthetics and Ideology in the Yugoslav and Post-Yugoslav Cinema*. Stanford University Press. ISBN 978-0-8047-5368-5. pp. 64-66.
180. Polat, A. (2012). "The Best City To Visit Travel Tournament 2012: Championship". Foxnomad.
181. Questback, (2015). *The Value of Employees: How to Increase Your Human Capital*. Questback.com. N.p., 2015. Web. 23 May 2018. Retrieved from: <https://www.questback.com/blog/the-value-of-employees-how-to-increase-your-human-capital/>
182. Reilly, R. (2014). *Five ways to improve employee engagement now*. Retrieved from: <https://www.google.com/search?client=firefoxbab&q=Reilly%2C+R.+%282014%29.+Five+ways+to+improve+employee+engagement+now>.
183. Resnik. (2015). *What is Ethics in Research & Why is it Important?*. Retrieved from:
184. <https://www.niehs.nih.gov/research/resources/bioethics/whatis/index.cfm>
185. Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.698
186. Rich, B., Lepine, J., & Crawford, E. (2010). Job Engagement: Antecedents and Effects on Job Performance. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635. doi: 10.5465/amj.2010.51468988
187. Richardsen, A. M., Burke, R. J., & Martinussen, M. (2006). Work and health outcomes among police officers: The mediating role of police cynicism and engagement. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13(4), 555-574. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.13.4.555>
188. Robbins, S., & Coulter, M. (2012). *Management (11th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: /Prentice Hall.
189. Roberts, D.R. and Davenport, T.O. (2002) *Job Engagement: Why it's Important and how to Improve it*. *Employment Relations Today*, 21-29
190. Robertson, I. (2012). *The importance of employee engagement in difficult times*. Retrieved from:
191. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/public-leadersnetwork/2012/may/03/importance-employee-engagement-difficulttimes?INTCMP=SRCH>
192. Robertson-Smith, G. and Markwick, C (2009). *Employee Engagement: A Review of Current Thinking*. Institute for Employment Studies.
193. Robinson, D., Hooker, H. and Hayday, S. (2007), *Engagement: The Continuing Story*, IES Report 447. Brighton: Institute for Employment Studies.
194. Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). *The drivers of employee engagement (408)*. Brighton, UK: Institute for Employment Studies. Retrieved from:
195. <https://www.employment-studies.co.uk/system/files/resources/files/408.pdf>
196. Sahinidis, A.G., & Bouris, J. (2008).). Employee Perceived Training Effectiveness Relationship to Employee Attitudes. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 32(1),63-76.
197. Saks, A.M., (2006). *Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement*.
198. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21 (7), 600-19.
199. Samoszuk, S. (2017). *Hospitality Industry: Definition & Overview - Video & Lesson Transcript | Study.Com.*" Study.com. Retrieved from:
200. <https://study.com/academy/lesson/hospitality-industry-definition-overview.html>
201. Sarikas, C. (2018). *Independent and Dependent Variables: Which Is Which?* Retrieved from: <https://blog.prepscholar.com/independent-and-dependent-variables>
202. Satyendra, A. (2015). *Staffing – A Function of Management | ispatguru.com*. Retrieved from: <http://ispatguru.com/staffing-a-function-of-management/>
203. 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*, 25, 293-437. doi:10.1002/job.248
204. Schaufeli, W., & Bakker, A. (2003). *Utrecht work engagement scale: Preliminary manual*. Utrecht: Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University.

205. Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. (2007). *Work engagement: An emerging psychological concept and its implications for organizations*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishers.
206. Schaufeli, W., Salanova, M., González-romá, V., & Bakker, A. (2002). The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach. *Journal Of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
207. Schaufeli, W.B. (2013). *What is Engagement?* London: Routledge.
208. Schaufeli, W.B., & Bakker, A.B. (2010). The conceptualization and measurement of work engagement. *A handbook of essential theory and research*, New York: Psychology Press, 2010, 10-24.
209. Schaufeli, W.B. (2017). *Work engagement in Europe: Relations with national economy, governance, and culture*. Research Unit Occupational & Organizational Psychology and Professional Learning. KU Leuven, Belgium. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.10491.31520
210. Schmitt, N., & Stuits, D.M. (1985). Factors defined by negatively keyed items: The result of careless respondents. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 9, 367-373.
211. Schneider, A., Hommel, G., & Blettner, M. (2010). *Linear Regression Analysis*. Deutsches Aerzteblatt Online. doi: 10.3238/arztebl.2010.0776
212. Scholarios, D., & Marks, A. (2004). Work-life balance and the software worker. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 14(2), 54.
213. Scott, K., McMullen, T., & Royal, M. (2010). The Role of Rewards in Building Employee Engagement. *Worldatwork Journal*, 19(4), 29-40. Retrieved from:
214. https://ecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1126&context=business_facpubs
215. Shaffer, J. (2004). *Measurable payoff: How employee engagement can boost Performance and profits*. New York: Communications world.
216. Showkat, N., & Parveen, H. (2017). *Non-Probability and Probability Sampling*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319066480_Non-Probability_and_Probability_Sampling
217. Shuck, B. (2011). Integrative Literature Review: Four Emerging Perspectives of Employee Engagement: An Integrative Literature Review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 10(3), 304-328. doi: 10.1177/1534484311410840
218. Silvestro, R., & Cross, S. (2000). Applying the service profit chain in a retail environment. *International Journal Of Service Industry Management*, 11(3), 244-268. doi: 10.1108/09564230010340760
219. Siu, O., Lu, L., & Cooper, C. (1999). Managerial stress in Hong Kong and Taiwan: a comparative study. *Journal Of Managerial Psychology*, 14(1), 6-25. doi: 10.1108/02683949910254675
220. Spector, P. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences* (1st ed.). SAGE Knowledge.
221. Stilinović, J. (2002). In Europe's Jerusalem", Catholic World News. The city's principal mosques are the Gazi Husrev-Bey's Mosque, or Begova Džamija (1530), and the Mosque of Ali Pasha (1560–61). Retrieved from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sarajevo>
222. Sundaray, B. K. (2011). Employee engagement a driver of organizational effectiveness. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 3(8), 53-59.
223. SurveyMonkey Team. (2018). *Benchmarking Survey: Maturity in Automation, Instrumentation, and Operations Management*. Retrieved from <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/NJSLRBP>
224. SurveyMonkey Team. (2018). *Likert Scale: What It Is & How to Use It*. Retrieved from:
225. <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/likert-scale/>
226. Swathi. S. (2013). Effecting employee engagement factors. *International Journal of Scientific & Research Publications*, 3(8), 1-3.
227. Taleo Research. (2009). *Alignment Drives Employee Engagement and Productivity*. Taleo Research.
228. Taylor, J., Bradley, S., & Nguyen, A. N. (2003). *Relative pay and job satisfaction: some new evidence*. (Economics Working Paper Series). Lancaster University: The Department of Economics.
229. Taylor, R. (1990). Interpretation of the Correlation Coefficient: A Basic Review. *Journal Of Diagnostic Medical Sonography*, 6(1), 35-39. doi: 10.1177/875647939000600106
230. Thoits, P. (1991). On Merging Identity Theory and Stress Research. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 54(2), 101. doi: 10.2307/2786929
231. Thomas, K., & Velthouse, B. (1990). Cognitive Elements of Empowerment: An "Interpretive" Model of Intrinsic Task Motivation. *The Academy Of Management Review*, 15(4), 666. doi: 10.2307/258687.
231. Thompson, C. (2018). *14 Benefits of Employee Engagement - Backed By Research*. Retrieved from:

232. <https://www.quantumworkplace.com/future-of-work/14-benefits-of-employee-engagement-backed-by-research>
233. Tourism Association of F.B&H. (2005). BH Tourism - Sarajevo, the City. Retrieved from: <http://www.bhtourism.ba/eng/sarajevothecity.wbsp>
234. Towers Perrin (2003). Working Today: Understanding What Drives Employee Engagement. The 2003 Towers Perrin Talent Report. Retrieved from:
235. http://www.keepem.com/doc_files/Towers_Perrin_Talent_2003%28TheFinal%29.pdf
236. Towers Perrin (2004). Working Today: Understanding What Drives Employee Engagement. The 2003 Towers Perrin Talent Report. Retrieved from:
237. http://www.keepem.com/doc_files/Towers_Perrin_Talent_2004%28TheFinal%29.pdf
238. Truss, K. (2006). The Future of Engagement: Thought Piece Collection. Institute for Employment Studies. Retrieved from:
239. <https://engageforsuccess.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Katie-Truss.pdf>
240. Tuckey, M., Bakker, A., & Dollard, M. (2012). Empowering leaders optimize working conditions for engagement: A multilevel study. *Journal Of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(1), 15-27. doi: 10.1037/a0025942.
241. Ungerson, C., & Yeandle, S. (2005). Care Workers and Work—Life Balance: The Example of Domiciliary Careworkers. In *Work-life balance in the 21st Century*(pp. 246-262). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
242. Vaidyanathan, G., & Maheshwari, U. (2016). Employee Engagement: A Literature Review. *International Journal Of Human Resource*, 6(2), 21-30.
243. Vance, R. (2006). Employee engagement and commitment; A guide to understanding, measuring and increasing engagement in your organization.VA: SHRM Foundation
244. Vandenberg, R. J., & Nelson, J. B. (1999). Disaggregating the motives underlying turnover intentions: When do intentions predict turnover behavior? *Human Relations*, 52(10), 1313-1336. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1016964515185>
245. Vazirani, N. (2007). Employee engagement. Working paper series (WPS05), SIES College of Management Studies.
246. Večernji list. (2016). 10 zanimljivih činjenica o BiH koje niste znali. Retrieved from:
247. <https://www.vecernji.ba/vijesti/10-zanimljivih-cinjenica-o-bih-koje-niste-znali-1054889>
248. Vignaswaran, R. (2005). The relationship between Performance Appraisal Satisfaction and Employee Outcomes: A study conducted in Peninsular Malaysia. (Master Thesis) University of Malaya.
249. Viljevac, A., Cooper-Thomas, H., & Saks, A. (2012). An investigation into the validity of two measures of work engagement. *The International Journal Of Human Resource Management*, 23(17), 3692-3709. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2011.639542
250. Wallace, L. and Trinka, J. (2009). Leadership and employee engagement. *Public Management*, Vol. 91 No. 5, pp. 10-13.
251. Walumbwa, F., Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Wernsing, T., & Peterson, S. (2008). Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure†. *Journal Of Management*, 34(1), 89-126. doi: 10.1177/0149206307308913.
252. Wang, H., Wu, C., Zhang, Y., & Chen, C. (2009). The Dimensionality and Measure of Empowering Leadership Behavior in the Chinese Organizations. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 40(12), 1297-1305. doi: 10.3724/sp.j.1041.2008.01297.
253. Wang, J. (2016). The Antecedents of Employee Engagement: A Comparative Analysis between Finland and Asia (Master Thesis). Aalto University, School of Business.
254. Wangenheim, G., Evanschitzky, H., & Wunderlich, M. (2007). How Employer and Employee Satisfaction Affect Customer Satisfaction: An Application to Franchise Services. *Journal Of Service Research*, 14(2), 136-148. doi: 10.1177/1094670510390202
255. Wefald, A. J., Smith, M. R., Savastano, T. C., & Downey, R. G. (2008). A structural model of workload, job attitudes, stress, and turnover intentions. Paper presented at the Midwest Academy of Management 2008 Annual Conference, St. Louis, MO.
256. Weinger, A. (2015). 8 Results-Driven Reasons You Need Employee Engagement. Retrieved from <https://doublethedonation.com/tips/blog/2015/09/why-employee-engagement-is-important/>
257. Wellins, R., & Concelman, J. (2005). Creating a culture for engagement. *Workforce Performance Solutions*(www.wpsmag.com). Retrieved from:

258. www.ddiworld.com/pdf/wps_engagement_ar.pdf
259. Westhuizen, N. (2014). Turnover intention and employee engagement: exploring eliciting factors in South African audit firms (Master Studies). Stellenbosch University.
260. Wheelen, T., & Hunger, J. (2012). Strategic management and business policy (13th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
261. Wollard, K., & Shuck, B. (2011). Antecedents to Employee Engagement. *Advances In Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), 429-446. doi: 10.1177/1523422311431220
262. World Travel and Tourism Council. (2017). TRAVEL & TOURISM ECONOMIC IMPACT 2017 BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA. World Travel and Tourism Council. Retrieved from:
263. <https://www.wttc.org/-/media/files/reports/economic-impact-research/countries-2017/bosniaherzegovina2017.pdf>
264. World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). (2017). Yearbook of tourism statistics. Madrid: World Tourism Organization (UNWTO).
265. WTO. (2007). Bosnia and Herzegovina | Data. Retrieved from: <https://data.worldbank.org/country/bosnia-and-herzegovina>
266. Wyatt, W. (2008). 2007/2008 Communication ROI Study. Secrets of top performers; How companies with highly effective employee communication differentiate themselves. Retrieved from:
267. www.watsonwyatt.com.
268. Young, J. (2018). William Kahn: The Founding Father of Employee Engagement – Peakon. Retrieved from: <https://peakon.com/blog/future-work/william-kahn-employee-engagement/>
269. Yücel, I. (2012). Examining the Relationships among Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Turnover Intention: An Empirical Study. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7, 44-58. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v7n20p44>
270. Zhang, X., & Bartol, K. (2010). Linking Empowering Leadership and Employee Creativity: The Influence of Psychological Empowerment, Intrinsic Motivation, and Creative Process Engagement. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 53(1), 107-128. doi: 10.5465/amj.2010.48037118.
271. Zhu, W., Avolio, B., & Walumbwa, F. (2009). Moderating Role of Follower Characteristics With Transformational Leadership and Follower Work Engagement. *Group & Organization Management*, 34(5), 590-619. doi: 10.1177/1059601108331242.