CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Employee Engagement

The concept of employee engagement was defined by Kahn (1990 p.694) as “the harnessing of organization members’ to their work roles; in engagement, people work and direct themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances”. According to Erickson (2005) Engagement is not only merely fulfillment but about passion and pledge—the willingness to invest oneself and consume one’s optional effort to help the employer succeed.

Schaufeli & Salanova (2007) defined engagement as “a positive, satisfying, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption”. i) Vigor is described by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the readiness to invest energy in one's work, and perseverance even in the face of difficulties. ii) Dedication refers to being intensely involved in one's work and feeling a sense of meaning, passion, motivation, pride and challenge. iii) Absorption, is categorized by being fully focused and happily absorbed in one’s own work, and time passes rapidly and the person has difficulties with separating oneself from work'.

Another way of looking to Employee Engagement is combination of both individual and organizational engagement Saks (2006), argues that displaying varying degrees of engagement is one way for individuals to repay their organization for the economic and socio-emotional resources they receive from it.

Employee engagement is different from concept of job involvement (Lawler and Hall 1970, Lodahl and Kejner, 1965) and commitment to organization (Mowday, 1982). Employee
engagement is a multidimensional construct – Employees can be emotionally and cognitively engaged. To be emotionally engaged is to form meaningful connections to others (e.g. coworkers and managers) and to experience empathy and concern for others’ feelings. Cognitively engaged refers to those who are intensely aware of their mission and role in their work environment. When people are engaged they become physically involved in their tasks, cognitively alert and ardently connected to others in ways that demonstrate their individuality (e.g., thoughts, feelings and values) (Kahn, 1992).

2.2 Evolution of Concept of Employee Engagement

Kahn (1990) said the Employee Engagement as “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people work and express themselves bodily, mentally, and emotionally during their role performances”. He found that “psychological conditions of meaning, security, and readiness serve as antecedents of personal engagement (Kahn, 1992)” According to Kahn (1992) Psychological meaningfulness states to one’s belief regarding how significant it is to carry oneself to a role performance. Psychological meaningfulness is achieved when people feel worthwhile, valuable and that they matter, the factors that Kahn found influence meaningfulness were task characteristics, role characteristics and work relations. Psychological safety means person’s perception of how safe it is to carry oneself to a role performance devoid of fear of harm to self-image, position, or career factors which he found effect psychological safety were relational relationships, group and intergroup forces at work, management style, and norms.

Employee engagement as defined by Maslach et al. (2001) as a psychological and emotional state, a ‘determined, positive affective motivational state of accomplishment opposite to state of
burnout’, they have proposed that engagement can be characterized by energy, involvement and efficacy. Luthans and Peterson (2002) stated that being cognitively engaged is being aware at thinking level and conscious of role and contribution towards achieving of the organization’s goals and to be affectively engaged is about emotional bondage with people and work in the organization. Schaufeli et al. (2002) explained employee engagement as "a constructive fulfilling, work related state of mind that is categorized by vigor, dedication and absorption" and a more “untiring and omnipresent affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual or behaviour”. Harter et al. (2002) stated that employee engagement is the individual’s immersion, and passion for work'. Hewitt Associates (2004) put it as an attitude which shapes the employees desire to act as ambassadors of the organization, stay in the organization and stretch beyond expected by the organization. Robinson et al. (2004), defined "engagement as a positive reflection towards the organizational goals and values, an engaged employee therefore understands and appreciates changing business contexts, works effectively as a team member and aims at improving both his own and the organization's performance". Hallberg and Schaufeli (2006) stated that employee engagement as being charged with energy and fully dedicated to one’s work by engagement is often differentiated from concepts like job involvement and organizational commitment. According to Harter et al. (2006) job involvement, organizational commitment, and engagement represent a sense of identification with work, but only engagement is reinforced by positive emotional states--and correlates with strongly wellbeing and health.

Macey and Schneider (2008) distinguished three broad conceptualizations of employee engagement, namely: state, trait and behavioral engagement. They proposed that engagement is sometimes defined on the basis of what it ‘is’ (psychological state), whilst on other occasions on
the basis of the behaviors it produces, and sometimes as a disposition or attitude towards one’s work (trait). Behavioral engagement is also defined in terms of exerting discretionary effort. Newman and Harrison (2008) argue that the defining features of employee engagement are the concurrent presence of three behaviors in employees, namely their performance in the job, citizenship behavior and involvement.

Lucey (2009) have found that "employee engagement is how each individual links with the company and the customers".

Sarkar (2011) stated that employee engagement helps to gauge and determine the extent and type of association an employee has with the organization. Employee engagement has also been defined as the amount of optional effort exhibited by employees in their job (Frank et al. 2004), engagement, is about passion and pledge—the readiness to invest oneself and put up one’s own discretionary effort to help the employer succeed (Erickson, 2005). Most often employee engagement has been defined as emotional and intellectual pledge to the organization (Baumruk 2004, Richman 2006; Shaw 2005).

Another way of looking at employee engagement is a combination of both individual and organizational engagement Saks (2006), states that demonstrating varying degrees of engagement is a way for individuals to pay back their organization for the economic and socio-emotional resources they receive from it.
2.3 Dimensions of Employee Engagement

2.3.1 Vigor, Dedication, and Absorption

Schaufeli & Salanova (2007) stated engagement involves high levels of energy and identification with one’s work, they define engagement as “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption”.

Vigor:

Demerouti et al. (2010) explained work autonomy and organizational commitment were substantially and positively related to vigor, but not strongly related to exhaustion. Work pressure and problems with mental health frequently coincided with exhaustion but was not associated with vigor. Unlike exhaustion, vigor partly depends on processes that emphasize motivation, like a readiness to invest effort.

Carnell A. et al. (2009) study showed that leaders who attempt to improve relationships amongst employees enhance at least one aspect of engagement namely vigor. Participants specified the degree to which they experience vigor and energy at work as well as the extent to which they developed secure and trusting relationships with colleagues.

Shirom (2003) found that the notion of vigor as an affective state experienced as a response to the characteristics of the job. Shirom defined vigor as an emotional state but not a mood state in that individuals can point their feelings of vigor expressly to the job and the workplace. He placed vigor as the feeling of physical strength, cognitive liveliness, and affecting energy.
Dedication-

Commitment as a psychological state is understood as a cause of various organizationally relevant outcomes, including various forms of pro-social behavior. 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 lead to that commitment. Organizational commitment is an important facet of the state of engagement when it is conceptualized as positive attachment to the larger organizational body and measured as a readiness to make use of energy in support of the organization, to feel pride as an organizational member, and to have personal identification with the organization. (Macey W. Het al, 2008)

Absorption:

Kahn (1992) explained on the concept of engagement that a true psychological presence at work go beyond simple task motivation, it reflects a legitimacy that results in employees connecting with work. It is from the experience that the work is a part of person’s own identity. It leads to employee development and productivity. It can be said Kahn’s (1992) description of psychological presence clarifies the distinction between the experiential state (psychological presence) and personally engaging behaviors that may accompany that state. Building on Kahn’s view, Rothbard (2001, p. 684) operationalized engagement through self-reported attention and absorption.

Absorption is a psychological state in which individuals feel completely absorbed in their activity (Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). This state is likely to arise when individuals feel they have developed the skills to execute a difficult task. Cooper-Hakim and Viswesvaran (2005) defined job involvement “as the level to which an employee psychologically relates to his or her job and
Brown (1996) found that a “state of involvement implies a positive and relatively complete state of engagement of core aspects of the self in the job” (p. 235). Erickson (2005) described the job as the key antecedent of the state of engagement, engagement or involvement in the task is critical to overall psychological state engagement. Job involvement is seen in current definitions of engagement as a facet of engagement, a part of engagement but not equivalent to it (Salanova et al., 2005), Maslach et al. (2001) have proposed that engagement can be described by energy, involvement, and efficacy.

2.3.2 Psychological Dimension of Engagement (Kahn, 1990, 1992)

Psychological Presence

Kahn (1990 1992) argued that engagement culminates from a state called psychological presence--a state in which the authentic, true facets of the self can be fully expressed. In this state, individuals do not need to curb their beliefs, values, thoughts, feelings, inclinations and relationships. All of these facets of themselves are manifested in the behavior at work.

Meaningfulness of Work:

According to Kahn (1990) when employees experience a sense of meaning in their work, this presence or engagement is more likely to ensue. For studying antecedents of meaningfulness of work, Rich et al. (2010) through their study found out that value congruence presumably represents the extent to which the job seems significant. It can be said that if individuals need to engage in roles that align with their aspirations and values, they see the job as more attractive, significant, and important.
**Psychological Safety:**

Another dimension when individuals feel that such dedication and application to their role will not culminate in undesirable or negative consequences, called psychological safety, engagement is also more likely (Kahn, 1990). That is, engagement surfaces when employees feel that problems or hard times are either unlikely or manageable.

**Psychological Availability:**

Individuals can continue this dedication and purpose to their work only if they can access the necessary resources, called psychological availability. That is, they need to be able to muster the necessary energy or effort (Kahn, 1990). Core self evaluations represent confidence, increasing the likelihood that individuals feel willing and prepared to spend themselves into the role, called availability (Rich B. et al., 2010).

### 2.3.3 The Job Demands-Resources Dimension

The social exchange dimension does not explain the forms of support that foster the obligation to barter and to express engagement ((Demerouti et al., 2001a). The job demands-resources model explains this (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). The concept also explained by (Bakker et al.2004; Bakker, Demerouti, de Boer, & Schaufeli, 2003;).

According to the job demands-resources model job demands, like high levels of pressure, undue expectations and conflicting requirements, may also lead to unbearable stress leading to burnout. Job demands here represent any facets of a role that demands sustained effort to hold or endure difficulties. The effort that needs to be made to meet these demands exhausts energy (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).
Opposite to above job resources, including autonomy, support, and feedback, can all foster engagement as well as help to get rid of the adverse consequences of undue job demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). According to definition of resources, resources facilitate work related goals, face job demands and stimulate growth. The resources facilitate learning or boost effort, which can change the state of exhaustion that demands tend to lead.

Job resources enhance engagement have been confirmed by many studies that. Study of Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) demonstrated social support, constructive feedback, and coaching from supervisors—all of which are examples of job resources—were positively correlated with three dimensions of engagement: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Similarly, in another study, supervisor support, appreciation, information, job control, climate and innovation, the various resources were also associated to engagement (Bakker et al. 2007).

Some studies have also shown that job resources reduce the effect of job demands on burnout. Bakker A, B, et al. (2005) demonstrated job demands, such as work overload, conflict between work and home responsibilities, and emotional demands, and usually result in exhaustion and skepticism. This relationship diminished when resources, for example support autonomy and feedback were available. Thus, resources seemed to lessen the harmful consequences of demanding environments.
2.4 Self Efficacy

Definition: Perceived self-efficacy refers to belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute courses of action to manage prospective situations (Bandura, 1997). Occupational self-efficacy has been defined as the belief in ability and capability to perform in an occupation (Pethe et al., 1999) having factors are confidence, command, personal effectiveness, positive attitude, adaptability, and individuality.

Self-efficacy results from the acquisition of cognitive, social, physical skills or linguistic, through personal and/or vicarious experience (Bandura, 1982). Individuals synthesize and evaluate this information about their task abilities and make decisions about choice of action, level of effort and duration of persistence for subsequent task activities (Bandura and Cervone, 1986). Bandura (1986) stated “Self-efficacy is the extent to which an individual believes him or herself capable of successfully performing a specific behaviour” Bandura, (1989) found that these beliefs influence “what challenges to Undertake, how much effort to use in the endeavour, (and) how long to persevere in the face of difficulties”. Confidence about successfully working in a particular task domain of a person is positively correlated to his or her self efficacy. Bandura (2007) found, “Perceived self-efficacy is conceptualized as perceived operative capability. It is concerned not with what one has but with belief in what one can do with whatever resources one can muster”

Through literature it is known that empowerment is a process in which people act on their own behalf to achieve greater control over their lives (Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Staples, 1990), because of this individuals experience confidence through greater self-control (i.e. self-leadership skill development) and found that efficacy perceptions will be enhanced (Manz and
Sims, 1996). Several studies examined individual components of self-leadership and provided an indication of their separate influence on self-efficacy. Bandura and Cervone (1986) found that after setting goal standards, individuals high in self-efficacy increased their efforts to meet the standards, whereas those low in self-efficacy did not.

According to Bandura's social cognitive theory, self-efficacy beliefs influence the choices people make and the path of action they pursue. Individuals have a tendency to engage in tasks about which they feel competent and confident and avoid those in which they do not. Efficacy beliefs also help determine how much effort people will expend on an activity, how long they will persevere when they deal with obstacles and how resilient they will be in the face of unfavourable situations (Schunk, 1981; Schunk, Hanson, & Cox, 1987; Schunk & Hanson, 1985). The higher the sense of efficacy the greater the effort, perseverance and toughness, efficacy beliefs also influence the amount of stress and anxiety individuals experience as they take on an activity (Pajares & Miller, 1994).

Perceived self-efficacy refers to belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute courses of action to manage prospective situations (Bandura, 1997). Considerable research by Bandura (1997) had found that self efficacy can be increased in four major ways – 1) effective mastery (successful direct experiences on job or in a training context), vicarious learning (On the job through mentoring programs or modelling in a training context), simple verbal persuasion, and social support for lower level jobs and strategic development for higher level jobs. Bandura (2000) had provided three specific approaches to develop self efficacies which he calls 1) guided mastery: which includes guided skill perfection and transfer back to job, 2) cognitive mastery modelling: that is about learning thinking skills and how to apply them and able to arrive at
solutions to problems and make effective decisions, 3) development of self discipline 
competencies like self motivation, and self management.

Occupational self-efficacy has been defined by Schyns & Collani (2002) as —one’s belief in one’s own ability and competence to perform successfully and effectively in situations and across different tasks in a job.

Self-efficacy can be taken as a representative variable of psychological empowerment as Conger and Kanungo (1988) have defined psychological empowerment as a motivational concept of self efficacy.

2.5 Empowerment

Perceived Organizational Support (POS) can be said to represent structural empowerment aspect for it is the subordinates ‘perception of organizations’ policies and practices, that define the functional aspect of the organizational structure (Guzzo Noonan, 1994) and directly influences the efficacy of four structural empowerment dimensions stated by Kanter (1977) namely opportunity, support, resources and information. It can be inferred that engagement is the expressed empowerment pertaining to a role.

Empowerment can be conceptualized as touching employees' inner natures (example- attitudinal shaping), their expressed behavior (example- Organizational citizenship Behavior), or both (example- self-management). Central to all forms of empowerment is the internal state of motivation (Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Gagne et al. 1997; Wilkinson, 1998), the meanings related to energizing employees (Thomas and Velthouse, 1990). Thomas and Velthouse's (1990) model depicted empowerment as based in four cognitions that affected a person's intrinsic
motivation for the job at hand. These four psychological dimensions of empowerment were impact, competence, meaningfulness, and choice.

Employee empowerment can be conceived in two ways (Boudrias et al., 2009):

(1) Set of managerial practices aiming at increasing employees’ responsibilities and autonomy; and

(2) Individual proactive work orientation

The concept of empowerment is at a difference with that of concept of a rigid hierarchy (French & Bell, 1999). The management’s role is to set up structures and processes in the organization which result in the organization’s working at its most effective level. Kanter’s (1993) structural theory of power states that the more access to and sharing of resources and information that people have, the more empowered they become. Kanter’s theory can be a valuable tool in an empowerment environment because it offers a theory to administrators to understand that an empowered environment in organization leads to employee empowerment, and also knowledge of how to implement it.

The concept of empowerment is closely aligned with this drive to gain organizational effectiveness through the wise use of human resources. With more organizations relying on team-based designs (Parker, 1994), empowerment becomes important at both the individual and team levels.

Conger and Kanungo (1988) pointed out that empowerment “is a principle component of managerial and organizational effectiveness and empowerment techniques play a decisive role in group development and maintenance”. Meanings of empowerment in practice is that empowered
employees have a high sense of self-efficacy, are given important responsibility and authority over their jobs, engage in upward influence, and see themselves as innovative (Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Ford and Fottler, 1995. Wilkinson (1998) classified the various concepts of empowerment as “five main types, namely information sharing, attitudinal shaping, task autonomy, upward problem solving, and self-management”.

Purcell (2003) had argued that employee engagement is only meaningful if there is a more genuine sharing of responsibility between management and employees over issues of substance. One of the main drivers of employee engagement was found to be employees having the opportunity to give their views upwards. Research shows where employees have been given control over how to do their work, they are more likely to focus intensely on what they are doing. Konrad (2006) stated engagement is closely linked to feelings and perceptions around being involved and valued, which in turn generates the kinds of discretionary effort that lead to enhanced performance. Such evidence implies that management needs to share control and allow employees to influence important decisions.

2.5.1 Psychological Empowerment

In the literature initially the concept of empowerment was part of concept of power. Empowerment is defined as having power in the organization (Burke, 1986; Kanter, 1983). Empowerment was subsequently viewed as a relational construct (Conger and Kanungo, 1988; 1989). Conger and Kanungo (1988) developed this view point; they equated empowerment with a sense of self-efficacy. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) expand on Conger and Kanungo’s (1988) framework in a cognitive model of task empowerment by suggesting improvements. They specified a conceptualization of empowerment; self-efficacy is supplemented with three
additional cognitive variables (called task assessments) that improve the intrinsic motivation of individuals.

Thomas and Velthouse’s (1990) model depicted empowerment as based in four cognitions, or “task assessments”, that affected a person's intrinsic motivation for the job one is doing. Elements of the work environment affected these task assessments, which in turn affected whether the individual acted in the empowered manner. These four psychological dimensions of empowerment were impact, competence, meaningfulness, and choice. According to Thomas and Velthouse (1990), impact is “the scale to which behavior is seen as making a difference in terms of accomplishing the purpose of the task”; competence is “the measure to which a person can perform task activities skillfully when he or she tries”; meaningfulness “involves the individual's inherent caring about a given task”; and choice “involves causal responsibility for a person's actions”.

Spreitzer (1995) built upon Thomas and Velthouse's (1990) model and defined meaning as “the value of a work goal or purpose, judged in relation to an individual's own ideals or standards”, competence as “an individual's conviction in his or her capacity to perform activities with skillfulness, self-determination (referred to as “choice” by Thomas and Velthouse) as reflected in “to do work as per one’s own way in the beginning and continuance of work behaviours and processes” and ' impact as “the degree to which an individual can influence strategic, administrative or operating outcomes at work”

2.5.2 Leadership Empowerment

Discussion above in Psychological Empowerment also discusses Relational Empowerment; Leadership Empowerment is also related to Relational Empowerment. Leadership
Empowerment is characterized by the redistribution, or devolution, of decision-making power to those who do not currently have it, and gives employees the power to do the job their positions demand (Carson & King, 2005; Cunningham et al., 1996; Johnson, 1994).

Empowered employees become active problem solvers they contribute to the plan and execute tasks (Cunningham et al., 1996). According to Johnson (1994), leadership empowerment behaviour creates an environment that promotes success, because employees are empowered through greater responsibility, decision-making authority, feedback, and information as well as motivation, support and encouragement.

According to Konczak et al. (2000), leadership empowerment behaviour includes six dimensions: accountability for outcomes, delegation of authority, self-directed decision making, information sharing, coaching for innovative performance, and skill development. Delegation of authority involve that the leader grant power to subordinates. Delegation of authority should increase intrinsic task motivation by effecting task measurements related to psychological empowerment (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Accountability for outcomes concerns the leader’s emphasis on the taking of responsibility for consequences. Empowerment redistributes power and provides a mechanism by which responsibility for performance is transferred to individuals. Self-directed decision-making entails that the leader encourages independent decision-making

Information-sharing entails that leaders share knowledge and information that enables employees to contribute optimally to organizational performance. Skills development concerns the leader’s assisting (rather than directing and/or controlling) of skills development and securing the apt training of employees (Wellins, Byham & Wilson, 1991). Coaching for performance is related to behaviour that supports calculated risk-taking and new ideas and that provides performance
feedback to employees, treating their mistakes and losses as opportunities to learn from it (Konczak et al., 2000). The relationship with one’s leader can have an effect on views of the safety of the work environment. A supportive leader is a leader who provides positive feedback, displays concerns for employees’ feelings, and needs and encourages employees to voice their concerns, who solves their work-related problems and develops employees’ skills and their interest in their work (May et al., 2004; Ryan & Deci, 2001).

2.5.3 Behavioral Empowerment

Empowerment is not only executed at work place to change employee cognitions, but also to foster (pro) active behaviors that could have an impact on organizational outcomes (Boudrias and Savoie, 2006). The above study has provided a conceptual framework and measurement instrument for behavioral empowerment. Based on review of literature (Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Laschley, 1999; Spreitzer et al, 1997; Thomas and Velthouse, 1990) and interviews of 20 managers from diverse organizations, their study pointed out that empowered employees carefully assume their work-related responsibilities and proactively initiate changes in their work environment. Empowerment could thus be demonstrated through both active “in-role” (example - proactive behaviours) and “extra-role” performance (example-organizational citizenship). In their study Behavioral Empowerment (BE) was defined as relatively self-determined behaviors aimed at securing work effectiveness or at improving work efficiency within the organization (Boudrias and Savoie, 2006)

Empowerment Implication: There is a common assumption between the empowerment approaches that employees can benefit themselves and their firms if their underutilized personal
resources are harnessed and directed in such a way as to enhance organizational efficiency and personal satisfaction.

2.6 Organizational Climate

Litwin and Stringer (1968) Organizational Climate can be defined as the perceived attributes of an organization and its sub-systems as reflected in the way an organization deals with its members, groups, and issues.

James and James (1989, 1990); James and Jones (1974) interpreted that organization climate within an organization refers to how organizational environments are seen and interpreted by its employees. Organizational climate is conceptualized as focusing upon the individual and seeking to understand the cognitive processes and behavior. Schneider and Bowen (1995) define the climate in an organization as the perceptions that employees share about what is important in the organization, got through their perceptions of the kinds of behaviors management expects and supports experiences on the job. According to James et al (1990) and Brown and Leigh (1996), perceptions of the organizational environment take on personal meaning for employees, in which a cognitive depiction of the characteristics of the environment is interpreted in terms of the individual’s values. According to Gilson and James (2002), climate reflects employees’ perceptions of and emotional responses to, the characteristics of the work environment.

Luthans et al, (2002) stated that clear institution of career way for every task and creating a method to identify role performances of employees beyond the already prescribed way as well as link it with suitable rewards and recognitions in-order to make employees feel “worthwhile and meaningful”.
Guzzo Noonan (1994) found that Organizations’ policies and practices (e.g. HR practices), that define the functional aspect of the organizational structure and directly influences the effectiveness of four structural empowerment dimensions namely opportunity, support, resources and information.

Prussia Gregory E. et al. (1998) opined that Managerial Practices of delegating larger decision-making power to first-line employees, providing appropriate training for them, giving them access to relevant strategic information and rewarding employees for achieving results and having enabling environment, task direction, and goal-setting for creating Self Leadership.

Locke (1969) stated that Supportive management indicate that managers trust their employees and have confidence in employees’ abilities to do their jobs and potentially create pleasurable emotional state by the appraisal of one’s job as for the achievement of one’s job values.

Brown and Leigh (1996) stated that supportive management as a major characteristic of employees’ psychological safety in the workplace and found that supportive management gives employees greater control over their efforts for doing work and the way they achieve their job goals.

### 2.6.1 Human Resource Development (HRD) Climate:

Rao and Abraham, (1986) defined HRD climate as “perceptions the employees have of the developmental environment of an organization” they have classified HRD Climate under three dimensions of general climate, OCTAPAC culture and implementation of HRD mechanisms. The general climate is the importance given to human resources development by the top management and line managers. The OCTAPAC items is the degree to which openness,
confrontation, trust, autonomy, proactive behavior, authenticity and collaboration are promoted and valued in the organization. HRD mechanisms measure the degree to which various HRD means like performance appraisal, potential appraisal, performance rewards, career planning, feedback and counseling, training, employee welfare are implemented successfully.

Hassan et al., (2006) stated HRD practices have been reported to be significant antecedents of HRD climate with organizations having better learning, training and development systems, information systems, and reward and recognition. “Developmental Climate” is essential for facilitating Human Resource Development (HRD).

Employee perceptions of different facets of HRD climate by various studies have co-related significantly to desirable workplace attitudes and different aspects of performance. Kuvaas and Dysvik (2010) reported that employee evaluations of their organization’s or the management’s commitment to employee development by helping them learn to acquire new competencies and skills were related positively to desirable work place attitudes and performance. Other HRD practices like development, training, learning opportunities (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007), performance management (Gruman and Saks, 2011), recognition and rewards (Wollard and Shuck, 2011), and Communication and information sharing (Bakker et al., 2011; Bindl and Parker, 2010; Welch, 2011), are related positively with work engagement. According to (Mishra, 1999) HRD climate improves employee commitment, involvement and satisfaction with the job. Also Mohanty and Routray, (2009) stated HRD climate improves organizational effectiveness by leading to better outcomes in terms of competent, satisfied, committed and dynamic workforce.
2.7 Relationship between Self Efficacy and Employee Engagement

- Pati Surya Prakash et al. (2010) in their study about Employee Engagement and Self-efficacy revealed that significant positive correlations exist between all the study variables. It was observed that both Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and Occupational Self Efficacy (OSE) relate differently to the different dimensions of employee engagement. While POS is moderately correlated with dedication, occupational self-efficacy is moderately correlated with the dimensions of vigor, and absorption. Influence of Occupational Self Efficacy (OSE) on Employee Engagement (EE) decreases on inclusion of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) in the regression model, Perceived supervisor Support (PSS) does not moderate the relationship between Occupational Self Efficacy (OSE) and employee engagement.

- Studies examining external leadership influences on self-efficacy perceptions generally focus on how the provision of feedback (Karl K.A. et al., 1993) or the use of effective training techniques (Gist, 1989) influences these perceptions. Two studies specifically emphasized leader behavior influences on self-efficacy perceptions. Redmond et al. (1993) found that leader behaviors including task direction and goal-setting positively influenced self-efficacy expectations. Sherer et al. (1989) found similar results in that the influence of an entrepreneurial parent (a leadership role) significantly affected subjects' level of self-efficacy and expectancy to pursue an entrepreneurial career.

- Chaudhary Richa et al. (2011) carried study about HRD Climate and Occupational Self-efficacy as Predictors of Employee Engagement on a sample a total of 66 samples from both public and private sector mangers in Manufacturing and Service Organizations of India. The findings of the study indicated that occupational self efficacy is highly correlated with employee engagement. Secondly, it can be observed that HRD climate is moderately correlated with employee engagement.
engagement. Employee engagement correlates most highly and significantly with confidence dimension of occupational self-efficacy, followed by general HRD climate and then with implementation of HRD mechanisms. Further study established that HRD climate and occupational self-efficacy significantly predict employee engagement.

- Kahn (1992) stated that psychological availability (readiness to personally engage at a particular moment) is type of confidence and is relatively stable individual difference, and through it the more confident the individual feels about his or her capabilities, the more likely the individual to feel available and prepared to engage fully in his or her role.

- Judge et al. (1997) stated that the confidence that Kahn discussed is reflected in the concept of core self evaluations, construct defined as individuals’ appraisals of their own worthiness, effectiveness, and capability. Judge and Hurst (2007) found that individuals with high core self-evaluations evaluate demands more positively, have greater ability to cope with these demands effectively, they put more efforts in the performance of their work roles and thus have job engagement.

- Study of Rich Bruce Louis et al. (2010) about Job Engagement’s antecedents and effects on job performance which was carried on 245 fire-fighters and their supervisors supported hypotheses that engagement mediates relationships between value congruence, perceived organizational support, and core self-evaluations, and two job performance dimensions: task performance and organizational citizenship behaviour. Engagement as mediator was able and exceeded job involvement, job satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation as mediator which were also included in study as mediators. In the study statistically significant indirect relationships through engagement between each of the antecedents and each of the outcomes is established and these relationships emerge in models that also include job involvement, job satisfaction and intrinsic
motivation as mediators. Results indicate that engagement fully accounts for the relationships between the antecedents and the performance outcomes.

- In a study by Mache Stefanie et al. (2014) on the topic about impact of resilience, self-efficacy, optimism and organizational resources on work engagement which was done through 223 respondents who were full time Doctors (Physicians) in various hospitals in Germany. In the research they found a significant positive correlation between self-efficacy and work engagement. It was found that higher a person’s self-efficacy, the more likely the employee begin job tasks, is able to meet various job demands, acts and decides originally and can handle job challenges or work problems.

- Luthans and Peterson (2002) study about employee engagement and manager self-efficacy conducted on 170 managers and their subordinates to assess the conceptual fit of Gallup’s employee engagement measure with a recognized and published psychological engagement theory framework and role that a manager’s self-efficacy may play in the employee engagement – managerial effectiveness relationship and practice. Findings of the empirical research was that both the cognitive and emotional engagement of employees are related to their manager’s self efficacy and the manager’s self efficacy was related to their perceived effectiveness as evaluated by the managers themselves, their peers and their subordinates. Results also showed that manager’s self efficacy was a partial mediator of relationship between emotional and cognitive engagement of their subordinates, and their effectiveness.

- Rothmann S, Storm K (2003) study about Work engagement in the South African Police Service found out that engaged police officers were more positive, self-efficient and showed active handling of situations.
• Xanthopoulou D et al (2007) in their study about role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model researched on technicians’ work engagement in relation to self-efficacy, self-esteem and optimism and found out that the personal resources were related to work engagement.

• A longitudinal study about occupational health psychology Work & Stress performed by Bakker et al. (2008) showed that self-efficacy and optimism make a unique contribution to explaining variance in work engagement over time found out that personal resources have a stronger impact on work engagement than other job resources.

• Individuals who perceive themselves positively are more likely to follow roles that bring into line to their values, called self concordance, which promotes intrinsic motivation (Judge et al., 2004) and may promote engagement at work. Neuroticism and extraversion are indeed related to engagement (Langelaan et al., 2006).

• According to (Rothbard, 2001) there is a limited amount of energy people possess that they can share, suggesting that engagement in some roles comes at the expense of engagement in other roles. The above strongly implies considerable intra-individual variance.

• (Hobfoll et al., 2003) stated personal resources are positive self-evaluations that are linked to resiliency and also refer to individuals’ sense of their ability to control and impact upon their environment successfully.

Judge et al., 2004, 2005 found – personal characteristics such as positive self-evaluations predict goal-setting, motivation, performance, job and life satisfaction, career ambition and other desirable outcomes, the reason for this is that the higher an individual’s personal resources, the more positive the person’s self-regard and the more goal self-concordance is expected to be experienced.
Individuals with goal self-concordance are intrinsically motivated to pursue their goals and as a result they trigger higher performance and satisfaction (Luthans and Youssef, 2007).

Dikkers Josje S.E. et al. (2010) -a longitudinal study on proactively, job characteristics, and engagement with a sample of 2124 examined whether high job demands and high job resources predict an increase in engagement over time, a proactive personality will lead to increased levels of engagement over time and high job demands and high job resources will be more strongly related to engagement over time among proactive employees than among less proactive employees.

The study concludes that there is association between proactive personalities and two dimensions of engagement (namely dedication and absorption) and proactive employees who perceived high levels of social support reported the highest levels of dedication 18 months later, irrespective of the perceived level of job demands.

2.8 Psychological Empowerment and Employee Engagement

- Laschinger, H. K. S. et al. (2002) in their longitudinal study about impact of workplace empowerment on staff nurses’ work satisfaction” carried through random sample of 185 staff nurses using structural equation modelling, its analyses revealed that changes in nurses’ access to workplace empowerment structures namely access to information, support, resources and opportunities to learn over a period of time affected changes in their feelings of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction over the same time frame. Six item scales to measure structural empowerment also consisted of Formal Power, and Informal Power.

- Ugwu F. O. et al. (2012) in their study about linking organizational trust with employee engagement and the role of psychological empowerment in the same, the study was carried with
a sample size of 715 employees from seven commercial banks and four pharmaceutical companies in south-eastern Nigeria. This study found out that psychological empowerment and organisational trust are positively related to work engagement. Also, psychological empowerment moderates the relationship between organisational trust and employee work engagement that is, where employees perceive poor organisational trust, those employees with greater psychological empowerment will show higher levels of work engagement than those with lower levels of psychological empowerment and also that employees who perceive both good organisational trust and great psychological empowerment will show higher levels of engagement.

- Mgbek D.M. (2007) in research study about use of employee empowerment as an effective instrument to increase administrative efficacy in the Local Government Area of Umunneochi, which was conducted in Nigeria. Based on the research results it was observed that an increase in the administrative effectiveness of the Umunneochi LGA through implementation of employee empowerment policies and procedures have seen positive changes in power distribution, civic engagement, rapid information flow, appropriate rewards, continuous employee development and community building. Empowered administrators have challenged inefficient policies and identified problems in the Umunneochi LGA. They also have been able to communicate and work with others to obtain the necessary resources, support, and information to solve problems and make decisions that are more efficacious.

- Quiñonesa Marcela et al. (2013) in their study about whether job resources affect work engagement via psychological empowerment. The study was conducted through a sample of Chilean public 1313 workers. The study establishes that psychological empowerment mediates the associations between job resources namely (psychological task autonomy, skill utilization,
and social support) and work engagement. The study also establishes that well being at work depend on psychological empowerment, core self-evaluations and emotional intelligence apart from PsyCap variables (i.e., optimism, efficacy, hope, and resilience). The results confirm the added value of psychological empowerment, as a resource in J-DR model. This study suggests of including psychological empowerment in intervention programmes to increase work engagement.

- Siegall Marc and Gardner Susan (2000) carried out study on contextual factors of psychological empowerment to test a multidimensional model of psychological empowerment and examine organizational factors that can affect employees' inner states in respect to this model, empowerment consisting of four psychological states (meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact), all four of which were necessary for empowerment to succeed.

Contextual Factors Discussed: Literature survey indicated that organizational environment was important to the creation of effective empowerment. Two of the factors were lateral and horizontal communication within the organization.

Thomas and Velthouse (1990) proposed through their study that the environmental variables of leadership, job design, delegation, and reward systems would have differential impact on the four components of empowerment. In studying the impact of job characteristics on perceptions of empowerment, Gagne et al. (1997) found that different job characteristics were predictive of the four different empowerment components. 203 employees (159 hourly, 44 salaried) from a manufacturing company participated in the study. The survey consisted of eight measures, four addressing contextual issues of empowerment and four describing the psychological components of empowerment. Spreitzer's (1995) scales were used to measure components of psychological empowerment. Findings through regression results (for the whole sample) showed that concern
for performance, communication with supervisor and general relations with the company determined meaning; communication with supervisor, and general relations with the company determined self-determination; and communication with supervisor determined impact.

2.9 Leadership Empowerment and Employee Engagement:

Empowered employees become active problem solvers who contribute to the planning and execution of tasks (Cunningham et al., 1996). According to Johnson (1994), leadership empowerment behavior creates an environment that leads to success, because employees empowerment of employees through greater responsibility, decision-making authority, information and feedback, along with motivation, support and encouragement.

Hackman and Oldham’s (1976) job characteristic model and self-determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985) supported autonomy. Baard et al. (2004); Deci, and Connell & Ryan (1989) also found out that an autonomy-supportive managerial style leads to positive results from subordinates which includes psychological adjustment on the job, task motivation and enhanced performance. Social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), behavioral self-management theory (Thorenson & Mahoney, 1974) and self-leadership theory (Manz, 1986) also supports the role of autonomy and self-direction.

Redmond, Mumford and Teach (1993)/ found that leader behaviors including task direction and goal-setting positively influenced self-efficacy expectations. Sherer et al., (1989) found similar results in that the influence of an entrepreneurial parent (a leadership role) significantly affected subjects' level of self-efficacy and expectancy to pursue an entrepreneurial career.
Amundsen S., Martinsen Qyvind L. (2013) in their study “Empowering leadership: Construct clarification, conceptualization, and validation of a new scale” had carried three studies. In Study 1 through devising a Empowerment Leadership Scale (ELS) and validated it through sample of 317. In study 2 through a sample of 215 it was found out those ELS had positive relationship with self-leadership and psychological empowerment. In Study 3 ELS was compared with other scales of measuring leader–member exchange (LMX) and transformational leadership and found to be distinct and better prediction of psychological empowerment. The psychometric properties of ELS were consistent across all three studies. The two EL dimensions a composite dimension of power sharing and motivational support, and other development support have fairly high correlation coefficients. But both of the above dimensions are found to be statistically distinct dimension. The first dimension includes autonomy support, consisted of empowering leader behaviours through delegation, initiative and goal focus, coordination and information sharing, efficacy support, and inspiring communication. The second dimension includes development support, included leader behaviours that influence subordinates' continuous learning and development through leaders' role modelling and guidance.

Findings of the study support ELS positive relationship to self-leadership and psychological empowerment, job satisfaction, work effort, creativity, and performance.

The above study establishes strong relation between Leadership Empowerment and Self Leadership and Psychological Empowerment. Both Self Leadership and Psychological Empowerment lead to Work Engagement is discussed in discussion of Psychological Empowerment.

Schalkwyk1 Sonet van et al. (2010) did study about job insecurity, leadership empowerment behavior, employee engagement and intention to leave in a petrochemical laboratory. Objective
of this study was to investigate the relationship between job insecurity, leadership empowerment behavior, employee engagement and intention to leave their jobs in a petrochemical laboratory. Sample of the participants was drawn through a convenient sample of 168 employees working in a petrochemical laboratory. Main findings were that job insecurity was not statistically significantly related to employee engagement and turnover intention. The results of the multiple regression analyses showed that 15% of the variance in employee engagement and 12% of the variance in turnover intention were predicted by job insecurity and, but that only leadership empowerment behavior contributed statistically significantly to employee engagement and turnover intention. Employee engagement predicted 26% of the variance in turnover intent. It partially mediated the relationship between leadership empowerment behavior and turnover intention.

Study by Boudrias J. S. et al, 2009 study on to investigate past the relationships between Supervisors’ Empowering Management Practices (SEMP), employees’ Psychological Empowerment (PE), and a new measure of employees’ Behavioral Empowerment (BE). The total sample of employees was made up of 359 individuals. Among these 359 employees, 185 were assessed by their immediate supervisor. Through the finding of research significant correlation was found between Supervisors’ empowering management practices (SEMP) and psychological empowerment (PE), Second, Supervisors’ empowering management practices (SEMP) were significantly correlated with behavioral empowerment (BE), when self-reported. The relationship was of similar magnitude, yet marginally non-significant, when behavioral empowerment (BE) was externally assessed. Third, there was a significant relationship between psychological empowerment (PE) and behavioral empowerment (BE), whether behavioral empowerment (BE) was self-reported or assessed by an external source. Psychological
empowerment (PE) partially mediates the relationship between Supervisors’ empowering management practices SEMP and behavioral empowerment (BE).

2.10 Relationships between Psychological Empowerment (PE) and Behavioral Empowerment (BE)

Relationships between Psychological Empowerment (PE) and a diverse set of behavioral outcomes have been investigated. Those studies results show that Psychological Empowerment (PE) is positively related to in-role performance (Bartram and Casimir, 2007; Cirka, 2000; Liden et al., 2000), customer service (Peccei and Rosenthal, 2001), innovative behaviors (Alge et al., 2006; Janssen et al., 1997), voicing of ideas and helping (Cirka, 2000), and diverse measures of organizational citizenship behaviors (Alge et al., 2006; Menon, 2001; Wat and Schaffer, 2005). These various studies lend support to the idea that Psychological Empowerment (PE) positively influences Behavioral Empowerment (BE).

2.11 Influence of supervisors’ managerial practices on Psychological Empowerment and Behavioral Empowerment

The paper discusses all the three Leadership Empowerment, Psychological Empowerment, and Behavioral Empowerment

- Arnold et al. (2000) suggested that participative decision-making, leading by example, coaching, informing and interacting positively with the team could be effective Supervisors’ Empowering Managerial Practices (SEMP).
- The study by Konczak et al. (2000) provides empirical support to this proposition by showing that similar supervisor practices are strongly correlated to Psychological Empowerment PE.
Studies have also shown that supervisors’ empowering practices, measured in terms of delegation/consultation (Menon, 2001) and transformational leadership (Avolio et al., 2004; Bartram and Casimir, 2007; Morrison et al., 1997) are positively related to Psychological Empowerment PE. Therefore, much empirical evidence supports the positive influence of Supervisors’ Empowering Managerial Practices (SEMP) on Psychological Empowerment (PE).

- Randolph (1995) similarly stated that the three keys to empowerment include sharing information, communicating a vision, and teamwork.

### 2.12 Relation between Organizational Climate and Employee Engagement

- Singh (2000) found that with if boss supports frontline employees, they perceived their roles to be less stressful and their fatigue from work is reduced, and their performance and perceived commitment levels were increased. Thoits (1995) stated that in service organization settings, a supportive environment would build commitment, reduce turnover intentions and increase performance.

- Babin and Boles (1996); Kopelman et al. (1990); Michaels et al. (1987) found that if customer contact employees perceive that their manager is concerned about them and provides appropriate control and authority over their work, they will feel more positively towards their work and Brown and Peterson (1994) contended that Employees will exert more effort in the workplace.

- Concept of reengineering founded by Hammer and Champy (1993) is based on innovative culture -A major feature of climate for innovation provides a supportive environment and makes employees responsible for most operational decisions so that they feel empowered. A climate
for innovation is about new things happening continually, also consisting of re-examination of systems operates, how jobs are designed, and products and services are delivered.

- Gilbreath Brad &. Montesino Max U (2006), in their research titled “Expanding the HRD Role: Improving Employee Well-Being and Organizational Performance”. In their conceptual paper supported by previous studies the hypothesis laid down is HRD professionals should take care of employee well-being and for assessing the work environment stress audit conducted primarily on parameters of job control, role overload, social support and supervisor behaviour. HRD professionals can improve quality of life and contribute to organizational effectiveness and the outcome would be healthier organizations, healthier employees, and recognition of HRD’s potential for transforming organizations.

- Sarangi S. and Srivastava R. K. study of 2012 “Impact of Organizational Culture and Communication on Employee Engagement: An Investigation of Indian Private Banks” through sample consists of 247 executives drawn from this sector found that correlation between organizational culture and employee engagement and also correlation between organizational communication and employee engagement are significant.

- Shadur, Mark A. et al. (1999) in their study “The Relationship between Organizational Climate and Employee Perception of Involvement”. A survey of 269 students was carried off for IT Company. The study found out that Supportive Climate and Organizational Commitment significantly predicted Employee Involvement. The parameters of involvement were participation in decision making, teamwork, and communication. organizational climate parameters consisted of job satisfaction, innovation, and support.

- Shuck Brad et al. (2014) in their Research Study “Human Resource Development Practices and Employee Engagement: Examining the Connection with Employee Turnover Intentions”
Research was conducted in the health care industry with a sample of 207. Results found out that participation in HRD practices and cognitive, emotional, and behavioural engagement were negatively related to turnover intentions. Regression analyses results were engagement partially mediated the relation between HRD practices and turnover intent.

2.13 HRD Climate and Occupational Self-efficacy (OSE) as predictors of Employee Engagement (EE)

Chaudhary Richa et al. (2011) carried their study of HRD Climate and Occupational Self-efficacy as predictors of employee engagement found that occupational self efficacy is highly correlated with employee engagement. Secondly, it can be observed that HRD climate is moderately correlated with employee engagement. Study established that HRD Climate and occupational self-efficacy significantly predict employee engagement.

2.14 The various drivers of Employee Engagement

The various constructs taken in this study namely Self Efficacy, Psychological Empowerment, Leadership Empowerment, and Organizational Climate are discussed in following papers:

- Sharma B. R and Raina A. et al. (2010) carried a study on determinants of Employee Engagement in a Private sector organization to find out what all situational and personal factors effect job involvement and Organizational commitment.

Findings indicate that only two independent variables objectivity and recognition emerged as the significant determinants of organizational commitment. Similarly, only two independent variables namely career opportunity and pay emerged as the critical determinants of job
involvement. It was concluded from this evidence that the situational factors are more important than the personal attributes of the employees in influencing employee engagement.

- Study by Sarkar S. (2011) on Employee Engagement at Manufacturing Industries was to find the factors contributing to the employee engagement and also study the various strategies implemented by HR professionals to enhance employee engagement in manufacturing organizations.

  The sample size for the survey was 10 manufacturing units. The samples are chosen by taking prior appointments with the HR Managers. Companies were approached based on the convenience and availability of chosen. 60 items were measured on 7 point Likert scale.

  Findings of the study were that factors that have high impact on employee engagement are: Top Management, Managers, Co workers, Intrinsic Motivation, Resources, Career Opportunities and Training and Development. The other factors which have significant impact on employee engagement are: Benefits, HR Policies, Recognition and Physical Work Environment. The HR Managers also feel that making employee's involved in day to day activities and decision making, as well as providing them an environment without interference affects the employee engagement. (The factors found relevant here are part of Psychological, and Leadership Empowerment and Organizational Climate in the present Research Paper)

  Bhuvanaiah T. and Raya R. P. (2015) in their conceptual Study paper about Mechanism of Improved Performance, Intrinsic Motivation and Employee Engagement found out that opportunities for growth and development, decision making authority, empowerment and supportive work environment, and leadership which instils a sense of purpose are four key
drivers of employee engagement. (The discussed drivers of Employee Engagement are part of Psychological and Leadership Empowerment, and Organizational Climate in our Study)

- Sowath A.R. et al. (2014) in their study of the antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement Dubin’s method. The theoretical model proposed in the paper of employee engagement identifies supervisor and co-worker relationships, job design and characteristics, HRD and workplace environment practices as the major antecedents to employee engagement. The paper proposes that job demands and individual characteristics act as moderators. The employee engagement is related to three major organizational outcomes: job performance, turnover intention (inverse relationship), and organizational citizenship behaviour.

- A study by Mishra B.et al. (2015) findings reveal that among the personal factors it is age, experience, and positive work values are impacting on Employee Engagement and five Situational variables are impacting critically on Employee Engagement (1) participative management; (2) communication; (3) career opportunity;(4) job content, and (5) pay. (The factors making significant impact on Employee Engagement are part of Psychological and Leadership Environment, and Organizational Climate in the present study)

- Another study by Employee Engagement Predictors in the Indian Segment of a Global Media Organization by Sharma B. R. & Raina A. D. (2013) also concluded that positively influential personal factors were positive work ethics, and internal locus of control and critical influential situational factors were (a) job content, (b) objectivity, and (c) benefits. ((The factors making significant impact on Employee Engagement are part of Psychological Environment, and Organizational Climate in the present study).

- A Study by Kumar V. (2014) was carried about what factors effect Employee Engagement in Business Organizations. In the study sample of 120 each was taken from IT, Banking and
Education Survey and it was established that Supportive Supervisory Relations, Rewarding Co-workers Relations, Spirituality and Alignment, Psychological Meaningfulness, Employee’s Job Resources, and Physical and Emotional Engagement are the antecedent of Employee Engagement; and In-Role Performance, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Job Involvement, Job Satisfaction, and Intention to Stay were the consequences of Employee Engagement. The study found out that Spirituality and Alignment mediates the relationship of Supportive Supervisory Relations and Psychological meaningfulness along with Employee Engagement and therefore importance of having the essence of spirituality among the employees.

- A study by Sarangi S., and Srivastava R. K. (2012) was carried about Impact of Organizational Culture and Communication on Employee Engagement. In the study Co-operative, Nationalized and Private sector were studied to understand the impact of organizational culture and communication on employee engagement. The research found out that out of factors defining organizational culture namely interdepartmental cooperation, autonomy, human resource orientation, improvement orientation, and external orientation; interdepartmental cooperation, and External orientation are significant predictors of Employee Engagement. Similarly out of subordinate communication organizational integration, supervisory communication, corporate information, personal feedback, communication climate, co-worker communication and media quality factors which define organizational communication and predict employee engagement; among the dimensions it has been found that supervisory communication, organizational communication, corporate information, co-worker information and media quality are more significant predictors of organizational communication in all three types of banks.
A Study by Pawar V. S. (2016) about Teachers’ Engagement in Higher Education. The sample of study was 689 respondent teachers from 58 universities in India. The established Teachers Perceived Organizational Support and Teachers Organizational Commitment account for 74% of the variance of Teachers Job Contribution, Whereas, Teachers Job Contribution, Teachers Perceived Supervisor Support and Teachers Rewards and Recognition account for 60% of the variance of Teacher’s Engagement. Experience significantly moderated the relationship and type of University too significantly moderated the relationship.

(The factors making significant impact on Employee Engagement are part of Psychological Environment, and Organizational Climate in the present study)

2.15 Research Gap

Based on studies conducted by various Researchers on Employee Engagement and its predictors, summary of various findings of the studies have been discussed here:

- Self Efficacy has positive correlation with Employee Engagement.
- Organization Support and Supervisory Support has positive Correlation with Employee Engagement.
- Leader Behaviour influences Self Efficacy.
- Organizational Climate and Occupational Self-efficacy are Predictors of Employee Engagement. Resilience, self-efficacy, optimism and organizational resources positively influences work engagement.
- Manager’s self efficacy effects Employee engagement. Self-efficacy, self-esteem, and optimism influences work engagement.
• Individuals who perceive themselves positively are more likely to pursue roles that align to their values, and that lead to engagement at work.

• Positive self-evaluations predict goal-setting, motivation, performance, job and life satisfaction.

• Workplace empowerment leads to work satisfaction.

• Psychological empowerment mediates the associations between job resources namely (Psychological task autonomy, skill utilization, and social support) and work Engagement.

• Job characteristics were predictive of the different components of Psychological Empowerment.

• Leadership Empowerment behavior have strong relation with self-leadership and psychological empowerment.

• There is Influence of supervisors’ managerial practices (SEMP) on Psychological Empowerment and Behavioral Empowerment (BE).

• Supervisors’ Empowering Managerial Practices (SEMP), in our study taken as Leadership Empowerment is strongly correlated to Psychological Empowerment (PE).

• A supportive environment i.e. Organizational Climate would build commitment, reduce turnover intentions, and increase performance. Opportunities for growth and development, decision making authority, Empowerment, and Supportive work environment and Leadership which instils a sense of purpose are four key drivers of Employee Engagement.

• Supervisor and co-worker relationships, job design and characteristics, HRD and workplace environment practices as the major antecedents to employee engagement.

• Participative management, communication, career opportunity, job content, and pay impact critically Employee Engagement. Supportive Supervisory Relations, Rewarding Co-workers Relations, Spirituality and Alignment, Psychological Meaningfulness, Employee’s Job Resources are the antecedent of Employee Engagement.
The literature review discussed above it has been found that none of the empirical study has been done having Self Efficacy, Empowerment consisting of Psychological Empowerment and Leadership Empowerment, and Organization Climate Constructs together and studying the impact of Employee Engagement and their relative importance in predicting Employee Engagement.

It is also found that none of the study covered Manufacturing Industry and Information Technology Services Sectors in NCR together in NCR to predict relative impact of Self Efficacy, Psychological Empowerment, Leadership Empowerment and Organization Climate on Employee Engagement and Compare both the sectors.

It is already discussed that both Manufacturing and Information Technology are the important drivers of Economy, contributors to GDP, and creators of Employment. Therefore there is need of a comprehensive study to finding the predictors of Employee Engagement in contemporary Environment in both the sectors and this study tries to fulfil that gap. There is fair representation of both the sectors in NCR as discussed above and therefore NCR was selected for this study to collect Data.