2.1 Introduction

This chapter unfolds with a review of literature on Employee Engagement, which includes unraveling the concept of employee engagement, employee engagement definitions, and its dimensions, antecedents of employee engagement and categories of employee engagement. The second part of this chapter deals with the Organizational Culture literature, its meaning, conceptualization and dimensions. The third part of the chapter deals with Organizational Communication, its meaning and dimensions. The chapter helps in identifying research gaps which lay the foundation for defining the research problem and building of the theoretical framework of the study.

2.2 The Meaning of Engagement

Symbolized by the images of combat and marriage engagement is associated with the active participation and investment of an individual’s whole person, not solely parts into role performance. In the context of the workplace, engagement takes on a more specific meaning. Within organizations these interactions manifest themselves in the contract of employment wherein employees pledge their services to their employer, commit themselves to their job, and undertake the obligations of employment. Employees assume and embrace roles within organizations by investing their energies into these roles. In-turn they become attached to and
are absorbed in the roles they perform. When they are emotionally and mentally engaged they take the organization to greater heights.

Organizations have recently begun focusing on the level of engagement of their employees in an effort to understand the underlying factors of employee motivation and performance (Gallup, 2005). Engagement with one’s work is important, given that work is a pervasive and influential part of an individual’s well-being, affecting not only the quality of an individual’s life but one’s mental and physical health as well (Wrzesniewski, Rozin, & Bennett, 2002). Most people must work to earn a living, which makes work an obligation rather than a choice. However, despite this apparent lack of choice, individual experiences with work are quite diverse, ranging from work as a monotonous grind to work as an expression of one’s identity (Hulin, 2002). Level of employee engagement is a predictor of both individual and organizational performance.

2.3 Evolution of Employee Engagement

Goffman (1959, 1961) was one of the first to use the term “embracement” to describe the investment of self and energy into one’s role. For Goffman, role embracement involved an admitted or expressed attachment to the role and an active engagement or spontaneous involvement in role activity; that is, a visible investment of attention and effort (Goffman, 1961). Behaviors that signify a lack of separation between a person and a role were indicative of role embracement, whereas behaviors that separated a person from a disdained role indicated role distance. To explain the concept, Goffman contrasted a police officer directing rush hour traffic, dancing with his arms and legs and blowing his whistle, as high role embracement. In contrast, a
young man expressed role distance from his merry-go-round attendant job through inattentiveness and gestures such as yawning and mock-grimacing.

Using Goffman’s view of role embracement, Kahn (1990) established a theoretical framework to understand when and why individuals invest varying degrees of themselves in work role performance. Through ethnographic interviews, Kahn explored engagement and disengagement among two groups of workers: counselors at a summer camp in the Caribbean and members of an architectural firm. Kahn explored conditions at work where people were personally engaged, i.e. expressed and employed their personal selves, or were disengaged and withdrew and defended their personal selves.

From this, Kahn developed a definition of engagement to include “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). For Kahn, the individuals’ engagement in their role was manifested by the investment of themselves along the three dimensions. Implicit in this definition is the notion that the individuals’ engagement is reflected by the investment of personal energies into their role, which can vary according to the contextual factors or requirements of the role. To illustrate this concept, Kahn described a scuba diving instructor who exhibited moments of engagement via all three dimensions during a diving expedition. The instructor employed himself physically, by checking gear and leading the dive; cognitively, by being vigilantly aware of divers, weather, and marine life; and emotionally, by his enthusiasm and empathy for the young divers who were both excited and fearful.

Conversely, personal disengagement is the uncoupling of self from role and is exhibited by a lack of physical involvement, cognitive vigilance, and emotional investment (Kahn, 1990).
These behaviors underlie what researchers have characterized as automatic or robotic (Hochschild, 1983), burnout (Maslach, 1982), apathetic, detached (Goffman, 1959, 1961), or effortless (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Kahn described an example of disengagement with one’s role in the action and thoughts of a senior architect who assigned tasks to subordinates, adopted a perfunctory approach to work, and failed to empathize or emotionally connect with clients or draftsmen.

From these and other examples, Kahn determined that an individual’s role engagement is reflected by a dynamic relationship in which an individual invested and divested personal energy and emotion into his or her role across the physical, emotional, and cognitive dimensions. As Kahn (1990, 1992) asserted, people exhibit engagement by “harnessing” themselves to their role through the investment of varying degrees of personal energies and emotions. Theoretical support for Kahn’s suppositions on engagement can be found in the work of Kelman (1958), who posited that the lowest investment of personal energies into role performance is one that was solely physical, automatic, or robotic as mentioned by Hochschild, (1983) and devoid of cognitive or emotional involvement. The next level of personal investment for Kelman (1958) was that which included cognitive energies. Traditionally, the investment of cognitive energies into role performance has been the focus of rational theories of motivation. Under these theories (i.e., Equity Theory, Adams, 1963, 1965; Expectancy Theory, Vroom, 1964), individuals are viewed as rational beings who cognitively assess personal costs and benefits before taking action.

Kelman’s (1958) highest level of motivation involved the investment of not only physical and cognitive resources, but also involved an investment of emotions. At this level of motivation, individuals are engaged in their work role through an emotional connection between
themselves and their role. This view is consistent with Kahn’s (1990), who noted that role engagement was the highest when people were emotionally connected to their work activity. Kahn’s conceptualization of engagement, as being manifested by three dimensions, is also consistent with the theoretical tripartite definition of attitudes, which have been categorized as comprising emotional, cognitive, and behavioral components (Campbell, 1963). Researchers emphasize not only on the role of cognitive evaluations in attitudes, but also the affect and behavioral components as well (Eagley & Chaiken, 1993). By detailing the manifestation of engagement in one’s role, Kahn (1990) provided a general description of engaging emotions, cognitions, and behaviors.

Interest in engagement arose with the shift in focus in psychology from weaknesses, malfunctioning and damage towards happiness, human strengths and optimal functioning (Rothman, 2003; Strumpfer, 2003; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi; 2000). Peterson, Nansook and Seligman (2005) regarded the study and promotion of happiness as important goals of psychology and suggested three routes to happiness, namely pleasure, engagement and meaning. Engagement, as a component of happiness, entails that individuals pursue gratification by applying their strengths. (Rothmann & Rothmann, 2010).

2.4 Importance of Employee Engagement

Employees are an asset to an organization. Using the organization’s intellectual capital has become an important source of competitive advantage. (Artur, 1994; Becker and Huslid, 2000; Buckingham and Vosburgh ;2001) One way organizations can successfully navigate these challenges and capitalize on their intellectual capital is to foster employee engagement.
Engaged employees are energized and passionate about the work they do. With passion comes excitement, enthusiasm and productivity. (Kroth and Boverie, 2003) It is very much an organization’s self interest that can build wealth as fast as disgruntled one can destroy it. (Catlette and Hadden, 2001)

Engaged employees are committed, motivated, energetic and enthusiastic about problem solving. They are absorbed in their work, put their heart into their jobs, are excited about doing a good job, exert energy in their work and are a source of competitive advantage for their employees. (Katzenbach, 2000) Each individual employee has direct and unilateral control over amount of discretionary effort he or she chose to make available to the organization (Catlette and Hadden, 2001). An engaged employee will consistently outperform and achieve new standards of excellence. (Harter, Schmidt and Hayes, 2002).

A survey conducted by Towers Perrin (2003) asserted that what drives employee engagement is when a company aligns its programs and practices within its framework to drive the right behavior from employees through to customers; it positioned itself to realize an appropriate return on people investment. On the contrary, when an organization builds its people programs in a strategic and operational vacuum- with no explicit or implicit links between behavior and investment, it will lead to drop in return on investment, profitability and customer retention. This report reflects on the need for organizations to focus on factors that influence engagement like competitive pay, followed by balance between work and personal life, advancement opportunities, competitive benefits, challenging work, merit pay, learning and development opportunities, competitive retirement benefits, caliber of co-workers and an employer with good reputation (Beauchesne, 2005)
As demonstrated in a study of hotel and restaurant service quality by Salanova, Agut and Peiro (2005), the employee’s level of job engagement, measured by the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzáles-Romá, & Bakker, 2002), predicted the overall service climate of the organization, which in turn predicted employee performance and customer loyalty. According to Corporate Leadership Council (2004), engaged employees are more likely to exhibit discretionary efforts and improve individual performance. They are less likely to experience cynicism and exhaustion.

Consulting firm Watson Wyatt (2004) after conducting extensive surveys concluded that employees with higher line of sight are expected to earn 18 percent more profits. Towers Perrin again conducted an interesting survey of 664,000 employees across various countries in 2006; its findings revealed that a higher level of employee engagement actually translated in improved financial outcomes of the organizations in terms of operating income, net income and earnings per share. The findings echoed that organizations with high levels of employee engagement, operating income improved by 19.2 percent in the 12 months, while organizations with low levels of employee engagement, operating income declined by 32.7 percent. A highly engaged employee force attributed to increase in net-income by 13.7 percent, versus a 3.8 percent decline for peer companies. In yet another measure earnings-per-share rose by 27.8 percent among companies with highly engaged employees as compared to a decline in 11.2 percent for other analyzed companies.

Gallup (2006) studied approximately 24,000 organizations and compared the top quartile and bottom quartile financial performance with engagement scores. Organizations with employees having engagement scores in the bottom quartile averaged 31-51 percent more employee turnover, employee turnover, 51 percent more inventory shrinkage and 62 percent more
employee accidents. While those with engagement scores in the top quartile averaged 12 percent higher customer advocacy, 18 percent higher productivity and 12 percent higher profitability. According to Robinson, Perryman, and Hayda (accessed from http://www.employment-studies.co.uk/summary/ on 8th Dec, 2011) engaged employees exhibit clear behaviors like belief in the organization, desire to improve their work, an understanding of the business strategy, ability to collaborate with and assist colleagues, willingness to demonstrate extra effort in their work, drive to continually enhance their skill set and knowledge base.

The rise of the younger generation of workers adds complexity to an already bewildering work context because they are increasingly turning to the workplace as a source of social fulfillment (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006), which places a great burden on employers who must appeal to social and other teleological aspirations of workers. If organizations are going to retain their best and brightest, then they must focus on promoting positive work experiences. (Alarcon, et al, 2010)

According to Johnson (2011), a negative correlation exists between instances of workplace deviance or counterproductive work behaviors and levels of employee engagement within organizations.

Applied correctly, engagement data can act as an early warning system for revenue and profit generation. The statistical relationship between engagement and financial success has been shown in numerous studies. For example, in the report Employee Engagement Underpins Business, companies with highly engaged employees outperformed those with less-engaged employees in three key financial measure-operating income, net income growth and earnings per share. (Cedric, 2011)
Sarkar’s study of employee engagement practices in the manufacturing sector in May 2011 reflected that engaged employees in an organization are drivers of high productivity and high customer satisfaction. She has suggested that the most likely benefits of having engaged employees in an organization are, decreased attrition rates, employees support in downtrend of the business also decreased absenteeism and employees become brand ambassadors of the organization.

2.5 Definitions of Employee Engagement

Ever since its evolution, numerous definitions can be derived from practice and research. According to Kahn (1990) employees can be engaged on one dimension and not the other. However, the more engaged the employee is on each dimension, the higher the level of employee engagement.

Maslach and Leiter (1997) initially defined the engagement construct as the opposite of burnout (i.e., someone who is not experiencing job burnout must be engaged in their job.) Luthans and Peterson (2002) elaborated on Kahn’s work on employee engagement, which provides a convergent theory for Gallup’s empirically derived employee engagement. They opined that that to be emotionally engaged is to form meaningful connections with others and to experience empathy for them. In contrast, being cognitively engaged refers to those who are acutely aware of their mission and role in their work environment.

Similarly Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002,) defined active engagement in terms of “high levels of activity, initiative, and responsibility.”
Schaufeli et al. (2002) define employee engagement as “a positive fulfilling, work related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption”. They further state that engagement is not a momentary and specific state, but is “a more persistent and pervasive affective – cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior”

Harter, Schmidt and Hayes (2002) define employee engagement as “the individual’s involvement and satisfaction with as well as enthusiasm for work”.

Hewitt (2004) defines employee engagement as the employees desire to say (speak positively about the organization), stay (desire to be a member of the organization) and strive ( go beyond the expected for the organization)

Mount, Harter, Witt, and Barrick (2004) defined engagement in terms of a “high internal motivational state.”

Wellins and Concelman (2004) suggest that “Employee engagement is the illusive force that motivates employees to higher levels of performance. This coveted energy is an amalgam of commitment, loyalty, productivity an ownership.” they further added that it includes, “feelings and attitudes employees have towards their jobs and their organization.”

Robinson, Perryman and Hayday (2004), define “engagement as a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its values. An engaged employee is aware of the business context, works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization”. They further add that organization must develop and nurture engagement which is a two way relationship between employer and employee.
Lucey, Bateman and Hines (2005) have deciphered that “Employee Engagement is how each individual connects with the company and the customers”

Development Dimensions International (DDI), (2005), defines Employee Engagement as “the extent to which people value, enjoy and believe in what they do.”

Little and Little (2006) have tried to unravel the construct of employee engagement. They have addressed several key issues like

- Attitude or behavior
- Individual or group phenomenon
- Relationship with constructs
- Measurement issues of the construct

Macey and Schneider (2008) looked at engagement attitudinally and behaviorally. They distinguished three broad conceptualizations of employee engagement, namely state, trait, and behavioural engagement.

Sarkar (2011) opined that employee engagement is a barometer that determines the association of a person with the organization.

*Common to all these definitions is the idea that employee engagement is a desirable state, having an organizational purpose. It connotes involvement, commitment, passion, dedication and enthusiasm at work.*
2.6 Relationship of Employee Engagement with Other Constructs

Employee engagement can be distinguished from other related constructs.

2.6.1 Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement

Job satisfaction is defined as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or experience (Locke and Henne, 1986). It is positively related to organizational commitment, job-involvement, organizational citizenship behavior and mental health. It is negatively related to turnover, perceived stress and pro-union voting (Kreitner and Kinicki, 2004) but the relationship of job satisfaction with performance is weak (Ostroff, 1992).


The Gallup survey items tap evaluative constructs traditionally conceptualized as satisfaction facets, including resource availability, opportunities for development, and clarity of expectations. Perhaps even more directly, some practitioners (e.g., Burke, 2005) measure engagement as direct assessments of satisfaction with the company, manager, work group, job, and work environment characteristics. Others distinguish between an affective, or emotional, component of engagement and rational or cognitive elements, linking the emotional component to job satisfaction.
Towers-Perrin (2003) suggested that “the emotional factors tie to people’s personal satisfaction and the sense of inspiration and affirmation they get from their work and being part of their organization” contemporary job satisfaction measures are largely considered descriptive (Brief & Weiss, 2002). The measurement of engagement with the Gallup measure (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999; Harter et al., 2002) where the items used to define engagement are all items descriptive of the conditions under which people work.

Engagement is above and beyond simple satisfaction with the employment arrangement or basic loyalty to the employer - characteristics that most companies have measured for many years. Engagement, in contrast, is about passion and commitment—the willingness to invest oneself and expend one’s discretionary effort to help the employer succeed.

Interestingly, many traditional measures of satisfaction include items that would seemingly tap facets that fit our conceptual space for engagement. For example, one item included in Brayfield and Rothe’s (1951) measure of job satisfaction reads, “Most days I feel enthusiastic about my work.” Enthusiasm is regarded as a marker of engagement by some (e.g., Harter, Schmitt, & Keyes, 2003), and the relevance of satisfaction is clear in that people invest more time in roles they find enjoyable (Rothbard & Edwards, 2003). Nonetheless, the conceptual similarity of items used in engagement and satisfaction surveys indicates confusion between the concepts. Both the constructs focus on’ positive effect,’ where the common use of the term broadly encompasses the hedonic dimension of pleasantness, happiness, or cheerfulness yet is portrayed more accurately when employee engagement is characterizing a high level of activation or energy and a state of pleasantness.
Although there may be room for satisfaction within the engagement construct, engagement connotes activation, whereas satisfaction connotes satiation. (Erickson, 2005). In addition, although “satisfaction” surveys that ask employees to describe their work conditions may be relevant for assessing the conditions that provide for engagement (state and/or behavioral), they do not directly tap engagement. Such measures require an inferential leap to engagement rather than assessing engagement itself.

Harter et al. (2002) explicitly referred to their measure (The Gallup Workplace Audit) as “satisfaction-engagement” and defined engagement as “the individual’s involvement and satisfaction with as well as enthusiasm for work” The Gallup survey items tap evaluative constructs traditionally conceptualized as satisfaction facets, including resource availability, opportunities for development and clarity of expectations perhaps even more directly, some practitioners (e.g., Burke, 2005) measure engagement as direct assessments of satisfaction with the company, manager, work group, job, and work environment characteristics. Engagement, in contrast, is about passion and commitment—the willingness to invest oneself and expend one’s discretionary effort to help the employer succeed.

Fernandez (2007) shows the distinction between job satisfaction, the well-known construct in management, and engagement contending that employee satisfaction is not the same as employee engagement and since managers cannot rely on employee satisfaction to help retain the best and the brightest, employee engagement becomes a critical concept. Other researchers take job satisfaction as a part of engagement, but it can merely reflect a superficial, transactional relationship that is only as good as the organization’s last round of perks and bonuses; Engagement is about passion and commitment-the willingness to invest oneself and expand
one’s discretionary effort to help the employer succeed, which is beyond simple satisfaction with the employment arrangement or basic loyalty to the employer (BlessingWhite, 2008; Erickson, 2005; Macey and Schnieder, 2008). Therefore, the full engagement equation is obtained by aligning maximum job satisfaction and maximum job contribution.

According to Swaminathan and Rajasekaran (2010), employee engagement occurs when Satisfaction, Motivation and Effectiveness intersect.

*Review of literature reflects that an employee may experience job-satisfaction on account of reasons and drivers which are not linked to engagement.*

### 2.6.2 Organizational Commitment and Employee Engagement

It refers to the degree to which an individual identifies with an organization and is committed to its goals. It is directly related to voluntary turnover. Researchers like Wellins and Concelman, (2004) suggests that engagement is an amalgam of commitment, loyalty, productivity and ownership. They suggested that “to be engaged is to be actively committed, as to a cause.” The Corporate Executive Board (2004), suggested that engagement is “the extent to which employees commit to someone or something in their organization, how and how long they stay as a result of that commitment.” In these and similar definitions, two possible threads of reasoning are implied - organizational and task/goal commitment. Commitment is regarded as a psychological state of attachment (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986) or binding force between an
individual and the organization (Meyer, Becker, & Vandenberghe, 2004). In fact, the items formulated by Meyer and Allen’s (1997) affective commitment scale focus on the concept of belonging, personal meaning, and “being part of the family” and the items in Mowday, Porter, and Steers’ (1982) measure of organizational commitment define not only the concept of belonging but also the additional concepts of effort. In both cases, commitment as a psychological state is regarded as an antecedent of various organizationally relevant outcomes, including various forms of pro-social behavior and/or organizational/job withdrawal. Based simply on the commonly specified antecedents and consequences of commitment and state engagement, affective commitment must be regarded as a facet of state engagement but not the same as state engagement. There are other facets or psychological states (e.g., feeling psychologically safe; Kahn, 1990) that make commitment only one of a number of states that legitimately comprise the full state engagement construct. It is important to note that the measures of commitment cited (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Mowday et al., 1982) are measures of the psychological state of commitment and are not descriptions of the conditions that might yield that commitment. McCashland (1999) refers to engagement and commitment interchangeably. Most often employee engagement has been defined as emotional and intellectual commitment to the organization. (Baumruk 2004, Shaw 2005, Richman 2006)

A meta-analysis by Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found that demographic characteristics (e.g. age, sex, level of education), role states, job characteristics, group/leader relations, organizational characteristics, motivation, and job satisfaction can enhance organizational commitment.
Organizational commitment is an important facet of the state of W.H. Macey and B. Schneider (2008) engagement when it is conceptualized as positive attachment to the larger organizational entity and measured as a willingness to exert energy in support of the organization, to feel pride as an organizational member, and to have personal attachment with organization. Joo and Shim (2010) have identified the antecedents of organizational commitment as personal characteristics and job characteristics, as well as organizational characteristics.

*Review of literature reveals that an employee who is committed to the organization may not always display attributes of an engaged employee.*

### 2.6.3 Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Employee Engagement

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is discretionary behavior that is beyond formal obligations. They lubricate the social machinery of the organization, reducing friction and increasing efficiency (Podsakoff, MacKenzie and Bommer, 1996) Certain aspects of organizational citizenship behavior are a part of employee engagement. (Robinson, et al., 2004 and Wellins Concelman, 2004) Early theoretical work on OCB emphasized the discretionary nature of certain behaviors that were regarded as essential to organizational success but not formally defined as part of the employee engagement. More recently, conceptual problems have been discussed in the literature regarding limiting discretion to extra-role behaviors, and the working definition of OCB has been modified to include those behaviors that support or in some way enhance the social and psychological environment essential for individual task performance (Organ, 1997), a term more closely aligned with the meaning of contextual performance (Le Pine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). Although the dimensionality of OCB has recently been
questioned, the original behaviors comprising OCB can be conceptualized as falling into the larger themes of support for others, organizational support, and conscientiousness (Borman, 2004; Le Pine et al., 2002). The behaviors falling within the latter category imply doing “something extra,” a notion consistent with a folk definition of employee engagement (e.g., “going the extra mile”) and distinct from the notion of simply raised levels of job facet performance, functional participation (Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994), self-discipline (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996), or generalized compliance (Le Pine et al., 2002). One conceptual challenge in considering OCB as engagement (i.e., as doing something extra) arises in addressing the issue of whether employee engagement refers exclusively to going “above and beyond.” The significance of the issue resides in the observation that the boundaries between in-role and extra-role performance are weak at best. Vey and Campbell (2004), for example, demonstrated that certain forms of OCB (conscientiousness and courtesy) were more likely to be considered in-role by a panel of survey respondents with supervisory experience. Essentially the conceptual issue is whether the behavior of interest must be discretionary—the person made a choice to do it—to be considered an example of engaged behavior. This would require all behaviors to be evaluated for the degree to which they involved making a choice to do more, to do something different, and so forth. It is acknowledged that this places a conditional value on such behaviors—they may be normal or typical in some circumstances (some groups and some companies), whereas the same behavior may be unusual in other circumstances.

To elaborate “a typical” implies a frame of reference. That frame of reference may originate in a variety of ways; attempts here at greater precision are not useful. For example, Meyer et al. (2004) suggested that under circumstances where failure to perform a task as usual might be
excused because of extraordinary conditions, otherwise in-role behaviors might be considered extra-role. This implies that certain conditions allow for freedom of choice as to whether to engage in certain task behaviors; engagement, as in “doing something extra,” would be considered doing what is normal when normal conditions do not apply.

*However, defining employee engagement behavior exclusively in such a manner would seem limiting in that it raises the question as to the frequency and extent with which opportunities to demonstrate such behaviors arise.*

### 2.6.4 Job Involvement and Employee Engagement

Lodahl & Kejner (1965) define job involvement as “the degree to which a person’s work performance affects his self-esteem”. They also argue that employees who are highly concerned with their jobs also reveal high involvement in their organizations. Kanungo (1982) identified different explanation of job involvement while studying the relationship of job involvement to numerous variables, including job characteristics, performance, turnover, and absenteeism. Lawler & Hall (1970) defined job involvement as the level of importance of one's job to one's personality, which is consistent with Lodahl and Kejner (1965). On the other hand, Bass (1965) considered job involvement as the level to which an individual is vigorously participating in his or her job. However, Etzioni (1975) projected three types of involvement: moral, calculative and alienative. He is of the view that individuals are morally involved, if they own the organizational goals. Blau & Boal (1987) stated that job involvement is the measure of extent to which a person recognizes psychologically with his or her job and mull over his or her job.
Job- involvement is the degree to which one is cognitively preoccupied with, engaged in and concerned with one’s present job (Paullay, et al., 1994). Job- involvement is shown to be related organizational citizenship behavior and job- performance (Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin and Lord, 2002). Wellins and Concelman (2004) have included job- involvement as a part of engagement. Engagement is closely associated with constructs of job – involvement. (Brown, 1996) Job- involvement is defined as the degree to which a job is central to the person and his or her identity. (Lawler and Hall, 1970) Kanungo (1982) suggested that job- involvement is a cognitive state of psychological identification. Job- involvement depends on need saliency and potential of a job to satisfy those needs. Unlike involvement, engagement involves active use of emotions, cognitions and behaviors. At a casual level, job involvement as a construct clearly occupies a portion of the conceptual space labeled state engagement. Indeed, as indicated earlier, Harter et al. (2002) specifically equated engagement with both satisfaction and involvement. Similarly, building on the work of Lodahl and Kejner (1965), Cooper-Hakim and Viswesvaran (2005) defined job involvement “as the degree to which an employee psychologically relates to his or her job and the work performed therein” and specifically equated job involvement and job commitment. Similarly, in his review and meta-analysis of job involvement, Brown (1996) indicated that a “state of involvement implies a positive and relatively complete state of engagement of core aspects of the self in the job”.

In his review of transformational leadership, Bass (1999) suggested that when the self-worth of the individual is involved, higher levels of involvement to the activity (i.e., job or task commitment as opposed to organizational commitment) follow from increased levels of task engagement because a lack of commitment to the leader’s goals would be dissonant with the
feelings of self-worth that follow from goal attainment. Self-engagement in this context refers to the willingness to invest effort toward task goal attainment. The difference between work as the referent of engagement and the organization as the referent of engagement is critical here, and such a distinction is even more apparent when discussing the relationship between job involvement and engagement. Erickson (2005) described the job as the key antecedent of the state of engagement, so for her, engagement or involvement in the task is critical to overall psychological state engagement. The key referent of engagement here is the job, not the organization. In addition, it follows that the logical consequences of involvement would be with regard to task/job outcomes and not directly to organizational-level outcomes. In this regard, based on a comparison of his meta-analytic results to those of Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) earlier meta-analysis of organizational commitment relationships, Brown (1996) concluded that job involvement is an antecedent of organizational commitment rather than a consequence. He based his conclusion on the fact that the relationship between involvement and various work outcomes is typically weak, yet the relationship between involvement and commitment is quite strong. Brown further concluded that organizational withdrawal decisions are less related to job involvement than to organizational commitment. As was true for the concept of organizational commitment, job involvement is seen in contemporary definitions of engagement as a facet of engagement, a part of engagement but not equivalent to it (Salanova et al., 2005).

Within the broader research literature, Maslach et al. (2001) have proposed that engagement can be characterized by energy, involvement, and efficacy. As others have done (e.g., Brown, 1996), these scholars positioned job engagement as conceptually distinct from organizational commitment because the focus is on work rather than the organization (much as job commitment...
can be regarded as different from organizational commitment) and as different from involvement in that engagement is a broader concept encompassing energy and efficacy.

It seems appropriate to regard Maslach et al.’s and Salanova et al.’s views of job engagement as a broad multidimensional construct encompassing a family of related and more specific constructs focused on individuals’ relationships with their work roles.

According to W.H. Macey and B. Schneider (2008) Job involvement (including task engagement and job commitment) as traditionally conceptualized and assessed is an important facet of the psychological state of engagement.

Review of literature indicates that job-involvement is an integral part of employee engagement but not its complete synonymous, as an employee may be engaged due to reasons beyond one’s job and not merely because of it.

2.6.5 Psychological Empowerment and Employee Engagement.

Empowering individuals could result in higher levels of work satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance (Liden, Wayne and Sparrow, 2000). Several researchers also suggest that empowered employees have a higher level of organizational commitment, as empowered employees tend to be highly concentrated, self-motivated and resilient (Avolio et al. 2004; Kanter 1983; Kraimer, Seibert, and Liden 1999; Spreitzer 1995; Thomas and Velthouse 1990). Empowering conditions, such as opportunities for decision autonomy, challenge, and responsibility make employees appreciate what they have. In turn, such appreciation results in feelings of meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact (Liden, Wayne, and Sparrow
2000). Consequently, they are likely to reciprocate by being more committed to an organization (Avolio et al. 2004; Eisenberger, Fasolo, and Davis-LaMastro 1990). Thus, it is likely that the more employees are empowered, the more highly they are committed to their organization.

Mathieu, Gilson, & Ruddy, (2006) suggested that empowerment is the “experience of authority and responsibility.” Conceptually, empowerment defined in this manner might be considered an antecedent or a condition of engagement, and the reader can see the conceptual slipperiness with which we are dealing. Indeed, any distinction between the state of engagement and psychological empowerment becomes considerably less clear when considering the four-dimensional model suggested by Spreitzer (1995).

These dimensions include meaning (sense of purpose), competence (self-efficacy), feelings of self determination (feelings of control), and impact (belief that one’s efforts can make a difference). These connote a readiness and/or an inclination toward action that fits the perspective of state engagement as energy. Indeed, Spreitzer (1995) articulated the idea that the four cognitions imply an active way of “wishing to” shape one’s work role and context, a meaning clearly aligned with folk conceptualizations of engagement.

In this perspective, the state of feeling empowered, as represented in an orientation towards action, would seem to occupy a portion of the conceptual space we would regard as a state of engagement. Supporting an interpretation of psychological empowerment as engagement, Spreitzer (1995) suggested that outcomes of empowerment include effort, persistence, and initiative. The feelings of empowerment connote an inclination to action vis-à-vis work (feelings
of self-efficacy and control and impact from one’s action) comprise another facet of state engagement.

The theory behind Kahn’s theory of personal engagement (Kahn, 1990) relates to the identification of three psychological conditions that impact on an individual’s engagement, namely psychological meaningfulness, psychological safety, and psychological availability. Psychological meaningfulness refers to ‘a feeling that one is receiving a return on investment of one’s self in a currency of physical, cognitive or emotional energy’ (Kahn, 1990).

Psychological meaningfulness refers to the value of a work goal in relation to the ideals of an individual (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). A lack of meaning in work can lead to apathy and detachment from one’s work (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990) and disengagement (May et al., 2004). Individuals are usually estranged from their selves under these kinds of conditions and restoration of meaning in work is a method of fostering an individual’s motivation and attachment to work (Seeman, 1972). The studies of May et al. (2004) and Olivier and Rothmann (2007) confirmed that psychological meaningfulness is a strong predictor of employee engagement. Joo and Shim (2010)’s study revealed that employees showed higher organizational commitment when they perceived high psychological empowerment and a high organizational learning culture.

*Review of literature revealed that psychological empowerment is a pre-condition of employee engagement.*
2.7 Dimensions of Employee Engagement

2.7.1 Physical Dimension of Employee Engagement

When engaged in a role, people employ and express themselves physically (Kahn, 1990). The physical dimension of engagement is manifested by the exertion of effort in one’s job. This exertion can range from lethargy (low engagement) to vigorous physical and mental effort. One’s physical engagement is thus partly dependent on the contextual or mental and physical requirements of the role. Kahn suggested that physical energies can be allocated to a range of different activities, including on-task, off-task, and self-regulation activities. However, when individuals are engaged in their role, physical energies are directed at the accomplishment of role task.

A conceptualization of the exertion of energies into one’s role that fundamentally captures Kahn’s physical dimension of engagement is that of effort (Campbell & Pritchard, 1976; Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Kanfer, 1990; Naylor, Pritchard, & Ilgen, 1980). Researchers have associated effort with three components - duration (or time commitment), intensity (force, i.e., energy exerted per unit of time), and direction (Campbell & Pritchard, 1976; Kanfer, 1991; Naylor, et al., 1980). Prior research has demonstrated a significant positive relationship between effort, defined as the amount of time a person spends working on an assigned task, and performance (Blau, 1993; Brown & Peterson, 1994; Fisher & Ford, 1998; Katerberg & Blau, 1983). Although these results suggested that effort as time on task leads to performance, this relationship is not as direct or linear as the relationship between effort and engagement. That is,
effort conceptualized as time spent on task fails to completely capture Kahn’s meaning of engagement in one’s role. Instead, effort as time is merely reflective of one’s role presence and not role engagement. Finally, there are practical limitations to measuring the physical dimension of engagement as time on task, as many individuals work a fixed number of hours and therefore their effort or amount of time spent on a task is beyond their control.

Kanfer (1990) proposed a measurement of effort that taps Kahn’s theoretical assumptions concerning the physical dimension of engagement. These researchers measured effort by asking how hard an individual was trying on a task. This method of questioning is reflective of the employees’ intensity level concerning their investment of personal energy into role performance, and thus a more complete indication of their engagement with their role. Research has shown that effort measured as intensity is significantly related to performance (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Rasch & Tosi, 1992; Terborg & Miller, 1978).

**2.7.2 Cognitive Dimension of Employee Engagement**

Kahn (1990) suggested that engagement was manifested by the investment of personal energies into cognitive labors. Previous research has shown that cognitive labors are comprised of two components - attention, the amount of time one spends thinking of role task, and absorption, the level of engrossment or intensity of focus on role task (Gardner et al., 1989; Goffman, 1959, 1961; Kahn, 1990; Rothbard, 2001). As a motivational resource of limited capacity (Kahneman, 1973; Locke & Latham, 1990), an employee’s attention to role task is under the exclusive allocation and control of the individual (March & Olsen, 1976). While working there may be
multiple targets that compete for one’s limited attentional resources, including role task, supervisor, organization, co-workers, or off-work targets such as personal and home life.

According to Rothmann, S., & Rothmann, S. (2010), the needs of businesses to maximise the inputs of employees have also contributed to the interest in engagement. Business needs are driven by intense, often global, competition, which is increasing the need for employees to be emotionally and cognitively committed to their company, their customers and their work.

2.7.3 Affective Dimension of Employee Engagement

As Kahn (1990, 1992) observed, people are engaged in their role when they exhibited behaviors that indicated the investment of personal energies and emotions. Other scholars have suggested that the investment of emotions into one’s role performance exemplified role attachment (Kelman, 1958). According to Kelman, (1958) the highest investment of personal energies into role performance is one that involved the infusion of emotions. At this level, individuals are “fully present” in their task through an emotional connection between themselves and their work. This view is consistent with Kahn (1990), who noted that individuals exhibited engagement in their work roles when emotionally immersed in an activity.

An individual’s emotional experience at work often results from one’s feelings of enthusiasm, pride, and hostility. Prior research on the dominant dimensions of emotional experiences of workers on the job has consistently identified two broad, general factors labelled Positive Affect (PA), and Negative Affect (NA), (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988; Watson, Wiese, Vaidya, &
Tellegen, 1999). Combining pleasantness and energy, Positive Affect is the degree to which an individual feels enthusiastic, active, and involved in the work that he does.

High Positive Affect (PA) is a state of high energy, full concentration, and pleasurable engagement. In contrast, Negative Affect (NA) comprises distress, sluggishness, dullness, and disengagement (Watson & Tellegen, 1985). Rothbard’s (2001) theoretical model of engagement builds on Watson and Tellegen’s (1985) circumplex model of emotion. Although, her results indicated that an individual’s emotions affected the relationships among attention, absorption, and engagement, Rothbard (2001) did not include an emotional dimension in her conceptualization of engagement.

Watson and Tellegen’s (1985) approach to the dimensions of emotions as either Positive Affect or Negative Affect has received criticism from other researchers. This criticism centers around the rotation of factors on the affective circumplex advanced by Russell (1980), Larson and Diener (1992).

Absorption, like attention, has been conceptualized as a motivational affective construct (Locke & Latham, 1990) that resembles flow, the “holistic sensation that people feel when they act with total involvement” (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975). During the flow state, people narrow their attention to specific stimuli, and little conscious control is necessary for their actions. Absorption is distinctly different from flow, in that flow has been conceptualized as a unique, short-term peak experience (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975, 1988, 1989, 1990), whereas Kahn characterized absorption as a pervasive and persistent state of concentration and focus.
Absorption also resembles intrinsic motivation, the desire to take part in an activity for its own sake (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Harackiewicz & Elliot, 1998). Tiegs, Tetrick, and Fried (1992) associated intrinsic work motivation with work content variables “task characteristics,” (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), such as job autonomy, skill variety, task significance, task identity, and job feedback. Absorption is distinctly different from intrinsic motivation, in that intrinsic motivation is task specific and additionally calls for a positive emotional state while absorption is neutral (Rothbard, 2001).

Attention and absorption can be theoretically linked to engagement through self-regulation (Lee, Sheldon, & Turban, 2003), a cognitive process that determines the transformation of motivational force into behavior and performance (Kanfer, 1990). Through this regulation of attention on executive functions, an individual allocates effort across on-task and off-task activities (Kanfer, 1990). For Kahn, engagement was indicated by the attention and absorption the individual exhibited in role activities. Support for the relationship between attention, absorption, and engagement is found in the work of Rothbard (2001) who operationalized engagement as attention devoted to and absorption in work. Her results revealed that engagement was a multidimensional construct, containing both an attention and absorption component. Engaged employees are more committed.

More immediately relevant to state engagement at work, Schaufeli (2008) and his colleagues define engagement as a “persistent, positive affective-motivational state of fulfillment in employees that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (Maslach et al., 2001). From a measurement perspective, questionnaire items (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, &
Bakker, 2002; Schaufeli et al., 2006) tap constructs similar to involvement and satisfaction but with an additional emotional, energetic, or affective tone, suggesting a high degree of overlap with PA: ‘‘I’m enthusiastic about my job’’ and ‘‘I feel happy when I am working intensely.’’ The important considerations for present purposes are (a) the distinct characterization of persistence or stability, if not consistency of experience of that state, and (b) the elevated emotional tone of the state itself (Schaufeli et al., 2002)

State affects or short-term affective reactions are divided into two general categories: moods and emotions. The primary difference between these two state affects is in their intensity, duration, and specificity. Emotions are intense, relatively short-term affective reactions to a specific environmental stimulus (Izard, 1993), while moods are less intense and longer lasting and do not have a specific environmental trigger (Frijda, 1993; Frijda & Mesquita, 1994). Most emotional theories support the link between specific emotions and specific types of behavior (Fredrickson, 1998; Levenson, 1994), such as engagement. Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) suggested that emotions in the work place may be more relevant to job satisfaction than are moods. Emotions vary in their intensity and are an important dimension of engagement, since emotional intensity has been shown to influence cognitive and motivational arousal (Martindale, 1981, 1995; Weiss & Cropanzano 1996).

Past research that has investigated the relationship between positive emotions and individual outcomes has shown that positive emotions widen the scope of attention (Fredrickson & Branigan, 2005), and increase creativity (Isen, Daubman & Nowicki, 1987). In addition, positive emotions have been shown to improve creative problem solving (e.g., Estrada, Young,
& Isen, 1994; Greene & Noice, 1988; Isen, Johnson, Mertz, & Robinson, 1985), and increase a person's ability to organize ideas and access alternative cognitive perspectives (Isen & Geva, 1987; Isen & Means, 1983; Isen, Nygren, & Ashby, 1988; Isen, Rosenzweig, & Young, 1991). Finally, positive emotions also have been shown to facilitate flexible, effective problem solving, good decision making, clear thinking, and accurate evaluations of events (Aspinwall & Taylor, 1997; Estrada, Isen, & Young, 1997; Isen, Johnson, Mertz, & Robinson, 1985; Isen, Shalker, Clark, & Karp, 1978).

Based on these findings, a substantial body of psychological research has shown that a person’s emotions influence job attitudes. The role of emotion is to energize the individual physiologically and to induce appropriate action (Wallbott & Scherer, 1989). The common theme underlying this research is one of integration, in that the individuals’ engagement in their role is not possible without an emotional connection. Thus, the traditional focus of work motivation on behavior and cognitions is limited, since it only addresses part of the individual, his or her hands and mind, but not his or her heart. Emotions are thus a sine qua non of employee engagement.

According to Bakker et al. (2008), research on burnout has stimulated research on employee engagement. Maslach and Leiter (1997) define burnout as ‘an erosion of engagement with the job’. The view of these authors is that employee engagement is characterised by energy, involvement and efficacy (i.e. the direct opposites of exhaustion, cynicism and low professional efficacy, which were identified as the dimensions of burnout). In contradiction to this view, Schaufeli et al. (2002) point out that although engagement is negatively related to burnout.
According to Johnson (2011) a sense of feeling valued and involved is the strongest driver. Organizations need to understand the voice of the employee and be aware of employees' needs, issues, and values. Several key components contribute to feeling valued and involved, including involvement in decision making, ability to voice ideas, opportunities to develop jobs, and the extent to which the organization demonstrates care for its employees.

2.7.4 Behavioral Dimension of Employee Engagement

Theresa Welbourne (2007) asserted that if an organization aspired to improve employee engagement across multiple organizations is to know what it looks like and focus on the behaviors (not just attitudes). She suggested a role-based performance model helps explain employee engagement by starting with the end goal in mind. The objective of all employee engagement initiatives is improved firm performance. The role-based performance model helps identify the types of behaviors needed from employees to drive performance. The model defines five key roles that employees occupy at work - Core job-holder role (what’s in the job description)- Entrepreneur or innovator role (improving process, coming up with new ideas, participating in others’ innovations), Team member role (participating in teams, working with others in different jobs), Career role (learning, engaging in activities to improve personal skills and knowledge) and Organizational member role (citizenship role or doing things that are good for the company) of long-term firm performance of the behaviors of employee engagement. Some researchers have included OCB and related variants (pro social behavior, contextual performance, and organizational spontaneity (Organ, Podsakoff & Mc Kenzie, 2006), role
expansion and the related constructs of proactive behavior (Crant, 2000), and personal initiative in the behavioral dimensions of employee engagement.(Frese & Fay, 2001).

Based on the perspectives of Kahn (1990) and Schaufeli et al. (2002, 2008), it can be concluded that employee engagement comprises three dimensions, namely a physical component (being physically involved in a task and showing vigor and a positive affective state), a cognitive component (being alert at work and experiencing absorption and involvement), and an emotional component (being connected to one’s job/others while working, and showing dedication and commitment).

While several articles have appeared on burnout (which is the antipode of engagement), research on employee engagement has just begun to emerge (Bakker et al., 2008), it is clear that research on employee engagement and the factors associated with it is still not robust.

Rothmann & Rothmann (2011) pointed out that there is a need for research to focus on expectations of employees to be engaged, both organizations and employees to be proactive, committed to high quality performance standards, and to take responsibility for their development.

*Review of literature suggests that depiction of vigor, dedication and absorption at work by employees are manifestations of physical, cognitive, affective and behavioral dimensions of employee engagement.*
2.8 Antecedents of Employee Engagement

Various researchers and consulting organizations have identified different factors as building blocks of Employee engagement. A Hewitt Survey in 2003 identified ten factors which lead to an employee feeling valued and involved and thereby leading to engagement. The predominant feature of this model is based on a survey that recognizes factors at work, individual factors and work-life factors as contributors to employee engagement. Hewitt Associates (Ray Baumruk, 2006) has worked with 2000 companies representing four million employees and have identified key drivers of engagement – employee relations, total rewards, career opportunities, quality of work life, HR practices & actual work itself. They have focused on 5 steps which managers can take up to facilitate employee engagement – Coaching & Career Support, Recognition, Accountability, Involvement and Communication.

Bakker et al. (2008) regard job and personal resources as important factors associated with employee engagement. Therefore most of the research on engagement as an experience of work activity has utilized the Job Demands-Resources (JDR) model (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner & Schaufeli, 2001; Hakanen et al., 2008), and the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989, 1998) to study the factors associated with employee engagement.

The JD-R model assumes that although every occupation may have specific work characteristics associated with well-being, it is possible to model these characteristics in two broad categories, namely job demands and job resources (Demerouti et al., 2001). Job demands refer to those physical, psychological, social or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical
and/or psychological effort, and that are therefore associated with certain physiological and/or psychological costs (e.g. work pressure, role overload and emotional demands). Job resources refer to those physical, psychological, social or organizational aspects of the job that may be functional in achieving work goals, reducing job demands and stimulating personal growth and development. Resources may be located at the level of the organization (e.g. salary, career opportunities, job security), interpersonal and social relations (e.g. supervisor support, coworker support and team climate), the organization of work (e.g. role clarity and participation in decision making), and the level of the task (e.g. performance feedback, skill variety, task significance, task identity and autonomy). These are labeled as drivers of employee engagement.

Kieron Shaw (2005) points out that although many organizations have an engagement “vision,” few have broken this down into clear goals, objectives and behaviours. They often fail to communicate clearly what the few key outcomes of an engagement program should be. An engagement strategy-setting process should include defining engagement, clarifying goals, qualifying outcomes, determining drivers, measuring and acting.

Peter Cheese (2005) has focused on analysis of data collected from 2400 employees & 240 HR executives from 26 organizations through a new measurement tool – The Accenture Human Capital Development framework which revealed that organizations with most engaged employees have built a culture that fosters motivation, commitment and passion for work. Variables like recognizing & rewarding performance, establishing a learning environment, creating knowledge sharing communities and managing the culture of change facilitate employee engagement.
The Conference Board, a prestigious non-profit business membership and research organization in USA (2006) identified key drivers as trust and integrity, nature and content of the job, career growth, co-workers/ team members and development of employee’s skills.

Woodruffle (2006) has suggested ten ways to engage employees. He has given special emphasis on non-financial motivators like advancement, autonomy, civilized treatment, employer commitment, environment, exposure to senior people, awarding of due praise, availability of support, feeling of being challenged, feeling of being trusted, feeling of working for a good and reliable organization, feeling of working on useful assignments and respecting work/life balance.

Gerard H. Seijts and Dan Crim (2006) state that it is imperative for leaders to identify the level of engagement in their organization and implement behavioral strategies that will facilitate full engagement. They have summarized ten C’s of Employee Engagement and suggested what leaders can do show that they value employees engage them. Leaders should provide challenging and meaningful work with opportunities for career advancement. They opine that providing career growth and job enrichment opportunities certainly benefit. Instilling confidence of employees in their own abilities and resources to achieve success can help in increasing employee engagement. Leaders must communicate a clear vision which will enable employees to understand what the organization’s goals are, why they are important, and how the goals can best be attained. Clarity about what the organization stands for, what it wants to achieve, and how people can contribute to the organization’s success is not always evident. Good leaders clarify their expectations about employees and provide feedback on their functioning in the organization. They establish processes and procedures that help people master important tasks
and facilitate goal achievement. They assert that good leaders congratulate liberally by showering praise and recognition whenever necessary. People want to know that their input matters and that they are contributing to the organization’s success in a meaningful way. Employee’s value control over the flow and pace of their jobs and leaders can create opportunities for employees to exercise this control. Studies show that, when employees work in teams and have the trust and cooperation of their team members, they outperform individuals and teams which lack good relationships. Great leaders are team builders who create an environment that fosters trust and collaboration. Leaders should strive to maintain a company’s reputation and demonstrate high ethical standards. People want to be proud of their jobs, their performance, and their organization. Good leaders help create confidence in a company by being exemplars of high ethical and performance standards.

Gerard H. Seijts and Dan Crim (2006) have also opined that if leaders actively try to identify the levels of engagement in their organization, find the reasons behind the lack of full engagement, strive to eliminate those reasons and implement behavioral strategies that will facilitate full engagement. They assert though that if these efforts should be ongoing, employee engagement will be easy to achieve.

According to Penna research report (2007) meaning at work has the potential to be valuable way of bringing employers and employees closer together to the benefit of both where employees experience a sense of community, the space to be themselves and the opportunity to make a contribution, they find meaning. Employees want to work in the organizations in which they find meaning at work. Penna (2007) researchers have also come up with a new model they called
“Hierarchy of engagement” which resembles Maslow’s need hierarchy model. In the bottom line there are basic needs of pay and benefits. Once an employee satisfied these needs, then the employee looks to development opportunities, the possibility for promotion and then leadership style will be introduced to the mix in the model. Finally, when all the above cited lower level aspirations have been satisfied the employee looks to an alignment of value-meaning, which is displayed by a true sense of connection, a common purpose and a shared sense of meaning at work.

Rothmann and Pieterse (2007) studied the relationship between job resources and employee engagement and found that growth opportunities in the job (i.e. variety, learning opportunities and autonomy) best predicted employee engagement. Rothmann and Joubert (2007) found that organizational support and growth opportunities in the job were strong predictors of employee engagement in the mining industry. High job resources, such as social support and feedback, may reduce the effects of job demands (Demerouti et al., 2001).

Five steps to employee engagement (Pasquale Mazzonna- Hamitton Davenport Partners July, 2007) can include clearing expectations regarding the job, career advancing, learning and development opportunities, regular feedback, perception of values, missions and vision and quality of working relations.

According to Upasana Agarwal et. al. (2007), employee-employer relationships influence the economic as well as the behavioral outcomes of an organization. HR practices are a part of high performing organizations but organizations with similar HR practices & employee skills vary in
their outcomes because of employee engagement. The authors have mentioned that antecedents of employee engagement are in the nascent stage and have not been identified fully. Lack of engagement is endemic and is causing large and small organizations all over the world to incur excess costs, under perform on critical tasks, and create widespread customer dissatisfaction (Rampersad, 2008).

According to B Medlin et.al. (2008), there is a relationship between goal-setting, optimism, and engagement and the impact on individual employee performance. Results indicate that organizations that feature formal, structured goal-setting processes leads to higher levels of employee engagement. Higher levels of employee engagement lead to increased employee optimism. Strong workplace optimism in turn leads to improved employee performance.

Blessing White’s Engagement Model (2008) focuses both on individual contributions to the organization’s success as well as personal contribution that he derives from his role. It identifies alignment of the organization’s goal with those of the employee’s values and aspirations as drivers of employee engagement. They view engaged employees as ‘enthused’ and ‘in gear” using their talents to make a difference in their employee’s quest for sustainable business success.

David Zinger (2009) has outlined a framework comprising of organizational inputs, leadership inputs and individual inputs of an employee for creating and fostering engagement. According to him the organization can contribute significantly by ascertaining the pulse of employees, creating a culture where employees are valued, trusted and recognized, top management are committed to
engaging employees, treat high performing employees differently and educating managers to leverage on their roles to enhance engagement. Zinger (2009) spells out that leaders should first engage themselves, listen actively, strengthen subordinates and find the simplest and significant ways for engaging employees. Finally employees need to focus on their contribution, be responsible and accountable, master personal energy and take their organization to greater heights.

According to Taylor (The Towers Perrin Global Workforce Study: Closing the Engagement Gap: A Road Map for Driving Superior Business Performance,” 2008, accessed on Dec 8th, 2011, from http://www.towersperrin.com/) there are 10 critical leadership capabilities that are essential to engaging employees are building trust, building esteem, communicating effectively, building an enjoyable and fulfilling work environment, being flexible in understanding individual needs, developing talent and coaching team members, reinforcing high levels of performance, engaging necessary knowledge, monitoring engagement issues and identifying appropriate team members for the team.

A study undertaken by Sarkar (2011) on employee engagement practices in the manufacturing sector revealed that rigorous training and development, idea collection schemes, monthly update on corporate goals and directions, providing growth opportunities, showing employees that you care about them are positive facilitators of engagement of employees.

As reflected in the review of extant literature there are several individual and organizational drivers which can act as antecedents and facilitate employee engagement. But despite the
presence of these drivers the extent and type of employee engagement may differ among employees in organizations.

2.9 Categories of Engaged Employee

Gallup has comprehensively identified 12 questions that most effectively measure the same. They have undertaken employee engagement surveys for several client organizations. They categorize employees into 3 different types -

Engaged--"Engaged" employees are builders. They want to know the desired expectations for their role so they can meet and exceed them. They're naturally curious about their company and their place in it. They perform at consistently high levels. They want to use their talents and strengths at work every day. They work with passion and they drive innovation and move their organization forward.

Not Engaged--“Not-engaged” employees tend to concentrate on tasks rather than the goals and outcomes they are expected to accomplish. They want to be told what to do just so they can do it and say they have finished. They focus on accomplishing tasks vs. achieving an outcome. Employees who are not-engaged tend to feel their contributions are being overlooked, and their potential is not being tapped. They often feel this way because they don't have productive relationships with their managers or with their coworkers.
**Actively Disengaged**—The "actively disengaged" employees are the "cave dwellers." They're "Consistently against Virtually Everything." They're not just unhappy at work; they're busy acting out their unhappiness. They sow seeds of negativity at every opportunity. Every day, actively disengaged workers undermine what their engaged coworkers accomplish. As workers increasingly rely on each other to generate products and services, the problems and tensions that are fostered by actively disengaged workers can cause great damage to an organization's functioning.

Blessing White Survey to measure the engagement practices in 2008 through interviews with HR and line leaders as well as online survey responses of 7,508 individuals from India, Southeast Asia, Australia, New Zealand, and China used an index that contained the items that reflect the two axes of **contribution and satisfaction**. By plotting a given population against the two axes, the study identified 5 distinct employee segments

**THE ENGAGED: HIGH CONTRIBUTION AND HIGH SATISFACTION** - These employees are at “the apex” where personal and organizational interests align. They contribute fully to the organization and find great satisfaction in their work. They are known for their discretionary efforts and commitment. Organizations need to keep them engaged because they can transition any time over to any of the three other segments, a move that would likely impact workforce morale and the bottom line.

**ALMOST ENGAGED: MEDIUM TO HIGH CONTRIBUTION AND SATISFACTION** - A critical group, these employees are among the high performers and are reasonably satisfied.
They may have consistent ‘great days at work’ but they know what these days look like. Organizations should invest in them for 2 reasons: they are highly employable and may be lured to greener pastures and they have the shortest distance to travel towards full engagement ensuring the highest pay off.

HONEYMOONERS AND HAMSTERS: MEDIUM TO HIGH SATISFACTION BUT LOW CONTRIBUTION - Honeymooners are new to the organization or their role- and are happy to be there. They are yet to find their stride or clearly understand how they can best attribute. It should be a priority to move them out of this temporary holding area to full alignment and productivity. Hamsters may be working hard but are in effect spinning their wheels, working on non essential tasks, contributing little to the success of the organization. Some may even be hiding out, curled up in their cedar shavings, content with their position. If organizations do not deal with them, other employees may resent or have to pick up the slack.

CRASH AND BURNERS: MEDIUM TO HIGH CONTRIBUTION BUT LOW SATISFACTION - Disillusioned and potentially exhausted, these employees are top producers who aren’t achieving their personal definition of success and satisfaction. They can be bitterly vocal that senior leaders are making bad decisions or colleagues are not pulling their weight. If left alone, they are likely to slip down the contribution scale to become disengaged, often bringing down those around them. They may leave, but they are more likely to take a breather and work less hard.
THE DISENGAGED: LOW TO MEDIUM SATISFACTION AND CONTRIBUTION-

Most disengaged employees don’t start out as bad apples. They still may not be. They are the most disconnected from organizational priorities, often feel underutilized and are clearly not getting what they need from their work. They are likely to be skeptical and can indulge in contagious negativity. If left alone, the disengaged are likely to collect a pay-cheque while complaining or looking out for a new job. If they can’t be coached or aligned to higher levels of engagement, their exit benefits everyone, including them.

Rothmann & Rothmann (2011) have pointed out that research is needed on ways not only to promote employee engagement, but also on interventions that will be effective in preventing distress and burnout in engaged employees.

*This study hence focuses on the role and impact of organizational antecedents like organizational culture and communication on promoting employee engagement.*

**2.10 Meaning of Organizational Culture**

The term ‘culture’ has different meanings and connotations for different researchers. For example, Kroeber et al (1952) compiled a list of 164 definitions of "culture" from literature. While its presence in sociology and anthropology is ubiquitous and almost as old as the disciplines themselves, the introduction of ‘organizational culture’ to the field of organizational studies is generally credited to Pettigrew in 1979 (Detert et al, 2000). Since then, researchers have grappled with questions from what is culture, who shares it, how did it come to be, what is
it composed of, how are its parts structured, how it works, conditions for culture to exist, 
conditions for culture to affect organizational efficiency as well as other organizational variables; 
to why and how do we change culture, in what way can culture contribute to controlling an 
organization, how can we measure culture, in what terms can we describe culture, the cultural 
change and the cultural difference in various contexts like national, occupational, positional, 
industry, firm, and its subunits, cross-cultural management in multinationals, mergers and 
alliances and cultural conflicts.

Broadly, two schools of thought exist about organizational culture whether it represents 
something an organization ‘is’ or ‘has’. Accordingly, researchers have analyzed the concept of 
Organizational Culture, both as a root metaphor, i.e. organizations as expressive forms, and 
manifestations of human consciousness (Cameron 1999; Smircich, 1983); and as an attribute, 
i.e. possessed by an organization and observable; and even property (Linstead, 2001). This is 
because some researchers are concerned by what appears to them to be more fundamental issues 
of meaning and the processes by which organizational life is possible which is in line with the 
view that an organization ‘is’ culture; while others give high priority to the principles of 
prediction, generalizability, causality, and control drawing from the view that an organization 
‘has’ culture (Smircich, 1983). Both approaches share the conception of organizations as 
organisms; existing within an environment that presents imperatives for behavior. However, 
literature is less sanguine about the reciprocal evolution of culture through behavior. Further, 
culture has been generally accepted to be a phenomenon which is enduring and relatively stable, 
which is why organizations across the world need external change agents to affect the cultural 
change intervention.
2.11 Conceptualization of Organizational Culture

Culture in the early 1980s was about explaining the concept, and often prescribed methods for studying and diagnosing culture; while later research was concerned with a more utilitarian approach and asked questions such as “what use may be made of the gained information?” (Hofstede, 1986). A new line of enquiry began around 1987 about the effects of culture on an organization’s performance (Arogyaswamy and Byles, Brown, 1992; 1987; Croft, 1990; Lewis, 1994; Nicholson et al., 1990; Petrock, 1990; Saffold, 1988; Sherwood, 1988; Van Donk and Sanders, 1993; Whipp et al., 1989); and whether and how culture can be changed to increase organizational effectiveness (Bettinger, 1989; Critchley, 1993; Fitzgerald, 1988; Hayes and Lemon, 1990; Poupart and Hobbs, 1989; Saraph and Sebastian, 1993; Smith et al., 1994). The perceived importance of culture that it has become one of the few organizational constructs that crosses traditional disciplinary divides. Evidence of this can be found in the range of organizational disciplines that have adopted the concept. For example, culture has been employed extensively in theorising in marketing (Jung, 2003), organizational behaviour (Lund, 2003), accounting and finance, operations management, psychology and international management.

2.12 Definitions of Organizational Culture

Pettigrew, in 1979 defined ‘culture’ as the system of publicly and collectively accepted meanings operating for a given group at a given time, an important practical consideration in an extended
stream of time, events, people, and processes with an example of sequence of social dramas where in each drama provided a clear point of data collection. The research on organizational culture is diverse and expansive (Campbell, 2004). Organizational culture is a set of assumptions, beliefs, and values (Kowalczyk & Pawlish, 2002; O’Reilly et al., 1991; Putz, 1991; Yousef, 1998).

Culture is also a shared understanding of feelings and experiences by its organization’s members (Canessa & Riolo, 2003). Values and beliefs, which are the building blocks of an organization’s culture, consist of symbols, communications scripts, events, myths, and ways of doing things (Chattopadhay, 1991). Culture is also the glue that keeps an organization together (Bass, 1981); it has also been considered an organizational social construct (Hofstede et al., 1990). O’Reilly (1989) classified culture as control measures and normative orders that include accepted attitudes, behaviors, risk-taking, rewards for change, receptiveness, mutually accepted goals, autonomy, and the shared belief that organizational action is required. Organizational culture is an organizational not an individual term (Hofstede, 1990). Group experiences in established organizations develop into organizational cultures (Camessa & Riolo, 2003; Cooke & Rousseau, 1988; Strasser, Smits, Falconer, Herrin, & Bowen, 2002).

Organizations also tend to have similar cultures in relatively homogenous business units and organizational types, with similar sizes, levels of technology, and configurations (O’Reilly et al, 1991; Webster, 2004). It has thus been determined that an organization’s culture has been influenced by both internal and external factors (Webster, 2004).Culture has been historically moulded (Hofstede et al., 1990) and deeply ingrained in an organization and as a result is
difficult to change (Atchison, 2002; Drucker, 1995; Hofstede et al., 1990; Narine & Persaud, 2003; Taylor, 2003).

Culture influences the communication skills and decision-making processes of the organization’s members and affects its credibility (Cooke & Rousseau, 1988; Fisher, 2000; Mycek, 2000). Organizational culture also shapes the organization’s level of socialization and learning (Cooke & Rousseau, 1988).

Williams’ (1980) theoretical model is based on an assumption of society being in a state of constant cultural change and negotiation. In any particular period there is a central, effective, and dominant system of meanings and values which are not merely abstract but which are “organized and lived”. Hofstede (1980) published a cross-cultural report exploring the differences in thinking and social action that exist between members of 40 countries between 1968 and 1972 and called it ‘national culture’. He argued that people carry mental programs developed early in the family during early childhood and reinforced in schools and organizations, and they contain a component of national culture.

Though providing a starting point for understanding national cultures, the study has come under criticism for using a comparative logic in a heterogeneous setting at a time when quantitative comparisons of organizational cultures within a single cultural context were seen as unfounded (Denison, 1996). When Schein (1983) emphasized the role of the founder and stated that organizational culture will always reflect the complex interaction between the assumptions and theories that founders bring to the group initially and what the group learns subsequently from its
own experiences, it also explained the importance of time and dynamics of change, of how the values came initially from the founder and, as the group learned while experimenting with behaviors over a period of time, culture was developed.

Paul Reynolds (1986) adopted a more utilitarian perspective and argued that statements about organizational culture should reflect differences related to industries, technical or task requirements and that to expect the same cultural systems to foster success in all industries seems inaccurate.

Meyerson (1987) identified three perspectives of organizational culture research: ‘integration’, ‘differentiation’ and ‘fragmentation’. The integrationist perspective positions culture as an integrating mechanism, the normative glue; differentiation emphasizes that different groups in organization embrace different and even incompatible beliefs, values and assumptions; fragmentation perspective acknowledges that ambiguity is an inevitable aspect of organizational life and organizational situations exist in which it is not appropriate to identify consistency of values and basic assumptions.

Marcoulides (1993) proposed a new model wherein organizational culture is hypothesized to consist of three interrelated dimensions: a socio-cultural system of the perceived functioning of the organization's strategies and practices, an organizational value system, and the collective beliefs of the individuals working within the organization, possibly explaining why some organizations are not performing at desired levels of productivity.
Detert et al (2000) presented another synthesis on organizational culture in terms of eight dimensions of organizational culture, on the basis of truth and rationality in the organization, the nature of time and time horizon, motivation, stability, change, innovation, personal growth, orientation to work, task, and co-workers, isolation vs. collaboration, and responsibility and orientation and focus-internal and/or external and how these dimensions corresponded to the values and beliefs of TQM.

Daymon (2000) applied a multi-perspective analytical framework to explore organization members’ experiences as they adjusted to, and strove to shape, working life in a new set up.

Van den Berg and Wilderom (2004) definition is based on experiences with ten studies in which organisational cultures were measured quantitatively (Wilderom, Van den Berg, Glunk, & Maslowski, 2001). They have defined organizational culture as shared perceptions of organizational work practices within organizational units that may differ from other organizational units. Organizational work practices are the central part of their definition. The definition is a shortened version of Kostova’s (1999). They assert organizational culture as “particular ways of conducting organizational functions that have evolved over time . . . [These] practices reflect the shared knowledge and competence of the organization.”

Kowalczyk & Pawlish (2002) correlated the importance of culture to an organization’s competitive advantage, adaptability, and level of innovation. It has been further noted that the culture of an organization may affect organizational system operations, productivity, leadership actions (Shaw, 2002; Taylor, 2002), performance (Cameron & Quinn, 1999), and organizational effectiveness (Parry, 2000; Valentino, 2004). Research has shown that culture has influenced
employees’ commitment (Lok & Crawford, 1999; Mycek, 2000; O’Reilly, 1989; Parry, 2000; Putz, 1991; Webster, 2004) and behaviors (Atchison, 2002; Cooke & Rousseau, 1988).

Zheng et al (2009) in a recent framework propose that as the organization goes through its life stages of start-up, growth, maturity, and revival, organizational culture evolves through corresponding mechanisms of inspiration, implantation, negotiation, and transformation. This framework also contributes to the literature on the dynamic view of culture and suggests that human resource development professionals need to be perceptive of the life stages of their organizations and intentionally leverage different cultural mechanisms to respond to critical organizational needs.

*Hence after reviewing the wide array of definitions on organizational culture which have evolved over time, we may conclude that it refers to practices and values which affect the way employees think, act and behave in an organization.*

### 2.13 Dimensions of Organizational Culture

Numerous versions and descriptions of organizational culture exist in the literature. In the organizational culture literature, there are many earlier generation studies that have produced a multitude of different constructs and a diversity of dimensions. (Morrison et al., 2006) The factors that define types of organizations culture are consistent and effective when aligned with the organization’s needs and preferences (O’Reilly et al., 1991; Wallach, 1983). Culture, as measured by O’Reilly et al. (1991), consists of eight factor structures. They defined the factors as
innovation, attention to detail, outcomes, aggressiveness, and supportiveness, emphasis on rewards, team orientation, and decisiveness. Chatman & Jehn (1994) deviated slightly from the definition of these factors by including innovation, stability, respect for people, orientation to outcomes, and attention to detail, team orientation, and aggressiveness.

Other descriptions of organizational culture defined by Testa, Mueller, and Thomas (2003) include independent dimensions such as internal versus external focus, and structural control versus flexibility. Fisher (2000) defined three dimensions of culture: comfort, which he defined as being paternalistic toward its members; complacency, in which employees are dependent on the organization for their total well being; and contribution, where employees are committed to excellence, chaos, and accepted change.

Van der Post, et al. (1997) started with 114 dimensions from previous studies and consolidated these into a fifteen dimensional framework through peer panel consultation and subsequent empirical testing. Ashkanasy, Broadfoot and Falkus (2000) developed a ten dimensional Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) instrument from eighteen previous surveys. Delobbe, Haccoun and Vandenberghhe (2002) started with 266 items based on analysing the dimensions of several existing frameworks and, through empirical testing and factor analysis ended with a nine factor framework. Xenikou and Funham (1996) combined the items of four organizational culture questionnaires in random sequence and, through empirical testing and factor analysis extracted five dimensions. Detert, Schroeder and Mauriel (2000) used a peer-assisted process to review the dimensions found in previous studies in order to conceptually propose a set of eight dimensions of organisational culture considered to be conducive to Total Quality Management.
Jaworski and Kohli (1993) defined a set of dimensions to study the top management beliefs and structural arrangements that could be seen as organizational antecedents to an effective marketing orientation.

Cameron (1998) in turn defined five dimensions of culture: (a) clan, which includes a concern for people and sensitivity to consumers; (b) hierarchy; (c) market-supported stability and control; (d) adhocracy, defined as flexibility; and (e) individualism.

Wallach (1983) noted three primary organizational cultures: (a) bureaucratic, which are hierarchical and compartmentalized; (b) innovative, which are exciting and dynamic; and (c) supportive, which are warm and humanistic.

Hofstede et al. (1990) in turn defined six opposing factors to describe organizational cultural differences: (a) process versus results oriented, (b) employee versus job oriented, (c) parochial versus professional, (d) open versus closed systems, (e) loose versus tight controls, and (f) normative versus pragmatic. In addition, Harrison (1972) defined four cultural types: power, role, people, and tasks.

Both Cooke and Rousseau (1988) and O’Reilly (1991) identified organizational culture in terms of direction and intensity (Cooke & Rousseau, 1988; O’Reilly, 1991). In contrast to O’Reilly et al. (1991), Bass and Avolio (1993) defined two levels of organizational culture: transformational and transactional. In defining these cultural styles, they noted that transactional cultures focus on behaviors and norms that implicitly define contractual relationships. Within the transactional culture, work responsibilities are a condition of employment. They defined transformational
cultures as environments where there is a general sense of purpose, family, and commitment. In this type of organizational culture, leaders and employees both share interests and a mission. Other researchers offered similar constructs while using different terminology from Bass and Avolio for classifying cultures. Their definitions of cultural styles include organic versus mechanistic and corporate soul versus rewards, which appear to mirror the same constructs of transactional and transformational respectively.

Kanter (1983) also used similar terminology when classifying culture. He has written about innovation, team building and participation, the promotion of change and transformation, faith in the leader’s direction, and effective crisis management to ensure the development of an effective organizational culture.

Cooke and Rousseau’s (1988) research also noted two contrasting styles at opposite ends of the spectrum. They defined one end as an organization committed to innovation, adaptability to change, teamwork, and personal development, while having a strong sense of vision. The other extreme emphasizes the status quo, task-oriented behaviors, supervision with limited rewards for innovation, and punishment for assuming risk-taking behaviors. These cultural extremes match the transformational and transactional definitions of Bass and Avolio (1993) respectively, which they note are at opposite ends of the spectrum.

Schein (1985) defined three levels of organizational culture: artifacts as level one, values, and beliefs as level two, and basic organizational assumptions as level three. Schein (1996) later redefined the classifications as (a) an operator culture, which is an internal culture based upon its operational success; (b) an engineering culture, based upon its designers who manage core
technologies; and (c) executive culture, based upon the belief and actions of the organization’s executive management team. Schein (1996) defined the engineering and executive cultures as predominantly transactional in nature, relying on rewards, control, and monitors. He noted that operational cultures often have an innovative component with transformational characteristics. Schein (1996) further noted that transformational properties are difficult to sustain if not supported by the executive leadership and its related culture.

Van den Berg and Wilderom (2004) dimensions of organizational proposed a comprehensive set of distinct dimensions- autonomy, external orientation, interdepartmental coordination, human resource orientation, and improvement orientation, which are based on behavior and practices of the organization.

Jung and Takeuchi (2011) have also asserted that organizational culture dimensions get reflected through its practices and human resource orientation.

2.14 Factors that influence the choice of Organizational Culture

Numerous factors influence an organization’s cultural characteristics. These include both internal and external factors (Comack, Brady, & Porter-O’Grady, 1997). These influences drive the need to change, as well as to adopt and support creative processes. Comack et al. (1997) believed that those influences could affect both interactions between leaders and employees, as well as the organization’s identity and purpose. The employee accepts the type of culture only when the leader is able to communicate effectively an organizational vision and to demonstrate trust.
(Bennis, 1999; Comack et al., 1997). Bennis (1999) noted that the leader’s decision-making style influences the type of organizational culture. Transformational decision-making directed toward organizational goals and vision stands in contrast to transactional decision making that meets individual needs.

The leader’s values and leadership style shape an organizational culture through the influence of daily practices, tasks, and behaviors (Hofstede et al., 1990; Sengupta, 2004). O’Reilly et al. (1991) argued that individual leadership motivations might also influence culture styles. A leader with a preference for aggressiveness and outcomes may be stimulated to develop an innovative form of culture. Other factors influencing the type of organizational culture include correlations between organizational cultural styles and type of industry tasks (Chatman & Jehn, 1994; O’Reilly, 1989) technology and growth rates (Chatman & Jehn, 1994; O’Reilly, 1989), and nationality, number of employees, business size, organizational structure (hierarchy), and control systems (Hofstede et al., 1990).

Different organizational constraints bound public and private service-based organizations, which in turn drive different cultures (Parry, 2000). Hofstede et al. (1990) identified values and behaviors shared by specific occupations that may influence culture. They also implied that service-based industries should cater more to people than to outcomes, thereby influencing the adoption of one style over another.

O’Reilly (1989) implied that high growth industries foster the creation of an innovative culture. Chatman and Jehn (1994) noted that opportunities for growth might promote innovation and a
flexible culture. They also suggested that those who require repetitive and predictable outcomes might require strong orientation to detail, reliability, and stability, along with strong control influences. These studies have also tended to demonstrate the influence of various organizational demographics on the type of culture embraced by an organization.

Al-Swidi & Mahmood (2011) recent study undertaken on the banking sector in Pakistan revealed that organizational culture evolves due to the dynamic interaction of variables within and outside the organization. As the interplay of these variables changes so does the organizational culture.

2.15 Impact of Organizational Culture on Organizational Effectiveness

There have been past studies revealing linkages of culture with performance and productivity (Gordon, 1991; Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Gotwan et al, 1992; Brown, 1992). Levels of culture, industry effects, competitive environment and customer requirements have also been analyzed.

Gordon (1991) developed the argument that organizational or corporate culture is strongly influenced by the characteristics of the industry in which the company operates. Within an industry, firms share the industry driven cultural elements which are influenced by industry characteristics and are based on assumptions about the competitive environment, customer requirements and societal expectations.
Kotter & Heskett (1992) conducted a number of related studies using 207 firms, over a five year period to examine the relationship of strong culture and performance and found only a modest correlation. However, firms with cultures suited to their market environment performed better. Gotwan et al(1992) demonstrated using data, from management surveys of 11 US insurance companies in 1981 that both a strong culture regardless of content and a substantive value placed on adaptability are associated with better performance for two to three subsequent years on two criterion measures of asset and premium growth rates from 1982 to 1987. The results support the findings of Denison (1990) that strength of culture is predictive of short-term performance.

Brown (1992) suggested that all three levels of organization’s culture (basic assumptions, values and beliefs and visible artifacts; as by Schein, 1984) are extremely powerful determinants of organizational life, and are intuitively incorporated into the actions of skilled executives who use them to manage people, formulate strategy and induce organizational change. Zammuto et al (1992) examined roles that organization design and culture play in the varying levels of success experienced by advanced manufacturing technology adopting organizations. Kale et al (1992) provide a conceptual framework within which cross-national personal selling interactions can be studied, evaluated and integrated suggesting that the degree of congruence in organizational cultures will affect the level of buyer-seller compatibility and outcome of sale interaction.

Gordon (1999) builds on the proposition that industry demands induce certain cultural characteristics, observed as consistent and widespread practices which are necessary for survival, but that these are not sufficient for superior performance. Empirical evidence was provided that industry membership, even at a crude level, is associated with certain aspects of a suitable
culture as seen in practices, and that these practices are related to a firm’s revenue growth within this broadly defined industry. One of the key challenges in research of the organizational culture and effectiveness (C-E) link relates to the establishment of a theoretical base for explaining the assumed relationships (Wilderom et al., 2000). In such C-E studies, most of the ideas about the relationship between culture and effectiveness have attributed the success of organizations to some combinations of values, beliefs and practices at the core of an organization’s social system. Such attributions imply the link without indicating the mechanism of how organizational Culture provides the framework for interpreting the interactive, ongoing, recreative aspects of organizations, beyond the merely rational or economic. In order to substantiate the assumed link, the operating mechanism of organizational culture on behavior has to be understood in order to further its link to (effective) behavioral outcome.

In the study of behavior, the traditional S-O-R (stimulus–organism–response) paradigm (Naylor et al., 1980) to model the process of acts– product–outcome has been applied by Liu and Walker (1998) in the modeling of the construction procurement process in terms of the B-P-O (behavior–performance–outcome) cycle. The B-P-O cycle assumes that the basic conscious actions of the individual are the actions of choice, i.e. judgment and decision making which are influenced by norms and acceptable practices. Culture affects our choices of actions and the way we behave through (culturally bound) values and beliefs. Behavior leads to performance, i.e., performance is determined by ability and behavior, where Performance (ability motivation), and Ability aptitude (training+experience)] (Vroom, 1964, 1995).
Performance is also defined as an aggregate of behaviours over time, tasks or people (Mitchell, 1983). As such, performance is always linked with behavior and is assessed by its outcome, hence the B-P-O cycle and motivation keeps the persons engaged in certain behaviours which would lead to the desired performance.

Behavior is a response to stimulus in the S-O-R paradigm in psychology, which assumes that an individual is inactive until acted upon by some stimuli, i.e. the stimuli cause the acts. However, Atkinson (1982) argues that individuals are active before being exposed to stimuli, i.e. individuals are actively motivated to do many different things before exposure to a particular stimulus situation. Atkinson and Birch (1970) conceive the impact of the immediate environment (or stimulus situation) on behavior to be the various instigating and inhibitory forces it produces and these influence the arousal of the individual’s tendencies to engage or not to engage in certain activities, i.e., the individual’s choice of behaviours is a response to the stimulus.

According to Rumelhart (1984), knowledge about any stimulus can be schematized and, therefore, individuals can have at their disposal many schemas that direct their behaviours. Harris (1996) argues that organization-context-specific schemas are most relevant to understanding organizational culture, since social knowledge is generally contextually bound.

Culture scholars also stress human motivation from the perspective of culture. However, to assume that individuals are endowed with a fixed set of needs and that a social institution is there to satisfy them commits a fallacy of abstract individualism and yet to assume that culture is unproblematically internalized is to ‘over socialize’ the individual and oversimplify the process.
by which a person actively appropriates socially shared meaning (Kashima, 1997). Strauss (1992) argues, in a broader sense, that human motivation is ‘the product of interaction between events and things in the social world and interpretations of those events and things in peoples’ psyches’. Therefore, the individual’s choice of behaviours is related to his/her schema and such schema are culture-embedded.

Schema theory based on a detailed review of the social cognition literature, Markus and Zajonc (1985) conclude that schema theory is the most useful and pervasive perspective on the mechanics of social cognition. While there are many definitions of schema, the definition offered by Marshall (1995) might be the most comprehensive: A schema is a vehicle of memory, allowing organization of an individual’s similar experiences in such a way that the individual can easily recognize additional experiences that are also similar, discriminating between these and ones that are dissimilar; can assess a generic framework that contains the essential elements of all these similar experiences, including verbal and nonverbal components; can draw inferences, make estimates, create goals, and develop plans using the framework; and can utilize skills, procedures, or rules as needed when faced with a problem for which this particular framework is relevant.

As implied from the above definition, schemas serve as mental maps which enable individuals to orient themselves within their experimental terrain and guide interpretation of the past and present, as well as expectation for the future (Harris, 1996).

As schemas incorporate more and more new information, they become expanded and increasingly elaborate (Lord and Foti, 1986; Fiske and Taylor, 1991; Harris, 1996). Self schema
(built up of the individual’s perceived needs, values, ability, roles and expectancy) interact with schema from other organizational members, which together contribute to a culture schema built up of values and practices held by the organization. Hence, schema theory suggests very important implications for expanding our understanding of the role of organizational culture in guiding sense making and behavior of employees in organizations.

Motivation theories suggest that people perform goal directed acts to satisfy their needs. As individuals draw inferences and create goals, they are relying on their schemas (D’Andrade, 1992). Given all human conscious behaviours are motivated by their needs and goals (Newstorm and Davis, 1993), individuals tend to evaluate their performance against the attainment levels of such goals and the satisfaction levels of their needs as the effectiveness of their behavioural outcomes. In an organization, rewards are basically classified in two categories: extrinsic rewards and intrinsic rewards (Robbins, 1996). However, the satisfaction of the employee is also dependent upon the fairness of the rewards according to equity theory (Adams, 1965). Hence, satisfaction is also influenced by the outcome of the individual’s ‘horizontal’ comparison with other organizational members, particularly peers. The analysis focuses on the individual’s (or micro level) perceived outcome effectiveness. The aggregate performance of organizational members leads to organizational (or macro level) outcome effectiveness since the performance of the organization is, to a large extent, attributable to the aggregation of individual performances moderated by external environment contingencies. The evaluation of organizational effectiveness is analogous to organizational assessment. Organizational assessment requires that the definition of performance be made explicit and that the organization analyst determines, at the outset, whose value judgments and criteria would be operationalized and measured. Thus, effectiveness
is defined as ‘the degree to which (an organization) realizes its goals’ (Etzioni, 1964) and, Therefore, involves a comparison between the goal level and outcome level. Organizational effectiveness in culture studies is multidimensional, usually centering on such dimensions as customer service quality, market share and economic return, external adaptation and ultimate survival. On the other hand, at the individual level, the person sets self-assigned goals based on his/her prior experience of the task and the level of aspiration. Once the acts are performed fully, the individuals will judge the results upon his/her level of aspiration in order to conclude a perceived performance level to be compared with the goal level originally set. If the performance level meets the goal level, the outcome is a success and would provide feelings of satisfaction. Feedback also plays a major role since it provides information (further stimulus) for setting future goal levels and aspiration (based on schema theory), which software of the mind (Hofstede, 1991) that is shared by organizational members, it influences the cognition and perception of its members, guides their behaviours, integrates its internal processes to ensure the ability to survive and adapt to the environment (Schein, 1985; Cooke and Rousseau, 1988; Denison, 1990; Denison and Mishra, 1995; Cameron and Quinn, 1999).

The critical role of the organizational culture as a factor of competitive advantage of a bank stems from the uniqueness of the culture that makes it inimitable and rare and from its dynamic characteristic that ensure its sustainability (Kilman et al., 1985; Ouchi, 1981; Owens, 1987; Schein, 1990; Zheng, Yang, & McLean, 2010).

The turbulent marketplace and the changing customers’ demands create many opportunities and challenges. These challenges, in turn, have been forcing banks, among other organizations, to be entrepreneurial in terms of exploring and exploiting the opportunities and being ready to tolerate
high risks. Therefore, it has been suggested by Al-Swidi and Mahmood (2011) that banks should establish an organizational culture in which high quality and innovative products and services are the ultimate outcomes.

Jung and Takeuchi (2011) undertook a study in Japan which established the interrelationships among top management leadership, organizational culture and human resource practices, and their associative effects on organizational performance.

*Therefore review of extensive literature establishes that the organizational cultural environment provides ‘stimulus’ to the individuals for the adoption of various attitudes and guide their feelings, thoughts and behavior towards their jobs and organization.*

### 2.16 Organizational Culture Studies in Different Contexts and Countries

New perspectives and directions have emerged in the field of organizational culture. Cross cultural studies were reported in the last decades which also witnessed research in cultural studies being reported from different countries like Bangladesh, Canada, China, Hong Kong, India, Malaysia, New Zealand, U.K., U.S.A., Singapore, South Africa (Bebbington et al, 2007; Bryson ,2008; Daymon ,2000; Jackson, 2005; Lee, Yu 2004; Ogbonna et al ,2002; Rashid ,2003; Taormina, 2008; Lucas, Kline, 2008 ) subscribing to the widespread interest in the field of organizational culture. Organizational culture studies have also taken place in areas of work-life programs (Chalofsky, 2008), organizational socialization (Taornima, 2008) and culture of family firms.
Mintu et al (1996) conducted a study to examine sellers' co-operative behaviors, exploring the behavioral characteristics and environmental cues prior to and during the actual negotiation encounter. The study investigates individual, organizational, and demographic-related antecedent variables and the co-operative negotiation process of industrial exporters representing two different cultures.

Williams (1998) developed a conceptual model of cross-cultural business relationships. An exploratory study was conducted to examine the impact of social and structural bonding as determinants of business relationship performance. The study found that knowledge of cultural orientation and its relationship to the social and structural bond that exists between partners is a key predictor of long-term commitment in cross-national business relationships.

Ogbonna et al (2002) performed a ten year, two phase study of UK Food retailing sector and suggested that industry macro-cultures may have impact on both the performance of individual firms and the management of organizational culture.

Rashid (2003) studied the influence of organizational culture on affective, cognitive and behavioral attitudes towards organizational change in Malaysian manufacturing industries. Findings show that different types of organizational culture have different levels of acceptance of attitudes toward organizational change. A survey using Competing Values framework in Hong Kong confirmed the validity of the model as a tool in differentiating organizations (Kwan et al, 2004).
Denison (2004) examined organizational culture in family and non-family firms and how it related to performance. It became increasingly clear that family business sustainability and accomplishment were rooted in something deeper, something beyond superficial explanation and it was their ‘positive’ culture. Sirmon (2004) proposed a model of cultural differences and international alliance performance to explain the ambiguous findings regarding the influence of national cultural differences on alliance performance.

Lee, Yu (2004) investigated relationship between corporate culture and performance in Singaporean firms and also demonstrated empirically that a set of replicable cultural dimensions exist across organizations, implies that culture can be measured with repeatable, easily administered instruments that permit systematic comparisons. Cultural Strength and innovation were found to be significantly correlated with sum insured in insurance industry, supportiveness was found to be related to growth in net profits in manufacturing industry and team orientation and task orientation were significantly correlated with staff turnover rates in hospitals. Some cultural dimensions were affected by industry membership while others were not.

Another study was conducted in South African military context as the wider society underwent transition from apartheid to democracy necessitating the integration of a multicultural force. Empirical study found significant differences in attitudes among cultural groups (Jackson, 2005). Barger (2007) suggested that in an international joint venture two cultures collide, a new culture is created and the culture of parent firm plays an important role in influencing the successful blending of cultures. This highlights the need for cross cultural management.
Bebbington et al (2007) presented a World Bank funded case study in Bangladesh to illustrate the ways in which cultural interactions between a variety of organizations mediate the ways in which textual commitments are translated into a range of diverse practices. ‘Security Culture’ with eight dimensions was investigated by Ruighaver (2007) focusing on end-users and on the technical aspects of security in IT industry calling for a management focus on security culture.

Bryson (2008) addressed the issues of time and perspectives which underlie the contested nature of culture by explaining the dynamics of organizational change through dominant, residual and emergent culture with a case study in New Zealand setting.

Taormina (2008) looks into the theories regarding leadership, organizational culture, and organizational socialization and how they can influence organizational culture in Chinese organizations.

Chalofsky (2008) links work-life programs suggests that organizational culture is the essence of workplace community. Lucas, Kline (2008), in a Canadian case study, tried to understand the influence of organizational culture on group dynamics of organizational change and learning. Certain group and cultural phenomenon when manifested had significant influence on group members’ response to organizational change and their capacity to learn.

Kralewski (2008) discussed ‘practice culture’ of medical groups to demonstrate that it is difficult to manage patient care when there is wide disagreement among clinicians about norms of
behavior. Based on the review of literature we find that Organizational Culture as a concept has achieved widespread importance in organizational studies across various contexts.

Al-Swidi & Mahmood (2011) study in Pakistan has established that customers nowadays have become very critical and selective this reflected in their demands for high quality and innovative products and services. Therefore, being successful in doing businesses requires banks, among other organizations, to pay great attention to the customers’ requirements and needs through innovative organizational culture.

*Organizational Culture has been conceptualized in different forms and has been found to relate to several individual and organizational phenomena both as an antecedent and as a consequence.*

### 2.17 Relationship between Organizational Culture and Individual Employees

Organizational culture has been found to be useful in understanding organizational variables like job satisfaction, work related attitudes like organizational commitment; individual’s sense-making, self-efficacy and collective efficacy (Harris, 1994; Bloor et al, 1994; Maignan et al, 2001; Lund, 2003; Walumbwa et al, 2005). Organizations display "learning disabilities," or what Argyris might call "defensive routines" that get in the way of the kind of second-order learning (Argyris and Schon, 1996). Parker (2002) demonstrates that because organizational members do not see the past of the organization in the same way, they orient themselves to different futures.
In addition, the struggle between organizations bent on normative control and individuals subjected to it is over the definition of reality (Kunda, 1992). According to the social information-processing view (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978) and cognitive view (Weick, 1969), the definitions of the situation offered by others and people’s past experiences in social context provide the selection mechanisms or norms and values through which people enact events. Although the term commitment is not used in the definition of culture, part of the idea of sharing values and goals is being committed to them (Beyer et al. 2000).

Several research results indicate a connection between employee attitudes and organizational culture. According to the research evidence, managers can increase employee satisfaction by creating cultures with characteristics expressed in terms of collegiality and collaboration (Xin Mac Millan 1999). Meglino et.,al (1989) indicated that organizational culture influences both the satisfaction and commitment of newcomers. The impact is mutual. On the one hand, employee satisfaction and commitment to the organization, including during change, could be improved by developing an appropriate organizational culture. On the other hand, job satisfaction could influence organizational culture – satisfied employees are more likely to engage in organizational citizenship behaviours beyond the requirements entailed in job descriptions, and by helping each other reduce the workload and stress of others (Bettencourt et al. 2001).

According to Schein (1992), organizational culture is influenced by task- and relationship-orientation. Harrison (1995) distinguishes between task and person oriented organizational cultures. Task culture emphasizes the superiority of the goals of the organization over the member’s personal goals.
Person oriented like Schein’s (1992) relationship-orientation is based on warm and harmonious interpersonal relationships. These two orientations – task orientation and relationship-orientation – are the vital aspects of organizational culture that can influence employee attitudes.

Jones (2000) Ruth Alas and Maaja Vadi’s (2004) study undertaken in Soviet proved the prediction of employee attitudes based on organizational culture. In the context of organizational change, task-orientation could influence people’s attitudes by establishing clear goals and developing values, which could help the achievement of these goals at all levels of the organization. But achieving employee participation in the beginning is not enough; ensuring that the change process does not reverse and building more effective relationships with peers are also necessary (Landau 1998). Relationship-orientation could influence people’s attitudes toward change through informal structures and communication (Salancik and Pfeffer 1978).

Harris (1994) proposed a schema based perspective that in the social setting of organizations, individuals make sense out of their experiences, based in large part on the outcomes of contrived mental dialogues between themselves and other contextually-relevant individuals or groups, again supporting the cultural negotiation process.

Bloor et al (1994) attempted to identify the complex interplay between individual sense makings, group beliefs and culture in an Australian home-care service. The stability of an organization's operating environment is identified as a major factor which facilitates and constrains the propensity for professional subcultures to radically transform or incrementally refine dominant organizational cultures.
Lund (2003) empirically investigated the relationship between organizational Culture types and job satisfaction in a survey of marketing professionals in USA. Job satisfaction was positively related to clan and adhocracy types of culture type and negatively to market and adhocracy.

Howard (2007) has asserted that people working in an organization behave in ways that are heavily influenced by organizational culture. Culture governs the way people think and the way they expected to be treated. He has highlighted that culture of an organization influences the performance, commitment and engagement levels of employees. Rampersad K. Hubert (2007) has opined that there exists an alignment of organizational culture with organizational and individual performance.

The role of organizational culture in shaping individual and organizational attitudes has been elaborated by Padma and Nair (2009). Organizational culture integrates the individual and organization as a system by facilitating congruence of interests of both employees and organization- this reflected in the various employee engagement initiatives of several IT and retail organizations. (Sarangi & Srivastava, 2009, 2010).

*Hence, the present study included Organizational culture as an antecedent impacting and predicting levels of employee engagement.*
2.18 Meaning of Organizational Communication

Communication refers to the transference and understanding of meaning. The purpose of communication is to transmit an idea from one mind to another, and that the success of that communication may be measured by the degree to which the message, as received and understood, agrees with the intention of the sender. (Hatch, 1964) Communication serves as a tool for control, motivation, emotional expression and information. (Scott and Mitchell, 1976). The directions of communication can be upward, downward or lateral in an organization. Interpersonal Communication may be oral, written and even non-verbal. It can be through formal group networks or even through informal grape wines. Choice of communication channels can be crude or through use of sophisticated technology. Despite best of organizational and individual efforts there may be existence of barriers. Communication satisfaction can be defined as "an individual's satisfaction with various aspects of communication in his organization" (Crino and White, 1981,) Relationships are proposed to exist between communication satisfaction, job satisfaction, and intent to turnover (Gregson Terry, 1990) Communication is crucial in organizations for connecting the workers and allowing the organizations to function effectively. Communication is an integral part of the organizational process as the flow of communication up and down the organizational hierarchy has its effects on efficiency, decision-making and morale of organizations. A study on internal communication therefore is essential for improving employee performance and for positive organizational outcomes. (Nordin et.al, 2011) Organizational communication (Zaremba, 2003), deliberates on the importance of communication that goes far beyond training employees with effective communication skills to also address the communication needs and challenges faced by organizations. As outlined by
Zaremba (2003), organizational communication consists of a number of principles: “Communication is a central and not a peripheral component of organizational effectiveness. It is not a frill. It is vital; Communication is a pervasive activity in organizations. It is not something that only some people in organizations must do or something that occurs infrequently; Organizational communication is multifaceted and deceptively simple matter”

2.19 Importance of Organizational Communication

A.S Hatch (1964) emphasizes that organizational communication should focus on individual communication to emphasize individuality and differences and on group communication to emphasize common interest and spontaneous cooperation. Communication is considered to be the lifeline of an organization. Likert (1967) conceptualized a causal sequence in which communication is seen as an intervening variable that leads to any of four end results productivity, satisfaction, labor-management relations, and profit. Jablin (1978) opined that importance of communication lay in dimensions of interaction patterns and related attitudes, openness in communication, upward distortion, upward influence, semantic distance, effective vs. ineffective superiors, feedback, and personal characteristics.

As Cheney (1983) has proposed, the content of employee communication may facilitate the identification process, because it discloses the goals, values and achievements of the organization. Communication can strengthen member identification because it provides organization members with an opportunity to create and share their subjective perceptions of the organization’s defining features, its norms, values and culture. Knowledge of these facets of the
organization creates a sense of shared meaning among employees. Communication helps create shared meaning because it provides social context cues (Sproull and Kiesler, 1991), which leads to the perception of social presence (Fulk and Boyd, 1991), and creates a shared interpretive context among organization members (Zack, 1993). Shared meaning provides organization members with a clear sense of the organization’s identity, and thus may strengthen member identification.

Mathieu and Zadiac’s meta-analysis (1990) shows communication to have a fairly strong link on commitment of individual employees.

Downs and Conrad (1996) following their study suggested that in their training, supervisors need to be confronted with their own expectations of subordinates. They could then explore their own behaviors which could facilitate more effective performance by the subordinates. They could be trained to ask for feedback or to ask questions themselves if messages are unclear or detail is inadequate. In other words, supervisors need to assess their own role in generating effective communication by subordinates. Second, training programs for subordinates can similarly focus on effectiveness-enhancing behaviors. Training on effective subordinancy could be included in one company's orientation program. They have emphasized that training that is common for supervisors evidently would be profitable for subordinates, also. Notable examples are report writing, active listening, and perception checking. Incentives for expected behaviors should also be clearly identified and appropriately communicated. These pertinent steps would go a long way in building a prosperous organization the effects of communication on individuals and their attitudes toward the organization. (Huff, Sproull and Kiesler, 1989) Specifically, research has
found that communication can affect employee attitudes that may be strongly related to organizational identification.

According to De Ridder (2004), organizational communication is instrumental in facilitating supportive employees. Organizations are first and foremost communicating entities (Clegg, Kornberger and Pitsis, 2005).

Andy Parsley (2006) has quoted a major study by Watson Wyatt: Connecting Organizational Communication to Financial Performance found that 'a significant improvement in communication effectiveness is associated with a 29.5 per cent increase in market value and that companies with the highest levels of effective communication experienced a 26 per cent total return to shareholders from 1998 to 2002, compared to a 15 per cent return experienced by firms that communicate least effectively'. Effective communications create engaged employees, creating loyal customers who in turn create bigger profits. The study conducted by Watson Wyatt (2007-08) has been quoted by Bill Trahant (2008) shows a strong correlation between effective employee communication and superior organizational performance. Organizations with the highest scores in effective employee communication (and the strongest organizational results) do many things differently from organizations with lower communication effectiveness scores.

The level of motivation of most people could be greatly increased through knowing more about their jobs, departments, companies, working conditions, and their individual and group relationship to others in their departments, companies, and in other comparable companies
In a study that explores the management of the psychological contract, Guest and Conway (2002) report that their results justify stressing the importance of communication that is directly related to daily work, the accuracy of instructions or the quality of feedback about an employee’s work. The management can stimulate employee commitment to the organization by increasing the quality of task-related communications. Providing good-quality task-related communications involves making sure the right information gets to the right place at the right time (De Ridder, 2004).

Five steps to employee engagement (Pasquale Mazznca- Hamilton Davenport Partners July, 2007) can include clearing expectations regarding the job, career advancing/learning and development opportunities and regular feedback.

There is some evidence that information provided by the management on both the running and the policy of a business affects commitment (De Cotiis and Summers, 1987). A supportive attitude can also be achieved through employee trust in the management. In order to attain this, it is essential that the trustee exhibits openness in his/her communications regarding all matters and organizational issues. These issues are always related to goals, organizational problems and organizational policy. Information about these topics is 'non-task-related' information. A good deal of internal media can be used to distribute this information. These media and messages can certainly be designed to foster employee enthusiasm about the organization (De Ridder, 2004).

De la Rey & Van der Waldt (2004) opined that management’s use of communication aims to achieve desired results in areas of developing a shared vision of the company within the organization, establishing trust in the organizational leadership, initiating and managing the
change process, and empowering and motivating employees. Mark Hughes (2006) has studied the role of communication in helping employees cope up and cause change.

Andy Parsley (2006) spells that effective organizational leadership is simple, where if leaders have visions of where they want to get to, and clearly and persuasively communicate that vision to employees, they succeed in achieving great results. Five steps to employee engagement (Pasquale Mazza–Hamilton Davenport Partners July, 2007) can include clearing expectations regarding the job, career advancing/learning and development opportunities, regular feedback, perception of values, missions and vision and quality of working relations. Some of the steps to employee engagement (Pasquale Mazza–Hamilton Davenport Partners July, 2007) include perception of values, missions and vision and quality of working relations. A study on top performing organizations undertaken by Watson Wyatt (2007-08), quoted by Bill Trahant (2008), found that when managers communicate effectively, employees receive clear, concise messages about corporate goals, performance, and results. Such communication reinforces priorities and direction from senior management and increases “line of sight.” Employees with a clear line of sight understand how their actions roll up to influence company goals and the bottom line.

E. Barrett (2002) has suggested that ‘without effective employee communication, change is impossible and change management fails.’ Mark Hughes (2006) has studied the role of communication in helping employees cope up and cause change. Trahant (2008) asserted that if people are involved in change and their input to the process is valued they will readily engage with it. Highly effective companies are more diligent and successful in engaging the
communication function in their organizations to manage and plan for change. Building a strong pool of informed managers to drive change pays big benefits.

Postmes et al's study (2001) reveals primarily that direct communication between the management and employees is strongly related to commitment. Violetta Bottazzo (2005) stated that organized preparation and execution of a special program, which is largely based on the internal communication in particular, is necessary to achieve the satisfaction of employees. The treatment of employees as the property and not as the expense is the starting point of a new paradigm of internal communication, which exceeds former one-way informing of employees, it is transferred from simple informing to one-way informing and then more and more also to two-way communication, from training and education to motivation and eventually to the participation of employees in the management with the sharing of responsibilities.

Absence of bottom-up channels of communication was often a hindrance to organizational effectiveness (Mark Hughes, 2007). Angela Sinckas (2005) has also mentioned about the need of ensuring the existence of appropriate communication channels in organizations to facilitate employee engagement. Woodruffle (2006) has mentioned that exposure to senior people is one of the non-financial motivators of employee engagement.

The degree to which employees are motivated to deliver their maximum performance is very heavily influenced by the degree to which their informational needs are satisfied and by the manner in which the process of communication is managed by the leaders and supervisors (A S Hatch, 1964). According to Violetta Bottazzo (2005), intranet helps in improve information
flows (who, what, when, to whom, how, with what), to put two-way forms of communication into effect (reverse loop), to put team work into effect (composition, structure, rules, remuneration), to raise the level of participation of employees in the management in accordance with organization’s needs. Angela Sinckas (2005) has mentioned that communication channels are linked to satisfaction levels of employees. Andy Parsley (2006) has mentioned that if desirable communication channels are absent or inappropriate, employee engagement suffers.

Ray Baumruk (2006) has mentioned that managers can facilitate employee engagement by displaying appropriate levels of involvement and communication. Barriers to effective organizational communication and engagement identified by Andy Parsley (2006) are managers who do not see communication as part of their day job; they have not developed their communication skills. According to Trahant (2008), training managers to be effective communicators is a critical component in aligning employees and transforming organizations. The dimensions of organizational communication chosen for this research would include task related communication pertaining to goals and performance made to employees, non-task related communication pertaining to vision, values, strategy of the organization, change communication pertaining to early information on reasons for change and its impact on employees, communication channels used by organizations and communication skills of managers affecting employee engagement.

Researchers have drawn the purposes of organizations in the field of internal communication as envisaging on ways to improve information flows. Directions and channels of communication which enhance team work and impact efficiency of individuals and organizations. The structure,
composition, orientation of employees will be impacted by the satisfaction of employees, methods for establishing, measuring and reporting, to improve motivation, responsibility, initiative, affiliation, innovative capability (management of organization culture and creating of stimulating microclimate), to put an appropriate management style into effect criteria, training to improve interpersonal communication and communication with customers, mainly at those employees, who directly contact with them, to build communication into the business policy of the organization and to provide adequate training (knowledge, know - how, skills) and connection between communication and policy of promotion, remuneration and personal and professional development,– to improve acquaintance and identification of employees with basic strategic documents (vision, strategy, business plans, etc.), to raise the capability of solving of interest and interaction conflicts and disputes.

Strategic goals of the organization can be accomplished through committed employees who are integrated with the organizational fabric. They are pro-active because they have been communicated about the organizational goals, realities and challenges. They are involved in its affairs. They act as change agents and nurture new hopes and horizons for the organization’s bright future (Lucey John, 2009)

Welch and Jackson (2007) had made a critical review in the attempt to comprehend the nature, scope, focus and goals of internal communication. It is reported that the organizational communication field of study looks at the context of organizations and their communication processes.
According to Trahant Bill (2008) a study undertaken by Watson Wyatt showed a strong correlation between effective employee communication and superior organizational performance. The study revealed that organizations should focus on keeping the customer front and center in all employee communication programs, design communication programs that engage employees in running the business, work to continuously enhance the communication effectiveness of managers, leverage the talents of internal communicators to manage change effectively, measure the impact of employee communication on key business metrics, maximize the employee experience “brand the highest scores in effective employee communication (and the strongest organizational results) do many things differently from organizations with lower communication effectiveness scores.

Trahant (2008) has outlined some communication best practices used by high-performing companies today, ones that have a direct and positive bearing on organizational performance. He has suggested that how these practices have significant value in a public-sector context, helping to align public-sector employees behind agency mission goals, drive improved organizational performance, assist managers in engaging employees, and create the conditions necessary to retain high-value federal employees over the long term.

Lucey John (2009) has highlighted the importance of communication surveys to indicate engagement and satisfaction levels of employees in organizations.

Various studies have shown that job resources and communication channels including social support from supervisors and colleagues, and the intrinsic nature of the job (e.g. skill variety,
autonomy and learning opportunities) are positively associated with employee engagement (Bakker et al., 2008; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

In a longitudinal study, Mauno, Kinnunen and Ruokolainen (2007) found that job resources predicted employee engagement better than job demands. Even Hakanen et al. (2008) conducted a longitudinal study and found that job resources predicted future engagement. Rothmann and Pieterse (2007) studied the relationship between job resources and employee engagement and found that growth opportunities in the job (i.e. variety, learning opportunities and autonomy) best predicted employee engagement.

Rothmann and Joubert (2007) found that organizational support and growth opportunities in the job were strong predictors of employee engagement in the mining industry. High job resources, such as social support and feedback, may reduce the effects of job demands (Demerouti et al., 2001).

Therefore, organizational communication is seen as important for individual and organizational effectiveness.

2.20 Relationship between Organizational Communication and Employee Satisfaction

One of the earliest studies by Herzberg (1966) Communication was one of ten original factors which he later synthesized into two-factor theory. Burhans (1971) designed several instruments to measure employee satisfaction with communication; but his instruments were based only on
item validity analysis, not factor analysis, and thus he failed to explore the generalizability or dimensionality of the relationship. Downs (1971) studied a public utility company and discovered that satisfaction with communication was linked with employee position in the organization.

Muchinsky’s (1977) study revealed that certain dimensions of communication are related to both perceived climate and job satisfaction. Various studies have highlighted the importance that communication has for the success of an organization and have shown that quality of communication in organizations is associated with employees, job satisfaction and motivation. (Orpen, 1997) Significant relationships have also been found between communication, job satisfaction and organizational climate, which ultimately lead to higher productivity. (Singh and Pestonjee, 1990; Joshi and Sharma, 1997) One research effort (Pettit, Goris, & Vaught, 1997) investigated organizational communication as a moderator of the association between job performance and job satisfaction.

Mathieu and Zadjac's meta-analysis (1990) shows communication to have a fairly strong effect on commitment. There is some evidence that information provided by the management on both the running and the policy of a business affects commitment (De Cotiis and Summers, 1987). However, other research suggests that the accuracy of communication is especially relevant in fostering participation and commitment (Trombetta and Rogers, 1988; Welsch and LaVan, 1981). Postmes et al's study (2001) reveals primarily that direct communication between the management and employees is strongly related to commitment. In a study that explores the management of the psychological contract, Guest and Conway (2002): De Ridder, Jan A. (2004)
stated that stressing the importance of communication that is directly related to management can stimulate employee commitment to the organization by increasing the quality of task-related communications. Providing good-quality task-related communications involves making sure the right information gets to the right place at the right time. However, the perceived quality of task-related communications will be especially high if employees feel the information provided supports their preferred approach to task performance. Thus, task-related communications should be geared as much as possible to the employees' approach to work, accuracy of instructions or the quality of feedback about an employee's work. The perceived quality of non-task-related communications is a good indicator of the extent of the management's success in conveying its uprightness.

The day-to-day contact middle level managers and frontline supervisors have with employees makes them a credible source of information about corporate strategy and business goals. Communication has in addition been found playing an important role in the process of organizational change. Besides, companies with effective communication have shown to have lower turnover rates than other organizations.

The 2003/2004 Watson Wyatt Survey has further substantiated the importance of organizational communication. This study examined the relationship between an organization’s communication strategy and practices and its shareholders returns. The results showed that organizations with the highest levels of effective communication experienced a 26 percent total return to shareholders from 1998 to 2002, compared to a 15 percent return experienced by firms that communicated least effectively. Their 2005-2006 studies not only confirm the earlier findings but also go a step
further; by showing that effective communication is a leading indicator of an organization’s financial performance. Simply stated, effective communication is good business. Besides, companies with effective communication have shown to have lower turnover rates than other organizations. (Gallup, 2002)

Nakra (2006) suggested that employee motivation and their identification with their organization are critically dependent on effective communication. This has moved internal communications to the center stage of progressive organization’s strategy. Informed organizations and their communication personnel have realized that effective communication relates directly to the employees, ability, motivation, and commitment on the job. Significant communication has in addition been found playing an important role in the process of organizational change. For building organizational identification, managers should pay serious attention to the internal communication by providing each employee with adequate information, the opportunity to speak out, get involved, be listened to and actively participate.

Yates Kathryn (2008) has stated that high-effectiveness companies recognize that communication is the key. They leverage key people to build commitment and line of sight among employees. They prepare managers and supervisors for their role as communicators in a variety of ways. Training to improve communication skills is often a starting point. These companies also package information so that it is easy to deliver, and they involve managers early in the communication process, giving them time to absorb the material before passing it along to their direct reports.
Nordin et.,al (2011) conducted a survey was to gauge employees’ satisfaction on the communication climate, supervisory communication, subordinate communication, horizontal communication, organizational perspective, organizational integration and media quality. Organization needs to have the ability to engage with the employees effectively as internal communication occurs continuously almost at all times within the organizations.

Communication acts as a tool for enhancing intra-group cooperation, which helps it to tide over economic turbulence and environmental uncertainties. (Sarangi & Srivastava, 2010)

*Review of literature clearly suggests that organizational communication plays a profound role in shaping employee attitudes. Hence it was considered as an antecedent of employee engagement in this study.*

**2.21 Dimensions of Organizational Communication- Satisfaction**

Thayer (1968) defined communication - satisfaction as the personal satisfaction inherent in successfully communicating to someone or in successfully being communicated with.

Crino and White (1981) viewed it as an individual’s satisfaction with various aspects of the communication occurring in his organization. It is an employee’s satisfaction with information flow and relationship variables within an organization and provides an operational means of determining managers and employees’ comprehensive perceptions of communication in their organizational contexts.
Downs and Hazen’s (1977) and Downs. (1990) research indicates that communication satisfaction is a multidimensional construct. The communication satisfaction construct, operationalized by Downs and Hazen in 1977, has become a successful research stream in organizational communication. Several studies have been completed using the "Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire" (Clampitt & Downs, 1987; Clampitt & Downs, 1993) and an expanded form of it called the "Communication Audit Questionnaire" (Downs, 1990). These studies have been conducted in a number of countries outside of the United States as well, namely: Nigeria (Kio, 1979), Mexico (Alum, 1982), China (Lee, 1989), Guatemala (Varona 1988, 1993, 1996), and Australia (Downs, 1991). The communication satisfaction construct has been used in three distinct contexts; interpersonal, group, and organizational (Hecht, 1978). Several studies across the globe have used this model to ascertain the level of satisfaction employees have towards their organizational communication.

Downs and Hazen (1977) explored the multidimensionality of communication satisfaction using an original questionnaire called "Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire" after thorough factor and items analyses.

The eight factors include the following:

**Organizational Perspective** deals with the broadest kinds of information about the organization as a whole. It includes items on notifications about changes, information about the organization's financial standing, and information about the overall policies and goals of the organization.
**Personal Feedback** is concerned with the workers' need to know how they are being judged and how their performance is being appraised.

**Organizational Integration** revolves around the degree to which individuals receive information about their immediate environment. It includes the degree of satisfaction with information about departmental plans, the requirements of their job, and some personnel news.

**Supervisory Communication** includes both the upward and downward aspects of communicating with superiors. Three of the principal items are the extent to which superiors are open to ideas, the extent to which supervisors listen and pay attention, and the extent to which supervisors offer guidance to their employees in solving job-related problems.

**Communication Climate** reflects communication on both the organizational and personal levels. It includes items such as the extent to which communication in an organization motivates and stimulates workers to meet organizational goals and the extent to which it makes them identify with the organization. It also includes estimates of whether or not people's attitudes toward communication are healthy in the organization.

**Horizontal Communication** concerns the extent to which co-workers and informal communication is accurate and free flowing. This factor also includes satisfaction with the activeness of the grapevine.
**Media Quality** deals with the extent to which meetings are well organized and written directives are short and clear, and the degree to which the amount of communication is about right.

**Subordinate Communication** focuses on upward and downward communication with subordinates. Only workers in supervisory positions respond to these items, which include subordinate responsiveness to downward communication and the extent to which subordinates initiate upward communication.

Downs (1990) expanded this questionnaire by adding two new factors, which were named as Top Management Communication evaluates the communication of top management with organization members. This factor includes items about top management's openness to new ideas, expressed caring, and willingness to listen.

Interdepartmental Communication deals with the communication that is needed among the different departments of the organization in order to facilitate its efficiency. It includes items about problem solving, teamwork, and communication among managers.

*The communication-satisfaction dimensions were considered pertinent for ascertaining employee attitudes towards the organization and determining employee engagement levels.*
2.22 Gap Analysis

Review of literature reflected that for tiding over challenges of globalization, immense competition, rapid and incessant change in the environment, organizations need to have engaged employees. This is more relevant in the service sector where employees directly impact customer engagement and play a more decisive role in ensuring profitability through growth. However review of literature revealed dearth of Extensive literature review in the service sector and especially in the banking services in India. The study was chosen to be undertaken in the banking sector owing to this reason.

Review of extensive literature suggested that not much emphasis has been given on exhaustively identifying the antecedents and predictors of employee engagement. Since engaging employees is a pertinent issue, focused efforts need to be undertaken by business organizations in that direction. This would help in introducing initiatives and designing interventions targeting various employee segments.

Another research gap emerged in the area of accurately identifying dimensions and characteristics of engaged employees in India. Though studies have been conducted by researchers and consultants across the globe more in-depth studies could be undertaken in India.

Extant literature review reflected that role of organizational culture and communication in shaping employee attitudes, feelings and behavior is evident. But no study had been undertaken
to study the role of organizational culture and communication on impacting and predicting employee engagement. The present study was undertaken to bridge this gap.

Both organizational culture and communication are multi-dimensional constructs, literature review also surfaced the need to identify the key dimensions. These would help business organizations envisaging on increasing employee engagement to focus on key variables and streamline their practices for enhancing employee engagement.

Thus literature review brought out the importance of developing a holistic employee engagement model to give organizations a sustainable competitive edge. Literature revealed the absence of an employee engagement framework through organizational drivers like culture and communication. The absence of a methodology which measures the same also surfaced as research lacunae. These research gaps have been identified and addressed through this study.