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ABSTRACT

In a world that is changing both in terms of the global nature of work and the diversity of the workforce, engaged employees may be a key to competitive advantage. Failure to effectively engage employees can result in wasted resources, suboptimal organisational performance, and deteriorating employee morale. On the other hand, successfully engaging and committing employees can result in higher levels of organisational performance as well as higher levels of job satisfaction, both of which are much needed in today’s environment. Employee Engagement is critical for organisational success and it’s a strong predictor of organisational commitment.

The purpose of the study was to explore employee engagement among Higher Education Institution workers and its impact on organisational commitment. This study adopted the quantitative research approach particularly the correlational design. An explanatory-descriptive survey design was used as the strategy enquiry. This prompted the use of questionnaires; in this case, standardized instruments were used. The Gallup Worker Audit (GWA) by Gallup was used to gauge employee engagement. The Organisational Commitment Questionnaire by Allen and Meyer was used to measure organisational commitment. The total sample constituted 142 employees drawn from three HEIs. Data analysis involved descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) for demographic characteristics, frequencies for engagement levels, chi-square tests for association between job posting (teaching versus non-teaching) and employee engagement, Pearson’s correlation between employee engagement and organisational commitment and regression analysis for engagement drivers. The outcomes of the research revealed the levels of engagement within HEIs at critical lows, with only 33.8% representing employees with high levels of engagement while the remaining 66.2% have low levels of engagement. The findings also indicated that employee engagement can indeed act as a predictor of organisational commitment with the two sets of score correlated moderately and positively $r = .607$, $p < .05$. Job posting (teaching versus non-teaching) proved to have no association with employee engagement. The twelve drivers from Gallup Work Audit have an effect in driving employee engagement. The low levels of employee engagement in HEIs calls for managerial attention to drive engagement among employees for organisational success.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.0 Introduction

Now more than ever, it has dawned upon managers that employees contribute a critical difference not only to organisational performance and innovation but also to competitiveness, and ultimately to the success of any business. It is crucial to ask questions that are pertinent to organisations such as what do organisations have to do to draw and keep dedicated, creative and flourishing employees who make organisations prosper, which working conditions stimulate employees to give their best, to be engaged, to go beyond what is expected and persist in the face of difficulties? Instead of old-fashioned organisational structures that are heavily reliant on management control and economic principles of cost reduction, efficiency, and cash flow, modern organisations should focus on the management of human capital.

This chapter presents the background to the study. The study carries out an exploratory survey of employee engagement (EE) among workers in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and the implications on Organisational commitment (OC).

Engagement refers to focused energy that is fixed toward organisational goals. Many authors have coined several definitions on the employee engagement construct that will be highlighted later in this literature (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008).

1.1 Background to the Study

This research seeks to establish the implications of employee engagement on organisational commitment among workers in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Zimbabwe. Higher education is critical to economic success and long-term development of Zimbabwe; a country that is facing several challenges of growth and development on many fronts. Higher education provides economic and social benefits, both to the individuals and the public. This is achieved through production of qualified human capital, adaptation to and generation of knowledge, promotion of
international cooperation and improvement in competitiveness on the global knowledge based economy.

In modern organisations employees are expected to be proactive and show initiative, collaborate smoothly with others and be committed to high quality performance standards and to be responsible for their own professional development (Bakker and Schaufeli, 2008). Organisations need employees who feel energetic and dedicated, and who are absorbed to their work. In other words, organizations need engaged workers.

Despite the fact that managers or organizations realize the importance of engaged employees there is no evidence that it is receiving due attention, which explains why the subject matter is still rather vague especially in the Zimbabwean context. In addition ‘employee engagement’ is a relatively new term in Human Resources literature and rose to prominence in 2000 onwards hence most organizations are not aware of this new phenomenon. Worldwide surveys done indifferent countries across the world have proven that employee engagement is amongst the top five challenging factors for management (Bates, 2004; Robinson et al., 2004).

Nguwi (2012) states that the importance of employee engagement is amplified in the Zimbabwean context because of increased competition, dwindling profit margins and shrinking demand. A national survey of 5222 employees carried out by industrial psychologist in Zimbabwe showed that 40.79% of the employees are aligned skeptics. They further defined aligned skeptics as employees that know exactly what needs to be done for organisational success, but are reluctant to push the initiative to accomplish these goals. According to Ortiz, Cernaz, Lau and Qin (2013) it is imperative to nurture the concept of employee engagement because disengagement, or alienation, is the locus of control for the paucity of enthusiasm and commitment of employees to the organization.

As a result of low engagement levels the survey by Nguwi(2012) also showed that employees are no longer committed to the organisations they are currently working
for because 52.55% of the respondents surveyed said that they are actively looking for employment elsewhere and 45.75% said that they would not refer their close associates and relations to their current employers. This means that approximately half of the employees surveyed were not committed to the organizations which they work for. Research in North America showed that 60% of employees intended to pursue new job opportunities if the economy improved in 2010 (Schroeder-Saulnier, 2010).

Research indicates that low EE does not only impact on performance but it also increases employee turnover, reduces customer service gratification and raises absenteeism rate (Cataldo, 2011). Ram and Prabhakar (2011) state that EE in recent years has become the most discussed topic in the popular business press and among business consultant firms. It can however be noted that employee engagement is an under-researched subject in Zimbabwe.

1.1.1 Effects of technological advancements and rising complexities

Bhatla (2011) observes that a number of factors such as the complexities of managing businesses relative lack of people that have vital skills, increasing pressure to transform into world class organizations and growing technological advancement have led to problems of pulling, retaining and making effective use of talent in many organizations worldwide. In the increasingly changing business scenario, it is now realized that some organizations usually secure and maintain a competitive cut above others through human capital as competitive advantage. It is truly to this end that EE is vital as a beneficial method of supervising and controlling people in organizations as engaged employees have proven to deliver good, highly distinctive service and they also form work groups which produce high quality outcomes, giving a company a superior competitive edge above others.

1.1.2 Impact of Economic slowdown on employees

The deep rooted implications of the economic slowdown have crept into the daily lives of many employees across the major sectors in Zimbabwe including the HEIs. With growing opportunities abroad and greater flow of information through the internet, contemporary employees want to be in the best workplaces, handling the
best suited responsibilities and enjoying greater autonomy. In support of this opinion, Hewitt (2013) postulated that the ability of companies to find, understand, and manage talent hinges upon getting a powerful, differentiated and engaging employment contract.

The global recession has taken its toll on employees as pay freezes, benefit cuts, and layoffs permeate the workforce, making it more difficult to maintain high levels of engagement (Hewitt, 2012). Against this backdrop, it is more important than ever before for businesses to develop and maintain a highly engaged labour force. Companies call for steadfast motivation and productivity in this constrained environment. Understanding employee needs must occupy the centre stage not only for the Human Resource team but also for management. Organizations should progressively convert from traditionalism (bureaucracy) to the present-day learning and individualized corporations. Bhatla (2011) highlighted that most of the problems in traditional ways of operating businesses come from the increasingly growing gulf developing between superiors and their subordinates, the longer chain of communication coupled with a lack of sufficient chances to be taken on board in vital work processes and in decision making. Existing literature points to the fact that companies which are better able to engage employees also deliver desirable business returns to shareholders and perform better due to improved organisational commitment.

1.1.3 Engagement levels
A growing body of literature is indicates that in many organizations, levels of employee engagement have reached crisis lows. Extensive global research by Right Management cited in Salami (2008) has revealed that in organizations employing more than 50 people worldwide only thirty four percent (34%) of employees identify themselves as fully engaged, while a huge fifty percent (50%) identify themselves as completely unengaged. Sixteen percent (16%) are regarded as neutral meaning they don’t fall in any two of the highlighted categories. Failure to effectively engage employees can result in wasted resources, suboptimal organisational performance, high labour turnover and deteriorating employee morale. On the other hand, successfully engaging and committing employees can result in higher levels of
organisational performance as well as higher levels of job satisfaction, both of which are much needed in today’s environment (Mangundjaya, 2012).

If employee engagement among HEI workers is low, organisational commitment will be undermined. This will lead to negative effects on the normal operations of the HEIs. This stems from the notion that Higher Education Institutions are very important to the society and the economy at large. If employees are disengaged from their job roles, the quality of education is compromised resulting in adverse effects on the economy and the country’s competitiveness at large.

Siddhanta et al. (2010) state that a well-functioning organization results from employees that are healthy, motivated and committed, that is employees that are engaged. Engagement occurs when employees are tied and committed to their job that is when they are interested about their daily occupational activities. It encompasses loyalty, pride and faith in the organization a preparedness to publicly support the organization and above all a marked feeling of personal responsibility. The worldwide economy having undergone notable shifts in recent years which have pushed the need for organizations to scout for creative ways to deal with new demographic technological, and marketplace realities (Siddhanta et al., 2010). These shifts made the organizations to re-evaluate costs associated with talent. High workforce performance and organisational success need to be maintained along with changes in strategies.

This study hence explores the levels of engagement among HEI workers and the impact on organisational commitment. Recommendations that could help raise the levels of engagement are discussed to help those institutions, who look ahead and make long-term plans for the future and who understand that people are the most valuable capital. Relationship between EE and OC is established. Gaps in literature are identified and highlighted in this research project.

1.1.4 Background to Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) In Zimbabwe

The proliferation of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Zimbabwe in the last thirty years has brought to the fore the need for an educational environment with
organisational structures, administration policies and management systems for these institutions to operate efficiently and effectively. Indeed the expansion and complexity of HEIs calls for sophisticated skills and the shouldering of immense responsibilities. The transition from elite to mass higher education after independence has been central to a gradual metamorphosis, a change driven by demographic, social, political and economic pressures.

According to Gurira (2011) the Zimbabwean higher education sector has undergone massive expansion since 1980. From one public university at independence there are now 18 universities in Zimbabwe according to ZIMCHE (2013). Student enrolment has risen from around 1140 at independence to over 50 000. Tertiary institutions have therefore become very large in size and breadth calling for knowledge in administration, management and leadership.

According to Middlehurst and Elton (1992 cited in Deem and Broy 2007) in such a rapidly changing and frequently threatening social, economic and political environment where all aspects of higher education are being questioned- from sources of financial support to the character, quality and efficiency of institutional activities- it is timely to examine the framework with which the purposes of higher education are realised. In an interview, one Vice Chancellor stated that

“In the [few] years I have been here [the university] has expanded, it’s doubled or more than doubled, in student numbers. If you have that rate of growth and have the complexity of types of degrees, a lot of mature students, part-time students, students coming in for day release, afternoon release, evening and weekend classes; you are running or the institution is running an inherently far more complex set of processes than ever before. Sorry but you cannot do without management.” (Deem and Brehony, 2007, p.13)

The effects of the massification of higher education have resulted in increased enrolments which have a direct bearing on the quality of education. The major challenge for HEIs in Zimbabwe is providing quality education in the context of increased student numbers against a background of limited and dwindling funding.
from government. In such a changing environment, more is expected from employees in tertiary education and employee engagement comes to the fore.

Higher Education Institutions are in essence social entities made up of social animals. However the individuals that make up these institutions are not homogenous. HEIs consist of several persons each specialising in doing part of the total task. Each individual may be working efficiently in isolation but the institution as a whole cannot realise its objectives unless there is mutual cooperation and coordination among members. Engagement can foster teamwork and coordination of efforts so that each individual is motivated to make their best contribution towards the accomplishment of superordinate organisational goals.

The role of HEIs cannot be over-emphasised and is indeed uncontested. They have immense social and public responsibilities. According to Gurira (2011) higher education avails to society a critical mass of citizenry who possess the capability to engage the most intractable problems of society. Thus with such an immense responsibility there is need to study EE in higher education because practice without science has no guide and is tantamount to a statue without a pedestal.

1.1.4.1 Signs of disengagement

a. High labour turnover
Over the past decade, institutions of higher learning have failed to retain critical technical staff, highly qualified lecturers and other employees with critical skills. As highlighted in the Financial Gazette (2012), HEIs have not been operating at full capacity for years, depriving millions of students of their right to quality education. Zimbabwe’s higher education sector has been hard hit by the “brain drain” of the past decade. The exodus of highly skilled and experienced professionals left universities, colleges and schools facing severe shortages in manpower and resources affecting the quality of education (Financial Gazette, 2012) and furthermore, it has been reported that a number of programmes especially in the sciences field are no longer on offer. According to a report by the country’s
Parliamentary Committee on Education (2012), universities countrywide are suffering a severe shortage of both academic and non-academic staff as a result of the brain drain and science departments have been the most heavily affected.

Kapungu (2007) in her paper prepared for the centre for International Private Enterprise states that the mass outmigration of the population to scout for greener pastures has resulted in shortages of skilled and qualified workers most notably in the education sector thereby compromising on the standards of education delivery in Zimbabwe. This coupled with low productivity, low investment levels throughout Zimbabwe, and low growth, has led to reduced investment in human capital and this further diminishes the quality of the workforce in Zimbabwe and the ability to be employed for school leavers.

An astounding twenty first century phenomenon is that despite provision of desirable benefits and remuneration many organizations have lost their best performing employees to other competing players in the industry for no clearly established reasons. Although, some employee turnover is regarded as normal it is however noted that if an organization truly engages its workforce, the chances of sudden unexpected loss of motivated, experienced and skilled quality workforce are minimised. Researchers have argued that engagement, as a motivational variable should lead to high levels of job performance (Kahn 1990; Rich et al., 2010; Christian et al., 2011). Basically employee engagement is the most suitable way of fostering improvement and stimulating organisational change.

b.Low Staff morale
Through observations in HEIs, regular public domain memos are circulated reminding the employees to be early for work because most of them are usually late for work and they leave the workplace earlier than the stipulated time. Recently in February 2014 a public administrative circular has been sent by the Registrar’s office in one of the institutions cautioning University employees to always dress formally during working days. Under normal circumstances, how can such a reminder be made to employees who belong to such an important and crucial institution with high minded staff members in administration? Customer care has been undermined such that most clients complain on the way they are treated by HEI employees.
Phone etiquette has proved to be an issue in most of the universities, with a number of staff members failing to communicate formally. The mentioned few issues show a high level of disengagement among HEIs employees.

c. Social loafing
One of the HEIs warned the university community to follow the right channel when posting notices on all users email platform due to abuse of this facility by some employees. By analysing the network traffic log of most HEIs’ networks, many employees have been recorded to have visited and spent most of their time on social websites such as Facebook during working hours thus compromising on their work roles. Internet bills constitute a huge chunk of HEIs’ expenditure because of individuals who spend most of their time downloading non educative materials like music, movies, pornographic material and games. Such actions clearly highlight how expensive it is for an organization to keep disengaged employees. Cataldo (2011) in support of this states that low employee engagement has ramifications far beyond immediate co-workers. According to the Gallup organization, the global cost for keeping actively disengaged workers over a five-year period was approximately $300 billion in lost productivity and employee performance (Cataldo, 2011).

d. Lack of innovation and initiatives among HEI workers
Having observed the Research Intellectual EXPOs done by Higher Education institutions in Zimbabwe almost on yearly bases, the researcher has noticed that not much activity has been going on in terms of innovations and initiatives. Most HEIs have been show-casing the same products and services every year. One HEI that used to manufacture drugs and produced a number of innovative products has once ceased because of lack of support to drive innovations. In this United States Dollar era the question remains whether innovation is suffering due to under-investment or it’s an issue of employees being detached from their work roles.

The researcher being an employee at one of the HEIs in Zimbabwe noticed that there is need for these organizations to understand the dynamics of employee engagement and how they can act as informative bench markers for improving engagement levels which positively impact on organisational commitment (OC). These anecdotal observations of employees at the chosen institutions under study
suggest that some employees could be disengaged and this affects the extent to which employees exhibit their level of organisational commitment. This made the researcher to conclude that employee engagement is a construct that needed to be explored in order to find ways of enhancing organization commitment. According to Riketta (2002 cited in May et al., 2004) employee engagement is important to cultivate because disengagement, or alienation, is central to the problem of workers’ lack of motivation and commitment.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
The Zimbabwean economy has faced a down-turn in the past decade due to a lack of innovation, commitment and other factors that were prevailing within the context of the political and economic crisis. Clugston (2000) cited in Colquitt et al. (2001) states that in response to the economic crisis, employers are compelled to engage employees as most of the organizations are going through rather stressful phases like wage freezes, lost bonuses, increased work demands and downsizing. Hewitt (2012) highlighted that the global recession has taken its toll on employees as pay freezes, benefit cuts, and layoffs permeate the workforce, making it more difficult to maintain high levels of engagement. In light of this disengaged employees experience high levels of stress, high absenteeism rates, imbalance of work and home issues and lack of interest in their jobs. This has negative effects on overall commitment of the workers to the organization which stifles productivity, innovation, change management, job satisfaction and quality of services offered. The biggest concern is the potential loss of HEIs’ most valued talent, hence the need to consider improving employee engagement on the organization’s radar screen.

1.3 Research Objectives
1. To find out the levels of engagement among employees in Higher Education institutions.
2. To identify the key drivers of engagement.
3. To establish if there is an association between job posting (teaching versus non-teaching) and levels of engagement.
4. To find out if there is a relationship between employee engagement and organisational commitment.
5. To suggest strategies that could be employed to raise engagement levels among workers

1.4 Research Questions
1. What are the levels of engagement among employees in Higher Education Institutions?
2. What are the key drivers of employee engagement?
3. Is there an association between job posting (teaching versus non-teaching) and levels of engagement?
4. Is there a relationship between employee engagement and organisational commitment?

1.5 Research Proposition
The independent variable in this research study is employee engagement and the dependant variable is organisational commitment. The proposition being that: Employees who are effectively engaged will exhibit higher levels of commitment towards their organization.

1.6 Justification of Research
It is worth the time, effort and expense to carry out this research for both theoretical and practical reasons.

- Markos and Sridevi (2010) stated that most studies connect employee engagement to survey houses and consultancies and the concept is less regarded as an academic conceptual element. Hence the study is an addition to secondary data and also a base for further research to other students.
- To the organization (particularly to management) - this research unravel issues that need to be addressed in order to improve employee engagement
- The research adds to the body of knowledge which can be used for improvements in the industry.
- The research highlights the gaps in this field of study.
1.7 Purpose of the Study
The study seeks to explore levels of engagement among HEIs workers and also establish the extent to which lack of engagement can affect organisational commitment.

1.8 Scope of Research
The study will be limited to employees currently employed in Higher Education Institutions. The research will extend to only three institutions that will be anonymously named Institution A, Institution B and Institution C.

1.9 Organization of the Study
Chapter Two reviews literature related to the study and concludes with an analytical framework for the study. Chapter Three is the methodology chapter, which describes how sampling was performed and how the analysis was carried out. Chapter Four presents and discusses the study results. Finally, Chapter Five is on discussion, conclusions and recommendations.

1.10 Limitations
The researcher feels that the area of study had limitations based on the premise that the topic of employee engagement is a rather sensitive issue which managers feel is important or rather critical for competitive advantage.

1.11 Chapter Summary
This chapter is an introductory chapter of the dissertation as a whole. It is the focal point of the study as it presents the rationale of carrying out this study as presented in the background of study and the reasons for the importance of the study have also been noted. It also draws attention to the research questions that the researcher need answers to in order unpack the key constructs in the research study.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

Chapter one presented and discussed the introduction to the study; namely the background to the study, the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions and research objectives. This second chapter presents a comprehensive review and discussion of theoretical propositions and empirical research findings related to the topic under study. This chapter critically scrutinises a variety of articles and literature related to the study. The study seeks to explore employee engagement among workers in Higher Education Institutions and its implications on organisational commitment.

Literature Review serves as the foundation for the development of this study. Hart (1998) postulates that critically reviewing existing literature is of fundamental importance to academic research. Hart (1998, p.27) notes that without systematically reviewing existing literature, it is very difficult to observe how an academic study can make new theory or methodology application or add to existing knowledge in whatever ways it may. Such a review should distinguish what has been done from what needs to be done and place the research in the context. The literature review rationalise the problem and develop the central proposition within the context of gaps in existing knowledge.

2.1 Evolution of Employee Engagement
Markos and Sridevi (2010) stated that most studies connect EE to survey houses and consultancies and the concept is less regarded as an academic conceptual element. Employee engagement is a relatively new concept for Human Resources Management (Rafferty et al., 2005; Melcrum Publishing, 2005; Ellis and Sorensen, 2007 cited in Markos & Sridevi, 2010). The concept, employee engagement originates from two concepts academically recognized, acclaimed and subjects of empirical
research-Commitment and Organisational Citizen Behaviour (OCB) (Markos&Sridevi, 2010). Employee engagement is similar to and overlaps with the two concepts above. Robinson et al. (2004) state that both OCB and commitment do not adequately bring about the particular two features of engagement and its two-way inherent feature, and the expected degree of employee business knowledge, even though engagement seems to overlap with the above mentioned two concepts. Rafferty et al. (2005) makes a distinction of employee engagement from the two earlier concepts of Commitment and OCB, on the basis that engagement vividly professes to be a two-way interdependent process between the organization and employee.

Schaufeli and bakker (2004) found that the concept of EE emerged from burnout research and was a general response to the increasing popularity of positive work psychology. The emphasis of this concept is mainly on human strengths and optimal functioning rather than weaknesses and malfunctioning. Maslach et al.(2001) noted that the dimensions of burnout are exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced professional efficacy.

2.2 Definition of the Phenomenon

2.2.1. Employee Engagement

In the past several years, many authors have written on the subject of employee engagement. One of the major challenges presented by literature is the lack of a universal definition of employee engagement (Kular et al.,2008). In support of this Markos and Sridevi (2010) assert that currently there is no single unitary definition of the term employee engagement. Kahn (1990 cited in Siddhanta and Roy, 2010) coined the term ‘engagement’ to describe how people use different levels of their selves – cognitively, physically and emotionally in performing their work roles. Generally engaged workers are more open to new information, more productive, and more willing to go the extra mile according to Bakker (2011). Moreover, engaged workers proactively change their work environment in order to stay engaged. It is widely accepted that employee engagement is a multi-dimensional(Kahn,1990). Truss et al. (2006) interpret EE as an intense enthusiasm for work, an emotional
state that encompasses the three aspects of engagement examined by Kahn (1990), and takes into account the often found subject flowing through most of these definitions. Development Dimensions International (DDI) (2005 cited in Anitha, 2013) views EE as the degree to which people believe, enjoy and value what they carry out in their day to day routine as part of their job. Its measure is somehow similar to employee satisfaction and loyalty.

Robinson, Perryman and Hayday (2004 cited in Anitha, 2013) argue that engagement entails employees having a positive attitude towards not only the organization on its own but also its values as well. Rothbard (1999) in concurrence with Kahn (1990) likens engagement to psychological presence and goes on to state that engagement involves two critical aspects: absorption and attention. Attention is the cognitive availability and amount of time that one spends pondering about a role. Absorption refers to one’s intensity of focus on a role and being firmly engrossed in a role. A fully engaged employee is intellectually and emotionally bound with the organization, gives a hundred percent effort, is passionate about the organization’s goals and is dedicated to live by its values. Such an employee goes beyond the basic job responsibility to delight the clients and drive the business forward. Employee engagement was also defined as emotional and intellectual commitment to the organization or the total freedom of decision effort manifested by employees in doing their job (Frank et al., 2004).

Scholars from various academic circles have defined employee engagement in variegated ways. For Kahn (1990, p. 694 cited in Ram and Prabhakar, 2011) employee engagement is making use of and tying organisational members to their roles at work. People make use of and convey themselves emotionally, cognitively and physically during functional performances in engagement. Contemporary, scholarly definitions of employee engagement suggest that the construct consists of three separate facets: cognitive engagement, emotional engagement, and behavioural engagement (Czarnowsky, 2008; Kahn, 1990; Mackey & Schneider, 2008; Rich et al., 2010; Saks, 2006 cited in Shuck & Reio, 2011).

Ariani (2013) defines employee engagement as a person’s enthusiasm and involvement in his or her job. The author however argues that Kahn’s engagement
concept is motivational because it refers to the allocation of personal resources to role performance and also to how intensely and persistently those resources are applied. Ariani (2013) is of the opinion that engagement focuses on the positive aspects of a person’s job. Employee engagement is thus employee capability to help a company to succeed, willingness by supplying the freedom to decide effort on a basis that can be sustained as noted by Little and Little (2006).

Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) posit that engagement is a work-related mind-set that is fulfilling, positive and constituted by three inextricably linked dimensions, namely absorption, dedication and vigour. According to Bakker and Leiter (2010) vigour is conceptualised as the skill to exude high resilience, immense energy, and willingness to invest willpower on the job, the capacity to not easily get fatigued, and persistence when confronted with difficulties. Dedication is defined as a strong involvement in work, enthusiasm, and sense of pride and inspiration. Finally, absorption is defined as a pleasant state of being immersed in one’s work, where time passes quickly, and of being unable to detach from the job (Bakker &Leiter, 2010).

Stander and Rothman (2010) note that the three dimensions of employee engagement identified by Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) correspond theoretically with the three aspects of engagement formulated by Khan (1990) and May et al.(2004), namely the physical aspect (vigour), the cognitive aspect (dedication) and the emotional aspect which is absorption.

Robinson et al. (2004, p. 9 cited in Robertson and Cooper, 2009) postulate that engagement is, an optimistic attitude possessed by an employee towards an organization and its values. Ram and Prabhakar (2011) asserts that higher levels of EE are evidenced when employees have more passion towards their work are enthusiastic, committed and more involved in their work. An attached or engaged employee is viewed as one who is aware of the business environment, and works with other fellow colleagues to enhance performance within the working environment leading to the benefit of the organization. In general, some items in most
engagement surveys focus on the aspects of engagement that are most obviously related to ‘positive’ employee behaviour, and cover established psychological concepts, such as organisational citizenship, organisational commitment and attachment. Albrecht (2010) noted that engagement is viewed as a positive work-related psychological state and reflects a genuine willingness to invest focused effort towards attainment of organisational goals. To be engaged in the workplace, requires employees to be more than physically present and carrying out their activities according to required requirements.

The highlighted definitions coincide with that of Little and Little (2006 cited in Armstrong, 2012) who define employee engagement as the employee’s eagerness and proficiency to help the company succeed, which is witnessed through employees discretionary effort on a sustainable basis.

As is the case with most constructs in the early phases of development, EE lacks a certain level of consistency in definition and application across fields (Shuck & Wollard, 2010). Shuck and Reio (2011) unpack the several ideas by many scholars concerning EE. The author states that some scholars suggest that EE is simply a reconceptualization of other well-researched variables (meaning old wine in a new bottle or same lady-different dress; Schohat and Vigoda-Gadot, 2010); others advocate its distinctiveness (Macey and Schneider, 2008; Saks, 2006). Further still, few peer reviewed measures or approaches for evaluating EE currently exist (Christian et al., 2011). Clearly, there remains room for scholarly exploration, growth, and dialogue around the topic of EE.

Various differing definitions exist which make it difficult to determine the condition of philosophy of EE as each research study look at employee engagement under a differing official procedure. Unless EE is widely defined and ascertained; it cannot be regulated and cannot be known whether efforts at improving it work or not (Ferguson, 2007). This illuminates on the difficulties in comparability resulting from differing definitions. It is claimed that although EE has been subjected to numerous definitions it also seems similar to some established and better known concepts like
‘Organisational Citizenship Behaviour’ (OCB) and ‘Organisational Commitment’ (OC) (Robinson et al.,2004). Thus Robinson et al.(2004) views engagement as a step higher up further than commitment. As a result, employee engagement appears to be another trend, or what others might view as ‘old wine in a new bottle’.

2.2.1.1 Levels of Employee Engagement

a. Actively Engaged Workers
Cataldo (2011) highlighted detailed profile of engaged employee based on G12 employee engagement survey by the Gallup organization. Engaged workers according to Gallup organization exhibit:

- Consistently high levels of performance
- Regular innovation and initiative for efficiency
- Planned building of supportive efficiency
- Clear understanding about the expected outcomes for their roles
- Emotional commitment to their roles
- High energy zeal
- Commitment to their work group, roles and organization

Koerner (2006) states that actively engaged employees are the stars in a company. They are passionate about what they do; they feel a strong connection to their company and perform at high levels every day while looking for ways to improve themselves and the company as a whole.

b. Disengaged Workers
Disengaged workers, on the other hand, view their jobs as an exchange of time for a pay check (Cataldo, 2011). They arrive and leave work on time, take their breaks, never or rarely volunteer for extra work or projects, and do little else in between beyond the minimal effort. Koerner (2006) relate disengaged staff as the company zombies who come to work every day and put in just enough effort to meet the basic requirements of their jobs. Without passion or innovation, these employees neither oblige to the company’s direction, nor do they work against it. Such workers may have been actively engaged workers at one time. Somewhere along the way,
though, they became disengaged because of some issues like a lack of career growth or promotion, a perception of salary inequality, job dislike, or distrust in their immediate supervisors and senior management (Saks, 2011).

c. Actively Disengaged Workers

Actively disengaged employees are the most damaging employees in the workplace. They are unhappy and let that discontent show in words, attitudes and actions. They undermine the performance of other workers by continually voicing their displeasure and listing the many reasons why they are so dejected in their roles. Koerner (2006) describe such employees as the proverbial bad apples that revel in their discontent while undermining the accomplishments of others. As a result, disengaged employees do not only achieve little themselves but also prevent others from being productive too. They are negative by nature, not happy in their work and they compound their lack of productivity by sharing this unhappiness with those around them. Cataldo (2011) shows that actively disengaged employees make up only 15-18 percent of the employee population in an organization. Their negative attitudes have an inconsistent effect on the performance of their co-workers and overall working performance. While it is not difficult to re-engage actively disengaged workers, it is much more challenging. Letting workers know that senior leaders are aware of employee engagement levels and are committed to taking positive action to address it is a key step (Cataldo, 2011).

2.2.2. Organisational Commitment

Organisational commitment was found to partially mediate the causal relationship between employee engagement and turnover intentions (Brunetto et al., 2012). Huynh et al. (2012) defines organisational commitment as a positive state of wellbeing that results from an individual’s strong sense of belonging with other workers and the recipients of one’s service. Field and Buitendach (2011) assert that organisational commitment is the employee’s obligatory feelings to keep with their organizations and these feelings can result from normative employees’ experience and pressures. It may manifest itself as a human striving for interpersonal attachment, as well as the need to be connected with one’s work and to the values of
an organization (Huynh et al., 2011). The importance of organisational commitment is to identify factors that induce employees’ decision to stay with or leave the organization in cases of unpleasant organisational situations.


The continuance component is based on the employees’ calculations of the perceived cost of leaving a specific activity in an organization. Allen and Meyer (1990) states that employees stay with their organizations because of the perceived high costs and or poor alternatives associated with leaving. Allen and Meyer (1990 cited in Agyemang and Ofei, 2013) postulated that employees feel loyal and responsible to their organizations because it is regarded as the right moral thing to do.

The normative component according to Allen and Meyer (1990) can be said to be a sense of obligation to an organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment may remain because they want to. Those with strong continuance commitment may remain because of the need to and those with strong normative commitment can remain because they feel they should. It is of paramount importance to observe that all the three forms of commitment can be experienced by employees in varying levels hence they are not mutually exclusive. Most studies have highlighted the prominence of the affective commitment component.

Jow and Liu (2004 cited in Armstrong, 2009) argue that commitment is not only a human relation concept but also involves generating human energy and activating human mind. They go further to note that without commitment the implementation of new ideas and initiatives will be compromised. Research has shown that OC lead to low labour turnover, reduced absenteeism, better motivation and improved performance. Given the above it implies that OC is an important concept to integrate or foster in the business strategy.
2.3. Drivers of Employee Engagement

Several studies have sought to point out factors that result in employee engagement and came up with models to highlight implications for managers (Markos & Sridev, 2010). Their analysis aimed to determine the drivers that will increase employee engagement level among workers. According to Heikkeri (2010), since there is no agreement among researchers in defining the term of employee engagement, all undertaken studies came up with different key drivers and propositions. By analysing the factors influencing the levels of EE, it is possible to combine them into four main groups: individual characteristics and personality of employee, organisational environment, leadership characteristics, and job characteristics (Heikkeri, 2010).

2.3.1 Individual characteristics and personality

According to Wildermuth and Pauken (2008b, p. 208), the personality of workers may affect engagement because for some people it is possible to remain engaged in spite of insufficient working conditions, poor management and a routine job. Wildermuth and Pauken (2008b) basing on the results of burnout research supported that an employee was most likely to be engaged if he or she had the following personality traits:

- Hardiness as openness to changes, ability to survive in difficult times
- Internal locus of control or extent of individuals beliefs that they can control events in their lives
- Active coping style as a characteristic of a person who uses dynamic strategies in order to manage with life problems or distresses.
- High self-esteem as a person's positive overall evaluation of own worth
- Extraversion as the state of being concerned primarily with things outside the self with the tendency to enjoy human interactions.

According to Wildermuth (2009, p. 16), the importance of studying individual characteristics of workers is not in identifying those people who are “born to be engaged”; instead, knowledge of staffs’ personalities may help leaders create an environment where all employees are able to express freely their true identities and to benefit from full usage of their own potential.
2.3.2 Organisational environment

The analysis of various studies on the organisational roots of employee engagement revealed several important factors connected to this phenomenon. These factors include relationships in the workplace, communication, congruence between organisational and individual values, and work-life balance (Heikkeri, 2010). Employee engagement levels can be influenced by the fit that exists between employees and their work environment (Christian et al., 2011). These work conditions have to inspire employees to be more motivated, innovative, more committed and more productive. To ensure this, employees should have access to information, resources, support and opportunities to learn and grow (Okpa, Tarela & Jaja, 2014). Good and rewarding relationships in the workplace create a comfortable and respectful environment for workers and improve the level of employee engagement. Kahn (1990, p.708–709) stated that interpersonal relationships promote psychological safety if they provide support, trust, openness, flexibility and lack of threat.

Heikkeri (2010) highlighted that two-way communication was identified as a driver of employee engagement by Robinson et al. (2004) and Mercer LLC (2007). The Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) made a survey of employee attitudes and engagement in 2006; findings showed that employees are more likely to be engaged if they feel well-informed about processes going on in the organization and have opportunities to feed their views upwards.

Congruence between organisational and individual values was found to be an important environmental factor connected to engagement (Wildermuth & Pauken 2008a). Values matter to employee engagement in levels of psychological meaningfulness and safety at work. Work-life balance, as a proper prioritization between "work" (career and ambition) on one hand and "life" (outside activities and family) on the other, is a significant predictor of employee engagement. Respondents to Penna’s (2005) research pointed out that being able to leave work on time and enjoy a work-life balance creates a positive experience at work (Heikkeri, 2010).
2.3.3 Leadership characteristics

Leadership style and management process have great influence on the levels of EE as highlighted by most researchers. Many aspects of the employee’s life at work are under the control and responsibility of senior leaders and line managers. Heikkeri (2010) is of the view that employees are more likely to be engaged at work when their leadership has the following features:

- Leader shows resilience, consistency, trust and competence.
- Leader is engaged and committed to the organization.
- Senior management has a clear vision about future success
- Management clearly articulates organisational goals and sets realistic performance expectations.
- Leader puts the right people on the right jobs and selects talent
- Management provide to employees care and support and recognition for a well done job, and has an interest in the worker’s well-being
- Leader provides employees opportunities for development and career advancement.

These features indicate that employee engagement can be affected by both the personal individuality of a leader and the management style, which can be characterized by the ways of making decisions and relating to subordinates.

2.3.4 Job characteristics

Results of several researches show that job characteristics are connected to EE. Kahn (1990) asserted that employees have a sense of psychological meaningfulness when they have meaningful tasks. Wildermuth and Pauken (2008b, p. 207) stated that meaningfulness results from individuals’ perceptions that their work matters. According to Kahn (1990, p. 705) a job is meaningful if it involves challenges, variety, creativity, and a clear description of procedures and goals. Kahn also suggested that people require jobs with reasonable combinations of routine and novelty. Wildermuth and Pauken (2008b, p. 207) stated that tasks should involve constant learning and progress. Engaged employees are likely to have some level of autonomy which provides self-determination to an employee and independence in scheduling their work and determining procedures. Employees gain a sense of ownership of the work and an opportunity to do work without constant supervision (Kahn, 1990, p. 706).
The Development Dimensions International (DDI) (2005) asserts that a manager has to do five important things to produce a workforce that is highly engaged (Markos & Sridev, 2010). These involve:

- Aligning efforts with strategy
- Empowerment of workers
- Promotion and encouragement of working in teams and collaborative work
- Helping people to develop and grow
- Providing supportive assistance and recognition where it is need

According to Towers Perrin Talent Report (2003) there are top ten workplace characteristics which most often result in employee engagement. The leading among the ten drivers as listed by Perrin include:

- Interest in the wellbeing of employees by senior management,
- Decision making power
- Challenging work

Gallup the oldest consulting company in carrying out engagement survey established that the manager plays a central key role to establishing an engaged and motivated work force. The Chief Executive Officer of Gallup company James Clifton notes that employees with close attachments at the work place are more engaged than workers who do not have close attachments at the work place (Clifton, 2008 cited in Markos & Sridev, 2010). Vance (2006) postulates that EE is inseparably linked to employer ways of operating. To illuminate on the various ways in which employees’ way of operating impact on job performance and engagement, a job performance model was presented by the researcher. Vance (2006) postulates that EE results from personal characteristics which include but are not limited to attitudes, abilities, knowledge, personality, temperament, skills and organisational context which encompasses physical setting, leadership, Human Resource practices and social settings that directly influence the person, context components of job performance and processes (Markos & Sridev, 2010).

Most movers of EE are not tied to financial matters in their making. Thus, any organization which has a committed management is bound to achieve desired levels
of engagement incurring less costs of carrying it out. Managers must not ignore financial aspects but should link performance with reward.

2.4. The Relationship between EE and OC

Employee engagement has been positively associated with important job-related outcomes such as employee retention and OC. The focus of this study is aimed at employee engagement because the study this construct is important since it can influence a series of positive behaviours such as creativity and innovation (Harter et al., 2002). Engagement as a concept is still in its prime in terms of academic research. It has often been mistaken with OC. While EE refers to an employee’s loyalty and commitment to his work, OC refers to an employee’s loyalty and commitment to his organization (Agyemang & Ofei, 2013). To clarify on this Khan (1990) points out that OC and EE are similar in that both capture aspects of employees' perception of themselves, their work, and their organization, as well as having an affective component. However, the distinction between the two is that EE focuses on the objective properties of jobs, roles, and work context.

OC can only develop where there is employee engagement. When employees trust their organization and the promises they make, they can display positive behaviour outcomes of EE. As stated above in Armstrong’s (2009) definition of OC concerns not only individual's identification with the organization but also the commitment of the organization to employees, for example, if what management says and what it does is not the same this thwarts the positive psychological contract employees have and leads to lowered EE and consequently OC as well. Dessler (1999 cited in Agyemang & Ofei, 2013) sees OC as crucial to individual performance in modern organizations that require greater self-management than in the past when employees were constantly supervised.

2.4.1 Employee engagement and affective commitment

Engaged employees drive personal energies into role behaviours and display the self within the role cognitively, emotionally or physically (May, 2004). Engagement
can also lead to the development of work attitudes like organisational commitment. Affective commitment is a component that is concerned with the manner employees are emotionally attached to the organization (Agyemang & Ofei, 2013). Employees that have affective commitment towards their organization strongly believe in the organisational culture, values and goals mainly because they correspond to their own values and goals (Mowday et al., 1979; Waste, 2005 cited in Agyemang & Ofei, 2013). Such employees are willing to stay with the organization and contribute towards organisational success. Emotionally attached employees are driven more by intrinsic factors. According to Meyer et al. (1998) strong affective attachment can also be elicited when employees enjoy their time at work and can rely on their employers to satisfy their needs and create constructive and supportive work environments.

Armstrong (2012) argues that the basic tenet of EE is employee voice. The concept of employee voice refers to the extent to which processes and structure of the organization empower employees directly and indirectly to contribute to decision making in the organization. It entails a bottom up–top bottom process, where leaders and employees interact and employees participate in matters of the organization that impact towards organisational success and some of the issues which might affect the employees. According to Morrison and Milliken (2000 cited in Cooks, 2008) the concept of employee voice encourages employees to employ themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally. This is because employees are empowered; they feel that they have an influence over their fate at work because they are included in making contributions over things they value and those that actually matter. The working environment will be packed with the necessary conditions, that is, meaningfulness, safety and availability which are necessary for the development of engagement. Consequently employees develop affective commitment towards the organization. This implies that engaged employees identify with the agency mission and are prepared to utilize the emotional, cognitive and physical energies essential to achieve performance. A study of fifty thousand (50,000) employees in the UK by Aon Hewitt (2013) found that employees with high levels of engagement have strong affective commitment and as a result they performed twenty percent better that their colleagues.
Research carried out by Gallup (2012) showed that engaging employees boosts employee’s health and well-being. Their research indicated that sixty two percent (62%) of engaged employees describe that their physical health has improved as a result of positive, supportive work environment. Discernment of the organization as a salubrious place to work intensifies employee’s level of support for the organization. According to a study carried out by White (2008 cited in Christian et al., 2011) forty one percent (41%) of engaged employees said despite the struggles that their organizations are facing they are willing to remain with the organization. This implies that employees have strong affective commitment as a consequence of EE. Thus employees that are engaged stay with the organization because they want to.

Empirical evidence indicates that leadership styles have an effect on the engagement levels that are within the company. The working conditions in the workplace as imposed by leaders can influence individuals to choose the ideal self that fits that environment. According to Khan (2005) collective interactions among groups (departments, areas, units) within the organization can affect either engagement or disengagement levels of employees. However, if leaders are constantly looking for faults and blame in some groups whilst favouring others, employees defend themselves by withdrawing from the work role. This implies that there is lack of emotional connections amongst these groups which leads to low affective commitment. This is because the employees no longer identify themselves as members of the group that are working towards the same goals and objectives.

Engaged employees have strong affective commitment because emotional engagement creates feelings of pride and enthusiasm in the organization. Thus as a result employees stay with the organization because they want to. High levels of employee engagement correlate positively with affective commitment.
2.4.2 Employee engagement and continuance commitment

Continuance commitment is employee's inclination to continue working for the organization because they are terrified of the costs that are associated with terminating their membership with the organization, lack of alternative employment in the market and recognition of the high costs that accompanies leaving discourages employees to leave the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Allen and Meyer (1990) assert that the costs associated with leaving are made apparent in two ways. Initially, employees are reluctant to leave the organization because they do not want to lose the benefits they have come to acquire from the organization due their years of service. These benefits include retirement packages, seniority status and specialized and untransferable job skills. Secondly, employee’s perceptions that finding a similar job would be difficult because of the hostile job market inhibit employees from leaving the organization. Thus individuals remain with the organization because of the detrimental effects that leaving can impose upon them.

Becker (1960 cited in Meyer and Allen 1997) proposed a side-bet theory which indicates that the need to remain part of the organization happens with the intention of clinging on to the side bets that have accumulated, that is pension packages, seniority (Meyer & Parfyanova, 2010; Wasti, 2005). Perpetual membership according to continuance commitment is based on the premise of weighing losses that compliment leaving relative to the rewards associated with staying in the organization. Therefore encouraged by the need to receive rewards, employees engage in positive work behaviour.

Sudden activities in organizations of downsizing as strategies of cutting costs have created an atmosphere of fear and apprehension as employees fear for the security of their jobs which leads to low levels of EE. Employee’s continuance commitment might also be shaken because, despite the fact that employees might acquire their retirement packages, the antecedent that had caused an individual to continue
working for the organization might not have been for the packages. Probably it might have been because employees enjoy their seniority status, revel in the social networks, job satisfaction and challenges that come with the nature of their job. Job insecurity can cause individuals to disengage from their jobs and lower their continuance commitment compelling them to search for alternative employment elsewhere which offer job security.

2.4.3 Employee engagement and normative commitment.
According to Meyer and Allen (1997) normative commitment is determined by employee’s feelings of obligation and loyalty to the organization. Mowday et al. (1979) notes that an organization that socializes its workforce in a culture that accentuates loyalty can reduce normative commitment. The organisational values, mission and goals are integrated and become an important component of individual identities. Thus by creating consistency between individual and organisational goals, values and mission normative commitment is developed.

Engaged employees enjoy their time at work. They are empathetic towards their colleagues and transfer their engagement to others. Khan (1990) found that engaged employees spend a considerable amount of time in and out of their formal work schedule with other organisational members. The social information theory by Salancik and Pfeffer (1978 cited in McKenna, 2012) suggests that the more time that engaged employees spend with others the more the chances that employees have meaningful interactions where accepted behaviours and expectations of the organization are communicated. According to May et al. (2004) the interactions that engaged employees have increase their loyalty toward the organization as they develop social identification with others. Social identification has been identified as factor that can influence normative commitment.

Employees that are obligated to stay with an organization feel that they owe the organization their duties especially in instances where the organization is loyal to its employees like providing the necessary benefits and rewards. As a result the
behaviour of employees with high normative commitment never strays from organisational goals because they feel that they should repay the debt bestowed upon them by the organization.

Employees engage when they feel that they are investing themselves in roles that have extrinsic (promotion, performance based pay and salary) and intrinsic (recognition by significant others, job satisfaction and autonomy) rewards. In line with this Herzberg in his Two-Factor Theory postulates that two types of needs motivate employees and these include Hygiene Needs/Factors (For example Supervision, Interpersonal relations, Working conditions and Salary) and Human Needs (For example Recognition, Work, Responsibility and Advancement). Unsatisfactory hygiene factors can act as de-motivators, but if satisfactory, their motivational effect is limited. However, leaders may be evasive when it comes to issues of rewarding employee’s accomplishments and reprimanding those that would have performed poorly. According to Senge (1990) this contravenes previously set organisational culture and values of rewarding performance which weakens employee engagement. This implies that employees who perceive that they have been treated unjustly are distressed because their efforts are not being recognised and appreciated as a result normative commitment is eroded because they no longer have that sense of moral obligation towards the organization. Meyer et al. (1993) asserts that when an organization creates a climate of loyalty and trust, employees stay because they ought to in order to deliver their part of the bargain in as far as the psychological contract is concerned.

The psychology of motivation is quite complex and Herzberg has exploded several myths about motivators which management should be aware of and these include shorter working week, increasing wages, fringe benefits, sensitivity or human relations training and communication. A study by Gallup organization in the UK showed that organizations that create apprehensive and culpable cultures have low engagement levels. Such cultures do not reinforce a loyalty and trust culture thus as a result employee’s normative commitment erodes. Employees are no longer
obligated to stay with the organization; employees just go through the activities in the organization but there lacks passion in the execution of work roles. This is because the workplace is not psychologically safe and the work lacks meaning (Khan, 1990).

2.4.4 Models explaining the relationship between employee engagement and organisational commitment

The Job Demand-Resources (JD-R) model (Maslach and Jackson, 1986) and the Social Exchange Theories (Blau, 1964) were employed to explain the relationship between EE and OC (Brunetto et al., 2012). The JD-R theory assumes that every job is associated with certain physiological or psychological costs or demands (Agyemang & Ofei, 2013). Job resources on the other hand are the physical, psychological and organisational aspects of a job that help employees' complete tasks successfully and achieve work goals; as those resources provide basic human needs and foster employee growth, learning, and development. According to the JD-R theory, job resources may cushion the impact of job demands on the employee.

Saks (2006) suggested that a strong theoretical rationale for employee engagement is provided by the Social Exchange Theory (SET). This theory alludes to obligations as produced through a number of related interactions between groups that are in conditions of mutual dependence on each other. SET assumes that employees tend to act in ways that reflects their organizations or managers treatment (Agyemang & Ofei, 2013). An assumption underling the SET is the idea of reciprocity where both parties adopt a contingent approach; one parties gives benefit based on previous contribution by the other party therefore adhering to the norm of reciprocity and reciprocation of benefit (Coyle-Shapiro & Shore, 2007 cited in Agyemang & Ofei, 2013). A basic tenet of SET is that associations between people develop with time into relationships reflecting trust, loyalty and mutual commitment basing on the adherence to rules of exchange by social actors. This view is supported by Stern (2010) quoted in McKenna (2012) who alludes that employee engagement develops when the behaviour of leaders in organizations, expressed in words, actions and attitudes strikes a chord with staff and elicits their commitment.
Combining these two theories, employees who are engaged actively in their organization may have a feeling of obligation to respond and repay the organization in some form. One way for employees to repay their organization is to increase commitment to the organization (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Hence an employee with a high level of engagement is likely to be committed to the organization that provides him with the necessary resources to complete his tasks. Favourable reciprocal exchanges are thus expected. This gives the evidence that employee engagement is an antecedent to organisational commitment.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

According to Saks (2006, p. 602 cited in Heikkeri 2010), researchers have done little in the modelling of engagement though there are two main research streams in this area. The first stream concerns the studies of Kahn (1990). His findings and model of engagement were later empirically tested by May et al. (2004). The second stream is represented by researchers of burnout, who developed a model of job engagement as the positive antithesis of burnout. Afterwards, Saks (2006) also offered as an alternative, to refer to the social exchange theory (SET) and developed his own model of employee engagement, which was also tested. Employee engagement models help in understanding what factors have an influence on employee engagement and can predict it, and also to identify the consequences of the phenomenon. The following theoretical formulations and models were designed to explain Employee Engagement and organisational commitment.

2.5.1 Models of Employee Engagement

Various studies have attempted to conglomerate the several attributes of engagement into models that are workable. In this research, three models of engagement will be discussed and only one engagement model will be selected for carrying out this study. One organisational commitment model will be discussed and used for this study.
2.5.1.1 Kahn’s Tripartite Employee Engagement Model

The conceptualization of the major basic tenets of employee engagement is credited to Kahn (1990). Kahn’s (1990) model posits that engagement is different from basic job involvement due to the fact that it dwells on how one commits him/herself during job performance and not on worker skills (Wilson 2009). In his qualitative study on the psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, Kahn (1990) interviewed several summer camp counsellors and some members of an architecture company about their experiences of engagement and disengagement at the workplace (Saks, 2006). Kahn (1990) discovered three psychological conditions closely related to engagement or disengagement in the workplace: availability, safety, and meaningfulness. He postulated that people question themselves about three fundamental queries in a role situation: (i) How logical is it for one to bring him/her into such a performance; (ii) How likely is it for one not to be prone to any harm or danger in doing so? And (iii) How free is one to do so? (Kular et al., 2008). Kahn discovered that some workers were more occupied at work in circumstances that presented them more psychological worthiness, psychological safety, and when they were more mentally unoccupied (Kular et al., 2008).

Specifically, Kahn (1990) argues that a state of meaningfulness is a scenario where workers feel worthwhile, valuable, and useful and appreciated for the work they do. Safety is regarded as the environment in which most people feel able to act in ways considered to be normal for individuals without fearing negative consequences. Safety exists in scenarios where workers possess the conviction that they are not going to suffer because of engaging in their work. Safety also exists in scenarios where workers perceive the organisational climate as one of supportiveness and openness. Kahn (1990) defines availability as a sense of possessing the personal psychological, emotional and physical means which they employ to engage with their job chores at particular moments. This model takes into cognisance that individual coping strategies in life outside the job can have an impact on one’s engagement to a particular job. Kahn’s (1990) investigations also conclude that most people have personal preferred views of themselves that they use and express during role performance. Employees engage with the job if they are able to match the existing...
psychological conditions at their workplace with their actions and work roles (Wilson, 2009).

In one study to verify observations by Kahn’s (1990) model, May et al. (2004) discovered that worthiness, safety, and availability were indicatively related to engagement. The model is highlighted in figure 1 below. They also discovered that job value improvement and role fit were positive predictive factors of supportive supervisor relations; rewarding co-worker and meaningfulness were positive predictive factors of safety whilst sticking to co-worker standards and self-consciousness were seen to be negative predictors; and resources available were positive predictive features of psychological availability while taking part in outside activities was revealed to be a negative predictor.

![Figure 2.1: Path-analytic framework of engagement (adapted from May et al., 2004, p. 25)](image)

The findings of Kahn (1990) and May et al. (2004) described engagement from the psychological point of view and identified the main factors that influence its level.
Kahn further developed this model in (1992) article on psychological presence and a “recursive model of psychological engagement” where three things, the work, the social system and individual distractions lead to the three conditions of engagement in the workplace (Ralph2009).

2.5.1.2 Aon Hewitt’s engagement model
Aon Hewitt defines engagement as the psychological and behavioural outcomes that lead to better employee performance. The Aon Hewitt model examines both the individual’s engagement outcomes and the potential engagement drivers that are part of the organisational work experience as highlighted in figure 2 below (Hewitt, 2013). Hewitt Associates LLC (2004 cited in Anitha, 2013) defined EE as the state in which individuals are emotionally and intellectually committed to the organization or group, as measured by three primary behaviours: Say, Stay and Strive.
**Engagement Drivers**

- Job security
- Safety accomplishment
- Work/life balance
- Empowerment
- Sense of accomplishment
- Work Tasks
- Communication
- Diversity and inclusion
- Enabling infrastructure
- Customer focus
- Performance management
- Innovation
- Talent @ staffing
- Brand/reputation
- Pay
- Benefits
- Recognition
- Career opportunities
- Learning and development
- Supervision
- Collaboration
- Senior leader
- BU leadership

**Engagement outcomes**

- Say
- Stay
- Strive

*Figure 2.2: Engagement Model (Adapted from Hewitt 2013)*

The model in *figure 2* above is defined through three attributes including the extent to which employees:

- **Say** - that is speak positively about the organization to all stakeholders
Stay – have an intense sense of belonging and desire to be part of the organization

Strive – are motivated and exert effort toward success in their job and for the company.

2.5.1.3 The Gallup Engagement Model
Ralph (2009) postulated that the Gallup GWA model was designed to assess a workplace with twelve self-report questions. These twelve questions sought to understand what is important to high performers (who are loyal and productive) in an organization. The Gallup GWA model was mainly influenced by Maslow’s’ hierarchy of needs (1970 cited in Freeney and Tieran, 2006 cited by Ralph, 2009). In short Maslow’s’ hierarchy of needs emphasize that the bottom of the needs pyramid must be met before any “higher” needs can be fulfilled.

The Gallup GWA model of engagement proposes that an employees’ most basic need is to be provided with materials or resources to do his/her job. Once this is met, an employee wants to feel they are contributing he organization and that they get something in return, that is they have an opportunity to use their talents and skills and they receive recognition and feedback. The third level of Gallup GWA Model states that workers want to experience a sense of belonging. This can be achieved through involvement of employees in decision making and having positive relationships with co-workers and supervisors (Ralph, 2009). At the top of the pyramid is self-actualisation or opportunity for personal development within the workplace.

2.5.2 Organisational Commitment Models

2.5.2.1 Meyer and Allen’s three-component model of organisational commitment
Meyer and Allen’s three-component model of organisational commitment has become the dominant model for study of workplace commitment (Jaros, 2007). Based on existing literature, Meyer and Allen conceptualised organisational commitment in terms of three distinct psychological states, each of which influences whether the
person will remain with the organization or not (Lee et al., 2001). The three psychological states are highlighted below:

- **Affective commitment** – this includes emotional attachment to the organization.
- **Continuance commitment** – involves recognition of costs associated with leaving the organization.
- **Normative commitment** – has to do with perceived obligation to remain with the firm.

Allen and Meyer (1990) and Smith (1993) developed scales to measure these commitment constructs (affective, continuance and normative commitment scales) (Lee et al., 2001). Several previous studies have reported evidence in support of the construct validity of these measures.

The three facets of organizational commitment are prompted by divergent factors and evoke work related behaviours’ that are different. Meyer and Allen (1996) noted that levels of work behaviour were positively correlated to measures of continuance commitment and affective commitment. Further research by Meyer and Allen (1991; 1997) revealed that affective commitment contributed significant correlations to the interpretation of concern for quality sacrifice orientation and willingness to share knowledge. Normative commitment contributed only to the analysis of sacrifice orientation and continuance commitment did no add significantly. These findings thus provide support for the supposition that the three aspects of commitment have varying implications for behaviours related to work besides turn over. Organizations that have high commitment strategies experience good retention levels, productivity, and quality and are happy with the organization.

### 2.5.3. Models chosen for this particular research

This research aims to assess employee engagement and its impact on organisational commitment among Higher Education Institutions. Literature Review draws out the common influences on employee engagement from various models. To provide comprehensible logical review, the differing contextual influences are dealt with within Kahn’s (1990, 1992) three conditions of employee engagement. Therefore Kahn’s framework is important as it is one of the few to consider
conditions of engagement at conceptual level. In addition to this, other models appear to fit within Kahn’s three conditions. Meyer and Allen’s three-component model will be used to explore organisational commitment among workers in Higher Education Institutions. This is the most popular model on organisational commitment which clearly explains this construct.

2.6 Importance of Employee Engagement

Increasing employee engagement is a way of achieving not only improved performance but also organisational commitment as it is tied to positive results for both the company and the worker. Research by Gallup (Buckingham and Coffman, 1999) and others (Amble, 2006; Carteret al, 2002; May et al., 2004) show that engaged employees are not only satisfied and have positive wellbeing but they also improve organisational performance (Heikkeri, 2010). Improving EE achieves economic benefits for the organization and results in positive outcomes for the employees (Ralph, 2009). Ralph (2009) stated that organisational performance data across the world shows that engaged employees make large positive difference to financial results. Engaged employees deliver better performance, which is critical for business success. These workers understand their role in the business strategy and have a strong connection and commitment to the company (Hewitt, 2013). They are more involved, and strive to go above and beyond in their jobs.

2.6.1 Outcomes of Employee Engagement

Engagement can result in the breaking down of an organization or moulding of it since engaged workers are said to invest themselves more in their jobs leading to better performance (Bhatnagar, 2007). According to the Gallup Organization, USA (1999 cited in Sarangi and Srivastava, 2012) engaged employees are more productive, profitable, focused and more less likely to bail out of the organization because they have a high degree of engagement. Employee engagement is inextricably tied to customer satisfaction, employee turnover, loyalty, profitability, productivity and safety criteria (Harter et al., 2002). According to Johnson (2011) engaged employees are utilitarian assets that guarantee organisational success.
2.7. Knowledge Gap

A clear definition of and scale for the employee engagement construct enables further research regarding its relationship with other important factors in management literature, including antecedents such as work role fit, overlapping constructs such as job satisfaction, related constructs such as organisational and social support, and individual outcomes such as creativity and productivity (Witemeyer, 2013). Due to the differences in definitions of employee engagement, an apparent lack of research on the predictive factors of engagement and whether interventions, like training managers on how to effectively communicate, can be helpful in increasing engagement. There is need for future research to focus on personal differences and whether variables such as personality and culture have an effect on engagement.

No work has been carried out on establishing the likely consequences of EE on organisational commitment thus the main thrust for this research. No literature has explored on the impact of EE on job postings of teaching versus non-teaching staff in HEIs. Conclusively most empirical studies have been carried out in the United States; thus in future research must be conducted in other countries where little is known about levels of engagement. The study of employee engagement at a global level is worthy undertaking given the increasingly rising number of multi-national organizations coupled with use of outsourcing. It is important to consider if the same engagement ways of achieving targeted aims work or do not work for employees in different countries with varying economies and cultures.
# 2.7.1 Knowledge Gap on Models

Table 2.1: Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Gaps in literature</th>
<th>Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement</td>
<td>Kahn’s Tripartite Employee engagement Model</td>
<td>This model is not clear on the drivers of employee engagement.</td>
<td>This model can be used in conjunction with Aon Hewitt model of engagement to clearly categorise EE drivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It does not show the outcomes of employee engagement.</td>
<td>The model shows employees are affected cognitively, emotionally and physically. Outcomes are highlighted in clearly in AON Hewitt model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The model is not clear on the implications of employee engagement on organisational commitment</td>
<td>Tests will be done on this research to find out the relationship between these two constructs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement</td>
<td>Job Demand-Resources Model</td>
<td>Model mainly focus on resources as the driver of employee engagement. It does not show the strength of other drivers on EE.</td>
<td>Model should exhaust all drivers so as to come up with a number of strategies to improve employee engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement</td>
<td>Social Exchange Theory</td>
<td>This model is not clear on the drivers of engagement.</td>
<td>The model should be linked with other models to clearly explain employee engagement construct and the drivers of engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Model does not show the levels of employee engagement</td>
<td>This model adopts a contingent approach where parties are in a state of reciprocal interdependence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement</td>
<td>The Gallup Engagement Model</td>
<td>Model does not clearly highlight the different forms of employee engagement.</td>
<td>The model mainly focuses on what is important for top performers in an organization. Whether employee engagement is a main driver for performance or not is not highlighted in the model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drivers of engagement are not shown in the model.</td>
<td>Model should be used along with Aon Hewitt model to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
determine the antecedents of engagement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee engagement</th>
<th>Aon Hewitt's engagement model</th>
<th>This model concentrate more on the drivers of employee engagement but it does not really link or categorise these drivers back to the original model of engagement.</th>
<th>Need to link the drivers with Kahn's engagement model to align drivers with the three types of engagement by khan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational commitment</td>
<td>Meyer and Allen's three-component model of organisational commitment</td>
<td>Model does not have any link with employee engagement.</td>
<td>The model should be tested statistically with an employee engagement model to determine the link on the two constructs. However the model is informative on the forms of commitment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 show models of employee engagement and organisational commitment. Khan’s Tripartite Model is the main employee engagement model where all other models draw their ideas from. Hewitt’s Engagement model mainly focuses on the drivers of engagement which are linked to the conditions of engagement by Khan. Meyer and Allen’s organisational commitment model is quiet exhaustive in highlighting the types of commitment by employees in an organization. The available engagement models do not however show any link with organisational commitment hence the main focus of this study.

2.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented a detailed analysis of the concept of employee engagement and organisational commitment. The main purpose was to direct the researcher on the important aspects and to concentrate on correspondence to the given research domain. It also presented previous research models presented by other researchers.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

The previous chapter presented and reviewed empirical studies on employee engagement and organisational commitment. It also presented the theoretical framework that guided the study. The study was positioned in terms of its utilitarian value to the identified knowledge gaps. This chapter presents the research methodologies that were utilised in fulfilment of the research objectives.

Research methodology is critical to fulfilling the aims and objectives of the study. Methodology focuses on the best means of gaining knowledge about the world. Guba and Lincoln (1994) argue that the issues must ultimately be engaged at the world view level. Questions of methods are secondary to questions of paradigm, the belief system or world view that guides the scientist in choices of method. Therefore the research paradigm determined whether the study adopted a qualitative (inductive) or quantitative (deductive) approach.

3.1 Research Philosophy

The study adopted the positivist research paradigm; hence it was located within the quantitative research approach. The nature of the study topic was ideal for using this approach because the constructs on the research are attitudinal hence can be measured effectively using quantitative methods. Patton (2001) defined a paradigm as a world view, a general perspective or way of breaking down the complexity of the real world. The research paradigm is the interpretive framework which is guided by “a set of beliefs and feelings about the world and how it should be understood and studied” (Guba, 1990, p. 33).

This research has a strong positivistic appeal. Positivism, by its adoption of the hypothetical-deductive approach, seeks to identify measure and evaluate any
phenomena and to provide rational explanation for it. This explanation attempts to establish causal links and relationships between the different elements (or variables) of the subject and relate them to a particular theory or practice. There is a belief that people do respond to stimulus or forces, rules (norms) external to themselves and that these can be discovered, identified and described using rational, systematic and deductive processes.

Positivism argues that there is a “real reality” that is “comprehendible” (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Saunders et al. (2009) states that positivism assumes the role of an objective analyst who makes independent interpretations on data that has been collected in a value free manner. The authors explain that positivism strives to control, predict and explain by dividing things into parts and isolating them into mechanistic processes in an external world. They also state that this type of approach is objective, value free, normally uses quantitative data, deductive, and that truth has to be conformed to empirical evidence.

The rationale for this research approach lies in the fact that the main constructs in the study are measurable and have evolved from a parsimonious body of theory. The study assessed employee engagement among HEI employees and ultimately explains the relationship between employee engagement and organisational commitment. As a result the quantitative (deductive) research approach was most applicable in light of the research questions the study seeks to address. Indeed as Teddle and Tashakkori (2009) put it, the research philosophy and approach is secondary to and guided by the study’s research objectives and research questions.

3.2 Research Design

The research adopted the explanatory-descriptive survey research design. The research design constitutes everything that the researcher employs and does in order to implement the research proposal, achieve the objectives of the research and answer the research questions (Oppenheim, 2005). The research design according to Oppenheim (2005) should be in tandem with the overall purpose of the study. Survey research seeks to find out what situations are occurring and the distribution
of phenomena in a population. Survey research aimed at explanation asks questions about the relationships between variables.

Some of the research questions for this study are descriptive while others are explanatory hence the choice of explanatory-descriptive survey research design. The rationale for this design lied in the fact that there are some questions that descriptive surveys which are enumerative cannot answer or can answer only inadequately. These include predictive questions from which relationships between variables can be inferred. Simultaneously there are questions that explanatory surveys cannot answer such as questions about the distribution of phenomena (Oppenheim, 2005).

3.3 Population
A population is “the total membership of a defined class of people, objects or events” (O’Leary, 2004, p. 102). Employees in Higher Education Institutions make up the core population. According to ZIMCHE (2013), there are 18 universities in Zimbabwe with an estimated staff complement of around 16,721 employees.

3.4 Sample
In carrying out research a choice can be made between enumerating the whole population and selecting just a part of it. The former is called a census and the latter is a sample survey. A census involves contacting the entire group you are interested in and a sample survey involves examining only a portion of the total group in which you are interested, and from it, inferring information about the group as a whole. Sampling involves selecting units of analysis (for example, people, and artefacts) “in a manner that maximises the researcher’s ability to answer research questions that are set forth in a study” (Teddele&Tashakkori, 2005, P.168). For the purpose of this study, a sample of 156 participants was selected but 142 respondents managed to complete and return the questionnaires. According to Bartlett, Kotrlik and Higgins (2001) the minimum sample size for a population of 10,000 is 119 participants. The sample size is commensurate with the anticipated level of statistical analysis as well as comparability and generalizability. For the purpose of
this study the sample data was drawn from three universities including Harare Institute of Technology (HIT), Midlands State University (MSU) and the University of Zimbabwe (UZ).

A sample survey presents various advantages for this type of study. Parten (1950) points out that there are three main advantages of sampling: speed, low cost, and increased accuracy and analysis of the data. Sampling takes less time to collect data than would be required to survey the whole population. Since there are fewer records to deal with data processing and analysis also consumes less time than would be the case if the entire population were to be surveyed. Depending on the nature of the survey, perception studies like this one, require short turn-around time since currency is of importance where an accurate snapshot of the attitudes of a particular group is desired. It is also important to note that speed is essential to ensure the data is “fresh,” especially when it comes to assessing opinions.

The smaller amount of data gathered by sampling as opposed to surveying an entire population can mean large cost savings. By limiting the group to be surveyed, less time, hence less costs, are involved in collecting, editing, cleaning and analyzing the data. Data accuracy is also enhanced as the researcher has to deal with a relatively small amount of data (Parten, 1950).

Nevertheless sampling has its own disadvantages. The main disadvantages of sampling include lack of representativeness and insufficient sample size. Both can cause errors. If the two are not attended to properly research results may be invalidated. A sample inadvertently involves the risk of dealing with partial information. Where this risk is not acceptable in seeking a solution, then a full census should be considered (Parten, 1950). Determining the right sample size is also another major problem with sampling.
3.5 Sampling Procedure
The two stage stratified random sampling procedure was used in this study. Stratified random sampling involves dividing the population in the various subgroups and then taking a simple random sample within each one (O’Leary, 2004). The sample for the study was taken from three universities including UZ, HIT and MSU. The first stage in this procedure involved classifying employees into two strata, namely teaching and non-teaching staff. The rationale for such a stratification system lied in the objective to establish whether belonging to one of the two strata has an impact on levels of employee engagement. The second stage in this sampling procedure involved the random selection of the participants in the two strata among the three selected Higher Education institutions.

3.6 Research Instrument
A self-administered structured questionnaire was designed to measure employee engagement and organisational commitment and the relationship between the two. O’Leary (2004) argues that a number of benefits accrue to a researcher from using a questionnaire as opposed to using an interview technique. For example questionnaires are cheaper and easy to manage than personal interviews. This was more so in this research since there were tight deadlines for completion of this study. Furthermore, a questionnaire provides an assurance that the anonymity of respondents will be respected since the respondents are not required to write their names. This is in stark contrast to the interview technique where respondents’ anonymity is compromised. Questionnaires can be completed by respondents in their convenient time. They are therefore not disruptive of any work schedules. Scales (which will be discussed in the following section) that measure employee engagement and organization commitment were adopted and incorporated in the questionnaire.

3.6.1 Employee Engagement
Employee engagement was measured using the Gallup Worker Audit (Q12). According to Harter et al. (2002) the Q12 is also inclusive of the three psychological
conditions mentioned by Khan (1990) that are necessary for engagement, that is, meaningfulness, safety and availability. According to Gallup (2006, 2009 & 2013) there are two employee surveys that are quite extensive. The first one is concerned with the consequences of employee’s attitudes towards the organization. These include satisfaction, loyalty, pride, customer satisfaction and organisational commitment. The second one focuses on issues that can be changed and drive the consequences previously mentioned. The Gallup Worker Audit is focused on the latter description of employee survey and constitutes of twelve questions where supervisory or managerial level can drive the change. Generally, it takes account of the work environment, that is, perception of recognition and rewards, role clarity, fit between requirements and abilities, resources and receiving feedback. Thus high or low levels of employee engagement are influenced by the workplace conditions as they are the unpremeditated causes of engagement.

Participants rated their levels of employee engagement on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). The Q12 consists of twelve questions. Sample items include: “I know what is expected of me at work, and “At work my opinions seem to count”. According to Forbringer (2002) statement one and two caters for employee’s needs; statement three to six encompasses employee’s understanding of what is expected of them by the organization; their fit to the organization is addressed by questions seven to ten and their opportunity for self-development is catered for in question eleven and twelve. This implies that organizations that follow the given categories can have high levels of engagement and those that do not follow have low levels of engagement. Thereby measuring employee engagement and providing the yardstick between low and high levels of engagement. Interesting to note is that, Forbringer (2002) arranged Q12 statements into a hierarchy of four distinct levels where level one which constitutes statements of employee’s needs had to be satisfied before one could reach level four which constitutes statements of opportunity for self-development the four levels are; What do I get? What do I give? Do I belong here? How can we all grow?
3.6.1.1 Reliability and Validity

The Q12 is a valid instrument for the study because it incorporates the three psychological conditions mentioned by Khan’s (1990) Engagement Model, a model which informed the study’s conceptualisation of employee engagement. It considers, person and organization fit, role fit (meaningfulness), employee’s discernment of their duties and perceptions of the organization towards the employees (safety) and prospects for self-advancement (availability). The Q12 mirrors respondent’s engagement levels to the organization through questions formulated empirically and that indicate levels of meaningfulness, availability and safety. Thus the rationale of using the instrument to measure employee engagement levels in this study is justified. The Q12 can predict intention to stay or leave the organization this therefore means that it is a crucial instrument to use in predicting employee engagement levels in accordance with the objectives of the study.

Harter et al. (2009) assert that the Q12 provides a substantial benchmark of employee engagement, making it the most widely used engagement instrument to measure employee engagement with 5.4 million responses from employees from different countries and organizations. This is because the Q12 is an instrument that measures the dynamic forces at work that can prognosticate consequences that are vital for the organization and recommendations that are applicable in the real world. According to Havenga et al. (2013) studies conducted in the African context using the Q12 obtained Cronbach’s alpha values ranging from .80 to .92. According to Coolican (2009, P.195), “good reliability is represented with alpha values from around .75 up to 1.” This indicates that the Q12 is a reliable measure of employee engagement which can be used in the African context because it is somewhat culture free, despite having been developed in Europe. A reliability test was run and the cronbach alpha was 0.744 which is within the general acceptable range of 0.7 to 0.8 according to Field (2005).

3.6.2 Organisational Commitment

Organisational Commitment was measured using the three-dimensional Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) originally
developed by Allen and Meyer (1990). Participants rated their levels of commitment on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). The OCQ has 24 items, of which 8 questions fall under each dimension of organisational commitment, namely, affective, continuance and normative commitment questions. Sample items include: “I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization” (affective commitment), “It wouldn’t be too costly for me to leave my organization now” (continuance commitment) and “I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to the organization” (normative commitment).

The scale of affective commitment address the extent to which employees are attached to the organization, feel that they are part of the organization, a feeling of organisational identity and involvement where the problems of the organization are considered as the problems of the employee as well and employee’s willingness to be tied to the company or organization for their career for life (Meyer and Allen, 1991). The continuance commitment scale deals with questions that are associated with the cost of leaving that make employees reluctant to leave the organization. Employees perceptions of the detrimental effects that leaving the organization might have trigger them to opt to stay with the organization and they see it as a need because they are not prepared to lose the accumulated stakes, that is status, the feeling that they have exerted so much in the organization which makes leaving difficult and considerations of compensation packages (Meyer and Allen; 1991& 1997). The normative commitment scale is concerned with questions that reflect employee’s decision to stay because they have to. According to Meyer and Allen (1991) leaving the organization is not considered as the right thing to do as employees feel that they ought stay and be loyal to the organization.

3.6.2.1 Reliability and Validity
The OCQ is a valid instrument for the study because it incorporates the three key constructs that make up organisational commitment according to Allen and Meyer’s (1990) Model of Organisational Commitment, a model which informed the study’s conceptualisation of the same. Meyer et al. (1993) reported internal consistency reliability estimates (Cronbach’s alphas) for affective commitment (0.82),
continuance commitment (0.74) and normative commitment (0.83). Studies by Coetzee et al. (2007), Ferreira (2009) and Lumley (2010) confirmed the reliability and validity of the organisational commitment scale in the South African context.

3.7 Data Collection
Permission to carry out the study was sought from the responsible authority. The questionnaires were self-administered. Active consent was sought from the participants at the time of survey administration and participants were informed that they have a right not to participate in the study. Data was collected from three higher education institutions namely MSU, HIT and UZ.

3.8 Data Processing and Analysis
The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 for Windows was used to analyse the data. Data analysis involved descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations and frequencies) for demographic characteristics, chi-square tests of association between job posting and employee engagement, regression analysis to assess the net impact of the drivers of engagement captured by the Q12 and Pearson correlations between employee engagement and organisational commitment. A pilot study was first conducted to test the instrument for internal consistency.

3.9 Ethical Considerations
Ethical principles were religiously adhered to so as to safeguard the needs of the participants and the organization. Ethical principles are a fundamental foundation of ethical codes that researchers have to adhere to in order to prevent the exploitation of human beings in research. Ethical principles were first introduced and defined in the Nuremberg code and were later reinterpreted in the Helsinki Declaration (Barry, 1988). These codes emphasized that the ethical principles need to be interpreted and applied within different cultural settings, many of which were unfamiliar to the international bodies that originally formulated these principles. Careful consideration at the level of application is important.
There are five ethical principles that are central when thinking about ethical problems in research that will guide the researcher namely beneficence and no maleficence; fidelity and responsibility; integrity; justice; and respect for people’s rights and dignity.

Permission to carry out the study was sought from the responsible authorities in all the three universities. The questionnaire was self-administered. Active consent was sought from the participants at the time of survey administration and they were informed that they have a right not to participate in the study.

Burns and Grove (1993) say that informed consent is a potential respondent’s agreement to voluntarily participate in a study. During this study respondents were adequately appraised of the issues relating to the study. Their rights to participate voluntarily in this study were articulated and so were their right to withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences. It was explained to the respondents that they would not incur any cost during the course of the study save for the time they would be required to furnish the researchers with relevant information.

**3.9.0 Anonymity and confidentiality** was pursued from the onset through to the completion of the study. Anonymity refers to a situation whereby it is impossible to link respondents to their responses (Burns & Grove, 1993). Anonymity of respondents in this study was guaranteed as respondents’ names were not disclosed on the questionnaires. The university names were not written on the questionnaires.

**3.9.1 Confidentiality** refers to safeguarding information provided by respondents to ensure that it is not reported publicly in a way which may expose their identity (Polit&Hungler, 1995). In this regard no personal identification information was
needed on the completed questionnaire. In addition the questionnaires were only numbered after data collection.

3.9.2 Self-determination was adhered to through notifying respondents of their independence of choice in choosing whether or not to participate in the study.

3.9.3 No physical or mental harm and discomfort was posed to the respondents during the course of this study.

All submitted questionnaires by respondents were coded and the SPSS version 21 program was used in analysing the data. Research findings will be made available to respondents who might so wish to have them.

3.10 Limitations
Given the area of study the researcher felt that the area of study had limitations based on the premise that the topic of employee engagement is a rather sensitive issue which managers feel is important or rather critical for competitive advantage.

3.11 Chapter Summary
This chapter highlights how the research was carried out taking particular interest in the research design, the population sample, the research instruments and the data collection procedures and data analysis procedure the researcher employed in the study.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Introduction
The previous chapter presented the research philosophy which steered the research approach and data collection. The major research objective of the study is to ascertain the levels of employee engagement and their implications for organisational commitment. This chapter presents the data, which will be analysed guided by the research methodology and research questions employed in the study.

4.1 Demographic Data Information
Preliminary sections of the questionnaire targeted demographic data.

4.1.1 Gender

![Bar Chart]

*Figure 4.1: Gender*
A total of 142 individuals participated in the study. Of these 59.2% (n=84) were male while 40.8% (n=58) were female.
4.1.2 Age

*Table 4.1: Ages of respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 to 39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 and above</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ages of the participants ranged from 21 years to 65 years. The mean age of the participants was 34.

4.1.3 Levels of Education

*Figure 4.2: Level of Education*
Of the participants, 10.6% (n=15) had certificates, 26.8% (n=38) had diplomas, 26.8% (n=38) had degrees, 33.1% (n=47) had masters and 2.8% (n=4) had PhDs.

4.1.4 Years’ experience in Higher Education

![Years’ Experience Pie Chart]

The majority of the participants had less than 10 years’ experience. Specifically, 49.3% (n=70) had 0 to 5 years’ experience, 38% (n=54) 6 to 10 years, 4.2% (n=6) 11 to 15 years, 1.4% (n=2) 16 to 20 years, 3.5% (n=5) 21 to 25 years, and 3.5% (n=5) 26 years and above.

4.2 Survey response

A total of 142 of the targeted 156 teaching and non-teaching completed the questionnaires which represents a response rate of 91%. This response rate of 91% is very acceptable for the results to be considered representative of the sample and
population. This is in line with Saunders (2007) who put forward that any response rate that is 50% and above would warrant validity of the study findings.

Data was analysed according to the following research questions;

1. What are the levels of engagement among employees in Higher Education Institutions?
2. What are the key drivers of employee engagement?
3. Is there an association between job posting (teaching versus non-teaching) and levels of engagement?
4. Is there a relationship between employee engagement and organisational commitment?

4.3 Levels of Employee Engagement
Levels of employee engagement among Higher Education employees were measured and the following observations were made.

4.3.1 General Engagement Levels

![Figure 4.4: Levels of engagement](image)

Figure 4.4: Levels of engagement
The findings shown in figure 6 indicate that 33.8% (n=48) of the employees are actively engaged, 60.6% (n=86) are disengaged, and 5.6% (n=8) are actively disengaged. The levels of engagement are very low which may have adverse implications for efficiency and effectiveness in Higher Education Institutions.

4.3.2 Engagement Levels by Age

Table 4.2: Age and Engagement Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your age</th>
<th>Actively Engaged</th>
<th>Disengaged</th>
<th>Actively Disengaged</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 to 39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 and above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicate that of those aged 48 years and above, 60% are actively engaged; of those aged between 40 and 47 years, 29% are actively engaged; of those aged between 32 and 39 years, 28% are actively engaged; of those aged between 26 and 31, 31% are actively engaged and of those aged between 18 and 25 years, 40% are actively engaged. While it appears that age does not have a significant impact on engagement levels, it can be noted that employees over 48 years have the highest levels of engagement. This could be due to the impact of length of tenure and its consequent effects on continuance commitment among employees.
4.3.3 Engagement Levels by Experience

Experience apparently has an effect on the levels of employee engagement. Generally, employees with more years of experience have higher levels of engagement. As indicated in table 4 below, 60% of the employees with over 26 years’ of experience and 80% of those with 21 to 25 years’ of experience in Higher Education Institutions are actively engaged. This could be due to the fact that experienced employees know what is expected of them and may have good rapport with co-workers and supervisors after many years working together.

Table 4.3: Experience and Levels of engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Levels</th>
<th>Actively Engaged</th>
<th>Disengaged</th>
<th>Actively Disengaged</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Key Drivers of Engagement

To examine the drivers or predictors of employee engagement, multiple regression, with employee engagement as the independent variable, and clarity of job expectations, work materials, opportunities to excel, recognition and praise, immediate supervisor support, encouragement, sense of accomplishment, employee perceptions of job importance, co-workers, having a best friend at work, regular performance feedback, and training and development opportunities as explanatory or predictor variables was run on the data.
Multiple regressions allows for identification of a set of predictor variables which together cohesively provide a powerful estimate of the phenomenon of interest (Coolican, 2009). The researcher examined multi-collinearity between predictor variables, heteroscedasticity among the residuals, and the model summary of the backward regression analysis of the data and beta coefficients of the predictive variables. The overall purpose of the analysis was to discover the relationship between each individual predictive variable and the dependant.

4.4.1 Data Checking and Screening
Before data can be analysed there is need to make sure that the data involved is not violating any of the assumptions required for a multiple regression analysis.

4.4.1.1 Normal Probability Plot

![Histogram](image.png)

*Figure 4.5: Normal Probability Plot*
The normal probability plot in *figure 7* shows a curvilinear relationship which satisfies one core assumption for multiple regression analysis that the distribution of the independent variables should be normal. This evident that the assumption of multiple regression test is not violated.

### 4.4.1.2 P-P plot Distribution

![Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual](image)

Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement

*Figure 4.6: P-plot distribution Observed Cum Probe*

The normal P-P plot\(^3\) shows that our residual values are sticking closely to the predicted straight line which satisfies a major assumption concerning residuals making our values relatively normal.
4.4.1.3 Heteroscedasticity

Figure 4.7: Partial regression plot

The partial regression plot indicates that the variance of residuals is not similar across different values of predicted levels of the criterion in multiple regressions. There is no obvious pattern in the scattergram between ZPRED and ZRESID and it is not funnel shaped which indicates that there is no heteroscedasticity.

4.4.1.4 Multi-collinearity Diagnosis

Multiple regressions require that there must not be too high a degree of Collinearity. Multi-collinearity is a statistical phenomenon in which two or more predictor variables in a multiple regression analysis are highly correlated which greatly diminishes their predictive power (Field, 2005). As displayed in Appendix 2, Pearson Correlations were calculated among the twelve predictor variables. None of the correlations reached the .80 threshold thus no two variables are closely related. The other checks for multi-collinearity among the predictor variables are Tolerance Values and
the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). According to Coolican (2009), tolerance that are very low (under .2) and VIF scores above 10 are indicated of multi-collinearity. Tolerance levels and VIF values in table 7 indicate that our tolerance values are well above .2 and well below 10 which indicate that there is no multi-collinearity. As such, the predictors variables are not closely correlated and therefore do not excessively influence each other.

4.4.2 Backwards Design Method of Multiple Regression

This is a method characterised by the exclusion of insignificant predictors at each step until we remain with the most parsimonious model that best explains variance in the dependant variable, in this case employee engagement.

4.4.2.1 Model Summary

Table 4.4: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>2.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Training and Development Opportunities, Having a Best Friend at Work, Clarity of Job Expectations, Regular Performance Feedback, Recognition and Praise, Co-Workers, Work Materials, Sense of Accomplishment, Employee Perceptions of Job Importance, Opportunities to excel, Encouragement, Immediate Supervisor Support

Table 5 shows the results of the predictive variables from backward multiple regression analysis. None of the predictors was removed leaving us with all the predictors in the model. The Adjusted R Square tells us that 88.9% of the variance in employee engagement is explained by the predictor variable. This gives the explanatory power of the model and thus variance in the dependant variable is accounted for by the predictor variables in the model.
4.4.2.2 Anova

Table 4.5: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5389.255</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>449.105</td>
<td>95.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>609.618</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5998.873</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Training and Development Opportunities, Having a Best Friend at Work, Clarity of Job Expectations, Regular Performance Feedback, Recognition and Praise, Co-Workers, Work Materials, Sense of Accomplishment, Employee Perceptions of Job Importance, Opportunities to excel, Encouragement, Immediate Supervisor Support

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement

ANOVA tells us whether our model accounts for a significant proportion of the variance in employee engagement or it is simply spurious. According to Coolican, (2009, p 470) “it is a comparison of the variance ‘explained’ and the variance ‘unexplained’ (the residuals).” If there is no significance then there would be no point continuing with the analysis. For this analysis, the result was $F(12, 129) = 95.034$, $p < .05$. Thus given that our p value is less than .05 then the model accounts for a significant proportion of variance in employee engagement.
4.4.2.3 Beta Coefficients

*Table 4.6: Beta Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-2.601</td>
<td>1.619</td>
<td>-1.607</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Job Expectations</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>5.948</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Materials</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>6.537</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to excel</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>5.375</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and Praise</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>8.882</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Supervisor Support</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>2.785</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>4.321</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Accomplishment</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>6.097</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Perceptions of Job Importance</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>5.553</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>6.769</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a Best Friend at Work</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>1.978</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Performance Feedback</td>
<td>1.402</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>10.576</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Development Opportunities</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>7.536</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement*

*Table 7* displays the coefficients which give a measure of the contribution of each variable in the model in predicting employee engagement. For example, the
Unstandardized Coefficients (b weights) indicate that we have a b value of 1.402 for regular performance feedback. This indicates that for every point increase in regular performance feedback there will be an increase of 1.402 in the employee engagement score, given that all other variables are held constant. The larger the b value, the greater the effect on the dependent variable.

Similarly, a large t value and a small p value suggest that a predictor variable has a large effect on the dependent variable. Generally, useful predictors have t values well below -2 or above +2 (Coolican, 2009). The t values in the coefficients table show that regular performance feedback is the strongest driver (t=10.576), followed by recognition and praise (t=8.882), training and development opportunities (t=7.536), Co-workers (t=6.769), work material (t=6.537), sense of accomplishment (t=6.097), clarity of job expectations (t=5.948), employee perceptions of job importance (t=5.553), opportunities to excel (t=5.375), encouragement (t=4.321), Immediate supervisor support (t=2.785), and having a best friend at work (t=1.978). None of the drivers have p values above .05 thus all are significant though the large p value for best friend at work indicates that it has a small effect on driving employee engagement.

4.4.3 Summary Report for Regression Analysis

A standard multiple regression was performed between employee engagement as the dependent variable and clarity of job expectations, work materials, opportunities to excel, recognition and praise, immediate supervisor support, encouragement, sense of accomplishment, employee perceptions of job importance, co-workers, having a best friend at work, regular performance feedback, and training and development opportunities as explanatory or predictor variables. Appendix 2 and tables 4 to 7 display the correlations between variables, model summary, ANOVA outputs, the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), standardised regression coefficients (beta) and $R (.948)$, $R^2 (.898)$ and adjusted $R^2 (.889)$. $R$ for regression was significantly different from zero, $F_{12,129} = 95.034$, $p < .05$. 
Twelve independent variables contributed significantly to the prediction of employee engagement: regular performance feedback (beta=.245), recognition and praise (beta=.222), training and development opportunities (beta=.187), Co-workers (beta=.162), work material (beta=.173), sense of accomplishment (beta=.164), clarity of job expectations (beta=.136), employee perceptions of job importance (beta=.142), opportunities to excel (beta=.143), encouragement (beta=.134), immediate supervisor support (beta=.086), and having a best friend at work (beta=.045). Altogether, 88.9% of variability in employee engagement was predicted by all twelve independent variables. The effect size was large \( f^2=1.02 \) indicating that the twelve drivers of employee engagement has a great impact of driving engagement among workers.

4.5 Employee Engagement versus Job Posting
To examine the association the association between job posting (teaching and non-teaching) and levels of engagement Chi-Square tests were run on the data.

4.5.1 Cross Tabulation Frequencies Job Posting and Employee Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What's your Job Posting</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Non-Teaching</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the employee engaged?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Frequencies Job Posting and Employee Engagement

Table 8 above show that of total respondents 44.37% are teaching staff and 55.63% are Non-Teaching staff. 34.92% of the teaching staff is actively engaged while 34.17% of the non-teaching staff category is actively engaged.
4.5.2 Chi-Square Analysis

Table 4.8: Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.009a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.74.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

4.5.3 Effect Size

Table 4.9: Symmetric Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Phi</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal Cramer's V</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.4 Results

To establish whether there is an association between job posting and employee engagement, a Pearson Chi-Square was conducted. This statistical procedure was optimal because frequency data were present for job posting and employee engagement. Chi-squares are the statistical procedure of choice when both variables are categorical or nominal and each observed case appears in only one cell.

Some 34.9% of the teaching staff is engaged (27/63) while 34.1% of the non-teaching staff is engaged. A $\chi^2$ analysis of association between employee
engagement and job posting was not significant, \(\chi^2 (1, N=142) = .009, p > .05\). The effect size for this finding, Cramer V, was small with \(\phi=.008\) (Cohen, 1988) since our \(df_{\text{smaller}}\) is 1. This tells us that there is no association between employee engagement and job posting. Engagement levels between teaching and non-teaching staff are relatively similar implying that job posting does not affect employee engagement but the dynamics of employee engagement come to play.

4.6 Relationship between Employee Engagement and Organisational Commitment

To assess whether there is a relationship between employee engagement and organisational commitment, the Pearson product-moment correlation was run on the data.

4.6.1 Normality

![Normal probability Plot](image)

*Figure 4.8: Normal probability Plot*
The normal probability plot indicates that the distribution of employee engagement score is relatively normal which does not violate key assumption for correlational analysis.

4.6.2 Heteroscedasticity

![Figure 4.9: Scatter Plot](image)

The scatter plot indicates that the pairs of readings are scattered randomly on the scatter-gram, but do form a consistent pattern with very few outliers. This does not violate the assumptions of correlation analysis.

4.6.3 Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement Score</td>
<td>43.22</td>
<td>6.870</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Score</td>
<td>81.77</td>
<td>11.906</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean engagement score was 43.22 with a standard deviation of 6.870 while the mean commitment score was 81.77 with as standard deviation of 11.906.

### 4.6.4 Correlation Results

*Table 4.11: Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engagement Score</th>
<th>Commitment Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement Score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.607**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The relationship between employee engagement and organisational commitment was investigated with Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficient. There were no violations of normality or heteroscedasticity in the analysed data. The two sets of score correlated moderately and positively $r = .607, p < .05$. The correlation coefficient itself is a measure of effect size. According to Cohen (1988), an effect size of .5 is large. Therefore there is a significant positive relationship between employee engagement and organisational commitment. Thus employees with high engagement scores tend to have high levels of organisational commitment (and the converse is equally true).

### 4.7 Reliability Analysis

*Table 4.12: Reliability Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.744</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To measure the reliability of the engagement scale used for the study, a reliability analysis test was run giving a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.744 shown in table 13. Field (2005) states that the generally accepted range of the Cronbach’s alpha measure is 0.7 to 0.8. Values substantially lower indicate an unreliable scale. The alpha level of 0.744 for this research is therefore worthwhile. All items of the engagement scale were included because they provided meaningful data to this research.

4.8 Chapter Summary
In this chapter, empirical data gathered through an explanatory descriptive was presented. Presentation and analysis of data was guided by the research questions. Findings indicated that the levels of employee engagement among HEI employees are low. Employee engagement drivers were tested and specifically, regular performance feedback was the strongest driver followed by recognition and praise, training and development opportunities, Co-workers, work material, sense of accomplishment, clarity of job expectations, employee perceptions of job importance, opportunities to excel, encouragement, immediate supervisor support, and having a best friend at work. Job posting proved to have no association with the levels of employee engagement. It was noted that employee engagement is positively related to organisational commitment. The next chapter discusses the findings that emerged from the data presented in chapter four focusing on explaining the findings within the context of the conceptual framework, other related studies and the recommendations. Areas for further research will be discussed in line with the two constructs of employee engagement and organisational commitment.
5.0 Introduction
This chapter discusses the findings in relation to the theoretical framework and related studies. The study results are compared with the existing body of knowledge from reviewed studies on employee engagement and organisational commitment. This chapter includes the conclusion and the recommendations that the researcher feels are significant in addressing the issues within Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). The discussion is guided by the research questions.

The purpose of the study is to measure employee engagement levels among HEI workers, identify the main drivers of employee engagement, examine association between job posting and EE and determine if there exists a relationship between EE and OC. The study is essentially an explanatory-descriptive survey. Participants were drawn from a two stage stratified random sample (n=142) from three HEIs in Zimbabwe. Data collection took place between 20 and 29 June 2014.

5.1 Engagement levels

The first research question this study attempted to address was:

*What are the levels of engagement among employees in Higher Education Institutions?*

5.1.1 General employee engagement levels
The study findings indicate that the levels of engagement among HEI employees are generally low. The results indicate that 33.8% (n=48) of the employees are actively engaged, 60.6% (n=86) are disengaged, and 5.6% (n=8) are actively disengaged. These findings are consistent with results obtained in an extensive global research by Right Management cited in Salami (2008) which revealed that in organizations employing more than 50 people worldwide only thirty four percent (34%) of
employees identify themselves as fully engaged, while a huge fifty percent (50%) identify themselves as completely unengaged. In their EE Trends Report Quantum workplace company carried out an EE research on a sample of nearly 10000 employees from differing organisations in Europe and the results showed that 37.2 percent of employees were ranked as engaged (Weisser, 2013); a finding which is also consistent with research findings. However, when compared with a study by Crabtree (2013) in the Middle East and Northern and Sub-Saharan Africa, who obtained disengagement levels of only 33%, the level of disengagement in the current study (60.6%) are much higher.

The levels of engagement obtained in this study are disquieting and have indeed reached crisis lows. The implications of such findings for organisational efficiency and effectiveness can be somewhat profound. It has been well documented that employee engagement results in positive work outcomes. Engaged workers are more open to new information, more productive, and more willing to go the extra mile according to Bakker (2011). Thus when a large portion of the employee is disengaged as is the case in this research, they are likely to lack vigour, absorption and psychological identification with their work may result in lower levels of productivity. A few of the employees came out as actively disengaged but despite them being few, the damage they can cause in an organisation can be intense. Actively disengaged employees are likely to toxic employees who will vehemently express their displeasure with the organisation to other employees in the work group which may rub on to other employees.

5.1.2 Engagement Levels by Age
While there are no significant gender differences in engagement levels, there are thought-provoking differences among age groups. Results indicate that of the respondents aged 48 years and above, 60 % of them are actively engaged while 40% of those aged between 18 and 25 years are actively engaged staff. The findings are analogous with those obtained by Lowe (2012) who revealed that those employees over 30 years and those aged 60years and above are highly engaged. This could be the result of the “newness effect” among those aged between 18 and 25years who are likely to be new recruits to the organisation. Lowe (2012) stated
that the newness effect wears off by the five year mark. The biggest drop in engagement usually happens between a new hire’s first and second year with the organization. This suggests that there is need for HEIs to fine tune induction programmes for new employees so as to minimise culture shock and reduce adverse reactions during the first year.

Those above 60 years are likely to be engaged because of continuance commitment. In a study by White (2008 cited in Christian, 2011), 41% of engaged staff reported that despite the struggles that their organisations are facing, they are willing to remain with the organisation. Continuance commitment is employee’s inclination to continue working for the organisation because they are terrified of the costs associated with terminating their membership with the organisation and lack of alternative employment in the market (Allen & Meyer, 1997).

5.1.3 Engagement levels by Experience
Findings indicate that years of experience have an impact on engagement. The results show that 60% of the employees with over 26 years’ of experience and 80% of those with 21 to 25 years’ of experience in Higher Education Institutions are actively engaged. Engagement levels improved with years of experience. To explain this Allen and Meyer (1990) states that employees are disinclined to leave the organisation because they do not want to lose the benefits that have accrued from the organisation due their years of service. These include seniority status, specialised and un-transferable job skills and retirement packages.

5.2 Key drivers of employee engagement

The second research question the study attempted to address was:

*What are the key drivers of employee engagement?*

In line with previous research in Africa and Euro American contexts, twelve variables contributed significantly to employee engagement. Specifically, regular performance feedback was the strongest driver followed by recognition and praise, training and development opportunities, Co-workers, work material, sense of accomplishment,
clarity of job expectations, employee perceptions of job importance, opportunities to excel, encouragement, immediate supervisor support, and having a best friend at work. These twelve drivers fall within the three broad predictors of engagement by Kahn’s (1990).

Consistent with the findings two way communication was identified as a very important driver of engagement (Robinson et al, 2004, & Mercer, 2007). In a study by the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (2012), findings ascertained that employees are more likely to be engaged if they feel well informed about processes going on within the organisation and opportunities to feed their views upwards. Regular performance feedback falls within the broad category of meaningfulness by Kahn (1990). Contrary to this research, Markos and Sridev (2010) found that employees who have close friends at work are more engaged workers. Generally, it becomes critical, given the low levels of employee engagement, for HEIs to utilise the aforementioned drivers of engagement.

5.3 Association between job posting (teaching versus non-teaching) and employee engagement

The third research question that guided the study was:

*Is there an association between job posting (teaching vs non-teaching) and levels of engagement?*

The results of the study indicated that there is no association between employee engagement and job posting (teaching staff versus non-teaching). This finding is dissimilar to Weisser (2012), whose analysis of workplace results showed that engagement varies depending on employees’ job posting. The survey found that the executives responded more favourably than the other employee groups. In this study, the association could have been insignificant because the job postings used are too broad especially considering that there are several subcategories subsumed under non-teaching staff as a job posting. As was put forward by Hewitt (2012), employee engagement dynamics and resultant human capital interventions and outcomes may vary significantly depending on the industry or region. Further it is
possible that there is a point to point correspondence in experiences of teaching and non-teaching staff given that they are working in the same field. Thus they share similar organisational cultures and their respective supervisors are likely to have comparable management styles. As such it is the prevailing dynamics of engagement that influence employee engagement levels.

5.4 Relationship between employee engagement and organisational commitment

The fourth research question guiding the study was:

*Is there a relationship between employee engagement and organisational commitment?*

Consistent with other studies, (Swarnalatha and Prasanna, 2013, and Geldenhuys et al., 2014), the study results indicate that there is a significant positive relationship between employee engagement and organisational commitment. This means that employees with high engagement scores tend to have high levels of organisational commitment (and the converse is equally true). Employees who are actively engaged to their organisations may have feeling of obligation to respond and repay the organisation in some form. One way for the employees to repay their organisation is to increase commitment to the organisation according to Agyemang and Ofei (2013). Hence an employee with high level of engagement is likely to be committed to the organisation that provides him/her with necessary resources to complete tasks. This gives evidence enough that employee engagement is an antecedent to organisational commitment.

5.4.1 Employee engagement versus Normative Commitment

Findings from this study indicate that the levels engagement are at critical lows which implies that the levels of normative commitment are also low since it is a positive correlation. This suggests lack of employee engagement from the HEIs has impacted on the sense of loyalty and obligation that employees feel towards the organisation. According to Meyer and Allen (1997) normative commitment is a state where employees are obligated to stay because they feel that they owe the
organization. This highlights that HEIs is doing little to fulfil their part of the bargain within the Social Exchange Theory of non-monetary and monetary rewards thereby eroding employee’s sense of loyalty and obligation to stay with the organizations. A fully engaged employee is intellectually and emotionally bound with the organisation, gives hundred percent efforts, feels passionate about its goals and is committed to live by its values.

5.4.2 Employee engagement versus Continuance commitment
The outcomes of the research indicated that the levels of engagement are low. This therefore implies that the levels of continuance commitment are also low given that it is a positive correlation. According to Allen and Meyer (1993) employees stay with an organization because they are not ready to lose the accumulated side bets (pension packages, pay, seniority and social networks) that they would have acquired. Studies by Hewitt (2013) indicated that pay has become an influential factor in determining engagement. However, because senior management is reluctant to provide substantial compensation packages employees have no feelings to continue their employment with their organization. This explains why the tertiary education sector has since 2007 been experiencing high levels of staff turnover which resulted in some programmes especially at post-graduate level being discontinued (ZIMCHE, 2013).

5.4.3 Employee engagement versus Affective commitment
Affective commitment is a component that is concerned with the manner employees are emotionally attached to the organization. Low engagement levels among HEIs indicate that employees’ affective commitment has also reached low levels. According to Armstrong (2012) one of the basic tenets of EE is employee voice. Employees feel valued when they are able to make contributions to things that are beneficial to the organization. Ironically HEIs have low levels of affective commitment yet by Nature University workers are expected to bring meaningful contributions and new inventions to the organization and the state at large.

As shown by the results employees do not have the platform to exercise this right to voice their concern which has contributed to the low levels of engagement. As a
result this has affected employee’s emotional attachment to their organizations because the organisational environment is not endowed with the necessary conditions that facilitate employee engagement. In this case HEIs are breaching the assumptions of the Social Exchange Theory because they expect the employees to give their all in the organization whilst they do not give back. Employees at HEIs have low levels of OC because the EE levels are low. This implies that HEIs consists of employees that no longer care about the well-being of the organization.

5.5Conclusion
This study sought to assess the levels of engagement and its impact on organisational commitment. The results indicate that the levels of engagement are low among employee in HEIs are worryingly low. It was also observed that there is a positive relationship between employee engagement and organisational commitment. The lack of initiative from HEIs to engage their employees has affected their OC levels to such an extent that their intentions of continuing membership with the organization are very low. It also emerged that regular performance feedback, recognition and praise, training and development opportunities, Co-workers, work material, sense of accomplishment, clarity of job expectations, employee perceptions of job importance, opportunities to excel, encouragement, immediate supervisor support, and having a best friend at work are key drivers of engagement among employees in HEIs.

Employee Engagement is rapidly gaining popularity and importance in the workplace and impacts on organizations in a number of ways. HEIs should thus recognize employees, more than any other variable, as powerful contributors to competitive position to gain competitive advantage. Engaged employees can help HEIs achieve their mission, execute their strategy and generate important business results. Hence EE should be a continuous process of learning, improvement, measurement and action. It has been observed that organizations with higher levels of employee engagement outperform their competitors in terms of profitability.
5.6 Recommendations

5.6.1 Key Strategies to Increase Employee Engagement in HEIs
The key drivers of employee engagement were highlighted and tested in this research. It is very important to note the following strategies:

5.6.2 Harness the Drivers of Employee Engagement
Knowing what drives employee engagement can help management in HEIs to plan on how they can implement the discussed key drivers of employee engagement. As such there is a need to re-examine the prevailing management practices to ensure that the identified drivers can be harnessed.

5.6.3 Get Senior Management Buy-In
Senior leader buy-in is critical for employee engagement initiatives to succeed. Good leaders create a culture of engagement, keep employee trust, and help increase productivity, employee satisfaction and retention.

5.6.4 Communicate with Employees
One of the hallmarks of organizations with strong employee engagement is communication. HEIs must implement employee engagement drivers and let employees know the steps being taken to assess employee engagement, the outcome of those steps, and the plans moving forward to improve employee engagement. Communication can take the form of meetings, articles in employee newsletters and on employee intranet or e-mail.

5.6.5 Act on the Results
Each HEI organization will differ in what they need to do to improve employee engagement. In some cases, for example, feedback may reveal that employees don’t understand the organization’s mission and vision. If this is the case, meetings can be arranged where the organization’s mission, vision and strategic plan are discussed and a link made to each employee’s role in the organization. The importance of their work and how it contributes to the organization’s success should be highlighted. The important point is that the action steps should be tailored to the needs identified through employee feedback.
5.6.6 Remove Systemic Barriers
Systemic barriers which affect the full participation of workers in HEIs should be removed. Factors such as efficient communication, trust, intrinsic and extrinsic incentives should be considered. There is the need for constant sharing and feedback of information between management and employees and that is paramount for the engagement, affective and normative commitment as well as motivation.

5.6.7 Involve employees in decision making
HEIs should involve employees in the decision making process. This can positively impact on organisational success because the general employees might have new ideas that can bring the direction of the organization in a new way that is beneficial to the organization. According to Armstrong (2012) there is what is called escalation of commitment. This is a tendency by management to hold on to strategies that have worked before. However, due to globalization and competition these strategies need to be reviewed from time to time because previous ideas may no longer be effective. Thus the researcher feels that the inclusion of employees in the decision making processes is critical to improve engagement levels and bring in new ideas for the benefit of these institutions.

5.6.8 Build strong relationships
Management and supervisors should build strong relationships with employees, and have a strong team interaction and lead in a “people-centred” way.

5.7 Areas of further research
- There is need for further research regarding the relationship of employee engagement with other important factors in management such as work role fit, overlapping constructs such as job satisfaction, organisational and social support, and individual creativity and productivity.
- Future research could focus on personal differences to determine whether variables such as personality and culture have an effect on engagement.
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EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT AMONG HIGHER EDUCATION EMPLOYEES

Welcome to this survey. I am an MBA student at the University of Zimbabwe. I am doing a research study on employee engagement and organisational commitment among workers in Higher Education Institutions. I invite you to complete this questionnaire. Your participation is voluntary: you don’t have to answer questions that you don’t want.

The results of this survey are completely anonymous; therefore DO NOT put your name anywhere on the questionnaire. Your identity is totally protected; no one will be able to identify you. So please answer the questions honestly and objectively. If the study is to be helpful, it is important that you answer each question as carefully as possible.

All answers should be recorded on the questionnaire. There are no right or wrong answers. Please give your honest opinions and answers. Pick only one answer for each question. If you need to change an answer, please erase or cross out completely.

Indicate your response with a tick (√) on the appropriate response option.

Thank you for your help.
SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Are you male or female?  
   Male  
   Female

2. What is your age?  
   ...........Years

3. Level of education  
   Certificate  
   Diploma  
   Degree  
   Masters  
   Ph D

3. What is your job posting  
   Teaching  
   Non-teaching

4. How many years of experience do you have in Higher Education (years)  
   0 to 5  
   6 to 10  
   11 to 15  
   15 to 20  
   21 to 25
   25 and above
**SECTION B: EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT SCALE**

Use the following scale to answer the following questions

**Rating scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD = Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>D = Disagree</td>
<td>N = Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>A = Agree</td>
<td>SA = Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I know what is expected of me at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In the last seven days I have received recognition or praise for doing good work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My supervisor or someone at work seems to care about me as a person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There is someone at work who encourages my development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>At work my opinions seem to count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The mission or purpose of my company makes me feel my job is important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My associates or fellow employees are committed to doing quality work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I have a best friend at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>In the last six months someone at work has talked to me about my progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The last year, I have had opportunities at work to learn and grow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION C: ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT SCALE**

Use the following scale to answer the following questions
### Rating scale

SD = Strong Disagree  
D = Disagree  
N = Neither Agree nor Disagree  
A = Agree  
SA = Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I enjoy discussing about my organization with people outside it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I really feel as if this organisation’s problems are my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I think that I could easily become as attached to another organisation as I am to this one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I do not feel emotionally attached to the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I do not feel a ‘strong’ sense of belonging to my organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I am not afraid of what might happen if I lose my job without having another one lined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>It will be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave my organization now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>It wouldn’t be too costly for me to leave my organization now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Right now staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I feel that I have very few options to consider leaving this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>One of the few consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice.

29. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.

30. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.

31. Jumping from organisation to organisation does not seem at all unethical to me.

32. One of the major reasons I continue to work in this organization is that I believe loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.

33. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.

34. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to the organization.

35. Things were better in the days when people stayed in one organization for most of their careers.

36. I do not think that to be a ‘company man’ or ‘company woman’ is sensible anymore.

THANK YOU!

Appendix 2: Research clearance letter
21 March 2014

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: ACADEMIC RESEARCH BY MS MELODY SHOKO (R099533K)

This letter serves to confirm that Ms Shoko is a bona fide Master of Business Administration (MBA) student at the Graduate School of Management, University of Zimbabwe. She is carrying out an academic research in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the MBA degree programme.

We kindly request you to provide her with the information that she requires. Please be assured that the Graduate School of Management upholds high levels of confidentiality and ethical standards in conducting research.

Thank you.

N. KASEKE (DR)
DIRECTOR, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT
1 Jels Court  
Ceres, Avondale  
Harare  

13 June 2014  

The Registrar  
Midlands State University  
P Bag 9035  
Gweru  

Dear Sir  

RE: Permission to carry out research at Midlands State University  

I am a Master of Business Administration student at the Graduate School of Management, University of Zimbabwe seeking permission to carry an academic research in partial fulfilment of the MBA degree programme.  

I am doing research on a topic titled: Employee Engagement among Workers in Higher Education Institutions in Zimbabwe: Implications for Organisational Commitment. The study seeks to explore levels of engagement among Higher Education Institution workers and also establish the extent to which levels of engagement can affect organisational commitment.  

Please be advised that I will uphold high levels of confidentiality and ethical standards in conducting research.  

Thank you for your kind consideration.  

Melody Shoko (R096933K)  

Appendix 4: Permission to conduct research: University of Zimbabwe
21 March 2014

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: ACADEMIC RESEARCH BY MS MELODY SHOKO (R096933K)

This letter serves to confirm that Ms Shoko is a bona fide Master of Business Administration (MBA) student at the Graduate School of Management, University of Zimbabwe. She is carrying out an academic research in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the MBA degree programme.

We kindly request you to provide her with the information that she requires. Please be assured that the Graduate School of Management upholds high levels of confidentiality and ethical standards in conducting research.

Thank you.

N. KASEKE (DR)
DIRECTOR, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

Appendix 5: Permission to conduct research: University of Zimbabwe
21 March 2014

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: ACADEMIC RESEARCH BY MS MELODY SHOKO (R096933K)

This letter serves to confirm that Ms Shoko is a bona fide Master of Business Administration (MBA) student at the Graduate School of Management, University of Zimbabwe. She is carrying out an academic research in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the MBA degree programme.

We kindly request you to provide her with the information that she requires. Please be assured that the Graduate School of Management upholds high levels of confidentiality and ethical standards in conducting research.

Thank you.

N. KASEKE (DR)
DIRECTOR, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT
## Appendix 6: Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clarity of Job Expectations</th>
<th>Work Materials</th>
<th>Opportunities to excell</th>
<th>Recognition and Praise</th>
<th>Immediate Supervisor Support</th>
<th>Encouragement</th>
<th>Sense of Accomplishment</th>
<th>Employee Perceptions of Job Importance</th>
<th>Co-Workers</th>
<th>Having a Best Friend at Work</th>
<th>Regular Performance Feedback</th>
<th>Training and Development Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Job Expectations Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.194*</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Materials Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>.274**</td>
<td>.197*</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.207*</td>
<td>.311**</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.206**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to excell Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.194*</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.251**</td>
<td>.261**</td>
<td>.171*</td>
<td>.209*</td>
<td>.344**</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.166**</td>
<td>.175**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and Praise Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.274**</td>
<td>.251**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.330**</td>
<td>.269**</td>
<td>.361**</td>
<td>.338**</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.205**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Supervisor Support Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.197*</td>
<td>.261**</td>
<td>.330**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.621**</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>.282**</td>
<td>.201*</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.174**</td>
<td>.318**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Perceptions of Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a Best Friend at Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Performance Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
| ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)