Chapter-1

Introduction
Employee engagement is a recently originated concept, widely attracting the attention of organizational researchers, HR consultants, and practitioners especially of Western Countries of the world. Gratton, Lind, and Popper (2004) stated that “the quest for employee engagement is now a days becoming a familiar theme, and many corporate leaders consider this is an important goal”. In India, there is not many, but only a few evidences of the study of employees’ engagement are found. The available literatures on employee engagement are revealing the fact either that so far the studies made on this topic were by consultants for the organization or carried out internally by the respective management to take the corrective steps to enhance the level of engagement in the respective organization. Many international research and consulting firms such as Hewitt Associates, Gallup etc. are undertaking researches on employees’ engagement on Indian firms. It is an observable fact that big corporations of the private sectors and a few public sector corporations such as Indian Oil Corporation (IOC), Oil and Natural Gas Commission (ONGC) are carrying out such studies with the help of international consulting and research organizations for taking corrective actions for their respective organizations. Generally, a study on engagement
are limited to assessment and determination of employees’ engagement levels and employees attitude with the behavioral outcomes (such as commitment, involvement, loyalty, retention etc.); and impacts on organizational outcomes such as management effectiveness, performance, profitability, customer satisfaction etc. Since the available literature reveals that engagement is a complicated concept linked with too many facets, further exploration on the unexplored dimensions is the need of the hour.

The present research on employees’ engagement has emerged mainly from two distinct counts. First, there was a need for making a study within an unexplored organizational environment. In public sector paper industry, there is dearth of evidences for engagement study. Secondly, engagement is by nature a very complicated concept and many dimensions of requires exploration. Reviewing the theoretical background relating to engagement would serve a better platform for making research propositions and for configuring the framework of a partial or full range empirical search. We shall now discuss how the concept of engagement has emerged.

1.1. The Concept

Employee Engagement - a new horizon of H.R Research: Business today is dynamic, with a steadily increasing pace of change. With the change in the business environment, management technology is also getting changed. The
discipline Human Resource Management is regularly capturing new techniques, processes, thinking from the diverse disciplines such as sociology, psychology, history, human dimension of economics, public administration, laws, and ergonomics. H.R.M today is one among the dynamic subjects of management and administration. Dynamism of a discipline depends on the innovation of thoughts, practices, and principles followed by HR practitioner, as forwarded by consultants and academia who are engaged in the quest for new chromophore to the subject. A plethora of such practitioners, consultants, and academia are giving a new aroma to the subject HRM through their constant quest for innovation of concepts, techniques, and principles.

Employee satisfaction, employees' attitudes, and perceptions have long been a focal topic in organizational and behavior research. A number of recent investigations have demonstrated a new and critical importance of these constructs. One area of particular interest is the role that employee engagement plays in individual and business-level outcomes. While there is no consensus on the formal definition of the term “engagement” appears to have emerged in research literature (Finn & Rock, 1997), one common thread running through research on that subject is the notion that desire and/or willing to participate, are fundamental components of engagement behavior. Finn’s (1989) studies on student withdrawal behavior exemplified this
participatory element when he categorized engagement as a multidimensional construct, including compliant/noncompliant behaviors (i.e., willingness) and initiative-taking behaviors (i.e., desire). Similarly, Kahn (1990) characterized engagement as consisting of physical, cognitive, and emotional components. Again, Mercer, a human resource consulting organization, in its web page (of 20th April 2005) in the context of the query ‘why employee engagement is necessary?’ mentioned that ‘employee engagement goes beyond the employee’s intent to leave. It includes the employee’s commitment to the organization and motivation to contribute to the organization’s success. As such, engagement can be seen as a broader concept than job satisfaction. While satisfaction is often a correlates of positive workplace outcomes, engagement is a direct antecedent of satisfaction, and necessary for more optimal satisfaction-outcome relationships.

Employee engagement is a concept, which receives considerable attention in HR circles, because it can either directly or indirectly affects on the company’s business performance. A recent article has indicated “the British Business Publication i.e. 'Management Today' highlighted the rapid emergence of employee engagement as a hot topic in company’s boardrooms and sought to educate its readership on the basics of Employee Engagement”. Similarly, Steve Bates (Feb 2004) too mentioned, “Employee engagement has
became a hot topic.” Gen Tuchow (May 11, 2005) also painted in the episode of employee engagement that there is a tremendous amount of current interest and research on employee engagement. Some skeptical employees might jump to the conclusion that it’s simply the latest corporate initiative that might be history within a year. How can a company distinguish employee engagement from these fads? What can a company do to embed engagement into the organization so that company can withstand changes and challenges over time? The literature on Employee Engagement is emerging day by day. The term ‘Employee Engagement’ now has become a HR buzz. As an emerging concept in the field of HR, a taxonomical analysis of the literature would help researcher to concretize and to linkup the dimensions for theoretical and empirical exploration.

**Taxonomy on Employees Engagement (EE):** Gallup had placed the term ‘Employee Engagement’ (EE) to the centre-stage (fathom, 2004) of organizational and HRM research. Since 1997, Gallup, has been studied on engagement. Before the presence of the term EE, the original term -engagement was merely a dictionary word -engage (in’geidz/v) formally used ‘to attract someone and keep his or her interest; or to take part; or become involved in an activity’. DDI an international research organization defined “En-gage-ment (in-’gaj-ment) as- the extent to which people value, enjoy, and
believe in what they do.” *Towers Perin* defined EE – is a rational and emotional duality; a combination of ‘the will’ and ‘the way’ demanded by an action, activity, or job in an organization, because to do better job in an organization employee need ‘the will’ and ‘the way’ to act on their sense of mission and passion. In the words of *Richard. Wellins, and Concelman. Jim (April-2005)* engagement is –“Passion, Commitment, Extra effort. These terms describe employee engagement—as the illusive force that motivates employees to higher (or lower) levels of performance”. *Wellins* explained engagement as a combination of loyalty, commitment, and taking responsibility by actively seeking improvements, which are in the interests of the company. *Welbourne Theresa* defined engagement in terms of what people do at work. Engagement is about getting rid of things that block productivity. *Rude* said, “Engagement is a mutual contract between employer and employee.” *Baranthal. Paul R.* stated that employee’s feel engaged when they find personal meaning and motivation in their work, receives positive interpersonal support, and operates in an efficient work environment. *Robinson D., Perrymen S., and Hayday S.* (Nov 2004) from Institute of Employment Studies-London defined engagement as: “a positive attitude held by the employee and its values. They are aware of business context, and works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefits
of organization, and to develop and nurture engagement which requires a two-way relationship between employer and employee”. It means - ‘Engagement’ is about the connection of employees to the goals and values of the organization. Derek Stokley defined engagement as “the extent that an employee believes in the mission, purpose and values of an organization and demonstrates that commitment through their actions as an employee and their attitude towards the employer and customers. Employee engagement is high when the statements and conversations held reflect a natural enthusiasm for the company, its employees and the products or services provided”. National Business Research Institute accepted the definition of ‘Employee Engagement’ as “the extent to which employees are passionate about their work, emotionally committed to their company and to their coworkers” In HR and Organization related literature, concepts of employee engagement are commonly threaded by the notion of willingness for participation in the job. Netware 2004 defined- “engagements is a state of complete involvements with one’s work or role.” Indian literatures have accepted (Business Today-Sept14, 2003)– “engagement is a barometer of how much employee want to improve the business result” as a definition. Glaspie, Nesbitt (April-2004) stated that there are different ways of measuring and defining engagement. Academic research (such as Katz and Kahn, in the Social Psychology of Organizations)
has identified three levels. The first level is 'commitment', i.e. joining and staying in the organization, low turnover, absenteeism; Second level is 'dependable behavior' i.e. strive for performance and excellence; the third level is 'innovative behavior' which goes beyond and beyond i.e. people with this behavior collaborate with colleagues, makes suggestions to improve the organization, and improve the organization's standing in the external environment. The definitions as forwarded by various proponents did not come to the final consensus of descriptor of employee engagement. Henceforth, the following part of the taxonomy is being concentrated on the descriptors and location of engagement.

**Types of Engagement:** *James Loehr, Ed.D., and Jack Groppel (2002)* stated full engagement happens through physical, emotional and spiritual engagement. Physical engagement means that employees have sufficient energy reserves to meet the demands they face. This is accomplished by eating right, sleeping right, exercising right, and getting adequate rest. Emotional engagement means employees bring a sense of hope, opportunity, and positivism to the daily storms of work. This is engaging the heart. Mental engagement means employees bring focus, clear thinking, and realism to the workplace. This is engaging the head. Spiritual engagement means employees bring a sense of purpose, passion, commitment, character, and integrity to
work everyday. Engaging the spirit is the most important element in the engagement process.

**Place and Descriptors of Engagement:** According to Robinson and Heyday, engagement is a combination of the organizational-facing aspects of commitment, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and motivation. Theoretically the crux of engagement incorporates several key components of commitment, motivation, organization citizenship behavior and there are strong relationship of among them (Graham- 1989). Therefore, Robinson and Hayday have placed engagement as a pivot of commitment, motivation, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB).

Scan of studies and other current literatures relevant to engagement showed that there are a few descriptors for ‘EE’. Halagera. Ray defined two terms i.e. “Not Engaged” and “Actively Disengaged.” According to him ‘Not Engaged’ mean those that show up, physically, to work everyday but fail to bring their passion, commitment, and discretionary efforts. They are just getting by, doing the bare minimum, and perhaps looking for a new job. The second term ‘Actively Disengaged’ means persons who spend the majority of the time by spreading their discontents; Undermine that their engaged co-worker is accomplishing and can accomplished. About ‘Engaged Employee’ in the study made by Wet Ware stated that engaged employees bring their
highest level of energy and focus to work; they drive innovation and move organization forward. In the context of ‘disengaged employees’ the corporation found that disconnected employee emotionally removed from their work. Various studies connected to employee engagement stressed on the following descriptors-

* Commitment to the organization
* Job ownership and pride;
* More discretionary effort (time and energy);
* Passion and excitement;
* Commitment to execution and excelling the bottom line for high performance;

Dimensions of Engagement: ISR – an International Research Consultancy organization defined that engagement is a three-dimensional concept, engagement remains in the heart of three dimensions. The three dimensions are-

(i) **Cognitive** (what do employees think about their company?) i.e.- are there intellectual “fit” between each employee and the organization? Do employees believe in the organization’s goals and objectives and support the values for which the organization stands?
(ii) **Affective** (what do employees feel about their company?) i.e. are there an ‘emotional bond’ between employees and the organization, which makes them proud to be a part of the organization? Would each employee recommend the organization as an employer?

(iii) **Behavioral Act** (how do employees act in relation to their company?)

There are two aspects to how employees act in relation to their company. One is whether employees exert the maximum effort in their work. Do they go the extra mile? The other is whether each employee intends to stay with the organization through successes and setbacks.

To achieve high levels of employee engagement and fully realize the benefits of employee engagement for the company each of these dimensions of engagement must be present, to some degree. The relative importance of each dimension may be vary from company to company, depending on its industry sector, strategic priorities, country of operation and the performance measurements that are critical to success in its particular competitive environment. The ISR study revealed, “...any organization must first understand the interplay between the three engagement dimensions within the context of its own internal and external environment if it wants to increase employee engagement”,
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**Elements of 'EE':** Engagement is a complex construct that can best be presented by breaking into number of individual elements. As a young concept, the researchers on engagement are on the continuous pursuit of exploration on the influencing factors, which have critical linkages and impacts on organization via 'EE'. In this section, researcher attempted to **delineate the empirically tested factors, which have critical influence over the EE.**

**Relationship:** Crabtree (2000-2004) tested workplace relationships are personal and the negative work place relationship dynamics have far-reaching and long-term consequences for organizations. It is quite true that 'people do not become soulless zombies when they arrive at the workplace'. In his study mentioned that workplace friendship, trusting, and supporting relationship help manger to create engaged employee. In his latest survey revealed that engaged employees perceive an element of selflessness in their best and closest partnerships, particularly those with their managers. Concerning personal impact-employees feel more engaged when they are able to make a unique contribution, experience empowerment, and have opportunities for personal growth. Past research (e.g., Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Thomas and Velthouse, 1990) concurs that the issues such as the ability to impact on the work environment and making meaningful choices in the workplace are
critical components of employee empowerment. DDI’s research on retaining talent (Bernthal and Wellins, 2000) found that the perception of meaningful work is one of the most influential factors determining employees’ willingness to stay and remain engaged with the organization is the critical outcome of the relationship among the employees in the workplace. Various study-employee engagement index results suggest that these relationships hold a key to employee engagement.

**Interpersonal Harmony:** Employees feel more engaged when they work in a safe and cooperative environment. By safety, we mean that employee trust one another and quickly resolve conflicts when they arise. Employees want to be able to rely on each other and focus their attention on the tasks that really matter. Conflict wastes time and energy and needs to be dealt with quickly. Other research from companies, conducted by The Great Place to Work Institute also found that trust and interpersonal harmony are the fundamental underlying principles in the best organizations. To get the job done employees also need cooperate. Partnership across departments and within the work group ensures that employees stay informed and get the support they need to do their jobs. DDI has introduced a new measure of employee engagement called the E3SM, which assesses the elements of engagement described above. It also includes a standard measure of employee satisfaction. This
measure is critical because the three components of employee engagement, and can all be considered as predictors or precursors of overall satisfaction of employee.

In the context of elements and critical influencing factors of engagement (Looi, Marausarz, Baumruk- 2005) the Hewitt model on engagement presupposes a unique concept. This concept was operationalized by three observable behaviors viz. Say, Stay, Strive. The “element ‘Say’ indicates, how much an employee speaks positively about the organization, to his/her coworkers, potential employees, and customers. ‘Stay’ measures how much an employee wants to be a member of organization and Strive measures how willing an employee is to extra efforts and how dedicated he/she is to doing the very best job possible”

**Critical Influencing Factors (Drivers of Engagement):** Employee engagement is a relatively new buzzword in the HR arena, but its true drivers are not often understood. Survey studies relating to engagement are fall under the two types (Balthazard-2004), i.e. type –1 (the classic attitude centric employee survey) and type-2 (optimal organizational performance model). In the type-1 surveys and researches have three components i.e. drivers, indicators, and outcomes. In the classic attitude- centric employee surveys drivers of engagement incorporates the attributes of the work environment that
are thought to have an impact on employee engagement. Engagement commonly tapped. The following drivers

* Leadership
* Relationship with manager
* Opportunities for advancement
* Job challenges
* Opportunities for learning
* Compensation and benefits
* Physical work environment
* Psychological work environment
* Teamwork, Etc.

The attitude centric surveys are deciphering the causal models, and stating the reciprocal nature of causal relationship between the perception of the work environment - climate and attitudes. Hewitt completed extensive research and identified the following drivers of engagement that influences by the employees perceptions of their work experience and engagement levels. Hewitt study ultimately concluded that typically employee engagement is driven by a combination of six factors within the modern business climate. These are as follows:
People- include the people an employee work with, such as senior leaders, managers, coworkers, and customers;

Work/ work values- include employee intrinsic motivation and values, availability of resources at work, and the extent to which an organization values being a good corporate citizenship;

Opportunities- Opportunities for training and development, and career advancement;

Processes and procedures- this include work processes, work flow and people practices and program, i.e. performance management;

Quality of life- means work life balance, and physical work environment;

Total Rewards- total rewards include pay, benefits, and financial and non-financial recognitions;

Covering the above-mentioned drivers, Hewitt’s model depicts the interplay and the reciprocal nature of interrelationship between the perception on the work environment and the experience at the workplace of the employees. The model and conceptual framework of the Hewitt explained the critical interplay of the six combinations of drivers, having similarities with the many models. Various international research and consulting organizations were adopted attitude centric research approach/model.
## Table 1
Commonly Accepted Drivers of Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL No</th>
<th>Drivers of EE</th>
<th>DDI</th>
<th>ESSR</th>
<th>Towers Perrin</th>
<th>Gallup</th>
<th>ISR</th>
<th>IES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maintenance of high ethical standard</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Challenging work</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Decision-making authority</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Evidence that the company is focused on customers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Career advancement opportunities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The company's reputation as a good employer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A collaborative work environment where people work well in teams</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Resources to get the job done</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Input on decision making</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A clear vision from senior management about future success</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Employees are treated with respect</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Management respect to employee.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Core values are concrete enough to put into practice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Senior managements interest in employee well being</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Employee's respect to management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pioneer research and consulting firm Gallup Organization (Thakray-2001) "identified 12 key employee expectation that, when satisfied, form the strong feeling of engagement". Along with the Gallup and Hewitt, a good number of international research and consulting firms identified different set of factors that drive the engagement. Among them Institute of
Employment Research (London), ISR, Gallup Organization, Kennexa Solutions, Development Dimensions International, Hewitt International, Towers Perrin, Burke Research (Inc.), Wetware Incorporation (New York), Meritz Research, National Business Research Institute (NBRI) etc. identified and listed drivers of engagement. In the table-1 of above showed the accepted drivers of engagement as mentioned by various researches and consulting firms.

**Indicators of Engagement:** If we recall back the statement made by Robinson and Heyday "engagement is a combination of the organizational-facing aspects of commitment, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and motivation" and pivot of commitment, motivation, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). A conclusion is made that the basic indicators of engagement are attitudinal building block of the pivot-'Engagement'. organizational citizenship behaviors are attitudinal indicators of engagement. Many researches included the indicators of engagement commitment, motivation, involvement and connection (Rude, Wellins and Jim, Katz and Kahn, Darek Stokley, Baranthal, Concelman. and many more) as the central indicators of engagement, and these indicators often used as a core indexes in both classic attitude centric survey research and research based on optimal organizational performance model. These indexes are consists of items such as 'I proud to be
part of the company', or 'I enjoy the work I do here', 'I am not distracted and detached and bored', 'I am feeling valued and involved here'. But the statement made by the Concealman. Jim (April-2005) as the "Engagement is Passion, Commitment, Extra effort. These terms describe employee engagement—as the illusive force that motivates employees to higher (or lower) levels of performance and discretionary efforts" revealing the existing linkages to organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as proposed by Robinson and Heyday. OCBs are discretionary behaviors not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and which promote the effective functioning of the organization (Katz and Kahn, 1986, in Rosenfield et.al, 1995). A Number of taxonomies of organization citizenship behavior were found, for example Bolino (1990) reports a five dimensional scale incorporating – altruism, generalized compliance, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue. Landen (2001) stated OCB bears four-dimensional profile encompassing – Interpersonal Helping, Personal Industry, Individual Initiative, Loyalty. But, in the recent model, OCB has incorporate three dimensions which is completely different that from the original one. The recent model of OCB incorporated sharing involvement, organizational ownership, and professional commitment (Pattanayak, Mishra, & Niranjana-2003). Virtually the profiles of OCB denoting the similarity with the
indicators as well as with the outcome of engagement. Engagement has a clear overlaps with the more exhaustively researched concepts of commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (Robinson and Heyday). Since, the determinants of engagement have clear overlapping with the determinants of OCB. The research attests to the linkages of work environment and work climate with OCB (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983. in Cooper 2002) in engagement literatures ‘the Drivers’ with the OCB.

**Outcomes of Engagement:** Outcomes are behaviors that are influence employee attitudes the classic behaviors that are tapped here are- (1) Productivity, (2) Discretionary efforts, (3) Retention. Though outcomes behaviors are accepted as productivity, discretionary efforts, retention, but it is much more controversial in deciphering and logically fit into acceptable conceptual frames. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, USA (www.bls.gov) conducted a comprehensive review of more than 100 studies and found that people practices have significant relationship to improvement of productivity, satisfaction and financial performance. Development Dimension International (DDI) research shows that when engagement scores are high, employees are more satisfied, less likely to leave the organization, and more productive. Beyond productivity Coffman and Gonzalez-Molina (2002) linked engagement with the firm’s competitiveness, as they stated “When engaged
employees utilize their natural talents, they provide an instant, and constant, competitive edge. They build a new value: emotionally driven connections between employees and customers." In support of Coffman and Molina, Stoklay rightly mentioned that organizations with employees who have pride those are strong and healthier than their competitor. Another statement ‘employee engagement is a partnership between the company and the employees where everyone works together to achieve the business objectives of the company and the personal aspirations of employees’ which attests the Stoklay’s quote. Basinsky stated that employee engagement is how organization goes about investing in their people practices to deliver better results by aligning them with the goals of the organization; it also indicates result of engagement at the overall organizational level. A host of researches - such as Reichheld (1996) “Loyalty Effect”; Sweetman (2001), Brooks (2000), Rollins (1998), Hayday (2003), Stern (2003), Mcdarmot (2001), Ron and Ronald testified the linkages of employee engagement (Satisfaction) more or less with productivity or profitability, financial outcomes, overall business performance, customer satisfaction and customer loyalty.

It is pertinent that employee’s attitude cannot influence organizational effectiveness and performance on their own. Employee must also behave appropriately- a factor, which is not included in the available models
Recent research indicates that employee satisfaction does not necessarily contribute to productivity (Hayday and Stern). They viewed satisfaction as passive attribute, while more proactive measures such as motivation level and brand management are viewed as more closely linked to the behavioural change, performance and ultimately to bottom-line performance. Goetzel and Ozminkowski (2002) was of the view that "employee productivity depends on the amount of time an individual is 'Physically present' at the job and also the degree to which he or she is "mentally Present' or efficiently functioning while present at the job". These indicate the shift toward linking employee engagement to performance, but it is very rare witnesses on the final model of the outcome of engagement.

Engagement has a clear linkage with excellence at organizational and individual level. According to Gardner (1967) excellences implies a striving for highest standards and is desirable for progress. Excellence does not happen miraculously, but springs from pace setting level of personal effectiveness and efficiency. Similarly, from the conceptual queue of Gonzalez-Molina (2002) engagement is linked with the firm's competitiveness and performance. Since the competitiveness and performance does not happen miraculously, but through the human efficiency and efforts. Linking to elements of engagement and the indicators of engagement- are like citizenship behavior, there must be
positive connections with the work excellence. Work excellence is a discretionary effort as like as OCB is a discretionary behaviour. Excellence creators have to put their discretionary efforts. Person who shows discretionary behaviour can put their discretionary efforts is easy assumable and investigative proposition.

The Comprehensive Model: Though, there are a good number of models developed by various researchers and consulting organization but from the taxonomical analysis on concept ‘Employee Engagement’ a comprehensive model (in Fig-2) may be framed to describe the interplay of factors, drivers, descriptors and the key organizational outcomes of employee engagement. A refined model of author in his work (2006) based on the elements covered by the other researches is the basis of the present study. This model was re-configured for easy and common understanding of the concept – employee engagement as well as self-explanatory. From this self-explanatory model, a few research propositions is made (the bold components are inserted in the model is the foundation for the above three research propositions). This is the basis of the present study since this model reconfigured for easy and common understanding of the concept - engagement.
1.II. The Context

The Hindustan Paper Corporation (HPC), Government of India enterprise, owns and operates two printing and writing paper mills in Assam State: Nagaon Paper Mill (NPM) located at Kagajnagar, Jagiroad (Morigaon); and Cachar Paper Mill (CPM) located at Panchgram. NPM started its commercial operation in October, 1985, and CPM started in April 1988. These mills, which are very similar in both equipments and production capacity, were built to provide industrial development and employment opportunities in this part of the country. After some years, the government of India decided to that these mills should become more profitable in operations and they would not be subsidized for regional and social development purposes. Jain, Singh and Kulkarni (March, 2005) stated—"in the wake of the economic liberalization, triggered by the new economic policy of the government in 1991, the Indian paper industry found itself confronted with the international competition. Almost overnight, the industry was exposed to the difficult task of integrating into the global economy. These have had an evolutionary effect on the traditional management style, triggering serious redesign of strategies to ensure survival". Along with the current of economic liberalization, HPC too stated to mould its survival strategy. The philosophy of HPC to achieve higher productivity at competitive price with the participation of employees
Figure-1:

Comprehensive model of Employee Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors affecting Engagement</th>
<th>Drivers (Work place Factors)</th>
<th>Indicators (Symbolic outcomes)</th>
<th>Key Org Outcomes</th>
<th>Actual outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership - Clarity of institutional values, Standards of ethical behavior, Respectful Treatment.</td>
<td>Immediate management, Senior management’s interest in employee well-being</td>
<td>Belief in organization; Desire to make things better; Understand business context; Respectful and helpful to colleagues; Keeping pace with the development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment - Employee Involvement in decision making;</td>
<td>Challenging and focused Work, Collaborative work environment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image: Institutional/organizational Image;</td>
<td>Clear vision from senior management, Value to employee’s contributions, Courtesy, Equal opportunities and fair treatment, Resources to get Job done,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development - Opportunity for Personal Development, Effective management of Talents; Physical &amp; psychological and work environment; Compensation and Benefits;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Barman, Jan 2006
and vendors indicates that both mills in Assam are on the productivity and quality drive from top to bottom and vice-versa. HPC group concluded MOU for the financial year 2005-06 with the Government of India by setting an ambitious target for enhancing degree of operational efficiency with future focused strategies on modernization and technological upgradation. HPC aimed at a sales turnover exceeding Rs. 900 Cr. in the year 2004-05, and Rs. 1050 crores in the financial year 2005-06. The sales turn over in the year 2003-2004 was Rs. 873 Crores. The survey conducted by Nath. K. (April-2003) on organizational process climate (OPC) in CPM and NPM by applying the Manning, George Curtis, Kent's (1986) inventory, (South Western Publishing, Cincinnati, pp.74-81) revealed that there are prevalence of 80% total quality OPC in both the units which is affecting the business process management (BPM) in a positive direction. The Bulletin of HPC (May-June, 2004) is witnessing the emphasis given by the CEO on the building of corporate culture, recognition of task, talents, teamwork to transform HPC to be a performance driven i.e. demanding and caring organization. In the same bulletin the CEO of corporation also stressed on the need for HPC to remain relevant, vibrant and winning. The core messages CEO- such as ‘we believe that creating the future begins here and now through our heads, hearts, and souls (in Papyrus Sept.-Oct, 2004); ‘all world class business enterprises are
today driven by advances in technology and new knowledge. Blending of customer understanding, innovation imperative, scientific research and technological development have become inescapable for sustained enterprise survival, success, and market leadership (in Papyrus, July-Aug 2004). Latest implementation of Modernization and Technological Up -gradation Plans (MTUP) in both the mills in Assam in Jan 19, 2005 (Papyrus, Jan- Feb, 2005) are reiterating the importance given on the commitment and competitiveness. These evidences are giving a sense over the practice of employee engagement in the paper industries in Assam.

1.11. Statement of the Problem

Depending on the basic theoretical underpinnings and the conceptual frame of engagement in such performance oriented paper industry a lot of researchable query emerged out. Among them a few but the mains are - How the management of HPC is engaging its bottom-line employee to reach their sated target of productivity and performance. Whether employees of the HPC are feeling engaged? What is their average level of engagement? If employees feel disengaged than what are the factors responsible for the same? Through which, HR mechanism HPC would be able to move in the journey of excellence? To address these queries present attempt is an academic exploration captioned as “Employees’ Engagement in Public Sector Paper
The literature-surrounding employee's engagement focused either the attitude centric or its relationship to the behavioral outcomes of employees' such as commitment, loyalty and retention, involvement. Majority of the study made on engagement and exploring drivers; and connected to the organizational performance, management effectiveness, and financial performance. Very rare evidences are found surrounding engagement and organizational citizenship behavior, and work excellence of the employees.

1.IV. Aim of the Study

The main aim of the study is the measurement and determination of levels of employees' engagement, to identify the key drivers of engagement in HPC. Examining the impacts of engagement on Work Excellence (WE) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and the relationship with components of OCB and WE.

Objectives of the Study: The following objectives framed to achieve the stated purposes systematically. They are-
1. To determine and compare the levels of employee’s engagement among the different levels of employees of the units of HPC in Assam.
2. To identify the key drivers of engagement in the context of HPC.
3. (i) To determine the level of employees’ organizational citizenship behavior (OCB); and (ii) to analyze individual and joint effects of the drivers of engagement on employees’ OCB.
4. (i) To determine the level of perceived work excellence (WE) among the employees of the units of HPC in Assam; (ii) to analyze individual and joint effect of drivers of employees’ engagement on employees’ WE.

2.V. Importance of the Study

There are few important reasons why this study needs to accomplish. First, there is a need to fill a gap in the literature concerning the engagement in the public sector paper industry. Research concerning in the engagement in public sector paper industry in India is rare. At the same time “empirical research on employee engagement is relatively new” as stated by Kniss Beth-an Insala consultant (Aug-2005). The statement of the research team of the Institute of employment Studies-London, they are- Robinson, Perryman and Heyday (2004) stated regarding the research on engagement – “Engagement is big in HR consultancy market, yet there is dearth of academic research in this
area. All these are stating the need for and importance of the present step for research in engagement.

Second, there is a desire to have a more complete understanding of behavioral attributes exhibited by engaged employees. It is becoming increasingly important to understand what other behavior can disclose by engaged employee. Only Robinson and Heyday (2004) linked up OCB with employee engagement, and felt further academic research for reinvestigations in the different organizational environment to probe the fact. This study aims to achieve the same direction as shown by Robinson and Heyday (2004).

Thirdly, the present research would help the management of concerned organization to take corrective action for engaging employee in a matching way as what the other global firm is doing. In general the study would help in developing the theoretical as well as practical insights for practitioners in the field of human resource management and organizational behavior, management training and development experts.

1. VI. Review of Literature

Literature pertaining to employee engagement is available with e-journals, web sites of the international research and consultancy organizations.
For reviewing the relevant literatures on the present area of research, the journey stated with reviewing of various sources mentioned above and ended with review on the few hard copies of texts published in the different journals and research based books. The reviewed literature was classified into three categories- (1) Global Studies (i.e. Study made by the global consultants and researchers on engagement), (2) Studies in Indian Corporation and (3) Study made by Individual Researchers within and outside the country (India).

1.VI. Global Studies on Engagement

The Employee Engagement Report- 2005, a study conducted by the Blessing White, of New Jersey, USA, a survey outcome of the responses collected with the seven-point response scale from 990 respondents, who are belongs to similar demographic breakdown. The respondents were from Financial Services, Health Care and Pharmaceuticals, High Tech, and Manufacturing and their job functions include Human Resource, Sales, Marketing, IT, Finance, Manufacturing, and production. The main focus of the report was- ‘Will employee stay, why or why not?; How do the employee feel about their job and the organizational directions?; what can improve the satisfaction and performance of the employee?; Are these talents been maximized by focusing on what matters most to them?; How do the employee feel about the managers?’ The key findings of the study was that – a few
employees are truly engaged; if they are not engaged they engaged by spinning, settling or splitting. The study revealed engagement is an individualized equation because work is personal, manager employee relationships matters more. This report really revealed an interesting fact among the employees’ of different sectors.

Kniss, Beth (Aug 2005) reviewed the most current researches on employees’ engagement made by the global consultancy firms such as-Towers Perrin, Hewitt, Mercer, Institute of Employment Studies-London. The author Beth articulated the key findings of these studies. Among the reports- ‘The Forum for People Performance Management and Measurement at North Western University’, ‘The Impact of Employee attitude on Market Response and Financial Performance (Nov-2004)’ also linked employees’ satisfaction to customer satisfaction and a company’s financial success. The study was conducted by mail survey methods, 110,000 questionnaires are mailed to media companies and response rate was 34 percent. The interesting findings of the study was articulated as follows-

- The key characteristic for explaining employee satisfaction is organizational communication.
- Employee satisfaction is a key precursor to employee engagement.
• Organizational culture is a significant driver of employee engagement, where employees must be expected to work together and provide a voice for the customer within the organization.

• When individuals and teams compete to implement optimal behaviors oriented and its customers, such competition can benefit both the organization and its customers.

• 64% apply the philosophy of employee engagement to their practices.

• Organization with engaged employees have customers who use their product more.

• It is an organization’s employee who influences the behavior and attitude of customers, and it is customers who drive an organization’s profitability through the purchase and use of its product.

Gratton, Lind, and Popper (2004) - a world’s leading expert and consultants of Concours Group explored the tangible approaches for creating stronger employee engagement in the 20 organizations in UK (including public corporations, privately held companies, and large non-profit organizations) renowned for their performance and demonstrably good at keeping their employees engaged. They examined differences between
successful engagement approaches of different company and explored the foundation for achieving competitive advantage and maximizing the business values. The finding of the study was not mentioned in the web.

Masztal, Jaci and Jarrett, Salaman, et.al. (2004) examined the survey process in 50 of the Fortune 500 and 161 Mid-sized companies in USA and also examined how employees can make difference. They conclude that ‘multiple employee listening posts most effectively support employee involvement and engagement’. The said research showed that engaged employees were more likely to stay with the company and advocate the company, its products and services, and contribute positively to bottom-line business success. For the engagement study they employed the five-point scale and linked the work effectiveness of employees.

Welbourne, Theresa M (2004) the leader of technology and research business named as eepulse that delivering web based survey powered by their software. The measurement and communication tool was developed based on Theresa’s own researches and consulting. She conducted a study in the area of employee engagement in high growth and high degree of changing organizations. In her study she demonstrated the effect of leadership and human resource management strategies on firm’s survival and financial performance. In the same study, it was found that there are five work related
roles i.e. - job holder role, team member role, entrepreneur role, career role, and organization member’s role. Employees are in highly engaged state when they are doing the non job roles. In her studies, she stressed on the need for shift of ownership from the owners, managers, and to the employees. She stated that the basic starting point of the engagement strategy was the shift of ownership to the bottom-line. She also focused on how various human resources, communication, leadership, and reward strategies were affecting engagement and long-term performance of the organizations’ and their employees within that high growth, highly changing firms.

Robinson, D, Perryman, S, Hayday, S, (2004) from the Institute of Employment Studies (IES) studied and measured employee engagement in NHS of UK. In the organization, there are 10,000 employees and they surveyed with the help of their own 5-itemed attitude scale instead of 12 itemed as prepared by Gallup organization. In-depth analysis of NHS case study revealed many interesting findings. This study found that engagement level declines when the employee gets older, but when the employee get oldest and becomes 60 years shows highest level of engagement. In addition, the study showed managers and professionals tend to have higher level of engagement than their colleagues in the supporting roles do, although the later groups are more loyal to their profession and to their jobs.
Bernthal, Paul R, (2004) identified and recognized the best work places to work for. The same were listed in the “Fortune’s 100 Best Companies to Work For”. Bernthal reviewed the concept of engagement and concluded that concept of engagement has had naturally evolved from the past research on high involvement, empowerment, job motivation, organizational commitment and trust. He reported that there are several standardized tools for measuring employee engagement, and for the same complexity the Development Dimension International (DDI), the firm where Bernthal worked developed a tool popularly known as E3™. The research concluded that engagement comprises three things- individual value, focused work and interpersonal support. Each of these components has three subcomponents that further define the meaning of engagement.

Ray, Halagera (Aug, 2004), studied on the outcomes of employees’ engagement. Halgera stated engaged employee were more innovative and productive, more committed to customer satisfaction, and accordingly produce more profits for their organization than their less engaged peer. His finding and conclusion are similar to other studies and the findings. This supported the link between employees’ satisfaction and engagement, employees’ productivity and ultimately on financial results.
Laffey, JoAnne, and Micucci, Joe (May 18, 2004) posted to website on behalf of Hewitt Associate (a global human resources outsourcing and consulting firms ‘NYSE:HEW’ operating from the 38 countries of the world) reported that employees drive the improved business performance and the return; and high growth companies have more effective motivation and communication practices. The study was conducted by gathering data from more than 4 Million employees, compared engagement levels and practices of double digit growth (DDG) companies (those with five year compound average revenue growth of 10 percent more) against companies that achieved less than 10 percent of growth. The study found that- the DDG companies provide greater opportunities and support for employee development; DDG companies frequently solicit feedback from their employees; employee at high growth companies are more connected to the business, its performance and its leadership. The study found leaders of high growth companies showed more engaged than the less growth company.

As reported by Conway Joe (2003), in the study, made on behalf of Towers Perrin, (an international management consultancy for financial services company worldwide with 900 employees, 79 offices in 77 cities and 24 countries), found that US workers remain focused on their jobs despite the tough economic climate, job layoff and other business challenges in the last
two years (2001-2002). The study focused on the medium and large organizations; demonstrate that employees are in mode of ‘Rational Endurance’ – doing what is required to help, keep themselves, and their companies afloat in a tough environment. However, at the same time the study showed that relatively few of the employee exhibited high level of engagement in their job, based on core set of workplace attitudes, which measures engagement. The findings has major implication for companies’ long term performance and their ability to retain the key talents as the economy improves and the job market opens up.

**Devanport, Thomas O. and Robert Darryl R.** (2003) a principal and a senior consultants respectively, of the worldwide consulting firm of San Francisco, studied on ‘The Challenges of Engagement’ for disillusioned IT professionals. The study reported the state of employee attitude in IT sectors, and found job security, work environment, supervision received by employee, organizational support and work life balance and the way organization recognizes the higher and quality performance were the critical factors as well as challenges for engagement of the IT professionals in USA.

The report entitled **Best Employers in Asia-2003** prepared by **Hewitt Associates (Asia)** identified the organizations in region, which identified important requirement for engaging employees in the firm where study was
conducted. In this study, 'The Best' were 75 companies. These companies classified into the local lists e.g. the Best Employer in China, The Best Employer in Hong Kong etc. The top companies selected from the local best. In that list name of Indian corporation not found. In this study, the key drivers influencing the Asian employees are -Recognition, Policies, and Career Opportunities were/are the central drivers for Asian employees. Also found that intrinsic motivation, values to society are essentially consistent in Asian society. The study conducted in Manufacturing, Pharmaceuticals, Bank-Finance and Insurance, Fast Moving Consumer Goods, Hospitality, Information Technology Related Company, Retail, Telecom, Transport, and others.

Another interesting survey made by *McNeely Hank*(2000) of the Kenexa a global HR consultancy firm of USA to examine how one of the world's largest sellers of the office products cultivate a positive work culture while continuing to focus on expensive employee growth. Understanding the committed employees perform better, office depots turned to an automated employee engagement solution to deliver on their mission to establish a high performing organization. The study conducted in the office depots of the company located in the 23 countries with a total number 50,000 people worldwide. The survey observed how employees view the company’s culture,
leadership, and their own experience at work. It had been shown to have definite impact of the level of service they were able to provide, and like organization were providing to their customers. Along with these, it revealed that employee engagement surveys empowered the employees by providing them with non-threatening venue to share their thoughts, perceptions, and opinion on various issues or theme across the organization. Realizing the benefits from the survey, the company made the survey as annual events with the help of Kenexa.

National Business Research Institute (NBRI) surveyed on employee engagement with a conceptual foundation that employees’ loyalty, do not fully address employees’ engagement. Employee’s loyalty focused more narrowly on intended future behavior (e.g. the likelihood that employee will stay). NBRI studies included employee’s loyalty, but added the critical dimensions of what employees think about the organizational goals and values- and whether they would support them. This is the cognitive concept engagement. The studies of NBRI included 43 questions covering 11 dimensions, which customized to meet the organization’s objectives. The dimensions incorporated in the survey were- Career Development, Climate, Communications, compensation, Culture, Employee Commitment, Job
Employee Engagement Survey gave everyone in Centrica the opportunity to comment on how his or her business was being ran. The survey measures engagement against key areas such as, CEO as an individual, impact of management, customer focus, team leadership, performance, and development. Since 1999, it has evolved from a measure of employee satisfaction to a tool that lends invaluable input into their strategic decision-making. In 2003, more than 74% of their employees took part in the survey. Following the survey-2001, the Centrica’s Executives targeted to four specific questions and established as the key to creating the right working environment for delivering better employee engagement. Recommendations made based on the results included enabling managers to focus on increasingly regular reviews of performance and team meetings, and on improving advocacy of Centrica’s products and services by employees.

Meritz Research another consultancy firm of USA undertakes the comprehensive research on the employee engagement in the area of education, communication, and motivation including- Organizational and employee research that establishes what motivates your staff and suggested in understanding of culture and key business issues of organization. They
conducted qualitative researches to probe the underlying issues behind employee commitment to a brand or organization, communication throughout the process to achieve buy-in, interest, and commitment, action planning to develop internal performance targets, design, and implementation of performance improvement solutions, and measurement of success. The core of their researches were on fresh approach to employee’s engagement which was developed in response to their clients’ need, and innovative methodology, reframing new scale from the validated scales accepted by a wide range of blue-chip clients globally.

The Certified General Accountants Association of Canada (CGA), a national self-regulating Association of 60,000 certified general accountants and students conducted a survey on engagement at CGA Canada in 2000. The association adopted 4 itemed/ issues among the managers and non managers. Based on this study CGA developed the research strategy of the engagement process and evaluation. In the case history one entitled “Engaging CGA-Canada employees in the business” revealed that there was a significant misalignment of views between managers and employees regarding fairness and willingness to provide feedback.

Dahl. Tor, in the seminal work entitled “Moving Mountain by Moving Mind: New Insight into Employees Peak Performance Enhancement by
Change Enablers" studied how leadership influence over the productivity. His
answer was that the leaders should work as change enablers. They are the key
in bringing change and innovation in an organization. In discussing over the
performance improvement and productivity, he touched on engagement and
leadership in the context of knowledge economy. He opined that the
productivity could be improved even up to 200 percent if leader can connect;
ignite the emotion and mind of the followers. Using the data from USA and
Europe, he demonstrated how much change an individual (usually about
50 percent in service industries, 25 percent in manufacturing industries) could
make. Dahl ultimately linked employee engagement with leader engagement
in engaging employees' for productivity.

ISR- an international research consultancy firm entitled ‘Creating
competitive advantage from your employees: ‘A global study of
engagement’ explored into the nature and causes of employee engagement;
and how companies can improve engagement to enhance business
performance. The survey was conducted across 10 of the world’s largest
economies- Austria, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Hong Kong, the
Netherlands, Singapore, the UK, and USA. Involving nearly 160,000
employees and from hundreds of different companies across the broad
spectrum of industries from High Tech to Financial Services, Manufacturing,
Pharmaceuticals, Telecom, Consumer Goods, retail Transport, Government and consumer goods industries etc. ISR studied on drivers of engagement that worked in the context and across the countries, and the roots of engagement. The study found that the specific drivers of engagement were culture, economic condition, and predominant management practices of these countries.

1.VI. (b). Studies by Individual Authors/Researchers

_Drapau (2005)_ studied engagement-satisfaction in the educational institution of Nova Scotia Community Colleges (NSCC), realizing the institutional effectiveness in knowledge driven depends upon the people/human, information, organizational capital they contribute through their work. The study/survey carried on in three colleges of Nova Scotia Community, in Nova Scotia during the year 2001, 2002, and 2003. The dimension of attitude scale for engagement were- (1) Treatment of employee (2) Quality of Department Management, (3) Organizational Leadership (4) Job Security, (5) Relation to Co-workers, Employee Benefits, (6) Compensation and Pay, (7) Professional Development, (8) Physical work Condition (9) Opportunities for Advancement. The result used for the purpose of change process of NSCC.
Beare, Paul L, Severson, S., and Brandt, Patricia (2004) made an interesting study entitled “The Use of positive Procedure to Increase Engagement On-Task and Decrease Challenging Behavior” to examine the use of positive procedure to increase engagement on-task-behavior and reduce self destructive and stereotypic cloth manipulation by 46-year-old man with severe disabilities. A single subject research design used to examine the effect of the combined DRA-DRO (Differential Reinforcement of Alternative Behavior- Differential Reinforcement of Other Behavior) procedure in fostering behavior that is more appropriate. Following 30 years of institutionalization, that person successfully integrated into community-based employment. The study found that the differential-reinforcement techniques used to increase Ed’s engagement in task behavior and to reduce the stereotypic behavior were effective. These procedures had previously documented with similar but less extreme behaviors (Foxx, 1982). It is a complete applied psychology applicable for the person bearing this type behavior, and its modification for the purpose of engagement.

Bathazard Claude (2004) studied on the type survey undertaken to study the engagement by the various researchers. It was found that there are two types of surveys- “The classic attitude centric employee survey”, the other one is “The conditions for optimal organizational performance” employed to
understand the employee engagement in organizations. Found that maximum studies conducted under the first type of study. Also evidenced, there were surveys used combine approach for understanding the engagement and satisfaction.

Koys, D. J (2001) added to the body literature through his study entitled ‘The Effects of Employee’s Satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), and Turnover on Organizational Effectiveness: A Unit Level Longitudinal Study’. The study was conducted to examine the relationship in the service sector in Chicago, gathered employee managers, and customers surveys and organizational records and HR outcome measures i.e employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover. This study demonstrated that HR outcome (such as employee performance and retention) influence organizational effectiveness and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) can also influences on customer satisfaction. He defined OCB to include Conscientiousness, Altruism, Civic Virtue, Sportsmanship, and Courtesy as the behavioral components of OCB.

Keye, Beverly and Jordan- Evans, Sharon (2000) in their ‘Building the Retention Culture’ mentioned that for retaining employees the corporation managers have to concentrate on the engagement factors. They incorporated engagement culture, environment, and managerial styles for the purpose of
retention of the employee. Finally they found that the core of engagement is the *creation of work environment* which loved by people, as a result they stay; show the loyalty to the organization.

*Baron, James N and Kreps, David M (1999)* in their work on engagement entitled ‘Engagement and Consistent Human Resources Practices’ studied how the inconsistency of human resource practices influence over the engagement of the employee in the context of merger and acquisition too. They had drawn the conclusion by studying the illustrative cases of Hewlett Packard, United Parcel Services, Lincoln Electric Company. On the basis of the study the author concluded that for engaging and re-engaging employees needs to maintain the consistency HR practices and policies.

*Mir. Ali, Mir. Raja, and Mosca, Joseph B* studied on changing employee relations in the context of new age employee through the theoretical lens of organizational commitment and engagement. Ultimately, built a theoretical model on employee and organizational relationship, commitment and engagement, with an aim to provide a conceptual foundation for creation of committed and engaged workforce for the public sectors industries in the new age.
Dr. Marie T, McCormick's (1999) in their dissertation explored engagement as a factor influencing employee satisfaction to large-scale organizational change. Dr. McCormick's study involved some 340 respondents within two organizations. The research demonstrated significant correlations between the levels of engagement (as measured by the MEEI©) and the degree of respondent satisfaction with large-scale change.

The MEEI Research Committee believed that employee engagement goes beyond the job-satisfaction. Thus, employee engagement defined as a personal state of authentic involvement, contribution, and ownership. This led to the hypothesis that employee engagement is a reliable factor in differentiating distinct levels of organizational productivity. Four regional, national, and international organizations including healthcare, educational, and pharmaceutical companies participated in this research project. The database for this research included 740 employees. They also provided high or "benchmark" productivity units and units with distinctly less productivity in order to test the hypothesis.

Cozzani. Charles. A, and Oakley. James L. made a series of the study on engagement. In the first series, they studied employee satisfaction and engagement to examine the linkage between organizational characteristics to employee attitude and behavior. For studying engagement and satisfaction, the
study employed Organizational Effectiveness Index (OEI). The study covered 90 organizations in USA with the help of the project managers. Total 5568 numbers of respondents took participation in this research. The scale relating to employee perspectives are stress job satisfaction and quality of services. Employee engagement from the employee perspectives are on the following dimensions- inspirations, involvement, and supportiveness. In the second series Cozzani and Oakley studied interrelationship between employee satisfaction and employee engagement and antecedents organizational characteristics, for these two attitudes and their downstream market and financial performance. The outcomes of the study were satisfaction and engagement has different organizational predictors, employee satisfaction and engagement both have direct and positive impacts on financial outcomes. The other outcomes of the study were job design and managerial/supervisory facilitation ton subordinate one among the key drivers of engagement.

1.VI.(C). Studies on Indian Corporation

Mercer –an international human resource & consulting firms studied with the basic question – whether employees engaged in their work and committed their organization’s success? Mercer studied on the confidence in the ability of leadership to steer their company through the turbulent economic times, and examined whether the employee understand how the works of
employee work contribute to the business success. Using six factors model, this incorporated the factors (drivers) such as confidence in senior management, paid fairly for good performance, organizations reputation for customer services, comparable benefit to industry, regular feedback on performance and reasonable workloads. The survey addressed the unique aspects of the work environment such as leadership, teamwork, communication quality, customer focus and included 125 survey items. This study incorporated 120 items and administered 215 organizations.

Studies on engagement in the context of Indian corporate sectors under the caption of ‘BT-Hewitt Best Employers Survey’ was conducted by BT-Hewitt Associate time to time. Hewitt conducted the studies to select the best employer in India, 2003. In this survey 220 organizations participated and the result revealed that the best employer have more engaged employee 76%, engaged employee are either satisfied or committed. The survey found that engaged employees speak positively about their company, have desire to be the part of future and contribute toward its success. There are evidences of the study in India made by the Gallup Organization on employee engagement by using Q12-‘global model’ in the organizations namely North Delhi Power Limited (NDPL) (July-Nov, 2003), Tata Teleservices (April-28/2003). In the context of study on engagement in India, Gallup and Hewitt both are the
American consulting organizations have/had studied different sectors. News clips by Srinivasan (2003), is the evidence of study in the context of engagement by the Gallup MBA Pvt. Ltd. In this news clip, it was stated that the Gallup-MBA carried out a study among one-lakh employees in over 130 organizations during 2000-03, and revealed that compared to the service and IT sectors, employees of Old Economy are more likely to have been cast in a role that utilizes their talents properly and had done better in employee engagement. The BT- Hewitt’s surveyed on best employers in India were primarily an exploration on engagement in the organizations of different sectors of Indian subcontinents. Hewitt’s survey-2002 covered 204 numbers of companies and 52000 white-collar employees. The study covered Energy and Power; Internet Services Providers, IT-enabled services, Health Management, Automobile & Auto-Components, Services and Hospitality, Heavy Engineering, Manufacturing, Chemical and Petro-Chemicals, Consumer Durables, Telecommunications and Banking and Financial Services, Agricultural Products, Biotechnology, Construction, and finally, Govt. and Public Sectors. Similarly, Hewitt studied for the year 2003, 2004, 2005; and these revealed that there are six basic drivers of engagement (Business Today, Sept.14, 2003) - i.e. people, work, opportunities, quality of work life, procedures, leadership which are anyway not different from the
driving force of engagement of other country and culture of the world. According to the finding, of the study of Virmani. Ravi and et.al -2002 the following basics are consistent across all the best employers in India. They are:

# High degree of employee’s satisfaction, commitment, and morale;
# A Sense of ownership and belongings- a collective relationship fostered by the organization;
# Opportunities for accelerated growth and development;
# Consistent application of HR practices in depth and breadth;
# Unique HR practices – many are developed from the employee suggestions;
# Sensitivity towards a balance between work and personal life;
# Alignment of HR practices with the business context;

1.VI.(d). Review of Literature on Citizenship Behavior

However, OCB is well-researched concept, and incorporated the basic constructs (dimensions) are five dimensional – altruism, generalized compliance, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue (Bolino, 1990). There are, a very few studies conducted on academic pursuits in the in India. All the studies are backed by the either western conceptual model or the tools developed by the western researchers and investigators. As evidences,
*Chaitanya and Tripathi (2001)* validated the dimensions mentioned in the Bolino. However, both of them also mentioned that there are quite a few studies on OCB with specific reference to the population of the west. In Indian context *Pattanayak, Misra, Niranjana* developed to measure organizational citizenship behavior. Their scale contained tree dimensional concept of citizenship behavior covered- Sharing Involvement, Organizational Ownership, and Professional Commitment. *Pattanayak and Niranjana (2002)* in their work relating to ‘Organizational Citizenship Behavior: a Proposed Hierarchical Model for Performing Organizations’ made only a conceptual review on citizenship behavior.

1.VI.(e) Observations from the Review

From the available literatures on engagement, found that the study on engagement is more popular in the western countries. This popularization both at international level as well as in India is due to the international research and consultancy organizations. From the observation few of major trends is worth mentioning- firstly, the international consulting firms mainly conducted their studies in the organization of health, education, telecom and communications, banking services, real estate, information technology, transport , an manufacturing sectors. The study mainly based on the crux of satisfaction, and the already established linkages of engagement with commitment, loyalty,
customer satisfaction, and firms' financial performance. Secondly, the individual researcher conducted study on the theme by adopting unit level longitudinal study. Whatever the survey conducted by the individual researcher shown the linkages firm performance, work environment and culture as either cause or effects of engagement. The context of the studies made by individual researcher was the pharmaceutical, knowledge based service organizations, pharmaceuticals, educational institutions and individual human being. Thirdly, from the study made on the international consulting firms such as Hewitt and Gallup showed the trend of assessing the levels of engagement in the format of exploring and finding the best to place to work for. The studies were conducted on Energy and Power; Internet Services Providers, IT- enabled services, Health Management, Automobile & Auto-Components, Services and Hospitality, Heavy Engineering, Manufacturing, Chemical and Petro-Chemicals, Consumer Durables, Telecommunications and Banking and Financial Services, Agricultural Products, Biotechnology, Construction, and finally, Govt. and few of the public sectors organizations.

Though, the studies conducted by the above-mentioned research and consultancy firms covered engagement in public sector organizations such as Indian Oil Corporation, Oil and Natural Gas Corporation and NTPC, but evidence on exclusive survey cum empirical or exploratory research within
public sector organizations is not found. Hence, the present attempt is to explore engagement in the public paper industry was undertaken to fill the gap.

Note: (Along with the review of above literatures, a popular source on HR and Behavioral Research, the Archive of Sri Ram Centre for Industrial, New Delhi also visited, and scanned the indexes for the 1997 to 2005 to collect the evidences on similar type of study on the engagement, mentioned in the references no 39-58).
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