



# International Journal of Engineering, Science and Humanities

An international peer reviewed, refereed, open-access journal  
Impact Factor 8.3 [www.ijesh.com](http://www.ijesh.com) ISSN: 2250-3552

## **Job and Personal Resources as Dual Drivers of Employee Engagement and Performance: An Integrative Conceptual Review**

**Dr. Rajeshwari Gwal**

Associate Professor, Acropolis Faculty of Management & Research, Indore

### **Abstract**

Employee engagement has attracted sustained interest because of its association with positive individual and organizational outcomes, yet there is still debate about what drives engagement and how it should be conceptualized. Building on the job demands–resources (JD-R) perspective and recent engagement literature, this conceptual paper examines how job resources (e.g., autonomy, feedback, supervisor support) and personal resources (e.g., self-efficacy, optimism, resilience) jointly shape employees’ cognitive, emotional, and behavioural investment in their roles. The paper first clarifies engagement as a positive, work-related state of vigor, dedication, and absorption, and then synthesizes evidence on key antecedents and outcomes of engagement in different organizational contexts (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Christian et al., 2011). An integrative model is proposed in which job and personal resources reinforce one another, especially under high job demands, and engagement mediates their effects on performance, well-being, and retention (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009). The paper identifies research gaps around cultural differences, demographic variables, and interventions, and outlines implications for managers seeking to build sustainable engagement

**Keywords:** Vigor, Dedication, Absorption, Employee Engagement

### **1. Introduction**

Organizations in competitive environments increasingly seek ways to elicit employees’ full contribution, not only in terms of presence and compliance but also through energy, enthusiasm, and proactive behavior. Employee engagement has emerged as a central construct in this discussion and is often linked to desirable outcomes such as higher performance, stronger commitment, and better customer satisfaction (Harter et al., 2002; Saks, 2006). Despite this interest, previous work has used varying definitions, measures, and theoretical lenses, which sometimes leads to inconsistent findings and confusion in practice.

A recent literature review distinguishes between engagement as a multifaceted construct that includes cognition, emotions, and behaviors, and engagement as a more unitary positive psychological state that is considered the opposite of burnout (Kahn, 1990; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Sun & Bunchapattanasakda, 2019). At the same time, three frameworks appear frequently in engagement research: Kahn’s needs-satisfaction view, the job demands–resources (JD-R) model,



# International Journal of Engineering, Science and Humanities

An international peer reviewed, refereed, open-access journal  
**Impact Factor 8.3** [www.ijesh.com](http://www.ijesh.com) **ISSN: 2250-3552**

and social exchange theory. This paper concentrates on an integrative resource-based view, arguing that job resources provided by the organization and personal resources carried by the individual are dual drivers of engagement and its outcomes (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009). The focus shifts from purely defining engagement to understanding how managers can build the conditions that enable it.

## **2. Conceptualizing employee engagement**

Kahn (1990) first described engagement as the harnessing of employees' "selves" to their work roles, such that people express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performance. Later research operationalized engagement as a specific, positive work-related state characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption, differentiating it from related concepts such as job involvement, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Vigor refers to high levels of energy and mental resilience, dedication captures involvement and a sense of significance, and absorption describes being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work (Schaufeli et al., 2002).

Other scholars and consulting firms have taken a broader view, defining engagement as employees' willingness and ability to contribute to organizational success, often summarised as "say, stay, and strive" (Hewitt, 2001; Macey & Schneider, 2008). From this perspective, engaged employees speak positively about the organization, intend to remain with it, and go beyond formal role requirements. Christian et al. (2011) suggest that engagement should be seen as a distinct motivational construct that predicts in-role and extra-role performance beyond traditional attitudes. In this paper, engagement is treated as a positive, activating state that integrates affect, cognition, and behavior, while keeping vigor, dedication, and absorption as core facets (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Soane et al., 2012).

## **3. Job demands–resources perspective**

The JD-R model offers a flexible lens to explain why some work environments foster engagement while others generate strain and burnout (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). It distinguishes between job demands—physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained effort—and job resources, which help employees achieve work goals, reduce demands, and stimulate personal growth (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Demerouti et al., 2001). Job demands such as role overload, emotional labor, or time pressure primarily predict exhaustion, whereas job resources such as autonomy, feedback, and social support predict engagement (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Hakanen et al., 2006).

Job resources have been shown to play both a motivational and a buffering role. They directly enhance engagement by increasing the meaningfulness of work and opportunities to learn, and they also help employees cope with high demands by providing instrumental and emotional support (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008; Crawford et al., 2010). Meta-analytic evidence indicates



# International Journal of Engineering, Science and Humanities

An international peer reviewed, refereed, open-access journal  
**Impact Factor 8.3** [www.ijesh.com](http://www.ijesh.com) **ISSN: 2250-3552**

that job resources and engagement are strongly and positively related across different sectors and cultures (Halbesleben, 2010; Christian et al., 2011). This suggests that investing in job resources is a robust strategy for organizations seeking to sustain high levels of engagement.

## **4. Personal resources and engagement**

Beyond the work environment, personal resources also influence how employees perceive demands and use job resources. Personal resources are positive self-evaluations and capacities that facilitate goal attainment and resilience, including self-efficacy, optimism, hope, self-esteem, resilience, and proactive personality (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007; Luthans et al., 2007; Rich et al., 2010). Employees with higher personal resources are more likely to view challenges as manageable, seek feedback actively, and engage more deeply with their roles (Bakker, 2011; Christian et al., 2011).

Empirical studies provide evidence that personal resources predict engagement, both independently and in interaction with job resources. Xanthopoulou et al. (2009) found that self-efficacy, optimism, and self-esteem were positively related to engagement and mediated the relationship between job resources and engagement. Simbula et al. (2011) reported that self-efficacy had both short-term and long-term lagged effects on engagement, suggesting that personal resources and engagement reinforce each other over time. Studies of personality traits indicate that extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional stability are associated with higher engagement, partly through their influence on how employees experience demands and resources (Langelaan et al., 2006; Gan & Gan, 2014).

## **5. Job resources, personal resources, and engagement: An integrative view**

Combining the JD-R perspective with research on personal resources leads to an integrative view in which engagement is shaped by both contextual and individual factors. Job resources provided by the organization—such as supportive leadership, participation in decision-making, clear feedback, rewards, and opportunities for development—create conditions that invite employees to invest energy and attention (May et al., 2004; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008). Personal resources influence how employees notice and utilize these opportunities: those with high self-efficacy and optimism are more likely to seek responsibility, interpret feedback constructively, and persist in the face of setbacks (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009; Luthans et al., 2007).

There is also evidence that job and personal resources interact. Under high job demands, resources become particularly salient, and their positive impact on engagement is amplified (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Hakanen et al., 2006). Conversely, in resource-poor environments, even highly resilient employees may struggle to remain engaged over time. The proposed integrative model suggests cyclical relationships: job resources enhance personal resources, which increase engagement, which in turn encourages employees to acquire or create additional



# International Journal of Engineering, Science and Humanities

An international peer reviewed, refereed, open-access journal  
Impact Factor 8.3 [www.ijesh.com](http://www.ijesh.com) ISSN: 2250-3552

resources (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007; Bakker, 2011). This dynamic perspective highlights why engagement can be self-reinforcing in supportive contexts and fragile in deprived ones.

## 6. Outcomes of employee engagement

A substantial body of research links engagement with positive outcomes at both the individual and organizational level. Engaged employees report higher job satisfaction, stronger organizational commitment, and lower turnover intentions (Saks, 2006; Rich et al., 2010). They also show more organizational citizenship behaviors, creativity, and proactive problem-solving (Hakanen et al., 2008; Christian et al., 2011). Longitudinal studies indicate that engagement can predict subsequent performance and financial indicators, such as productivity, sales, and customer satisfaction (Harter et al., 2002; Salanova et al., 2005).

At the organizational level, units with higher engagement scores tend to have better safety records, lower absenteeism, and higher profitability (Harter et al., 2002; Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Engagement also appears to benefit employee well-being by reducing burnout and promoting positive affect and psychological resilience (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Halbesleben, 2010). However, some scholars caution that excessive or poorly managed engagement could, in certain contexts, contribute to workaholism or work–family conflict, suggesting a need to balance engagement initiatives with attention to recovery and boundaries (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008; Sonnentag, 2011).

## 7. Gaps and future directions

Despite extensive research, several gaps remain. First, many studies have focused on Western contexts, with relatively fewer examining engagement in diverse cultural settings where expectations of work and leadership differ (Farndale et al., 2014; Sun & Bunchapattanasakda, 2019). Cross-cultural work suggests that job resources such as participation in decision-making or team climate may have different salience across countries, indicating that engagement drivers are culturally embedded. Second, demographic variables and personality differences have often been treated as control variables rather than central themes, leaving questions about how age, gender, and career stage shape engagement trajectories (Sun & Bunchapattanasakda, 2019).

Third, more research is needed on the mediating and moderating role of engagement. Many studies show that engagement mediates the relationship between HR practices, leadership, and performance, but fewer examine conditions under which engagement is most effective as a mediating mechanism (Albrecht et al., 2015; Saks, 2019). Finally, there is limited evidence on structured interventions aimed at increasing job and personal resources to enhance engagement over time. While some longitudinal studies show promising effects of resource-building programs, more rigorous designs and evaluations are needed (Bakker, 2011; Knight et al., 2017). Future work could also explore digital and hybrid work arrangements and their implications for engagement.



# International Journal of Engineering, Science and Humanities

An international peer reviewed, refereed, open-access journal  
Impact Factor 8.3 [www.ijesh.com](http://www.ijesh.com) ISSN: 2250-3552

## 8. Practical implications for organizations

For practitioners, the integrative resource-based view suggests that engagement can be actively shaped by aligning work design, leadership, and HR practices with employees' psychological needs. At the job level, organizations can enhance engagement by providing autonomy, clear roles, constructive feedback, and opportunities for skill use and development (May et al., 2004; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008). Supportive leadership, characterized by fairness, recognition, and open communication, reinforces psychological safety and meaningfulness, which Kahn (1990) identified as core conditions for engagement.

At the individual level, organizations can invest in training and development initiatives that build personal resources such as self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience (Luthans et al., 2007; Knight et al., 2017). Coaching, mentoring, and strengths-based feedback can help employees recognize their own resourcefulness and align tasks with their strengths (Albrecht et al., 2015). HR systems that combine fair rewards, career development, and participative decision-making are likely to foster perceptions of social exchange and reciprocity, further encouraging employees to respond with higher engagement (Saks, 2006; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Importantly, engagement initiatives should also consider workload and recovery opportunities to avoid promoting unsustainable levels of effort.

## 9. Conclusion

This paper has argued that employee engagement is best understood as a positive, work-related state arising from the interplay between job resources, personal resources, and job demands. Job resources such as supportive leadership, participation, and feedback provide the structural basis for engagement, while personal resources such as self-efficacy and resilience influence how employees interpret and use these opportunities (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009). Engagement, in turn, mediates the relationship between resources and outcomes, predicting performance, well-being, and retention (Christian et al., 2011; Rich et al., 2010).

By integrating contextual and individual perspectives, the proposed model highlights why some employees thrive even in demanding environments, while others disengage despite apparently favorable conditions. For researchers, it points to the value of longitudinal, cross-cultural, and intervention studies that can unpack these dynamics more precisely. For practitioners, it underscores that sustainable engagement is not a quick fix, but the result of coherent, resource-oriented strategies that respect employees' needs and capacities.



# International Journal of Engineering, Science and Humanities

An international peer reviewed, refereed, open-access journal  
**Impact Factor 8.3** [www.ijesh.com](http://www.ijesh.com) **ISSN: 2250-3552**

## References

1. Albrecht, S. L., Bakker, A. B., Gruman, J. A., Macey, W. H., & Saks, A. M. (2015). Employee engagement, human resource management practices and competitive advantage: An integrated approach. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 2(1), 7–35.
2. Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(4), 265–269.
3. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.
4. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209–223.
5. 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.
6. Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89–136.
7. Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874–900.
8. Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 834–848.
9. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512.
10. Farndale, E., Beijer, S., Van Veldhoven, M., Kelliher, C., & Hope-Hailey, V. (2014). Work and organisation engagement: Aligning research and practice. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 1(2), 157–176.
11. Gan, Y., & Gan, Y. (2014). Personality and work engagement: The mediating role of job demands and job resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(1), 1–20.
12. Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43(6), 495–513.
13. Hakanen, J. J., Perhoniemi, R., & Toppinen-Tanner, S. (2008). Positive gain spirals at work: From job resources to work engagement, personal initiative and work–unit innovativeness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73(1), 78–91.



# International Journal of Engineering, Science and Humanities

An international peer reviewed, refereed, open-access journal  
Impact Factor 8.3 [www.ijesh.com](http://www.ijesh.com) ISSN: 2250-3552

14. Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2010). A meta-analysis of work engagement: Relationships with burnout, demands, resources, and consequences. In A. B. Bakker & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 102–117). Psychology Press.
15. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268–279.
16. Hewitt. (2001). *Employee engagement: A driver of organizational performance*. Hewitt Associates.
17. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724.
18. Knight, C., Patterson, M., & Dawson, J. (2017). Building work engagement: A systematic review and meta-analysis investigating the effectiveness of work engagement interventions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(6), 792–812.
19. Langelaan, S., Bakker, A. B., Van Doornen, L. J. P., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: Do individual differences make a difference? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40(3), 521–532.
20. Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 541–572.
21. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3–30.
22. 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(1), 11–37.
23. Rich, B. L., LePine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617–635.
24. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619.
25. Saks, A. M. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement revisited. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 6(1), 19–38. [sciencedirect](https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEP-01-2019-0001)
26. 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.



# International Journal of Engineering, Science and Humanities

An international peer reviewed, refereed, open-access journal  
**Impact Factor 8.3** [www.ijesh.com](http://www.ijesh.com) **ISSN: 2250-3552**

27. Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiró, J. M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1217–1227.
28. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315.
29. 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.
30. Simbula, S., Guglielmi, D., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2011). A three-wave study of job resources, self-efficacy, and work engagement among Italian schoolteachers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(3), 285–304.
31. Soane, E., Truss, C., Alfes, K., Shantz, A., Rees, C., & Gatenby, M. (2012). Development and application of a new measure of employee engagement. *Human Resource Development International*, 15(5), 529–547.
32. Sonnentag, S. (2011). Recovery from fatigue: The role of psychological detachment. In P. L. Ackerman (Ed.), *Cognitive fatigue* (pp. 253–272). American Psychological Association.
33. Sun, L., & Bunchapattanasakda, C. (2019). Employee engagement: A literature review. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 9(1), 63–80.
34. Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands–resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(2), 121–141.
35. Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(1), 183–200.