

**8<sup>th</sup> ICEEPSY, 2017**  
**The International Conference on Education and Education  
Psychology**

**VIETNAMESE EMPLOYEE WORK ENGAGEMENT.  
INFLUENCE OF ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION TACTICS  
AND WORK-HOME INTERACTIONS**

Bui Thi Hong Thai (a), Tran Thi Minh Duc (b)\*

\*Corresponding author

(a) Faculty of Psychology, University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Viet Nam National University, Ha Noi,  
Viet Nam, buihongthai2003@yahoo.com

(b) Faculty of Psychology, University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Viet Nam National University, Ha Noi,  
Viet Nam, ttmduc@gmail.com

***Abstract***

Work engagement is seen to be affected by plenty of organizational factors and individual psychological characteristics of an employee. This study was conducted in an effort to discover which organizational socialization tactics and work-home interactions factors have the strongest influence on an employee's work engagement. As such, the study aims at measuring and exploring the impacts of organizational socialization tactics (content, context and social tactics) and work-home interactions (positive work-home interaction, negative work-home interaction, positive home-work interaction and negative home-work interaction) on Vietnamese young employees' work engagement. Data were collected from questionnaires with 675 respondents with highly academic background, under 30 years old and with less than 5-year working experience at their organizations. The measuring instruments adopted in the study include the Organizational Socialization Tactics scale (Cable & Parson, 2001), the Survey Work-Home Interaction-Nijmegen (Geurts, 2000) and the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli & al., 2002). The results demonstrated a significant relationship amongst all independent variables, except *negative home-work interaction*, and the dependent variable. Furthermore, *positive work-home interaction* was the most influential factor on employee work engagement. These results carry an implication that it is crucial for young employees to maintain positive relationship between work and private life, apart from organizational socialization tactics to improve their work engagement.

© 2017 Published by Future Academy [www.FutureAcademy.org.UK](http://www.FutureAcademy.org.UK)

**Keywords:** Work engagement, organizational socialization tactics, work-home interactions, young employee.



## 1. Introduction

Employee work engagement has been a concern in organisations, as managers look for different methods to maintain and promote engagement in their workforce (Chandani, Mehta, Mall, & Khokhar, 2016). Work engagement is worth striving for both employees (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008) and organizations (Christian, Garza, & Slaughter, 2011) by dint of its important role. For employees, high level of work engagement has a significant relationship with their job satisfaction, job performance (Shmailan, 2016), loyalty (Durkin, 2007; Biswas & Bhatnagar, 2013), citizenship behaviour and productive work behaviour (Ariani, 2013). It can also be beneficial for their mental health (Leijten, Van Den Heuvel, Van Der Beek, Ybema, Robroek, & Burdorf, 2015). For an organization, work engagement can mediate the relationship between psychological climate and organizational effectiveness (Kataria, Garg, & Rastogi, 2013), and it also increases organizational commitment (Agyemang & Ofei, 2013). In other words, work engagement has a crucial role in organization's development and productivity.

For aforesaid reasons, a large number of studies have looked at the related factors or predictors to work engagement. There are numerous publications demonstrating various factors such as clarity of company values (Mona, 2013), the job itself, career development, relationship with management, compensations and benefits, work environment, and teamwork (Mai & Nguyen, 2016). However, little attention has been given to the correlations between employee work engagement and different organizational socialization tactics, and employee work engagement and their work-home interactions. The current study therefore focuses on organizational socialization tactics and work-home interactions as independent variables, and seeks to understand their roles in Vietnamese young employees' work engagement.

### 1.1. Work engagement

Work engagement is defined as “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state, characterized by vigour, dedication, and absorption” (Schaufeli, Salanova, Bakker, & González-Romá, 2002, p. 74). Engagement refers to a persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Vigour is characterized by high level of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one's work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties. Dedication is characterized by experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and involvement in one's work. And absorption is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work. (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Researchers suggest that vigour and dedication constitute the core dimensions of engagement because they are seemingly the opposite poles of the burnout dimensions of exhaustion and cynicism, whereby vigour and exhaustion span a continuum labelled “energy”, and dedication and cynicism span a continuum labelled “identification” (quoted by Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006).

Work engagement is seen to be influenced by plenty of organizational factors and individual characteristics of an employee. In this study, we would like to initially examine the impacts of

demographics and job characteristics on Vietnamese young employees' work engagement. Therefore, our first hypothesis is as follows:

H1. There is significant difference in work engagement score among Vietnamese young employees, depending on their demographic characteristics.

## **1.2. Organizational socialization tactics and their relationship with work engagement**

Socialization tactics refer to strategies designed by the organization for the purposes of helping newcomers adapt to early entry experiences and perform a transition from one role to another (Van Maanen and Schein, 1979; Jones, 1986). Van Maanen and Schein (1979) defined a typology of socialization tactics with six dimensions: (1) collective vs. individual; (2) formal vs. informal; (3) fixed vs. variable; (4) sequential vs. random; (5) serial vs. disjunctive; and (6) investiture vs. divestiture. From these six dimensions, Jones (1986) argued for the existence of three broad factors:

- (1) content tactics: Employees are informed of specific stages existing in the organization for training, and there is a clear roadmap for their role adjustment;
- (2) context tactics: Employees are provided with task requirements as a group member and with formal training before starting the actual job; and
- (3) social tactics: Employees are provided with positive feedback and affirmed by organizational insiders as well as guided within the organization by a trusted insider.

In this study, we adapted three factors from Jones (1986) to examine their impacts on employee's work engagement. Saks, Uggerslev and Fassina (2007) found in their meta-analytic review of over 30 related studies that socialization tactics are negatively related to role ambiguity, role conflict, and intention to quit, and positively related to fit perceptions, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job performance and a custodial role orientation. In other words, organizational socialization tactics help young employees succeed in professional tasks; and their work engagement, in our opinion, will increase accordingly. Thereby, we propose another hypothesis below:

H2. All three organizational socialization tactics are positively related to employee work engagement.

## **1.3. Work-home interactions and their relationship with work engagement**

The interaction between work and home (or non-work, according to Madjar, Oldham & Pratt, 2002) has been an important aspect in the studies of employees' work behaviour because they are unseparated domains. Work is defined as a set of (prescribed) tasks that an individual performs while occupying a position in an organization (Guerts & Demerouti, 2003). Home or non-work refers to activities and responsibilities within the family domain, or also beyond the family domain like one's social life and private life (Dupuy, Le Blanc, & Mégemont, 2006). Work-home interaction is defined by Geurts et al. (2005, p. 322) as "an interactive process in which a worker's functioning in one domain (e.g. home) is influenced by (negative or positive) load reactions that have built up in the other domain (e.g. work)". They distinguished four dimensions of work-home interaction:

- (1) negative work-home interaction: state in which negative load reactions triggered at work hinders a person's functioning at home (e.g. a low salary and overwork);

- (2) positive work-home interaction: positive load reactions built up at work that facilitate functioning at home (e.g. a good/fair working environment)
- (3) negative home-work interaction: negative load reactions established at home that fetter a person's functioning at work (e.g. no support from family); and
- (4) positive home-work interaction: positive load reactions built up at home facilitate functioning at work (e.g. emotional support from family).

Regarding the relationship between work engagement and work-home interactions, researchers posed the question whether employees may become so absorbed in their work that this negatively affects other parts of their lives, such as their work-home balance (Halbesleben, Harvey, & Bolino, 2009). Rodríguez-Muñoz, Sanz-Vergel, Demerouti, and Bakker (2014), and therefore call for more research on this subject to “better understand how work engagement relates to experiences lived outside the work domain” (p. 279). In this study, we are interested in whether the work-home interactions can influence the level of employee work engagement. From our viewpoint, when employees feel a positive relationship between work and home, they can better engage in work. On the contrary, a negative relationship between work and home can cause their decreased investment in work. Therefore, we propose and test the following hypotheses:

H3. Positive dimensions of work-home interaction are positively related to employees' work engagement.

H4. Negative dimensions of work-home interaction are negatively related to employees' work engagement.

## **2. Problem Statement**

According to Lovakov, Agadullina & Schaufelic (2017), most researches on engagement have been carried out with the job demands - resources model. Different researchers demonstrated that work engagement is positively correlated with job resources such as social support, positive feedback, the employee's self-efficacy, work autonomy, and a diversity of work tasks, which helps workers cope with job demands.

Young employees who have just entered work with a change of role (students - workers), status (outsider - insider, Feldman, 1976), need help from the organization as well as their own efforts to be able to work. The majority of researches on organizational socialization tactics indicated that the influence on the employees' proactive behaviours included feedback-seeking, information-seeking, boss relationship building, networking, job change negotiation, etc. (Gruman, Saks & Zweig, 2006; Saeed, Shamsodin & AhmadReza, 2013), as well as on their organizational commitment (Simosi, 2010). About the work-home interactions, various research findings showed that the balance between work and private life had certain impacts on job satisfaction (Arif & Farooqi, 2014) and employee retention (Kar & Misra, 2013). However, there has been little research into the relationship between organizational socialization tactics and work engagement, also in the relationship between work-home interactions and work engagement. We hope this study might contribute to filling this gap in the literature. |

### **3. Research Questions**

- (1) [Is there an impact of demographic and work-related characteristics on Vietnamese young employees' work engagement? (gender, age, marital status, type of institution, type of employment contract, work experience, working time per day, level of salary, and intention to leave the organization).
- (2) Whether the organizational socialization tactics and work-home interactions influence employee work engagement?
- (3) Which of the organizational socialization tactics and work-home interactions have the strongest influence on employee work engagement? |

### **4. Purpose of the Study**

[The study aims to:

- (1) describe Vietnamese young employees' work engagement by their demographic characteristics; and
- (2) measure and explore the impacts of organizational tactics (content, context and social tactics) and work-home interaction (positive home-work, positive work-home, negative home-work and negative work-home interaction) on Vietnamese young employees' work engagement.]

### **5. Research Methods**

#### **5.1. Design and procedure**

Based on the discussion on the theoretical background and research questions, four hypotheses were proposed to constitute the research framework. The core hypotheses in this study were to justify effects of organizational socialization tactics and home-work interactions on new employees' work engagement. Furthermore, we supposed that for young employees, the positive work-home interaction is the strongest factor affecting their work engagement.

According to Katz (1980), organizational socialization tactics are more important during the first few months at work than later, thereby most of the participants in our study work at their organizations for less than 1 year. There are also participants with more than one year of work experience (and a maximum of 5 years) but this rate is low. Data was obtained at different organizations in Ha Noi. In April 2017, a pilot study was conducted on 60 employees to check the face validity and reliability of translated scales. The survey was undertaken from May to July 2017 on 700 employees. 675 were returned, making a response rate of 96.4%. Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured during data collection.

#### **5.2. Participants**

The 675 young employees from different organizations in Ha Noi, Viet Nam have highly academic backgrounds, were under 30 years old and with less than 5-year working experience at their organizations. Their personal information is presented in Table 01.

**Table 01.** Personal information of participants (N = 675)

	<b>Category</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Gender	Male	219	32.4
	Female	456	67.6
Age	Min = 21, Max = 30, Mean = 25.66 (SD = 2.55)		
Marital status	Single	468	69.3
	Married	207	30.7
Qualification	Secondary	65	9.6
	Bachelor	513	76.0
	Master	97	14.4
Type of organization	Domestic	580	80.0
	Foreign-owned	69	10.2
	International Joint Venture	71	10.5
Work experience	1 year	366	54.6
	1 year - 2 years	135	20.2
	Above 2 years - 5 years	174	25.2
Position	Staff	602	89.5
	Manager	71	10.5

### **5.3. Measure**

#### **5.3.1. Work engagement**

Work engagement was measured by using the 17-item version scale developed by Schaufeli et al. (2002). The measure consisted of three subscales: (1) Vigour (VI - 6 items, e.g., “When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work”), (2) Dedication (DE - 5 items, e.g., “I am enthusiastic about my job”) and (3) Absorption (AB - 6 items, e.g., “When I am working, I forget everything else around me”). Participants were given questionnaires with responses on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 4 (always). The confirmatory factor analyses (CFA’s) using structural equation modelling (SEM) techniques were adopted in this study. The results obtained showed that the three-factor model fit the data well (Kline, 2011):  $\chi^2 = 178.995$  (96),  $p < .001$ ; CFI = .949, TLI = .928, GIF = .913 and RMSEA = .064. The scale reflected excellent reliability with Cronbach’s Alpha of .908 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 2006). The reliability was good for each subscale: Vigour with  $\alpha = .740$ , Dedication with  $\alpha = .883$  and Absorption with  $\alpha = .831$ .

#### **5.3.2. Organizational socialization tactics**

To measure organizational socialization tactics, the questionnaire developed by Cable and Parsons (2001). Which was adopted in this study. include 12 items in total with three factors (4 items for each factor): (1) Context tactics (e.g., “I did not perform any of my normal job responsibilities until I was thoroughly familiar with departmental procedures and work methods”), (2) Content tactics (e.g., “The way in which my progress through this organization will follow a fixed timetable of events has been clearly communicated to me”) and (3) Social tactics (e.g., “I am gaining a clear understanding of my role in this organization from observing my senior colleagues”). Participants were given questionnaires with responses on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The results of a CFA indicated that the three-factor model fit the data well,  $\chi^2 = 179.192$  (89),  $p < .001$ ; CFI = .937, TLI

= .903, GIF = .957 and RMSEA = .069. The estimated Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were .81, .751 and .776 for context tactics, content tactics and social tactics, respectively.

### 5.3.3. Work-home interaction

The relationship between life work and life outside work was measured by the Survey Work-Home Interaction - Nijmegen (SWING) developed by Geurts et al. (2005). The scale consisted of 22 items with four types of work-home interaction: (1) Negative work-home interaction (8 items, e.g., "I do not have the energy to engage in leisure activities with my spouse/family/friends because of my job"), (2) Negative home-work interaction (4 items, e.g., "I have difficulty concentrating on my work because I am preoccupied with domestic matters"), (3) Positive work-home interaction (5 items, e.g., "I fulfil my domestic obligations better because of the things I have learned on my job") and (4) Positive home-work interaction (5 items, e.g., "I take my responsibilities at work more seriously because I am required to do the same at home"). All items were on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 4 (always). The results from the confirmatory factor analysis affirmed the structure of four factors on Vietnamese employees with the data:  $\chi^2 = 377.433$  (184),  $p < .001$ ; CFI = .968, TLI = .960, GIF = .951 and RMSEA = .039. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of each factor were: Negative work-home interaction .871, Negative home-work interaction .810, Positive work-home interaction .791 and Positive home-work interaction .802.

### 5.4. Data analysis

Data was coded and analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS, version 23.0). For descriptive statistics (the percentage or the mean value), we used initial data. For statistical inference, we eliminated some extreme values to guarantee the criteria of normal distribution. To test our hypotheses, we employed the following statistics methods: T-test, ANOVA, Bivariate Correlation and Linear Regression Analysis.

## 6. Findings

Table 02 presents the means, standard deviations and inter-correlations of the variables. With a range from 1 to 4, the results demonstrated that Vietnamese young employees tended to highly score all three types of organizational socialization tactics, three dimensions of work engagement and the positive interaction between work and life (Positive WHI and Positive HWI). However, the scores were low on the variables of negative interaction between work and life (Negative WHI and Negative HWI).

**Table 02.** Mean, standard deviations and reliabilities of variables

<i>Variable</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>
1. Context tactics	2.26	.64	1	4	.81
2. Content tactics	2.50	.61	1	4	.751
3. Social tactics	2.89	.54	1	4	.776
4. Negative WHI	1.83	.54	1	4	.871
5. Negative HWI	1.74	.58	1	4	.810
6. Positive WHI	2.52	.58	1	4	.791

7. Positive HWI	2.57	.56	1	4	.802
8. VI	2.66	.62	1	4	.740
9. DE	2.60	.60	1	4	.883
10. AB	2.38	.63	1	4	.831
11. WE	2.55	.52	1	4	.908

Note: WHI - work-home interaction, HWI - home-work interaction, VI-Vigour, DE-Dedicate, AB-Absorption, WE-Work engagement

### 6.1. Effect of demographic and work-related characteristics on work engagement

Variables of demographic and work-related characteristics in this study include gender, age, marital status, education level, type of organization, work experience, work position and working time per day. To test hypothesis 1, multiple of T-test, One-way ANOVA and Bivariate Correlation were carried out. Only significant results on relationship between these characteristics and work engagement are presented in the following session.

#### Gender

The results from an Independent Samples T-test indicated that gender had an effect on work engagement. Male employees ( $M = 2.67$ ,  $SD = .49$ ) had higher work engagement score than females ( $M = 2.49$ ,  $SD = .50$ ),  $t_{(667)} = 4.184$ ,  $p < .001$ .

#### Work position

An Independent Samples T-test showed that work engagement score was related to employee's position at work,  $t_{(665)} = 4.167$ ,  $p < .001$ . Manager ( $M = 2.78$ ,  $SD = .49$ ) had greater work engagement score than staff ( $M = 2.52$ ,  $SD = .49$ ).

The above-mentioned results confirmed the effect of some demographic characteristics on employee work engagement, supporting our hypothesis 1.

### 6.2. Relationship between organizational socialization tactics, work-home interaction and work engagement

Below are results of significant relationships between work engagement and the other independent variables:

- Context tactics and work engagement ( $r_{(669)} = .211$ ,  $p < .01$ );
- Content tactics and work engagement ( $r_{(669)} = .307$ ,  $p < .01$ );
- Social tactics and work engagement ( $r_{(665)} = .187$ ,  $p < .01$ );
- Negative work-home interaction and work engagement ( $r_{(667)} = .142$ ,  $p < .01$ );
- Positive work-home interaction and work engagement ( $r_{(669)} = .399$ ,  $p < .01$ );
- Positive home-work interaction and work engagement ( $r_{(664)} = .426$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

Among the seven independent variables concerning organizational tactics and home-work interaction, six are positively significant related with work engagement, except negative home-work interaction. Based on these results, we will test our hypothesis 2, 3 and 4.



### 6.3. Factors predicting work engagement

To test the predicting relationship of the work engagement (hypotheses 2, 3 and 4), each of the organizational socialization tactics and work-home interaction were regressed on work engagement using the enter method.

Table 03 summarizes the regression analysis with organizational socialization tactics and work-home interaction as predictors of work engagement. The application of three factors of organizational socialization tactics in the model 1 of the regression analysis produced a statistically significant model ( $F_{(3,665)} = 29.423$ ,  $p < .001$ ), accounting for approximately 11.3% of the variance. All of three factors of context tactics ( $\beta = .124$ ,  $t = 3.173$ ,  $p < .01$ ), content tactics ( $\beta = .229$ ,  $t = 5.564$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and social tactics ( $\beta = .111$ ,  $t = 2.881$ ,  $p < .01$ ) positively predicted work engagement, which supported Hypothesis 2. Content tactics seemed also to be the strongest influential factors on work engagement.

**Table 03.** Multiple regression analyses for organizational socialization tactics and work-home interaction predicting work engagement

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> $\Delta$
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>B</i>						
1 (Constant)	1.561	.12		13.05	.000	29.423	.342	.117	<b>.113</b>
Context tactics	.097	.03	.124	3.173	.002				
Content tactics	.188	.034	.229	5.564	.000				
Social tactics	.103	.036	.111	2.881	.004				
2 (Constant)	1.110	.11		10.22	.000	65.214	.479	.229	<b>.226</b>
Negative WHI	.152	.03	.161	4.681	.000				
Positive WHI	.171	.040	.194	4.244	.000				
Positive HWI	.284	.042	.306	6.702	.000				
3 (Constant)	.725	.144		5.054	.000	38.288	.510	.261	<b>.254</b>
Context tactics	.055	.029	.07	1.922	.050				
Content tactics	.085	.033	.103	2.619	.009				
Social tactics	.074	.036	.078	2.071	.039				
Negative WHI	.161	.033	.170	4.855	.000				
Positive WHI	.153	.040	.172	3.786	.000				
Positive HWI	.230	.043	.247	5.285	.000				

In the second model, the regression analysis with three dimensions of work-home interaction as predictors of work engagement produced a statistically significant model ( $F_{(3,658)} = 65.214$ ,  $p < .001$ ), accounting for approximately 22.6% of the variance. Positive work-home interaction ( $\beta = .194$ ,  $t = 4.244$ ,  $p < .001$ ), positive home-work interaction ( $\beta = .306$ ,  $t = 6.702$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and negative work-home interaction ( $\beta = .161$ ,  $t = 4.681$ ,  $p < .001$ ) positively predicted work engagement, providing support for Hypothesis 3. However, Hypothesis 4 was not confirmed. Specifically, negative home-work interaction was not in correlation with work engagement while negative work-home interaction was positive correlated with work engagement. In addition, results also indicated that positive home-work interaction seemed the strongest influential factors among different dimensions of work-home interaction on work engagement.

Finally, combination between three factors of organizational socialization tactics and three dimensions of work-home interaction in the model 3 of the regression analysis produced a statistically

significant model ( $F_{(6,652)} = 38.288, p < .001$ ), accounting for approximately 25.4% of the variance. In this model, positive home-work interaction always acted as the strongest influential factors on work engagement with the  $\beta$  value the highest ( $\beta = .247$ ).

## 7. Conclusion

### 7.1. General discussion

Our first purpose in this study was describing Vietnamese young employees' work engagement by their demographic characteristics. This study found a link between some demographic characteristics of employees and their work engagement such as gender, types of the organization and work position of employees. These results were/or were not reported in some other studies.

First, in regard to gender effect on work engagement, Lovakov et al. (2014), Schaufeli and Bakker (2004b) shared the same results that men had higher work engagement score than women. Fong and Ng (2012) indicated higher level of vigour for women and higher level of dedication and absorption for men. However, Zecca et al. (2015), Garg (2014) did not affirm any difference in the level of work engagement between men and women. From a gender role perspective, high level of work engagement among men could be explained by familial tasks (Rothbard, 1999). Specifically, men can dedicate themselves fully to their work while women seem to be more or less distracted by numerous familial responsibilities. From perspective of Vietnamese culture, men are often perceived as being able to withstand more pressure to ensure success at work than women. This is because the "ideal Vietnamese man" seems to be strongly associated with his success at work, which could explain why men scored higher than women in work engagement in this study, as success in work affirms men's social value.

Second, as for work position, managers have higher work engagement than staff. Johnson (2010) indicated that the opportunities for professional development were one of factors which could promote work engagement among managers. We adapted her finding to explain our results. In fact, in any type of organizations, managers often have an advantage over employees in accessing better career ladders. And high work engagement can enable them to seize professional development opportunities. Furthermore, we suppose that our finding is consistent with results from some studies on manager's role in employee work engagement. According to Jyotsna (2008), the manager needs to have visionary thinking and future orientation for employees to increase their work engagement. As holding a position with strong sense of responsibility, high work engagement among managers can be a good example for employees, at the same time can maintain staff's respect for their managers.

There are a lot of individual variables affecting work engagement indicated in others studies such as age of employees (employee engagement keeps increasing with their age, Lovakov et al., 2014); marital status (married employees have a higher level of engagement than single employees, quoted by Garg, 2014); work experience with the present organization (work experience have negative relationship with work engagement, Truss et al., 2006). But these findings have not been recorded in our research. This may be due to the similarity in terms of demographic characteristics of our participants (i.e age, qualification, work experience, etc.).

The principal purpose of the study was measuring and exploring the impacts of organizational tactics (content, context and social tactics) and work-home interaction (positive home-work, positive work-home, negative home-work and negative work-home interaction) on Vietnamese young employees' work engagement.

With regard to the organizational socialization tactics, other studies have recognized its importance on employees' proactive behaviour. For example, Saks, Uggerslev and Fassima (2007) indicated that social tactics were strongest predictors of adjustment outcomes. However, we have not noted any studies mentioning the relationship between organizational socialization tactics and work engagement. The findings from this study affirmed that content, context and social tactics are positively related to employee work engagement and they also can predict its variance. Moreover, content tactics appear to be the strongest influential factor on work engagement. It seems that when the employees are well-informed of their individual development at work, they stay better focused on their work.

Regarding work-home interaction, except for the negative home-work interaction, the three other types (negative work-home interaction, positive work-home interaction and positive home-work interaction) are positively related to and potential predictors of work engagement. These results are either for or against the findings of Rothmann and Baumann (2014). They indicated that negative home-work/work-home interaction was negatively associated with work engagement while positive home-work/work-home interaction was positively affected work engagement. Our findings also pointed out the positive correlation between positive home-work/work-home interaction and work engagement. In the context where almost all employees have to deal with pressure between work and private life, these findings reinforce the important role of work-life balance and reaffirm that work and life are unseparated domains. In other words, employees can be really engrossed and satisfied with their work when their private life is good. Similarly, the development at work, to some extent, is useful for their private life. Besides, the positive association between negative work-home interaction and work engagement found in our study seems to justify the argument of Halbesleben, Harvey, and Bolino (2009) that becoming so absorbed in work can negatively affect other parts of life. Whether work engagement, in this case, can be understood as "workaholism" which was described as "the compulsion or the uncontrollable need to work incessantly" (Oates, 1971). Among these three types of work-home interaction, the positive work-home interaction seems the strongest influential factor on work engagement. And its value stays the same when the combination of three types of work-home interaction and three types of organizational socialization tactics is used in predicting work engagement's variation.

## **7.2. Conclusion**

This study provided evidence for the relationships between organizational socialization tactics and work engagement, between work-home interaction and work engagement. Among all independent variables, positive work-home interaction seems the strongest influential factor on employee work engagement. These results carry an implication that it is crucial for young employees to maintain positive relationship between work and private life, apart from organizational socialization tactics to improve their work engagement. In the future, we think more studies should be conducted to understand what can mediate or moderate these relationships.

## Acknowledgments

[This is to acknowledge funding from Vietnam National University, Ha Noi. This study was conducted as a part of the project: “Professional socialization’s conduct of young employees and the organization’s influence”. Project number: QG.16.42]

## References

- [Agyemang, C.B., & Ofei, S.B. (2013). Employee’s work engagement and organizational commitment: A comparative study of private and public sector organizations in Ghana. *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, 1(4), 20-33.
- Ariani, D.W. (2013). The Relationship between Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 4(2), 46-56. doi:10.5430/ijba.v4n2p46.
- Arif, B. & Farroqi, Y.A. (2014). Impact of Work Life Balance on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among University Teachers: A Case Study of University of Gujrat, Pakistan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Engineering*, 5(9), 24-29.
- Cable, D.M., & Parsons, C.K. (2001). Socialization tactics and person-organization fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 1-23.
- Chandani, A., Mehta, M., Mall, A., & Khokhar, V. (2016). Employee Engagement: A Review Paper on Factors Affecting Employee Engagement. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 9(15), 1-7. doi: 10.17485/ijst/2016/v9i15/92145.
- 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, 89-136.
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22, 187-200.
- Biswas, S., Bhatnagar, J. (2013), Mediator analysis of employee engagement: role of perceived organisational support, P-O fit, organizational commitment and job satisfaction, *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers*, 38(1), 27-40.
- Dupuy, R., Le Blanc, A., & Mégémont, J.L. (2006). Incertitudes au cours de la carrière et construction des perspectives temporelles. *Psychologie du travail et des organisations*, 12, 678-183.
- Durkin, D. (2007), How loyalty and employee engagement add up to corporate profits, *Chief Learning Officer*, 6(11), 30-34.
- Feldman, D.C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 433-452.
- Fong, T. C., & Ng, S. (2012). Measuring Engagement at Work: Validation of the Chinese Version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 19(3), 391-397. doi: 10.1007/s12529-011-9173-6.
- Garg, N. (2014). Employee Engagement and Individual Differences: A Study in Indian Context. *Management Studies and Economic Systemes*, 1(1), 41-50.
- Geurts, S.A.E. & Demerouti, E. (2003). Work/non-work interface: A review of theories and findings. In M.J. Schabracq, J.A.M. Winnubst & C.L. Cooper (Eds.). *The handbook of work and health psychology*. Chichester: Wiley, 279-312.
- Geurts, S.A.E., Taris, T.W., Kompier, M.A.J., Kompier, M.A.J., Dijkers, J.S.E., Van Hooff, M.L.M. & Kinnunen, U.M. (2005). Work-home interaction from a work psychological perspective: Development and validation of a new questionnaire, the SWING. *Journal Work & Stress. An International Journal of Work, Health & Organisations*, 19(4), 319-339.
- Gruman, J.A., Saks, A.M., & Zweig, D.I. (2006). Organizational socialization tactics and newcomer proactive behaviors: An integrative study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 90-104, doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2006.03.001.

- Halbesleben, J. R. B., Harvey, J., & Bolino, M. C. (2009). Too engaged? A conservation of resources views of the relationship between work engagement and work interference with family. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(6), 1452–1465. doi:10.1037/a0017595
- Hanaken, J.J., Bakker, A.B., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology, 43*, 459-513. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001.
- Johnson, M.S.B. (2010). *Differences in Drivers of Employee Engagement and Leadership Engagement at a Large Quasigovernment Agency*. Thesis of Doctor of Education, Nova Southeastern University.
- Jones, G. (1986). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy and newcomers' adjustments to organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 29*, 262-79.
- Jyotsna, B. (2008). Managing capabilities for talent engagement and pipeline development. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 40*(1), 19-28.
- Kar, S. & Misra, K.C. (2013). Nexus between Work Life Balance Practices and Employee Retention – The Mediating Effect of a Supportive Culture. *Asian Social Science, 9*(11), 63-69.
- Kataria, A., Garg, R., & Rastogi, R. (2013). Psychological Climate and Organizational Effectiveness: Role of Work Engagement. *The IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*(3), 33-46.
- Katz, R. (1980), "Time and work: toward an integrative perspective", in Staw, B. and Cummings, L. (Eds), *Research in Organizational Behavior, Vol. 2*, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, 81-127.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Leijten, F.R., van den Heuvel, S.G., van der Beek, A.J., Ybema, J.F., Robroek, S.J., & Burdorf, A. (2015). Associations of work-related factors and work engagement with mental and physical health: a 1-year follow-up study among older workers. *J Occup Rehabil, 25*(1), 86-95. doi: 10.1007/s10926-014-9525-6.
- Lovakov, A.V., Agadullina, E.R., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2017). Psychometric properties of the Russian version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9). *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art, 10*(1), 145-162. doi: 10.11621/pir.2017.0111.
- Madjar, N., Oldham, G.R. & Pratt, M.G. (2002). There's No Place like Home? The Contributions of Work and Nonwork Creativity Support to Employees' Creative Performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(4), 757-767.
- Mai, N.K., & Nguyen, H. T. U. (2016). Factors Affecting Employee Job Engagement towards Aircraft Maintenance Organizations. A Mediation Analysis of Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management, 4*(4), 339-346, doi: 10.18178/joebm.2016.4.4.414.
- Mona, M.N. (2013). Investigating the high turnover of Saudi nationals versus non- nationals in Private sector companies using selected Antecedents and Consequences of employee engagement. *International Journal of Business and Management, 8*(18), 41-52.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (2006). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Lightning Source.
- Oates, W. (1971). *Confessions of a workaholic: The facts about work addiction*. New York: World.
- Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Sanz-Vergel, A. I., Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Engaged at work and happy at home: A spillover-crossover model. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 15*(2), 271-283. doi:10.1007/s10902-013-9421-3.
- Rothbard, N. (1999). *Enriching or Depleting: The Dynamics of Engagement in Work and Family*, Dissertation Abstracts International US: University Microfilm International, 59 (10-A).
- Rothmann, S. & Baumann, C. (2014). Employee Engagement: The Effects of Work-home/Home-work Interaction and Psychological Conditions. *SAJEMS NS, 17*(4), 515-530.
- Saeed, M., Shamsodin, N., & AhmadReza, K.M. (2013). How Institutional Socialization Tactics Affects the Drivers of Socialization Newcomers' Proactivity and Socialization Outcomes. *Research Journal of Recent Sciences, 2*(6), 11-16.
- Saks, A.M., Uggerslev, K.L., & Fassima, N.E. (2007). Socialization tactics and newcomer adjustment: A meta-analytic review and test of a model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 70*, 413-446.

- 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, 293-315. doi: 10.1002/job.248.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004b). *Test manual for the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. Unpublished manuscript, Utrecht University, The Netherlands*. Utrecht. Retrieved from <http://www.schaufeli.com>.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Bakker, A. B., & González-Romá, V. (2002). The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A two sample confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92. doi: 10.1023/A:1015630930326.
- Shmailan, A.S.B. (2016). The relationship between job satisfaction, job performance and employee engagement: An explorative study. *Business Management and Economics Vol.4 (1)*, 1-8.
- Simosi, M. (2010). The role of social socialization tactics in the relationship between socialization content and newcomers' affective commitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(3), 301-327, DOI 10.1108/02683941011023758.
- Truss, C., Soane, E., Edwards, C., Wisdom, K., Croll, A. and Burnett, J. (2006). *Working Life: Employee Attitudes and Engagement*, London: CIPD.
- Van Maanen, J. and Schein, E. (1979). "Towards a theory of organizational socialization", in Staw, B. (Ed.), *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 1, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, 209-64.
- Zecca, G., Györkös, C., Becker, J., Massoudi, K., De Bruin, G. P., & Rossier, J. (2015). Validation of the French Utrecht Work Engagement Scale and its relationship with personality traits and impulsivity. *Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée/European Review of Applied Psychology*, 65(1), 19-28. doi: 10.1016/j.erap.2014.10.003. |