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ABSTRACT

Employee engagement has recently become more and more widespread for discussion among consulting firms and in the popular business press. However, employee engagement has rarely been studied in the academic literature and almost none is known about its leader mindfulness-related antecedents, especially in Food and Beverage Industry. In addition, both elements of leader-follower social capital including goal congruence and social interaction are conducive to stimulating high-quality knowledge flows, they might help followers better appreciate their leader’s contributions. Therefore, this study investigated the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement, and leader-follower goal congruence and social interaction served as moderators in the relationship. Sample of this study was 256 full-time employees working in Food and Beverage industry in Vietnam. Quantitative research design and online questionnaires were adopted to test the research hypotheses. The researcher used IBM SPSS Statistics to do the descriptive, correlation and hierarchical regression analysis. The result indicated that employees whose mindful leaders will show more engagement. Moreover, it was concluded that both goal congruence and social interaction have significant moderating effects on the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement. This study, in conclusion, pointed out the importance of leader mindfulness in organizational management field and provides recommendations in human resource management in Food and Beverage industry in Vietnam.
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CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background, problem statement, research purpose, research questions, significance of the study and definition of terms. The background concentrates on introducing current researches on leader mindfulness and employee engagement. The problem statement will point out the gap among previous studies and the reason why this problem which is worth researching. In addition, the research purpose, research questions and the significance of the study address the accomplishment of conducting this study. Finally, key terms of this study will be defined.

Background of the Study

Recently, Food and Beverage industry in Vietnam has enjoyed a dramatic growth compared with other industries experiences. In Vietnam, this sector has been rocketed in the last decade, contributed by both foreign and local brands. It is forecast as one of the robustest sector in Asia and will increase by 16.1% during 2016-2020 period as a result of rising income and a tendency of utilizing products with great value. So far, “Vietnam’s Food and Beverage sector consists of over 540,000 outlets including over 430,000 street kiosks; 7,000 fast-food restaurants; 80,000 full-service restaurants; 22,000 cafeterias” (“Vietnam sees flourishing,” 2018). It means that lots of career opportunities for Vietnamese are created in this potential industry. Employees in this industry are regularly encountered emotional labor and it is critical for them to manage their emotions during their job. Emotional labor forces employees particularly susceptible to emotional exhaustion, which may decrease their work engagement (Côté & Morgan, 2002; Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011).

As an essential basis of organizational sustainable development, work engagement creates many concerns for lots of researchers (Schaufeli, Taris, & Van Rhenen, 2008). Engaged employees are avidly passionate about their tasks (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004) and play a significant role in encouraging others (Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2009). Some researches verify the valuable benefits of employee engagement for not only individuals and also organizations (Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2008; Rurkkhum & Bartlett, 2012; Shuck, Reio Jr, & Rocco, 2011; Shuck, Ghosh, Zigarmi, & Nimon, 2013). Inspecting what promotes employees to be eager to show stronger work engagement is subsequently an interesting topic, in particular, for human resource development (HRD) specialists (Shuck, Ghosh, Zigarmi, & Nimon, 2013) and, in general, to organizational management board (Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2009).
Companies are facing more and more pressure in this competitive market. In the meantime, the working atmosphere is also continuously shifting: we are advancing faster, cooperating more, and applying technology more comprehensively in almost every area. Based on a study performed by Ehrlich (2017) on concentrating leaders, in this background, with the convenience of technology, leaders and professionals are constantly working harder but paying less attention to their present duties at hand. Chief Executive Officers (CEO) confess that they feel compelled to lead and act in response to change as rapidly as possible and that they are having difficulties in selecting and focusing on their tasks. It is said that the United State has lost approximately six billion dollars annually in productivity because of job interruptions and employees seem to work with continuous partial attention (Spira & Feintuch, 2005). Other than financial influences, there exist some other serious costs for our capacity to take the lead and maintain meaningful lives.

A previous research about Microsoft directors showed that some of their products (such as instant messaging, email, etc) affect their ability to finish tasks (Iqbal & Horvitz, 2007). Microsoft directors, in that research, were disrupted 10-30 times on average per hour. They can only get back on duties 10-25 minutes after the interruption. And it sometimes even took them over 30 hours to get focused back. Counting all the time up indicates that the directors were practically never on duties. In other words, they were in fact twirling. The distraction not only comes from outside information, but also comes from ourselves as often as others. How many times we check e-mail can be stated as a good instance. Most people declare that they check frequently every day. One of the reasons might be the fact that checking e-mail accelerates the brain in the same way as addiction. Consequently, it is important for us to question ourselves whether we are obsessed to self-interruption. Regrettably, it may grow into a brutal negative sequence. The less attention we pay, the harder it turns out to pay attention.

We usually attempt to handle growing pressure by striving to execute various things at the same time (e.g., multi-tasking). We are inclined to over-estimate our capability to multi-task, but a part of our brain responsible for functioning (planning, prioritizing, and selecting) can only concentrate on one task at a certain time (Spira & Feintuch, 2005). Whenever we assume that we are performing multiple tasks, we are in fact shifting quickly hither and thither among them. Take the aforementioned Microsoft employees as an example, they are switching from task to task, which implies they are losing their current concentration every time they shift, and then need to get the way back. In the case that we do multiple tasks, we finally become 40% slower and it
probably causing twice as many errors (Spira & Feintuch, 2005). Organizational interest in mindfulness has been growing significantly during the recent years, according to which mindfulness could be depicted as a present-concentrated devotion and awareness (Bishop et al., 2006; Brown, Ryan, & Creswell, 2007). This concern is supported by a substantial amount of research exhibiting variety of well-being associated advantages of mindfulness such as decreasing anxiety and higher cognitive performance (e.g., Baer, 2003; Chiesa & Serretti, 2009; Chiesa, Calati, & Serretti, 2011; Eberth & Sedlmeier, 2012). In consideration of well-being, organizational study has consequently discovered intrapersonal advantages of mindfulness in the working context (Good et al., 2016; Reb & Atkins, 2015). Moreover, research has linked mindfulness with lesser emotional exhaustion and higher level of job satisfaction (Huulsheger, Alberts, Feinholdt, & Lang, 2013), improved performance (Dane & Brummel, 2014), superior organizational citizenship behaviors and lesser deviance (Reb, Narayanan & Ho, 2015), as well as fewer turnover intentions (Reb, Narayanan, Chaturvedi, & Ekkirala, 2017). These effects of mindfulness are similarly crucial to organizations and employees themselves since they boost organizations’ achievement and support employees to sustain good health (Cascio, 2012).

“Leadership” is normally connected to the CEO level. Although they play the pioneering role and represent the company in every situation (Mintzberg, 1973), leadership in reality exist at numerous levels in companies. At lower ones, supervisors take charge of leadership by guaranteeing that companies convert plans to actions, accomplish shared objectives, and fulfill their responsibilities. To guarantee that, supervisors frequently offer guidance, inspiration, and feedback to their staffs (Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994). These leadership actions put a substantial impact on employees (e.g., Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Thus, it is critical to identify factors associated with superior leaders’ efficiency on their employees and companies.

In spite of prospective expansion, the study of mindfulness at work is still in an early period, consequently certain major doubts are yet available for additional inspection (Good et al., 2016). Predominantly, mindfulness research in companies has primarily centered the intrapersonal impacts of mindfulness in such a way that how mindfulness of an employee influences their well-being and performance. Nevertheless, not much experimental attention has been placed to the effect that mindfulness of an individual can bring to others in the same company. This is mainly valid for leaders who may have substantial influence on their own employees (Chemers, 2001).
Actually, although it is always argued that mindfulness might positively affect leaders’ manners and subsequently employee outcomes (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005; Carroll, 2008; Fry & Kriger, 2009; Verdorfer, 2016), not much empirical evidence is found for this view. Therefore, in accordance with Good et al. (2016), in the lately observed assessment of the mindfulness research, there is still a lack of a strong view of the possibility and the method that leader mindfulness can bring about particular leadership actions that, in sequence, generate essential employee outcomes.

Regarding to this point, it still remains vague about how the social capital is implanted in this relationship (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Payne, Moore, Griffis, & Autry, 2011). Social capital implies the total of the real and prospective resources implanted inside, accessible through, and originated from the relationships acquired by a social unit or an individual (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). This research concentrates on two key characteristics of leader–follower social capital, specifically, goal congruence and social interaction (Lazarova & Taylor, 2009; Payne et al., 2011). Regardless of the accepted advantages of leader mindfulness to improve employee well-being (Mayer, Bardes, & Piccolo, 2008), little academic study examines aspects which may encourage its effective application (Smith, Montagno, & Kuzmenko, 2004; Spears & Lawrence, 2002). In line with investigation into the contingent part of leadership (e.g., Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005; Zhu, Avolio, & Walumbwa, 2009), the author suggests that the social background of leader–follower exchanges may perform that well (Shuck, Rocco, & Albornoz, 2011). This introduces appropriate signals or evidence followers could utilize to explain their leaders’ behaviors (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978).

Sequentially, the objective of this study is to investigate the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement, as well as how this relationship might be moderated by leader–follower social capital.

**Problem Statement**

Firstly, mindfulness is regularly associated with Eastern spiritual traditions, especially Buddhism. However, it has become the hot topic of a considerable amount of research conducted by various Western scholars. Many big organizations are beginning to teach employees mindfulness such as Aetna, Apple, Diageo, Deutsche Bank, BlackRock, GAP, Goldman Sachs, Google, General Mills, Green Mountain Coffee, Intel, Monsanto, Navigant, McKinsey, NY Life, Target, Procter & Gamble, The U.S. Marines, The European Central Bank, The U.S. Army, hospitals, police departments, public schools and MBA programs. Fortune 500 companies are
conducting research about mindfulness benefits including (1) learning, focus, memory, decision-making, and creativity; (2) communication, productivity and collaboration; (3) well-being, emotional intelligence, internal and external relationships; (4) engagement and job satisfaction; and (5) lower level of stress, absenteeism, and turnover (Spira & Feintuch, 2005).

Secondly, it has been disputed that research on mindfulness at workplace still has certain limitation. Almost every study on workplace mindfulness has only concentrated on intrapersonal influences of how employee mindfulness benefits him or herself (Good et al., 2016; Sutcliffe, Vogus, & Dane, 2016). In condition that interpersonal interactions and relations are the center matters of organizational issues (Weick, 1979), it is really unfortunate. To the present time, the connection between leader mindfulness and positive employee outcomes have only been examined in three studies. Specifically, using a field study design, Reb, Narayanan and Chaturvedi (2014) found that leader mindfulness went along with higher employee in-role and extra-role performance, employee job satisfaction, and reduced employee stress (e.g., better work life balance and lower emotional exhaustion). Particularly, their research also revealed that higher leader mindfulness is a catalyst of better employee well-being (e.g., job satisfaction and need satisfaction) as well as higher employee performance (e.g., in-role performance and organizational citizenship behaviors). By testing the model in two field studies and one laboratory experiment, Schuh, Zheng, Xin, and Fernandez (2019) also concluded that leader mindfulness was indirectly related to employee performance via a serial mediation model - transmitted through leader procedural justice enactment and reduced employee emotional exhaustion. Finally, Reb, Chaturvedi, Narayanan, and Kudesia (2018) recently used two field studies of leader–employee dyads to show that the more mindful leaders were, the better their employees performed and this process was explained through sequential mediation model of leader–member exchange (LMX) quality, interpersonal justice, and employee stress.

However, relating to this topic, it is unclear about how the social capital embedded in leader–follower relationships (Adkere & Roberts, 2008; Payne et al., 2011) can enhance the process in which a leader’s awareness may induce its effect on employee engagement, especially in Food and Beverage industry in Vietnam. The Ministry of Industry and Trade estimated Vietnam’s annual consumption of food and drink products accounts for about 15 percent of Gross Domestic Products (GDP) and this rate will rise in the future. In addition, Vietnam is expected to enter the Top 3 Asian countries posting the highest growth rate of the F&B industry by 2020. Hence, this study
starts to address these gaps by empirically investigating the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement with the moderating effect of leader-follower social capital among Food and Beverage industry employees in Vietnam.

**Research Purposes**

Based on the preceding discussion, this study has two major research purposes as follows:
1. To examine the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement.
2. To examine the moderating effect of leader-follower social capital (including goal congruence and social interaction) on the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement.

**Research Questions**

This study aims to answer the following questions:
1. Is leader mindfulness related to employee engagement?
2. Does leader–follower social capital (including goal congruence and social interaction) moderate the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement?

**Significance of the Study**

**Contribute to Organizational Management**

This study will help organizations identify the factor that affect the employees’ engagement in the workplace and try to find solutions to this issue. Enhancing the engagement of employees at work will promote employees’ well-being and productivity, which accordingly provides the organization useful suggestions to improve both individual and organizational performance. If we can create a higher level of mindfulness for leaders in particular and organizations in general, it will be beneficial to enhance job satisfaction and increase revenue at the same time.

**Contribute to HRD Professionals**

The result of this study may provide HRD professionals practical suggestions. It may be indicated that HRD professionals can invest more in practices which stimulate leader mindfulness through recruiting, training, performance assessment, and reward systems. In addition, this study is expected to find that leader-follower social capital including goal congruence and social interaction moderate the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement. Thus, an important role for HRD professionals may be to develop socialization ideas promoting newcomers’ learning about mutual goals and encourage their informal exchanges with supervisors.
Contribute to Research

Even though previous studies in the literature have discussed each of the variables (leader mindfulness, employee engagement, leader-follower social capital) of this study, none of these emphasizes on the connection between leader mindfulness and employee engagement. Moreover, there has been until now no studies considering the moderating effect of leader-social capital in mindfulness research. For previous HRD scholarship, this study will help them uncover organizational factors that lead to employee engagement at work. This study can consequently contribute to the current literature by addressing these research gaps.

Definition of Terms

Mindfulness was defined as maintaining human’s consciousness aligned with the present moment. Moreover, Brown and Ryan (2003) stated that consciousness consist of both awareness and attention. Awareness implies the context of consciousness, continuously censoring the inside and outside context. Attention is a process of concentrating conscious awareness which provide high level of sensitivity to a limited span of experience (Westen, 1999). Mindfulness can be considered as a superior attention and awareness of current moment or present experience (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Besides, leader mindfulness is the leaders’ high quality of consciousness. Leaders with higher level of mindfulness may utilize their capacity to concentrate their attention on present moment in an active manner to extract better from their employees (Reb et al., 2018). Therefore, this study will adopt this definition.

Employee Engagement

Employee engagement is a positive and enjoyable mind state that differs from each person over a short time at work (Sonnentag, Dormann, & Demerouti, 2010), and is portrayed by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Breevaart, Bakker, Demerouti, & Hetland, 2012; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004b). Vigor involves lots of energy and mental resistance, dedication implies being passionate about duties and motivated by the task, and absorption suggests being completely concentrated on duties. This dynamic approach helps researchers examine how leaders exert an effect on work engagement of followers in natural workplace. Therefore, this study will adopt the above definition of Schaufeli and Bakker (2004b).
Leader-follower Social Capital

Social capital requires a broad definition (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Payne et al., 2011), including structural aspects such as employees’ working in intra-firm networks (Zhang, Zheng, & Wei, 2009), content-related aspects such as the existence of a shared vision between organizational employees (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005), and relationship dynamic aspects, such as the familiarity and trustworthiness of intra-firm exchanges (Bouckenooghe, De Clercq, & Deprez, 2013; Gubbins & MacCurtain, 2008). Since this research focuses primarily on the leader–follower relationship, two specific factors of leader–follower social capital: goal congruence and social interaction would be studied. These two factors demonstrate superior content-related and process-related features of intra-firm relationships, respectively (Payne et al., 2011), and consequently present a thorough explanation for the interactive resources implanted in leader–follower relationship. Goal congruence is associated to content, in terms of the extent to which the leader and follower have the same goals for the organization (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991). Social interaction instead links to the process and demonstrates the extent to which both parties identify each other on a personal level, through informal interactions going beyond established formal ways (Carmeli, Ben-Hador, Waldman, & Rupp, 2009; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Thus, this study will adopt the definition derived from the article of Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998).
CHAPTER II  LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the study reviews literatures about leader mindfulness, employee engagement, leader-follower social capital. All the hypotheses will be provided afterwards.

Leader Mindfulness

Mindfulness has commonly been known as human capability to get their “attention to the experiences occurring in the present moment, in a nonjudgmental or accepting way” (Baer, Smith, Hopkins, Krietemeyer, & Toney, 2006, p.27). It could be judged by two key characteristics: First, a devotion to “here and now” (Brown et al., 2007) is considered. In fact, mindfulness includes an emphasis on the present instead of pondering about the past or doubting about the future. Therefore, being mindful implies a understanding of what is occurring in our surroundings, involving other individuals, things, or events (Barnes, Brown, Krusemark, Campbell, & Rogge, 2007). In contrast, a lack of mindfulness is depicted as little or no attention, more precisely as performing behaviors in an instinctive way, as well as a separation from duties and happenings (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Second, mindfulness entails a nonjudgmental and observing stance. Hence, mindfulness has been described as an alignment that emphasizes precisely perceiving instead of evaluating and promptly judging (Weick & Putnam, 2006). Mindfulness can take place in two distinct modes: (1) as a feature with fairly steady interpersonal variations or (2) as a variable state which permits mindfulness to be enhanced (Good et al., 2016). From perspective of a trait, prior research indicated that people differ in their ability to be mindful (Davidson, 2010). Actually, some researches have revealed that mindfulness is an important concept for better understanding about stable differences in one’s feelings, attitudes, and behaviors (Chiesa & Serretti, 2009). In some other researches, mindfulness have been considered as a state and some propose that mindfulness could be trained via quick mindfulness engagements, for example, via guidelines that concentrate our attention to the present (Arch & Craske, 2006; Long & Christian, 2015). Previous research has presented that such involvements can have exerted positive influences on participants’ feelings and behaviors (Hafenbrack, Kinias, & Barsade, 2014) and that these influences are comparatively durable (Hülsheger et al., 2013). Both the trait and state perceptions of mindfulness are noticed as equally valid and, indeed, as complementary (Good et al., 2016).

Examining mindfulness is important because it has been demonstrated to have positive impacts at work through enhancing a wide range of critical employee outcomes (Glomb, Duffy, Bono, & Yang, 2011). Mindfulness may be opposite to mindlessness. Mindlessness is described
as neither having awareness of, nor paying attention to, the events which a person is engaged in or of the personal states (e.g., emotions) that person is undergoing. Furthermore, some traits of mindlessness can be stated such as doing tasks automatically, daydreaming, pondering about the future, or contemplating the past (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Writings on the state of being fully in the current moment long time ago in reflective traditions have argued that being mindfulness can bring a variety of benefits, especially well-being. By contrast, a mindfulness study in a Western model is comparatively recent. This study has continuously shown positive relationship between mindfulness and beneficial outcomes. For instance, it is discovered that mindfulness reduces constant pain (Kabat-Zinn, Lipworth, & Burney, 1985), boosts immunity (Davidson et al., 2003), lessens anxiety (Kabat-Zinn et al., 1992), and increases emotional well-being and useful impact (Brown & Ryan, 2003). A few proofs suggest that nurturing mindfulness abilities via practical practice (e.g., meditation) result in structural adjustments for the dorsolateral prefrontal area of one’s brain, which is related to positive affects (Cahn & Polich, 2006).

Recent study suggests that mindfulness may also influence an individual’s relationship quality. For example, Wachs and Cordova (2007) noted that mindfulness improved human’s capability to convey psychological states with others and controlling their anger, which brought about an increase in marital relationship. Other research indicates that mindfulness enhances human’s capacity to handle relationship strain (Barnes et al., 2007). These beneficial effects could be partly since mindfulness may boost empathic care for partners (Block-Lerner, Adair, Plumb, Rhatigan, & Orsillo, 2007). It is additionally argued that mindfulness turns human from an argumentative attitude into a more collaborative attitude in complicated relations such as disputes (Riskin, 2002).

These outcomes from some domains of social life relating to the beneficial effects of mindfulness suggest that mindfulness can also accelerate leadership performance (Reb et al., 2018). If mindfulness can indeed enhance relationship quality, as the above suggestions, it may be proved to be beneficial for the leader–follower relationship, and as a consequence, for employee positive outcomes at workplace.

As stated above, there is not much theoretical and unexpectedly lesser empirical research has focused on the importance of mindfulness at work. Furthermore, while this research is aiming to make a significant contribution to organizational scholars by examining the function of the quality of attention and consciousness in organizations, it is comparatively silent on the
interpersonal influences of mindfulness. An interesting issue is whether mindfulness of one organizational member affects the working experiences and outcomes of other organizational members. One kind of members who plays an extremely important part is those in leadership positions. It is generally acknowledged that how leaders perform their leadership through various leadership styles activities influences employee well-being, attitudes, behaviors, and performance (e.g., Gerstner & Day, 1997; Lowe et al., 1996). Although we have heard much about the leader behaviors influencing employees, we still have little empirical research about how leaders’ quality of consciousness, which is also known as leader mindfulness (Reb et al., 2018), impacts their employees. Lots of authors have lately conduct a few studies about benefits of leader mindfulness. It is said that these benefits include positive consequences for employees such as higher level of performance and better well-being (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005; Carroll, 2008). Nevertheless, empirical validation up to now has been mostly unreliable.

This research focuses on supervisors as leaders. To execute effectively, supervisors are expected to take numerous leadership obligations such as direction providing, support offering, creativity motivating, and feedback delivery to their subordinates (Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994). This perspective on supervisory management stresses that leadership not only come from one side of the leader but also occur within a dynamic collaboration between supervisor and subordinate, explaining in a particular managerial background. Uhl-Bien (2006) argued that “leadership is relational and cannot be captured by examination of individual attributes alone” (p.671). Meanwhile, Bennis (2007) indicated that, at a fundamental degree, “leadership is grounded in a relationship” (p.3). Leader–member exchange theory and relational leadership theory both highlight that the quality of the relationship between leader and follower will facilitate critical employee outcomes such as well-being, job satisfaction, and there is considerable empirical support for this connection (Brower, Schoorman, & Tan, 2000; Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, & Ferris, 2012; Gerstner & Day, 1997).

According to the outcomes study of Ehrlich (2017), leader mindfulness can be divided into six broad categories (Figure 2.1.). The model places body, spirit, emotion and mind in the center since these elements are crucial for identifying the significance of being present.

Whenever we appear completely together with those four characteristics, we may certainly connect with others to create interactions and relations. The intimacy of those fundamental characteristics indicates a shared connection. For instance, if we get bodily ill, we frequently
become impatient and pessimistic. In contrast, if we get stressful, it is likely harsher to be vigorous and optimistic, which aggregates the emotional problem. When there is a close link, we may be aware of how to take the lead and motivate. Nevertheless, only being present is insufficient for full connection. To form strong relations, it is essential for us to own supplemental skills like compassion. Comparably, with the objective of encouragement, we additionally ought to be able to do more than just simple connection. It leads to the need of transmitting a value that encourages others to acknowledge a greater and longer-term purpose.

Figure 2.1. Leader mindfulness model. Adapt from “Leader Mindfulness”, by J. Ehrlich, 2017, Organizational Dynamics, 46(4), p.236.

**Employee Engagement**

Employee engagement has lately known as a broadly trendy term (Robinson, Perryman, & Hayday, 2004). Nonetheless, most of the content about employee engagement could be found in practitioner journals, therefore it tends to be based on practical context rather than theoretical and empirical research. As noticed by Robinson et al. (2004), there has been astonishingly little academic and empirical research on such a popular topic. Engagement is defined by burnout researchers as the positive converse of burnout (Maslach, Schaufelli, & Leiter, 2001). Accordingly, Maslach et al. (2001) noted that engagement is categorized by energy, attachment, and efficacy, which are the straight opposites of three burnout dimensions including exhaustion, skepticism, and inefficacy. Studies on burnout and engagement also found that the key dimensions of burnout - exhaustion and skepticism and those of engagement - vigor and dedication are direct opposites
(Gonzalez-Roma, Schaufeli, Bakker, & Lloret, 2006). From the academic perspective, engagement is believed to be associated with but different from other concepts in organizational behaviors. Organizational commitment is also different from engagement such that it indicates one’s attitude and connection towards the organizations. Engagement is not considered as an attitude; it is actually the extent to which one is attentive and immersed in their roles. Besides, while organizational citizenship behavior implicates informal and voluntary behaviors which can help co-workers and organizations, the emphasis of engagement is a person’s formal role performance instead of voluntary and extra-role behaviors.

Schaufeli & Bakker (2004b) described employee engagement as follows:

Engagement is a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Rather than a momentary and specific state, engagement refers to a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior. (p.92)

This article recommends one of the most cited definition of employee engagement (Fearon, McLaughlin, & Morris, 2013). By following it, the author could identify employee engagement as the extent to which employees are all emotionally, physically, and cognitively associated with their job duties (Harter & Schmidt, 2008; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004a). While the objective of this research is not to concentrate on various approaches applied to explain employee engagement (Shuck, 2011; Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Wollard & Shuck, 2011), it is however valuable to find out how this research’s classification has any connection with prior methods. This definition was initially conceived by Kahn (1990), who put so much focus on the emotional, physical, and cognitive features of employee engagement. Shuck and Wollard (2010) emphasize the usefulness of the engagement idea in HRD area, in which it was perceive as employees’ emotional, cognitive, and behavioral state leading to preferred organizational outcomes. Later, the three dimensions are reflected in Schaufeli Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, and Bakker (2002) definition. Specifically, the vigor, dedication, and absorption dimensions indicate employees’ enthusiastic, emotional, and cognitive states respectively (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010; Song, Kolb, Lee, & Kim, 2012).

Employee engagement consequently is a universal term, hence, extremely engaged employees get higher grade on three facets (Kahn, 1990). It encompasses the concurrent involvement of emotional, physical, and cognitive dynamism in the work context (Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010). Employees may be believed merged in their responsibilities emotionally,
physically, or cognitively, but the status of being “engaged” involves all three types of simultaneous involvement (Kahn, 1990). Employee engagement can be conceptually differentiated from related concepts such as job satisfaction, job embeddedness, organizational commitment or work holism (Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2008; Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006; Schaufeli, Taris, & Bakker, 2006). Engaged employees accomplish their tasks because they love their work and are drawn towards it, which is also known as intrinsically motivated (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010).

Employee engagement additionally implies “the simultaneous employment and expression of a person’s “preferred self” in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional), and active, full performances” (Kahn 1990, p.700). Engaged employees entirely exploit themselves in their presentation with robust private energy to their own emotional, physical and cognitive endeavors (Kahn, 1990; Rich et al., 2010). In other words, they do not only physically show up in the workplace, but more significantly, they are also psychologically existing - more attentive, participated, and concentrated in their task performance. In a nutshell, engaged employees let their full selves to emerge in their jobs (Kahn, 1992; Rich et al., 2010). Moreover, employee engagement is motivational, because it involves the distribution of personal resources to the task performance (Rich et al., 2010), consequently to personal sacrifices (Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2005). It is not surprising, since prior studies proposed that over-engagement at work may endanger one’s non-work relationships as well as commitment (Halbesleben, Harvey, & Bolino, 2009). To sum up, although the concept of engagement in the practitioner literature easily overlaps with some other constructs, it has been described in the academic literature as a unique construct which consists of emotional, cognitive, and behavioral elements connected to individual task performance. Additionally, engagement is different from other workplace constructs, most remarkably organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment.

**Leader-Follower Social Capital**

Social capital can be defined as a broad construct (Nahapiet & Ghoshl, 1998; Payne et al., 2011), combining structural viewpoint such as employees’ positioning in intrafirm networks (Zhang et al., 2009), content-related viewpoint such as the existence of a mutual vision among organizational members (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), along with relationship dynamic viewpoint such as the credibility of intrafirm exchanges (Bouckenooghe et al., 2013; Gubbins & MacCurtain,
Because of this research’s attention on the leader–follower association, the author shows interest in not the obligation of employees’ structural positioning in the organization’s larger network but rather two more explicit essentials of leader–follower social capital: goal congruence and social interaction. The reason is two of them could respectively secure critical content- and process-related levels of intrafirm relationships (Payne et al., 2011), and consequently present a thorough imagination of the relational resources implanted in leader–follower connection. Goal congruence describes the content, involving the extent to which both the leader and follower think of the consistent targets in the direction of the organization (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991). Social interaction, conversely, implies the process and indicates the extent to which both parties appreciate each other on an individual point via casual contacts getting beyond conventional formal styles (Carmeli et al., 2009; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Present research highlights the importance of resilient leader–follower relationships towards effective organizational outcomes (Lazarova & Taylor, 2009; Leana & Van Buren, 1999) without identifying how the social capital rooted in such relationships might contribute to the useful implementation of leader mindfulness (Payne et al., 2011).

Social capital indicates “the sum of the actual and potential resources embedded within, available through, and derived from the network of relationships possessed by an individual or social unit” (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998, p. 243). This study focuses on two critical aspects of leader–follower social capital, namely, goal congruence and social interaction, which exhibit critical aspects related to the content and process of social capital, respectively (Lazarova & Taylor, 2009; Payne et al., 2011). Goal congruence displays the presence of mutual goals between leader and follower (Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991); specifically, it implies whether followers perceive an overall strong “fit” with the organizations (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). On the other hand, social interaction displays the existence of a strong relationship between leader and follower (Carmeli et al., 2009), comprising the extent to which both parties personally know each other rather than preserving an arm’s-length relation (Bouckenooghe et al., 2013). Because both components of social capital are equally conducive to motivating high-quality knowledge (Leana & Van Buren, 1999; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998), they may support followers to better recognize the value of the assistances that mindful leaders can produce to their work contexts. Based on this reason, the author derives some hypotheses, which are summarized in the conceptual framework in Figure 3.1.
This study first provides arguments for the existence of a positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement, then examine the contingencies of this relationship.

**Leader Mindfulness and Employee Engagement**

Expanding previous study, this research suggests that leader mindfulness may bring about useful effects through optimistic outcomes in the structural environment as a result of improved relationship quality. Study about leader–member exchange argues that “effective leadership processes occur when leaders and followers are able to develop mature relationships (partnerships) and thus gain access to the many benefits these relationships bring” (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995, p.225).

A strong theoretical basis for explaining the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement could be recognized in social exchange theory (SET). SET asserts that commitments are generated through a series of collaborations between both parties who are in a state of shared interdependence. SET’s fundamental assumption is that connections may steadily develop into belief, devotion, and mutual obligations as long as both the parties abide by “rules” of exchange (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). “Rules” of exchange regularly comprise mutuality or repayment in that the activities of one party bring about a reaction and/or reply from the other party. As an example, if one individual receives economic or socioemotional resources from the organization, (s)he feels obliged to reply in a kind manner to repay her/his organization (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). It is in harmony with Robinson et al.’s (2004) explanation of engagement as a shared relationship between employers and employees.

This study suggests that leader with higher level of mindfulness can bring about more employee engagement since mindful leaders are thought to be better capable of delivering support and/or socioemotional resources to their own employees. Kahn (1992) suggested that employees whose state in relationships with a higher level of psychologically present leaders might be given more resources to explore a complete range of their experiences at workplace. Reb et al. (2015) likewise found that mindful leaders, with the exposed presence, can provide their employees with greater resources. Moreover, mindful people are also better able to be entirely in “here and now” with others. When supervisors communicate with their subordinates, the supervisor may be noticed by subordinates whether to be fully present with their full being, not only in physical aspect. In case the supervisor is completely present in interaction with the subordinate, the subordinate might feel appreciated and treated respectfully, or with a sensation of interpersonal justice.
Based on the study of Saks (2006), a method for employees to pay back the organization is demonstrating their extent of engagement. In particular, employees might choose to engage themselves in different levels in response to all the resources offered by their organization and their supervisors. Making oneself more completely into one’s mission tasks and dedicating greater amount of emotional, cognitive, and physical resources may be a very useful way for an individual to repay the organization’s support. Employees always find it more difficult to measure their levels of job performance even if performance is usually evaluated and considered as the base for compensation and some administrative decisions. Consequently, employees are prone to exchange their own engagement for resources provided by the organization. Drawn all above reasons together, the author proposes the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 1**: Leader mindfulness is positively related to employee engagement.

**The Role of Leader-Follower Social Capital in the Relationship between Leader Mindfulness and Employee Engagement**

In order to make followers to identify the benefits of leader mindfulness, it is required they must be persuaded that this consciousness-related leadership may improve their own working situation (De Clercq, 2014). This study also argues that those understandings are supposed to emerge to the degree that (a) subordinates perceive their goals to be consistent with those of their supervisors and (b) both the two parties sustain solid personal relationships. Therefore, the author hypothesizes that the levels of goal congruence and social interaction should moderate the relationship between followers’ perceptions of leader mindfulness and their work engagement.

If leaders and followers have similar goals, the knowledge shared between them is believed to possess high quality, due to the belief that those knowledge sharing lead to more effective goal accomplishment (Leana & Van Buren, 1999; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). When followers perceive the high goal congruence, they accordingly become more knowledgeable about the process in which organizational decisions are reached (Leana & Van Buren, 1999; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998), and the thoughtfulness and awareness that mindful leaders dedicate to them seem to be easily interpreted as supportive. Specifically, goal congruence offers more cues to followers about how decisions influence their performance (De Clercq, Thongpapanl, & Dimov, 2011), by this means invigorating the perception that mindful leaders are offering a safer and meaningful working environment (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Kahn, 1990). On the contrary, when these goals are
not in harmony, the information about how decisions are made does not placed easily (Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998), thus there may be not much appreciation of what mindful leaders do.

Goal congruence might also increase the degree to which leader mindfulness becomes leveraged to generate enhanced employee engagement, since common goals produce a mutual interpretation of methods to solve work-related issues (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Mutual interpretations construct a deeper understanding about which kind of organizational knowledge is the most principal to solve those issues, as well as how these solutions can be incorporated into daily work (Leana & Van Buren, 1999). Moreover, it further intensifies appreciation of followers towards mindful leaders’ supports to their personal working situation by encouraging the incorporation of knowledge from both the parties which otherwise will stay disconnected (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Payne et al., 2011). As a result, when both the parties have the similar goals, employees may generate a better understanding about how a leadership method focused on the present moment can make great contribution to the quality of their job (Spears & Lawrence, 2002), which consequently enhances their work engagement.

**Hypothesis 2a:** The positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement is moderated by goal congruence, such that the relationship is stronger when goal congruence is higher.

Social interaction reflects the existence of informal interactions and solid personal ties, in which leaders and followers may know each other on a personal basis (Carmeli et al., 2009; Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998). Strong social connections support followers to have the feeling of appreciation towards what mindful leaders offer to narrow their gap of conflicting viewpoints (Uzzi, 1997), therefore conflict resolution attempts are not seen as threatening to their personal working situation, because will be the case in the lack of significant social relationships (Rispens, Greer, Jehn, & Thatcher, 2011). As an alternative, they seem to be as efforts to develop it. To the degree that followers understand their leader on a personal basis and involve in profound informal exchanges, leader mindfulness may provide deeper insights for the followers into how this attentiveness can be leveraged to accomplish conflict or issue resolutions as well as create safer personal working circumstances (Brown & Leigh, 1996). Strong personal connections also facilitate the capacity to learn (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). In this study, these connections consider followers in a wider, more useful setting of leader knowledge (De Clercq et al., 2011) and consequently a larger collection of tools with the aim of the improvement of their work on the daily basis. Otherwise
stated, because profound social interactions can enrich the diversity of exchanged knowledge, the fairness underlying leader mindfulness (Smith et al., 2004) becomes more beneficial for followers, allowing them to leverage the attention that the leader places on their well-being into significant working contributions, then consequently into improved employee engagement (Kahn, 1990).

**Hypothesis 2b:** The positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement is moderated by social interaction, such that the relationship is stronger when social interaction is higher.

**Summary**

Through studying lots of previous literatures, four variables of this study – leader mindfulness, employee engagement, leader-follower social capital specifically goal congruence and social interaction – were already reviewed. In the meantime, hypotheses of the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement with the potential moderating effects of goal congruence and social interaction in this relationship were also developed. Next chapter of this study would display further the research framework, questions, samples, and instruments elaboration. Research process, data collection and analysis introduction will be covered as well.
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter gives more explanation about the research framework, research hypotheses, research sample and research instruments used during the research process. Data collection and data analysis will also be comprised. At last, the overall research process is described as bellows.

Research Framework

The model of this study is developed grounded on the research purpose and also in consistent with the literature review. It briefly covers and illustrates the whole study. First, the independent variable is leader mindfulness (X) which is measured by leader mindfulness scale. The study examines the relationship between this independent variable and the dependent variable that is employee engagement (Y). Moreover, the moderating effects of leader-follower social capital including goal congruence (MO1) and social interaction (MO2) on this relationship will be assessed in this study. Figure 3.1. is shown as bellows:

![Research framework diagram]

Figure 3.1. Research framework

Research Procedure

There was supposed to be nine steps which will be followed to complete this study as bellows:
Figure 3.2. Research procedure

To conduct this research, the topic needed to be determined first. A literature review then had to be performed in order to have a better understanding of the decided variables. After that, research questions and hypotheses were also identified, based on which a research framework was developed so that readers may have a general view about the relationship among chosen variables. In addition, the quantitative method was used to analyze data in this study. In order to do that, the author already developed a set of instruments derived from previous researchers. After the proposal of this study, data collection and the analysis were carried out. Last but not least, research conclusions and suggestions were recommended based on the results of this study.
Research Hypotheses

Based on the research questions and related literature review which were already discussed in previous chapters, the following hypotheses are as follows developed. These hypotheses will examine the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement, and also the moderating effects of goal congruence and social interaction on this relationship, of Vietnamese employees in Food and Beverage industry.

**H1**: Leader mindfulness is positively related to employee engagement.

**H2a**: The positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement is moderated by goal congruence, such that the relationship is stronger when goal congruence is higher.

**H2b**: The positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement is moderated by social interaction, such that the relationship is stronger when social interaction is higher.

Research Sample and Data Collection

The sample of this study involved full-time employees from Food and Beverage industry in Vietnam whose direct supervisors. By restricting with a conditional question referring to a direct supervisor, participants were expected to have certain understandings about their supervisors. Convenience sampling and snowball sampling were used to reach the participants in a faster and more convenient way. Because of the geographical distance, the sample data were collected using online-based survey to test the three variables: leader mindfulness, employee engagement and leader-follower social capital. With previous experience in Food and Beverage industry in Vietnam, the researcher contacted 3 human resource managers currently working in this field and asked them to spread the survey to their employees. 170 individuals in the author’s personal networks were also sent e-mails with the direct link to the content of the questionnaire. Within the next two months, this group was reminded twice. The author also took advantage of social networks such as Facebook, LinkedIn, etc. to post that link while at the same time encouraged participants to forward the information to as many of their network connections as possible. Data collection period was done within five months from August to December in 2019. In total, there were 258 respondents completing the questionnaire. However, the author had to exclude 2 respondents who were not serious in answering by only choosing 1 answer for all the questions. Finally, a total of 256 qualified respondents were collected.
Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire includes four different scales in total, each of which will measure one variable of this study: leader mindfulness, employee engagement, goal congruence and social interaction. All the questions measuring four variables were developed from previous research in the literature review. The survey comprised five main sections. The first section contained fifteen items measuring leader mindfulness from employee’s perspective. The second section contained nine items testing employee engagement. The third section contained four items testing goal congruence. The fourth section contained four questions testing social interaction. The last section dealt with participants’ demographic information such as gender, age, educational background, marital status and job tenure.

Given that the participants were Vietnamese employees, Vietnamese version questionnaire translated by the researcher was used in this study. However, questionnaires for leader mindfulness, employee engagement, goal congruence and social interaction were originally developed in English. Therefore, back translation method was applied for the purpose of ensuring the consistency. Two experts were invited to review the adequacy and two peers were also invited to check English and Vietnamese translation and conducted back translation as well.

Measurements

Leader Mindfulness

Because this study does not aim to differentiate different mindfulness dimensions, the Mindfulness Attention and Awareness Scale (MAAS; Brown & Ryan, 2003) was chosen in this study. It is acknowledged as a unidimensional scale rather than a multi-dimensional scale like the Five Factor Mindfulness Questionnaire (Baer et al., 2008). In spite of some criticism of the MAAS, a substantial amount of validity and reliability evidence supports the application of this scale (e.g., Carlson & Brown, 2005; Höfling, Ströhle, Michalak, & Heidenreich, 2011; Hülsheger et al., 2013; Roche, Haar, & Luthans, 2014). Employees evaluated their leaders’ mindfulness through the 15 items of the MAAS on a 6-point scale (1 = almost always, 6 = almost never). Sample items were “My supervisor finds it difficult to stay focused on what’s happening in the present”, “It seems my supervisor is ‘running on automatic’ without much awareness of what (s)he doing” and “My supervisor finds himself/herself preoccupied with the future or the past”. Responses were reverse scored in that higher values suggest higher mindfulness. The Cronbach’s alpha value was 0.946 (See Table 3.1.).
Table 3.1.

*Leader Mindfulness Measurement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Questionnaire Component</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LM1</td>
<td>My leader could be experiencing some emotion and not be conscious of it until sometime later.</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>Brown &amp; Ryan (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM2</td>
<td>My leader breaks or spills things because of carelessness, not paying attention, or thinking of something else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM3</td>
<td>My leader finds it difficult to stay focused on what is happening in the present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM4</td>
<td>My leader tends to walk quickly to get where he/she is going without paying attention to what (s)he experiences along the way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM5</td>
<td>My leader tends not to notice feelings of physical tension or discomfort until they really grab his/her attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM6</td>
<td>My leader forgets a person’s name almost as soon as (s)he has been told it for the first time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM7</td>
<td>It seems my leader is “running on automatic,” without much awareness of what (s)he is doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM8</td>
<td>My leader rushes through activities without being really attentive to them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM9</td>
<td>My leader gets so focused on the goal (s)he wants to achieve that (s)he loses touch with what (s)he is doing right now to get there.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Questionnaire Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LM10</td>
<td>My leader does jobs or tasks automatically, without being aware of what (s)he is doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM11</td>
<td>My leader finds himself/herself listening to someone with one ear, doing something else at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM12</td>
<td>My leader drives places on ‘automatic pilot’ and then wonders why he/she went there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM13</td>
<td>My leader finds himself/herself reoccupied with the future or the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM14</td>
<td>My leader finds himself/herself doing things without paying attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM15</td>
<td>My leader snacks without being aware that (s)he is eating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Employee Engagement**

Employee engagement was measured with a 9-item scale, a shortened version of the original 17-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), which has an outstanding psychometric value (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). Because the three fundamental dimensions of work engagement (vigor, dedication, and absorption) are typically substantially correlated, this 9-item scale offers an excellent indicator of employee engagement (Schaufeli et al., 2006). Participants evaluated how often they undergone each of the nine statements on a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), such as “At my work, I feel bursting with energy”, “I am proud of the work that I do” and “I get carried away when I am working”. The Cronbach’s alpha value was 0.916 (See Table 3.2.).
Table 3.2.

*Employee Engagement Measurement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Questionnaire Component</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha value</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE1</td>
<td>At my work, I feel bursting with energy.</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>Schaufeli et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE2</td>
<td>At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE3</td>
<td>I am enthusiastic about my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE4</td>
<td>My job inspires me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE5</td>
<td>When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE6</td>
<td>I feel happy when I am working intensely.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE7</td>
<td>I am proud on the work that I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE8</td>
<td>I am immersed in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE9</td>
<td>I get carried away when I am working (reversed).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Goal Congruence**

This study utilized a 4-item scale derived from previous research (De Clercq et al., 2011). The response structure was a 5-point Likert scale with options ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), which participants used to evaluate items such as: “My supervisor and I have a similar vision regarding the organization’s future” and “My supervisor and I think alike on most issues with respect to the organization”. The Cronbach’s alpha value was 0.829 (See Table 3.3.).
**Goal Congruence Measurement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Questionnaire Component</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha value</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC1</td>
<td>At my work, I feel bursting with energy.</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>De Clercq et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC2</td>
<td>At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC3</td>
<td>I am enthusiastic about my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC4</td>
<td>My job inspires me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Interaction**

Based on previous studies (Bouckenooghe et al., 2013), social interaction was measured with a 4-item scale that reflects the intensity of the social relationships between employees and their own supervisors, such as “I spend significant time together with my supervisor in social situations” and “I maintain a close social relationship with my supervisor”. The Cronbach’s alpha value is 0.846 (See Table 3.4.).

**Social Interaction Measurement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Questionnaire Component</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI1</td>
<td>I spend significant time together with my leader in social situations.</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>Bouckenooghe et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI2</td>
<td>I maintain close a social relationship with my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI3</td>
<td>I know my supervisor on a personal level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI4</td>
<td>My relationship with other colleagues is very informal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control Variable

To minimize the impact of method variances and to clarify the correlation between leader mindfulness, employee engagement, goal congruence and social interaction, some control variables were used in this study and maybe related to employee engagement. They are gender and tenure.

Gender. This study also controlled for gender because it may affect the level of employee engagement (Halbesleben et al., 2009). It was coded as 1 = Male, 2 = Female, 3 = Other.

Tenure. Previous research has shown that stability in employee engagement over time was higher for those who have longer tenure (Bal, De Cooman & Mol, 2013).

Validity and Availability

This section contains two parts, the pilot test section explored the reliability of the instrument design, the main study section presented the result of construct and reliability.

Pilot Test

Because the target sample were Vietnamese employees, therefore before conducting the pilot test, two professional experts working in human resource field more than five years were contacted. They are both Vietnamese native speakers and have a high level of English level education. As a result, these experts gave some suggestions about the English translation and made the necessary changes on the questionnaire.

After making some changes on the scales, the final questionnaire was ready for the pilot test. The pilot test was applied to 50 employees working full-time in Food and Beverage industry in Vietnam with a direct supervisor. The designed questionnaire mainly contained 15-item leader mindfulness scale, 9-item employee engagement scale, 4-item goal congruence scale, 4-item social interaction scale, and other demographic questions.

The Cronbach’s alpha value was calculated to assess the reliability of the measurement usage, the commonly accepted criterion of the Cronbach’s alpha value is higher than 0.7 (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). Table 3.5. shows the reliability of these scales, the Cronbach’s alpha value of
leader mindfulness was .918, employee engagement was .869, goal congruence was .708, and social interaction was .708. Thus, there was no need to modify in this stage.

Table 3.5:
Reliabilities for Each Variable of This Study (N=50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total Item Number</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader Mindfulness</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Congruence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Study

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was applied collectively to ensure the construct validity. Items of each variable were run through CFA using MPlus version 7.4 to see whether the data fit well with the theoretical measurement model. The fit between observed and proposed model was assessed by the following indices: the ratio of Chi-Square (X2) to degree of freedom (df) = 1.61, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .95, the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) = .94, the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .05 and the Standardized Root Mean Square (SRMR) = .04 were considered as the measurements of model fit which are commonly performed in literature. The criteria of fit indices and the model test result of this study are listed in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6.
Summary of Model Fit Indices and Model Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Acceptable Level</th>
<th>Satisfactory Level</th>
<th>CFA Test Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$/df</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
<td>&gt; 0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
<td>&gt; 0.95</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt; 0.08</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>&lt; 0.08</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

The quantitative approach was utilized in this study to examine the correlations among testing variables. After the data collection was completed, the author used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 23 and the following techniques to carry out data analysis.

Descriptive Statistics Analysis

Cronbach’s α test was conducted to assess internal consistency for each construct. Descriptive statistics can give readers the whole image of the data collected during the research period. Frequency distribution, which comprises percentage and numbers, was used to represent the demographic information, including participants’ gender, age, educational background, marital status and job tenure. The author utilized the mean and standard deviation to examine all the variables of this study, which are leader mindfulness, employee engagement, goal congruence, social interaction, and control variables.

Pearson’s Correlation Analysis

The linear relation between two continuous variables could be considered as correlation, and researches adopted coefficient of correlation, also called Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson’s $r$) to indicate the degree of the correlation. When the absolute value of Pearson’s $r$ is closer to 1, the degree of the correlation is stronger. Moreover, the positive Pearson’s $r$ means the correlation is positive; in contrast, the negative Pearson’s $r$ means the correlation is negative. In this study, the author utilized the correlation analysis to examine the relationship between control variables and leader mindfulness, employee engagement, goal congruence, social interaction.

Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Hierarchical regression analysis was used to examine if the interaction of leader mindfulness, goal congruence and social interaction have impact on employee engagement, which at the same time can test the hypothesis 2a and 2b of this study. Control variables were put in the first model, then leader mindfulness, goal congruence and social interaction were in the second model. Lastly, the interaction term of leader mindfulness, goal congruence and social interaction were in the third model.
CHAPTER IV RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This session demonstrates the results after analyzing the data collected in order to examine the proposed relationship between leader mindfulness, employee engagement, goal congruence and social interaction.

Hypotheses examined in this study were: (1) Leader mindfulness is positively related to employee engagement, (2a) The positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement is moderated by goal congruence, such that the relationship is stronger when goal congruence is higher, and (2b) The positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement is moderated by social interaction, such that the relationship is stronger when social interaction is higher. Correlation analysis was used to examine the relationship among variables and hierarchical regression analysis was used to examine the relationship further.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.1 provides the details of the characteristics of each participant, which include gender, age, marital status, education and tenure. This type of analysis helps the reader have an overview of characteristics of the participants regarding frequencies and percentages. These were the characteristics this study intended to find out because the author considers that they are important when it came to analyze the relationship among variables of the study.

Of the total participants, the majority was female 60.5% while male and other accounted for 38.7% and .8% respectively. For the age item, employees who were 26 to 30 years old represented 43.4%. Besides, employees who were 20 to 25 years old were 40.6% of the sample. Thus, these two groups represented the highest percentage of participants of the entire sample. Then, the employees who were 31 to 35 years old had 14.1%. Only 1.6% of participants were 36 to 40 years old. Finally, the lowest percentage were those who are 41 to 45 years old, which only had .4%.

On the analysis of marital status, more than half of participants remained single, accounting for 67.2%. While 32.4% of participants were married, the rest .4% already divorced or separated. Furthermore, regarding to the educational background, .4% were employees at high school level or below while the percentage of those from college was 2.3%. Then, the employees with bachelor’s degrees constituted 60.2% of the responses, 34.4% employees had a master’s degree and finally only 2.7% had a doctoral degree. Lastly, in terms of tenure on current organization, the majority of the population had 1 year but less than 2 years of experience, accounting for 27%. The second highest percentage was 26% for employees working from 2 but less than 3 years. 24% of
responses had less than 1-year experience. Those employees with 3 but less than 4 years represented 17%, 4 but less than 5 years constituted 3%, and finally 5 years above of tenure represented 4%.

Table 4.1.

Participants Demographic Statistics (N=256)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced or Separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High school or below</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (years)</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year but less than 2 years</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 year but less than 3 years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 year but less than 4 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 year but less than 5 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 years and above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation Analysis

The correlation analysis was conducted in order to examine the relationship between all variables. Table 4.2 listed the mean, standard deviation (SD), correlation, and reliability of the variables. Firstly, the analysis included the control variables: gender and tenure. Then, independent variable was leader mindfulness and the moderator of the research model were goal congruence and social interaction. Moreover, it also comprised the dependent variable employee engagement.

When it comes to the independent variable of this study, leader mindfulness, Table 4.2 showed that it is significantly and positively correlated with the dependent variable, employee engagement ($r = .744, p < .01$). However, it is significantly and negatively related to goal congruence ($r = -.618, p < .01$) and social interaction ($r = -.667, p < .01$).

Dependent variable, employee engagement, is significantly and negatively related to goal congruence ($r = -.654, p < .01$) and social interaction ($r = -.719, p < .01$).

In summary, leader mindfulness is significantly and positively correlated with employee engagement. In other words, higher leader mindfulness can result in higher employee engagement. Through correlation analysis, the hypothesis of this study, leader mindfulness is positively related to employee engagement, was supported. Moreover, the Cronbach Alpha values of all variables were above 0.8, suggesting that all the measurements had an acceptable reliability.

Table 4.2.
Mean, Standard Deviation, Correlations and Reliability of Variables (N=256)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>1.621</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tenure</td>
<td>2.594</td>
<td>1.292</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leader mindfulness</td>
<td>3.901</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>-.135*</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>(.946)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Goal congruence</td>
<td>2.002</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.172**</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-.618**</td>
<td>(.829)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social interaction</td>
<td>1.921</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.169**</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-.667**</td>
<td>.686**</td>
<td>(.846)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Employee engagement</td>
<td>3.062</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>-.138*</td>
<td>.202**</td>
<td>.744**</td>
<td>-.654**</td>
<td>-.719**</td>
<td>(.916)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=256; Cronbach’s alpha value are on the diagonal in parentheses *p < .05, **p < .01
Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Hierarchical Regression was used to analyze the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement. When conducting the regression, control variables were entered first. Thereafter, the independent variable (leader mindfulness) was entered to test its effect to dependent variable. The results of the linear regression are displayed in Table 4.3.

Hypothesis 1 stated that leader mindfulness is positively related to employee engagement. The results in Table 4.3. indicate that 50.9% of the total variance of employee engagement can be explained by leader mindfulness ($F = 110.416, p < .001$). The result of the analysis also showed that leader mindfulness was significantly and positively related to employee engagement ($\beta = .287, p < .001$). Therefore, hypothesis 1 was supported.

Table 4.3.

Results of Regression Analysis for the Relationship between Leader Mindfulness and Employee Engagement (N=256)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\beta$ 1</th>
<th>$\beta$ 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>.287***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>7.862***</td>
<td>110.416***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.568***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. $R^2$</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.563***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.509***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>7.862</td>
<td>297.118***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

This analysis was used to examine the moderating effect of goal congruence and social interaction on the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement. Control variables considered for this analysis were gender and tenure. Three steps were conducted to test the moderating effect as above mentioned. Firstly, control variables were entered, followed by the independent variable (leader mindfulness) and the moderator. Goal congruence and social interaction were entered as individual moderators.

Hypothesis 2a predicted that the positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement is moderated by goal congruence, such that the relationship is stronger...
when goal congruence is higher. The findings for this hypothesis were designated in the Table 4.4. It can be seen that the interaction term in the hierarchical regression analysis added a significant incremental variance for model 3 ($\Delta R^2 = .021, p < .001$).

In order to display the effect of moderator in detail, the interaction effect was plotted in the Figure 4.1. to test slope differences. Goal congruence was divided into high and low groups. This figure shows that the slope of high goal congruence is greater than that of low goal congruence. In other words, for employees with higher levels of goal congruence, high leader mindfulness can result in more employee engagement, while for employees with lower levels of goal congruence, high leader mindfulness can result in less employee engagement. Therefore, the result reveals that goal congruence strengthen the positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement. Thus, hypothesis 2a was supported.

Table 4.4.

Results of Regression Analysis for the Relationship between Leader Mindfulness and Employee Engagement, Goal Congruence as Moderator (N=256)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Main effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Mindfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.542***</td>
<td>.478***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Congruence</td>
<td>-.305***</td>
<td>-.319***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Mindfulness x Goal Congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td>.157***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>7.862***</td>
<td>104.386***</td>
<td>91.121***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.625***</td>
<td>.646***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. $R^2$</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.619***</td>
<td>.639***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.566***</td>
<td>.021***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>7.862</td>
<td>189.211***</td>
<td>14.916***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$
Hypothesis 2b predicted that the positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement is moderated by social interaction, such that the relationship is stronger when social interaction is higher. The findings for this hypothesis were designated in Table 4.5. It can be seen that the interaction term in the hierarchical regression analysis added a significant incremental variance for model 3 ($\Delta R^2 = .07, p < .05$).

In order to examine the effect of moderator in detail, the interaction effect was plotted in the Figure 4.2. to test slope differences. Social interaction was divided into high and low groups. This figure shows that the slope of high social interaction is greater than that of low social interaction. In other words, for employees with higher levels of social interaction, high leader mindfulness can result in more employee engagement, while for employees with lower levels of social interaction, high leader mindfulness can result in less employee engagement. Therefore, the result reveals that social interaction strengthen the positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement. Thus, hypothesis 2b was supported.

*Figure 4.1. Moderating effect of goal congruence on the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement*
Table 4.5.

Results of Regression Analysis for the Relationship between Leader Mindfulness and Employee Engagement, Social Interaction as Moderator (N=256)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Main effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Mindfulness</td>
<td>.468***</td>
<td>.442***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
<td>-.394***</td>
<td>-.384***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Mindfulness x Social Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.091**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>7.862***</td>
<td>118.027***</td>
<td>96.996***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.653***</td>
<td>.660**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. $R^2$</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.647***</td>
<td>.653**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.594***</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>7.862</td>
<td>214.898***</td>
<td>5.121**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Figure 4.2. Moderating effect of social interaction on the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement

Summary and Discussions

The present study was conducted to examine the relationship between leader mindfulness, goal congruence, social interaction, and employee engagement. After conducting the correlation analysis and Pearson’s correlation analysis firstly, it was found that leader mindfulness is
positively related to employee engagement. In other words, leader with higher level of mindfulness may lead to more employee engagement. According to the study of Saks (2006), it is usually more complicated for employees to measure their levels of job performance. Therefore, the social exchange theory can explain the fact that levels of engagement is utilized by employees to recompense the support from their supervisors and organizations (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

The result also shows that goal congruence has a moderating effect on the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement. This is consistent with De Clercq et al. (2011) who suggested that goal congruence assist employees to understand more clearly about the mechanism that their performance are influenced by decisions. That is to say, employees may be persuaded that mindful leaders are offering a safer and meaningful working environment (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Kahn, 1990). The results in this study provide support for hypothesis 2a. The positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement is moderated by goal congruence, such that the relationship is stronger when goal congruence is higher.

Besides, this study also finds a moderating effect of social interaction on the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement. As stated by Uzzi (1997), solid social acquaintances reinforce gratitude of employees towards what mindful leaders propose to reduce conflicting perspectives. In addition, leader mindfulness may help the followers form a deeper perception on how this mindfulness can be applied to bring about argument resolutions as well as originate securer individual working contexts (Brown & Leigh, 1996). Thus, hypothesis 2b is also supported. The positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement is moderated by social interaction, such that the relationship is stronger when social interaction is higher.

Table 4.6. below summarizes the results of the data analysis, followed by a more detailed description of each supported hypothesis.
Table 4.6.

*Hypotheses Testing Results Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1  Leader mindfulness is positively related to employee engagement</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a The positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement is moderated by goal congruence, such that the relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is stronger when goal congruence is higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b The positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement is moderated by social interaction, such that the relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is stronger when social interaction is higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter, firstly, will cover the conclusions of the study; secondly, will present implications, limitations and recommendations for management and future research.

Conclusions

The purpose of this particular study was to examine whether leader mindfulness would influence employee engagement, and also explore how the moderating effect of leader-follower social capital (goal congruence and social interaction) would influence the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement. The goal of this study was to enhance employee engagement and benefit organizations by rethinking the leader-follower relation. The results of the data analysis of the previous chapter shows that: First, leader mindfulness actually had a positive relationship with employee engagement; Second, goal congruence in fact had a strengthen influence on the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement. Finally, social interaction also showed a strengthen effect on the relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement.

Implications

Theoretical Implications

In the perspective of previous literature regarding employee engagement, almost none is known about its leader mindfulness-related antecedents. Moreover, most studies on workplace mindfulness has only concentrated on intrapersonal influences of how employee mindfulness benefits him or herself while interpersonal interactions and relations are the center matters of organizational issues. To the present time, the connection between leader mindfulness and positive employee outcomes have only been examined in three studies, according to Reb et al. (2014), Reb et al. (2018), and Schuh et al. (2019). Through a series of data analysis, this study pointed out the positive relationship between leader mindfulness and employee engagement, and the moderating effect of goal congruence and social interaction in that relationship. These results could enhance the understanding of the current literature regarding the relationships among these four variables.
**Practical Implications**

This study offers essential recommendations for companies in Food and Beverage Industry in Vietnam with regards to the demand to develop an engaged workforce. The expansion of an engaged workforce gradually has become a main concern for human resource practitioners, who acknowledge the useful contributions of high engagement to improved customer satisfaction assessments and excellent financial accomplishment. Obviously, significant advice for HRD professionals must be founded in authentic experimental proof (Shuck & Wollard, 2010). While various corporations attempt to boost engagement among their employees, a lack of theory-driven researches advises companies about how to achieve this goal (Shuck, Reio Jr, et al., 2011). This research illuminates two crucial factors boosting work engagement: leader mindfulness and leader-follower social capital (goal congruence and social interaction).

Specifically, with the aim of increasing organizations’ employee engagement, management board and human resource practitioners may focus more on investing in enhancing the leaders’ mindfulness. Firstly, recruitment policies can take into consideration to hire leaders with this characteristic to ensure the engagement of their employees. More importantly, systematic endeavors can put in the first priority such as mindfulness training, especially programs designed for the workplace. Mindfulness meditation is a good example of employee development methods used by several Fortune 500 organizations including Google, General Mills, Apple and Nike. Executing so, this research recommends, will bring about variety of benefits for both leaders and employees, with regards to physical conditions as well as psychological well-being.

Similarly essential, this research discloses that to gain the complete advantages of fostering leader mindfulness, human resource professionals must contemplate the social capital of their leader–follower relationships including goal congruence and social interaction. A leader with higher mindfulness offers abundant foundations for a more engaged workforce, but this procedure may confront challenges before it has the final result. Therefore, human resource professionals need to acknowledge that several employees might not realize how mindful leaders could really support their personal duties. This challenge is most noticeable when leaders and followers have varying goals, or their exchanges are restricted to formal backgrounds. On the contrary, companies may gain most from mindful leaders when they promote both devotion to mutual objectives and casual exchanges across hierarchical levels. Consequently, an imperative role for human resource professionals may lie in the expansion of socialization ideas that encourage newcomers’ learning
about organizational standards and objectives as well as arouse their casual interactions with supervisors, for instance, by establishing such discussion outside the usual workplace.

In principle, Food and Beverage organizations in Vietnam should combine leader mindfulness with an emphasis on improving goal congruence between leaders and followers. Leaders are supposed to be instructed to not only be mindful but also to boost orientation of follower objectives with their own objectives and those of their company; or else, the impacts of leader mindfulness are not so noticeable. This result may be accomplished through the apparent communication of key targets, during official training and development programs as well as through everyday decision making. Additionally, when combined with casual social interactions, the possibility of reaching high levels of engagement will improve much more.

Nonetheless, it is advisable for human resource professionals to understand that such social interactions can in fact backfire in the lack of consistent objectives. When the two parties involve in casual communications and recognize each other on a personal level, nervousness could increase in the existence of substantial objective variances, such that employees fail to acknowledge the attempts mindful leaders execute, in which situation leader mindfulness is unlikely to lead to helpful work manners. If employees and supervisors cannot solve their core disputes about which objectives would be followed, the negative attitudes may increase even more in the existence of solid social interactions. Therefore, when improving platforms that boost internal communication, human resource professionals should understand that in some circumstances - such as when significant variations in the organization’s strategies prevent perceptions of goal congruence between leader and follower - it may be better to discourage informal interactions between employees and their supervisors, to prevent the escalation of unfavorable feelings that lead to personal animosity and ultimately undermine the potential of leader mindfulness to create positive work attitudes. For example, open workplace designs developed to promote social interactions should be used with great caution in the presence of limited congruence among organizational members so that they do not compromise the benefits of leader mindfulness. Instead, human resource professionals should proactively assess whether employees and supervisors hold different goals for their organization and ensure that any associated personal animosity does not escalate when employees are forced to interact with their leaders in informal settings.
Limitations and Future Research Suggestions

Despite the contribution made to the literature, this study still has some limitations. First, due to the time constraints, the authors only employed the quantitative method. It notably brought about a limitation that it would be hard to inspect the participants’ full ideas and recommendations. Second, this study used a cross-sectional design which means the data were collected at the same single point time. Therefore, the author needed to treat causal judgement with caution with four variables. Third, this present research only tested on a small group of 256 valid respondents in Food and Beverage industry in Vietnam because of the researchers’ distance difficulty, which could lead to sample bias relating to generalizability. Finally, this current examination might only provide a glance into the complication of leader–follower connections. For instance, the authors merely concentrated on employee’s awareness of their leader mindfulness.

Based on above limitations, the author hereafter provides some suggestions that can be considered as references for future researchers. First, it is vital to take into consideration the demand for more qualitative studies about mindfulness at work. In contrast to quantitative research, qualitative research put more close considerations to specific explanations and processes which trigger the conceptual constructs. Second, a longitudinal design could be better distinguish between short- and long-term effects of leader mindfulness, as well as elucidate the underlying mechanisms that connect such leader mindfulness with employee engagement. Third, cross-country studies could provide additional insights into the relative importance of leader–follower relationships for leveraging servant leadership into positive employee attitudes across different cultural contexts. Last but not least, future studies may supplement this research by assessing leader mindfulness from the leader’s perception.
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APPENDIX A: RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Participants,

I am Huong studying Master’s degree in the International Human Resource Development at National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan, R.O.C. I am currently conducting a research project for my thesis. The purpose of the research is to evaluate employees’ engagement level toward the work and their perceptions about their leaders. This study concentrates on supervisors as leaders. More specifically, supervisors are supposed to carry out various leadership responsibilities such as direction provision, support giving, motivate creation, and feedback provision to their subordinates.

I would be grateful if you could spend 10 to 15 minutes answering the following questions. When you participate in this study, you will be asked to read a series of statements and indicate your disagreement or agreement about one of your supervisors by marking the appropriate response category. Any information you provide is confidential and nothing will be published that identifies you. The results will be used to provide valuable suggestions for business employers in Vietnam. Therefore, your participations would make significant contribution to me.

If you have any questions about the survey, or about being in this study, you may contact me.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Huong Nguyen

FILTER QUESTION

Are you a full-time employee who have a direct supervisor in Food and Beverage industry? (If Yes, please move to the next page. If No, you can stop the questionnaire here, thank you for your participation)

Yes  No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART I</th>
<th>The following 15 statements are about your perception about your supervisor. Using the 1-6 scale below, please select one answer that best reflects your situation. (Leader Mindfulness - LM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My supervisor could be experiencing some emotion and not be conscious of it until some time later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My supervisor breaks or spills things because of carelessness, not paying attention, or thinking of something else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My supervisor finds it difficult to stay focused on what’s happening in the present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My supervisor tends to walk quickly to get where he/she is going without paying attention to what (s)he experiences along the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My supervisor tends not to notice feelings of physical tension or discomfort until they really grab his/her attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My supervisor forgets a person’s name almost as soon as (s)he has been told it for the first time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It seems my supervisor is “running on automatic,” without much awareness of what (s)he is doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor rushes through activities without being really attentive to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My supervisor gets so focused on the goal (s)he wants to achieve that (s)he loses touch with what (s)he is doing right now to get there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My supervisor does jobs or tasks automatically, without being aware of what (s)he is doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>My supervisor finds himself/herself listening to someone with one ear, doing something else at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My supervisor drives places on ‘automatic pilot’ and then wonders why he/she went there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My supervisor finds himself/herself preoccupied with the future or the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>My supervisor finds himself/herself doing things without paying attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My supervisor snacks without being aware that (s)he is eating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PART II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The following 9 statements are about your engagement level toward the work. Please read each of the following questions carefully and indicate your disagreement or agreement by marking the appropriate response category. (Employee Engagement - EE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>At my work, I feel bursting with energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>At my job, I feel strong and vigorous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am enthusiastic about my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My job inspires me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I feel happy when I am working intensely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am proud on the work that I do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am immersed in my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I get carried away when I’m working</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART III**

The following 4 statements are about the congruence level between your supervisor’s goal and your goal for the organization. Please read each of the following questions carefully and indicate your disagreement or agreement by marking the appropriate response category. (Goal Congruence - GC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My supervisor and I have a similar vision regarding the organization’s future</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My supervisor and I think alike on most issues with respect to the organization</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Most of our objectives are fully aligned with those of the other functions</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My supervisor and I perceive their problems as mutual problems</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART IV**

The following 4 statements about your interpersonal social relationships at work. Please read each of the following questions carefully and indicate your disagreement or agreement by marking the appropriate response category. (Social Interaction - SI)
PART VI: Demographic information

1. Gender
   - Male
   - Female
   - Other

2. Age
   - 20-25
   - 26-30
   - 31-35
   - 36-40
   - 41-45
   - 46-50
   - 50 above

3. Educational background
   - High school or below
   - College
   - University
   - Master
   - PhD
   - Other

4. What is your current marital status?
   - Single
   - Married
   - Divorced or Separated
   - Other

5. How long have you been working in your current company?
   - Less than 1 year
   - 1 year but less than 2 years
   - 2 years but less than 3 years
   - 3 years but less than 4 years
   - 4 years but less than 5 years
   - 5 years and above