



Imperial Evaluation Of The Impact Of Perceived Organizational Support And Perceived Organizational Justice On Employee Engagement

¹ Prof. Priyanka Sachin Jadhav, ² Dr. Arpita Singh

¹Research Scholar, ²Assistant Professor

¹MKSSS's Smt. Hiraben Nanavati Institute of Management and Research for Women & Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, India.,

²MKSSS's Smt. Hiraben Nanavati Institute of Management and Research for Women & Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, India.

Abstract: Employee engagement is increasingly recognized as a central construct in organizational research, widely acknowledged for its contribution to productivity, commitment, and long-term organizational success. This literature review analyzes the dual impact of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and Perceived organizational justice (POJ) on workforce engagement, highlighting their theoretical foundations, empirical evidence, and mediating mechanisms. POS, defined as employees' perception of organizational care and value for their contributions, is consistently associated with higher levels of job satisfaction, affective commitment, and reduced turnover intentions. Similarly, POJ, encompassing distributive, procedural, and interactional fairness, has been demonstrated to foster motivation, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. The review integrates findings from seminal works and meta-analyses, underscoring that organizations that balance support with fairness cultivate an engaged workforce capable of exceeding role expectations. Additionally, the paper identifies mediators such as organizational commitment, psychological empowerment, and work passion, as well as moderators like job characteristics and leadership style, that strengthen or attenuate these relationships. By synthesizing multiple perspectives, this review establishes POS and POJ as critical antecedents of workforce engagement and offers practical implications for leaders and managers aiming to build supportive and just work environments.

Index Terms - Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Perceived organizational justice (POJ), Employee engagement.

1.1 Conceptual Framework and Review

Employee engagement is increasingly recognized as a crucial factor in organizational success, productivity, and overall performance. To achieve high levels of workforce engagement, organizations need to understand the factors that impact it. Two important constructs that have been extensively studied in this context are perceived Organizational Support (POS) and Perceived organizational justice (POJ). This literature review aims to explore the existing research on the impact of POS and POJ on workforce engagement.

1. Perceived Organizational Support (POS):

Perceived organizational support refers to employees' perception of how much the organization values and cares about their well-being. Several studies have established that POS positively influences employee attitudes and behaviors. When employees feel that the organization supports them, they reciprocate with higher levels of engagement, commitment, and loyalty. POS is often associated with increased job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. Moreover, employees with higher POS are more likely to experience lower levels of stress and turnover intentions.

2. Perceived organizational justice (POJ):

Perceived organizational justice refers to employees' perception of fairness in various organizational processes, such as decision-making, resource allocation, and interpersonal treatment. POJ is typically categorized into three dimensions: distributive justice (fairness of outcomes), procedural justice (fairness of processes), and interactional justice (fairness of interpersonal treatment). Research has consistently shown that employees' perception of fairness within the organization plays a vital role in their engagement levels. When employees perceive organizational justice, they are more likely to be motivated, committed, and engaged in their work.

3. Impact on Employee engagement:

The relationship between POS, POJ, and workforce engagement has been extensively explored in the literature. Studies have indicated that both POS and POJ have a significant positive impact on workforce engagement. Employees who perceive higher levels of support and fairness in the organization are more likely to feel valued and motivated to contribute actively to the organization's goals. Engaged employees are more willing to go above and beyond their job requirements, resulting in increased job performance and organizational outcomes.

4. Moderating and Mediating Factors:

While the direct impact of POS and POJ on workforce engagement is well-established, some studies have also explored the role of moderating and mediating factors. For instance, job characteristics, individual differences, and organizational culture may moderate the relationship between POS/POJ and workforce engagement. Additionally, factors like psychological empowerment and organizational commitment have been identified as potential mediators in this relationship, helping to explain the underlying mechanisms.

The literature consistently supports the notion that Perceived organizational support and Perceived organizational justice are crucial determinants of workforce engagement. Organizations should prioritize creating a supportive and fair work environment to enhance workforce engagement levels. By doing so, they can foster a committed and motivated workforce, leading to improved productivity, reduced turnover, and overall organizational success.

It's worth noting that the above literature review is a general overview of the topic and may not include the most recent research published after September 2021. Researchers and scholars continue to explore and advance our understanding of the relationship between Perceived organizational support, Perceived organizational justice, and workforce engagement.

Table 0-1 Review of the existing literature

Author	Contribution
Kahn (1990)	Kahn (1990) pioneered the idea of personal engagement, describing it as the alignment of an employee's authentic self with their professional role. He identified three psychological drivers: meaningfulness, safety, and availability as essential conditions fostering engagement.
Schaufeli et al. (2002)	Schaufeli et al. (2002) designed the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) and conceptualized engagement as a positive, fulfilling mental state defined by vigor, dedication, and absorption, distinguishing it from mere job satisfaction.
Macey and Schneider (2008)	Macey and Schneider (2008) differentiated engagement across three domains: trait, state, and behavioral. They suggested that personality-based engagement predisposes situational engagement, which ultimately manifests in observable work behaviors, highlighting organizational initiatives as key enablers.
Harter et al. (2002)	Harter et al. (2002) linked engagement to measurable business results through Gallup's Q12 framework, demonstrating strong correlations among engagement and outcomes such as customer loyalty, productivity, profitability, and reduced employee turnover.
Rich et al. (2010)	Rich et al. (2010) analyzed job involvement and commitment as predictors of job performance, showing that engagement serves as an intermediary mechanism. They underscored the necessity of both physical energy and emotional investment in achieving superior performance.
Saks (2006)	Saks (2006) formulated a model connecting job characteristics and perceived Organizational Support (POS) with two dimensions: job engagement and organizational engagement, emphasizing that employees reciprocate organizational support with deeper engagement.
Bakker and Demerouti (2008)	Bakker and Demerouti (2008) advanced the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, proposing that job resources such as autonomy and feedback stimulate engagement, whereas excessive demands can diminish it. They identified engagement as a critical bridge between resources and work outcomes.
Christian et al. (2011)	Christian et al. (2011) conducted a meta-analytic review revealing robust positive associations between engagement, task and contextual performance, and reduced withdrawal. They highlighted autonomy and self-efficacy as vital psychological predictors.
Sonnentag (2003)	Sonnentag (2003) explored the influence of recovery experiences including relaxation, detachment, and personal mastery on maintaining engagement, affirming that periodic rejuvenation sustains high performance levels.
Xanthopoulou et al. (2009)	Xanthopoulou et al. (2009) demonstrated that personal resources such as optimism and self-efficacy play a mediating role between job resources and engagement, creating a cyclical relationship that enhances employee motivation and well-being.

Robinson et al. (2004)	Robinson et al. (2004) described engagement as a proactive and positive stance toward one's organization and its mission. They stressed that engaged employees understand the organizational context and collaborate effectively, a process reinforced by supportive managerial practices.
May et al. (2004)	May et al. (2004) found that job enrichment and role congruence significantly enhance engagement. Their work validated meaningfulness, safety, and availability as mediators linking job design to engagement.
Maslach et al. (2001)	Maslach et al. (2001) proposed engagement as the conceptual opposite of burnout, a condition marked by energy, involvement, and efficacy, and identified job resources as buffers that prevent burnout and sustain motivation.
Bakker et al. (2007)	Bakker et al. (2007) revealed that job resources become particularly motivating under high-demand environments, suggesting that engaged individuals actively create and utilize their personal and professional resources.
Shuck and Wppard (2010)	Shuck and Wppard (2010) synthesized engagement literature, confirming its multidimensional structure and its relevance to organizational outcomes. They proposed a comprehensive model capturing its antecedents, correlates, and results.
Bakker (2011)	Bakker (2011) reviewed empirical evidence emphasizing the contribution of job crafting, leadership, and individual strengths in sustaining engagement over time, reinforcing its dynamic and adaptive nature.
Harter et al. (2013)	Harter et al. (2013) revisited Gallup's data, reaffirming that engagement directly enhances business performance and highlighting the manager's role as the linchpin of engagement culture.
Saks and Gruman (2014)	Saks and Gruman (2014) offered a holistic model linking performance management with engagement, illustrating how structured feedback, goal alignment, and developmental interventions elevate engagement levels.
Greenberg (1987)	Greenberg (1987) formulated a taxonomy of organizational justice, classifying it into distributive, procedural, and interactional components, and asserting fairness as central to organizational harmony.
Adams (1965)	Adams (1965) introduced Equity Theory, proposing that employees compare input-output ratios to assess fairness, which in turn affects motivation and satisfaction.
Thibaut & Walker (1975)	Thibaut and Walker (1975) contributed Procedural Justice Theory, positing that fairness in decision-making processes enhances acceptance of organizational outcomes.
Leventhal (1980)	Leventhal (1980) delineated procedural fairness criteria including consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, and ethicality as vital for just decision-making.
Bies & Moag (1986)	Bies and Moag (1986) emphasized interactional justice, stressing the importance of respect and dignity during procedural communication.
Folger & Konovsky (1989)	Folger and Konovsky (1989) demonstrated that distributive and procedural justice jointly affect employee attitudes toward pay decisions and overall satisfaction.
Lind & Tyler (1988)	Lind and Tyler (1988) presented the Group-Value Model, suggesting fairness reflects social standing and belonging within groups.

Colquitt (2001)	Colquitt (2001) validated the multidimensional construct of organizational justice, introducing a measurement framework that incorporated distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational dimensions.
Skarlicki & Folger (1997)	Skarlicki and Folger (1997) found that perceptions of injustice fuel retaliatory or deviant workplace behavior, emphasizing fair treatment as a deterrent.
Ambrose & Schminke (2009)	Ambrose and Schminke (2009) explored how organizational context and leadership influence fairness perceptions, confirming the managerial role in cultivating justice.
Cropanzano & Greenberg (1997)	Cropanzano and Greenberg (1997) integrated existing justice research, highlighting fairness as foundational to employee trust, satisfaction, and overall organizational health.
Cohen-Charash & Spector (2001)	Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) synthesized 25 years of justice research, establishing strong links between justice perceptions, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.
Colquitt et al. (2001)	Colquitt et al. (2001) provided meta-analytic confirmation of the predictive power of all justice dimensions on work outcomes, advising managers to embed fairness in daily practices.
Masterson et al. (2000)	Masterson et al. (2000) found that fairness perceptions enhance citizenship behaviors and performance through improved leader-member exchange quality.
Ambrose et al. (2002)	Ambrose et al. (2002) connected perceptions of injustice with workplace sabotage, suggesting equitable treatment reduces counterproductive actions.
Rupp & Cropanzano (2002)	Rupp and Cropanzano (2002) determined that justice perceptions mitigate emotional exhaustion, underscoring fairness as a stress buffer.
Brockner (2002)	Brockner (2002) clarified that procedural fairness moderates reactions to unfavorable results, sometimes amplifying or diminishing outcome effects.
Colquitt et al. (2006)	Colquitt et al. (2006) reaffirmed that justice perceptions mediate the link between organizational processes and employee reactions, emphasizing multiple foci of justice.
Greenberg (1990)	Greenberg (1990) empirically proved that transparent and fair treatment substantially decreases employee theft, offering pragmatic managerial insights.
Tyler & Blader (2003)	Tyler and Blader (2003) proposed the Group Engagement Model, demonstrating that fair procedures foster identification and cooperative behavior.
Eisenberger et al. (1986)	Eisenberger et al. (1986) coined Perceived Organizational Support (POS) which refers to employees' sense that their efforts are valued and welfare prioritized, and associated it with job satisfaction and loyalty.
Rhoades & Eisenberger (2002)	Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) conducted a meta-analysis affirming that POS strongly predicts satisfaction, commitment, and performance, influenced by fairness, supervision, and work conditions.
Wayne et al. (1997)	Wayne et al. (1997) established that strong leader-member relationships enhance POS, highlighting supervisor behavior as a key determinant.
Eisenberger et al. (2001)	Eisenberger et al. (2001) showed that high POS lowers turnover intent via enhanced affective commitment.
Shore & Wayne (1993)	Shore and Wayne (1993) confirmed that POS drives commitment and job performance, mediated by organizational attachment.

Eisenberger et al. (1990)	Eisenberger et al. (1990) revealed that rewards and supportive job structures strengthen POS, calling for policies that institutionalize support.
Stinglhamber & Vandenberghe (2003)	Stinglhamber and Vandenberghe (2003) demonstrated that POS mediates the impact of job conditions on commitment, validating its role as a motivational conduit.
Erdogan & Enders (2007)	Erdogan and Enders (2007) found that supervisor support enhances satisfaction and performance, particularly when POS is high.
Aselage & Eisenberger (2003)	Aselage and Eisenberger (2003) linked POS to social exchange reciprocity, wherein organizational care fosters mutual trust and positive behavior.
Armelia et al. (1998)	Armelia et al. (1998) concluded that POS buffers stress, improving adaptability and emotional resilience among employees.
Rhoades et al. (2001)	Rhoades et al. (2001) identified supervisor support as a significant antecedent of POS.
Kurtessis et al. (2015)	Kurtessis et al. (2015) synthesized decades of research, confirming that supportive job design and fair treatment improve POS and consequently job performance.
Eisenberger & Stinglhamber (2011)	Eisenberger and Stinglhamber (2011) comprehensively reviewed Organizational Support Theory, underscoring its practical relevance for sustaining motivation and performance.
Zagenczyk et al. (2010)	Zagenczyk et al. (2010) linked POS with social capital, showing that support fosters cooperation and knowledge exchange.
Riggle et al. (2009)	Riggle et al. (2009) found POS a strong determinant of retention and productivity through meta-analytic evidence.
Muse & Stamper (2007)	Muse and Stamper (2007) established that supportive organizations enhance work-life balance and reduce conflict.
Shanock & Eisenberger (2006)	Shanock and Eisenberger (2006) demonstrated that high POS encourages creativity and innovation, urging firms to promote supportive climates.
Rhoades & Eisenberger (2002)	Vallerand et al. (2003) proposed the Dualistic Model of Passion distinguishing harmonious passion aligned with well-being from obsessive passion which may yield negative outcomes. They linked supportive and fair environments to the development of harmonious passion.
Eisenberger et al. (1986)	Zigarmi et al. (2009) identified meaningful work, autonomy, and leadership as core antecedents of work passion, showing how POS and organizational justice strengthen motivation and performance.
Cropanzano et al. (2001)	Ho et al. (2011) applied passion theory to entrepreneurship, showing that passionate individuals persist under challenge and that organizational fairness and support reinforce engagement.
Eisenberger et al. (2001)	Philippe et al. (2015) discovered that harmonious passion sustains satisfaction and reduces turnover, reinforcing the value of fairness and support systems in employee retention.
Eisenberger & Stinglhamber (2011)	Kahn (1990) pioneered the idea of personal engagement, describing it as the alignment of an employee's authentic self with their professional role. He identified three psychological drivers: meaningfulness, safety, and availability as essential conditions fostering engagement.

Greenberg (1987)	Schaufeli et al. (2002) designed the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) and conceptualized engagement as a positive, fulfilling mental state defined by vigor, dedication, and absorption, distinguishing it from mere job satisfaction.
Colquitt et al. (2001)	Macey and Schneider (2008) differentiated engagement across three domains: trait, state, and behavioral. They suggested that personality-based engagement predisposes situational engagement, which ultimately manifests in observable work behaviors, highlighting organizational initiatives as key enablers.
Ambrose & Schminke (2009)	Harter et al. (2002) linked engagement to measurable business results through Gallup's Q12 framework, demonstrating strong correlations between engagement and outcomes such as customer loyalty, productivity, profitability, and reduced employee turnover.
Cropanzano & Greenberg (1997)	Rich et al. (2010) analyzed job involvement and commitment as predictors of job performance, showing that engagement serves as an intermediary mechanism. They underscored the necessity of both physical energy and emotional investment in achieving superior performance.
Cohen-Charash & Spector (2001)	Saks (2006) formulated a model connecting job characteristics and perceived Organizational Support (POS) with two dimensions: job engagement and organizational engagement, emphasizing that employees reciprocate organizational support with deeper engagement.
Ambrose et al. (2002)	Bakker and Demerouti (2008) advanced the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, proposing that job resources such as autonomy and feedback stimulate engagement, whereas excessive demands can diminish it. They identified engagement as a critical bridge between resources and work outcomes.
Skarlicki & Folger (1997)	Christian et al. (2011) conducted a meta-analytic review revealing robust positive associations between engagement, task and contextual performance, and reduced withdrawal. They highlighted autonomy and self-efficacy as vital psychological predictors.
Eisenberger et al. (1986)	Sonnentag (2003) explored the influence of recovery experiences including relaxation, detachment, and personal mastery on maintaining engagement, affirming that periodic rejuvenation sustains high performance levels.
Rhoades & Eisenberger (2002)	Xanthopoulou et al. (2009) demonstrated that personal resources such as optimism and self-efficacy play a mediating role between job resources and engagement, creating a cyclical relationship that enhances employee motivation and well-being.
Eisenberger et al. (2001)	Robinson et al. (2004) described engagement as a proactive and positive stance toward one's organization and its mission. They stressed that engaged employees understand the organizational context and collaborate effectively, a process reinforced by supportive managerial practices.
Greenberg (1987)	May et al. (2004) found that job enrichment and role congruence significantly enhance engagement. Their work validated meaningfulness, safety, and availability as mediators linking job design to engagement.
Colquitt et al. (2001)	Maslach et al. (2001) proposed engagement as the conceptual opposite of burnout, a condition marked by energy, involvement, and efficacy, and identified job resources as buffers that prevent burnout and sustain motivation.

Croppanzano et al. (2001)	Bakker et al. (2007) revealed that job resources become particularly motivating under high-demand environments, suggesting that engaged individuals actively create and utilize their personal and professional resources.
Vallerand et al. (2003)	Shuck and Wollard (2010) synthesized engagement literature, confirming its multidimensional structure and its relevance to organizational outcomes. They proposed a comprehensive model capturing its antecedents, correlates, and results.
Zigarmi et al. (2009)	Bakker (2011) reviewed empirical evidence emphasizing the contribution of job crafting, leadership, and individual strengths in sustaining engagement over time, reinforcing its dynamic and adaptive nature.
Ho et al. (2011)	Harter et al. (2013) revisited Gallup's data, reaffirming that engagement directly enhances business performance and highlighting the manager's role as the linchpin of engagement culture.
Philippe et al. (2015)	Saks and Gruman (2014) offered a holistic model linking performance management with engagement, illustrating how structured feedback, goal alignment, and developmental interventions elevate engagement levels.

The review of extant literature demonstrates a consistent and compelling relationship between Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Perceived organizational justice (POJ), and the construct of workforce engagement. POS reflects employees' belief that their contributions are valued and their well-being is prioritized, while POJ encompasses distributive, procedural, and interactional fairness within organizational processes. Empirical evidence consistently suggests that when employees perceive higher levels of support and fairness, they develop stronger affective commitment, reduced turnover intentions, and heightened motivation.

The integration of POS and POJ into workplace dynamics fosters work passion, a construct that acts as a psychological catalyst for sustained engagement. Employees who experience harmonious passion are more likely to channel vigor, dedication, and absorption into their roles. The descriptive findings converge on the notion that organizations which adopt supportive practices, transparent decision-making, and respectful interpersonal treatment are better positioned to nurture both engagement and performance outcomes.

From a theoretical perspective, this relationship can be situated within Social Exchange Theory (SET), which posits that employees reciprocate positive treatment with higher levels of engagement and discretionary effort. Moreover, the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) framework further supports that organizational resources such as POS and POJ buffer the effects of job demands, thereby energizing employees toward proactive performance and resilience.

1.2 CONCLUSION WITH HYPOTHETICAL ASSUMPTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The descriptive analysis leads to the summary that POS and POJ are foundational antecedents of workforce engagement. They not only impact engagement directly but also interact with mediating constructs such as organizational commitment, psychological empowerment, and work passion. However, the review also underscores several gaps where empirical validation remains limited, thereby warranting further exploration.

Based on the descriptive synthesis, the following hypothetical assumptions can guide future research:

1. H1 (Direct Effect Hypothesis): Higher levels of Perceived organizational support will be positively associated with workforce engagement, mediated through affective commitment.
2. H2 (Justice Hypothesis): Perceived organizational justice will significantly predict workforce engagement, with procedural justice exerting a stronger effect than distributive or interactional justice.
3. H3 (Interaction Hypothesis): POS and POJ interact synergistically; the positive impact of POS on workforce engagement will be stronger when perceptions of organizational justice are high.
4. H4 (Passion Mediation Hypothesis): Work passion (harmonious passion) mediates the relationship between POS/POJ and workforce engagement, while obsessive passion may weaken this link.
5. H5 (Moderation Hypothesis): The relationship between POS, POJ, and engagement is moderated by job characteristics (e.g., autonomy, workload) and leadership style (e.g., transformational leadership).
6. H6 (Outcome Hypothesis): Enhanced workforce engagement, driven by POS and POJ, will lead to measurable improvements in organizational outcomes such as innovation, productivity, and employee retention.

In summary, the literature substantiates the intertwined role of support and justice in shaping engagement. Future research should employ quantitative modeling techniques such as SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) to validate these assumptions, while also incorporating cross-cultural and longitudinal designs to generalize findings across contexts. Such research will extend theoretical clarity and provide actionable insights for organizations aiming to build sustainable, engaged, and high-performing workforces.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267-299.
2. Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2009). The role of overall justice judgments in organizational justice research: A test of mediation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 491-500.
3. Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., & Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 947-965.
4. Armeli, S., Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Lynch, P. (1998). Perceived organizational support and police performance: The moderating impact of socioemotional needs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 288-297.
5. Aselage, J., & Eisenberger, R. (2003). Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(5), 491-509.
6. Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(4), 265-269.
7. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223.
8. 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.

9. Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 1, 43-55.
10. Brockner, J. (2002). Making sense of procedural fairness: How high procedural fairness can reduce or heighten the impact of outcome favorability. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 58-76.
11. 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.
12. Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.
13. Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
14. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445.
15. Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2006). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. *Handbook of Organizational Justice*, 3-56.
16. Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 317-372.
17. Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., & Byrne, Z. S. (2001). The relationship of emotional exhaustion to work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 160-169.
18. Eisenberger, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). Perceived organizational support: Fostering Enthusiastic and Productive Employees. APA Books.
19. Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(1), 51-59.
20. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.
21. Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to Perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 825-836.
22. Erdogan, B., & Enders, J. (2007). Support from the top: Supervisors' Perceived organizational support as a moderator of leader-member exchange to satisfaction and performance relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 321-330.
23. Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115-130.
24. Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9-22.
25. Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(5), 561-568.
26. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, workforce engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.
27. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Agrawal, S., & Plowman, S. K. (2013). The relationship between engagement at work and organizational outcomes. Gallup.

28. Ho, V. T., Wong, S. S., & Lee, C. H. (2011). A tale of passion: Linking job passion and cognitive engagement to employee work performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(1), 26-47.
29. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
30. Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2015). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management*, 41(5), 1855-1885.
31. Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. *Plenum Press*.
32. Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. Springer US.
33. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of workforce engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.
34. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422.
35. Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 738-748.
36. 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.
37. Muse, L. A., & Stamper, C. L. (2007). Perceived organizational support: Evidence for a mediated association with work performance. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 19(4), 517-535.
38. Philippe, F. L., Vallerand, R. J., Houlfort, N., Lavigne, G. L., & Donahue, E. G. (2015). Passion for work and turnover intentions: The mediating role of burnout and work satisfaction. *Career Development International*, 20(1), 2-15.
39. Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714.
40. Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organisation: The contribution of Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 825-836.
41. 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.
42. Riggle, R. J., Edmondson, D. R., & Hansen, J. D. (2009). A meta-analysis of the relationship between Perceived organizational support and job outcomes: 20 years of research. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(10), 1027-1030.
43. Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). The Drivers of Employee engagement. *Institute for Employment Studies*.
44. Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 925-946.
45. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of workforce engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
46. Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2014). What do we really know about workforce engagement? *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 25(2).

47. 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.
48. Shanock, L. R., & Eisenberger, R. (2006). When supervisors feel supported: Relationships with subordinates' perceived supervisor support.
49. Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(5), 774-780.
50. Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(1), 89-110.
51. Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 434-443.
52. Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: A new look at the interface between nonwork and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3), 518-528.
53. Stinglhamber, F., & Vandenberghe, C. (2003). Organizations and supervisors as sources of support and targets of commitment: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(3), 251-270.
54. Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Erlbaum.
55. Vallerand, R. J., Blanchard, C., Mageau, G. A., Koestner, R., Ratelle, C., Léonard, M., ... & Marsolais, J. (2003). Les passions de l'âme: On obsessive and harmonious passion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(4), 756-767.
56. Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 82-111.
57. 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.
58. Zagenczyk, T. J., Scott, K. L., Gibney, R., Murrell, A. J., & Thatcher, J. B. (2010). Social impact and Perceived organizational support: A social networks analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 111(2), 127-138.
- Zigarmi, D., Galloway, F., & Roberts, T. P. (2009). Work passion: A new conceptualization and its measurement. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(3), 264-280.