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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Employee engagement has become a subject of interest to the majority of business leaders and human resource practitioners. Despite this, there remains a paucity of critical academic literature on the subject, and relatively little is known about how employee engagement can be influenced by management. The purpose of the study was to establish the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement for the Zimbabwean Building Societies. Due to poor people practices the Building Societies were experiencing productivity deficits, high staff turnover, loss of market share, high work related accidents, to mention but a few. These symptoms suggested that there was a colossal managerial challenge of employee disengagement which manifested itself in various forms.

While it may also be clear that an organisation needs an engaged workforce what also needed to be answered is whether or not rising engagement levels would result in improved or better organisational performance as well.

Literature revealed that the predictors of employee engagement are not exhaustible and therefore there is no one size fit all groups of employee engagement predictors unique to a particular sector, country or region. The group of predictors selected for the study include work output, people philosophy, total rewards, wellbeing, business alignment and employee growth. Similarly literature has revealed that employee engagement is associated with positive outcomes. The associated outcomes considered in the study include, customer service, productivity, employee retention and absenteeism and discretionary effort.

The study was quantitative in nature, and a survey research was adopted. Participants were randomly selected and a structured questionnaire was used to collect data. The research findings revealed that work outputs, business alignment and total rewards had a significant explanatory power on employee engagement, whilst employee engagement significantly predicted it’s associated outcomes. Though less emphasis maybe given to people philosophy, wellbeing and employee growth, it is also important for the Building Societies not to shelve them because employees are unpredictable, unique and that times change. It is important to allude that corporate leaders need to value employee engagement the same way they emphasize on the attainment of corporate targets so that the benefits of employee engagement are realised.
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CHAPTER 1

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Employee engagement has become a subject of apprehension for most leaders and executives in business across the world. They recognise that the level of employee engagement not only affects employee moral but is also a vital predictor of organisational effectiveness and business success. In this study, employee engagement was defined as according to Industrial Psychology Consultants, (2014) as the level to which employees are emotionally committed to both their Job and the organisation. Prior research has confirmed that engaged employees are more satisfied, productive, focused and committed.

There are a number of drivers of employee engagement that have been proposed, but these however vary from country, sector and organisations. However, the most common employee engagement drivers as according to Emergence Growth, (2015) include work outputs, employee growth, total reward, people philosophy, business alignment and wellbeing. The associated outcomes of employee engagement being good customer service, discretionary effort, productivity and employee retention. It is however important to consider that employee engagement must not be misconstrued to employee satisfaction. This is because engaged employees are generally satisfied but satisfied personnel may not be engaged either to the job or to the organisation. The study therefore aimed at assessing the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement amongst the Zimbabwe building society employees.

This chapter presents the research by outlining the background of Zimbabwe Building Societies and employee engagement, the research statement of the problem, research objectives, research questions, hypotheses, justification of study and delimitation of the study.
1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The Zimbabwe financial services sector has proved to be the fastest growing sector within the country’s economy. The average annual growth rate according to the Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe is 13% on average, this is regardless of the copious obstacles that have tried to impede growth in the sector. These obstacles include, decline in investor confidence arising from the country’s ten billion debt which is prohibiting the economy from attracting offshore credit lines and the absence of a functional lender of last resort i.e. the Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe (RBZ), hence the sector remains poised for growth.

The financial service sector of Zimbabwe is regulated by the RBZ and comprises of commercial banks, merchant banks, building societies, microfinance institutions, insurance companies and a savings bank. As the study focused mainly on the building societies, it is important to state that apart from their revenues being subject to taxation, building societies face controls on minimum capital requirements, deposits, interest rates and on reserve and liquidity ratios. Zimbabwe has a total of four building societies namely FBC Building Society, ZB Building Society, Central African Building Society (CABS) and CBZ Building Society. The minimum capital requirement for building societies as stated by the RBZ stands at 20 million dollars. In accordance with the January, 2015 monetary statement the core capital levels for the building societies were as follows; CABS - $92.82 million, CBZ Building Society - $65.54 million, FBC Building Society – 29.54 million and ZB Building Society - $15.58 million.

These Building Societies primarily practice the deposit-taking system where intentional or voluntary deposits are used to avail loans to those in need. In these circumstances, deposit taking and lending is done at different rates of interest i.e. as prescribed by the regulating authority, the RBZ. The general goal of building societies in Zimbabwe is to provide mutual savings wherein depositors save to purchase properties. In this case depositors should have attractive and innocuous saving patterns. These building societies practice something that is close to the contractual system where potential house owners have to have accounts with the institutions in order to qualify for a mortgage or housing loan. Generally potential home owners are assessed from the following criteria, the client’s ability to meet the minimum deposit, the
clients’ ability to meet monthly installments, gainful employment, availability of security and an assessment of the clients risk profile. These specified conditions help prevent non-performing loans.

Building societies generally have a mandate to safeguard investors’ funds against risks that jeopardize profitability and investors' monies. In chasing this mandate, building societies are often seen to charge unrealistic interest rates which range between 18% and 25% percent per annum over a period of ten to twenty years. These rates of interest have made their properties very expensive and unaffordable to most medium and low income groups, who in-turn also finds it difficult to meet their stiff lending terms.

The building societies also have a goal of accumulating funds for disbursement through shares and deposits. In Zimbabwe trying to collect funds for accumulation has become a mammoth task, this is because customers have lost confidence in banking as such it has become a game of the survival of the fittest amongst the building societies. According to the monetary policy statement of January, 2015 the number of deposits to withdrawals declined significantly from year 2014, meaning the building societies ability to lend has been compromised.

In spite of the operating environment challenges which include economic factors like credit risk, liquidity constraints, low savings, volatile deposits the building societies operated profitably as at 31 December, 2014. On aggregate the net profit for the building societies for the year ended 31 December, 2014 was $10.8 million, which was however below the $16.4 million reported for 2013 yearend. In-order to boost returns, building societies are instating cost containment measures.

Employee engagement has become prominent amongst both academic and industrial psychologists as there is a need to shape attitudes and behaviours at work for purposes of maximizing shareholder wealth. According to Guest,(1989) employee engagement is unique to employee commitment and satisfaction in that it is positively correlated and ground to performance outcomes. This however separates Human Resource Management from its previous personification of personnel management. Personal management was largely centred on
administrative functions which include conflict resolution, salary and benefit processing as well as recruitment and selection. The new persona to personnel management which is now human resource management is insightful of creating value and being the right partner to the business whilst at same time gaining buy in from employees. In this context, employee engagement provides a model and metrics for human resource practitioners to utilise.

Employees together with their behaviour are the hub of business triumph. Considering the constrained and tough Zimbabwean economic environment, an engaged workforce that delivers on organisational victory is imperative. According to Robinson,(2006)companies with engaged employees outperform their competitors because employees are compliant, innovative and optimistic.

Over the past years Zimbabwe employee engagement levels have been declining annually since 2011. The employee engagement levels according to Industrial Psychology consultants, (2014) were 60.21% for 2014, 60.54% for 2013 and 65.8% for 2012.

When gauging employee engagement levels, there are basically five employee segments, these include value creators, core contributors, aligned sceptics, lost believers and the disengaged (Gallup, 2014). Value creators are employees engaged both to the organisation and to their jobs. They are basically the top performers that contribute to the overall success of the organisation. According to the 20/80 pareto principle they are the 20% that cause organisations to prosper. The core contributors are engaged to their jobs but not the organisation. Aligned sceptics, this group of employees are committed to the organisation but not their jobs. Aligned sceptics know what is required of them but are just not keen to do what is expected. Lost believers are employees with misdirected commitment, they strive towards the wind. The disengaged employees are basically the deadwood of the organisation and are more of seat fillers. The results of the study conducted by Industrial Psychology Consultants reveal that comparatively Zimbabwean employees are comprised of 38% aligned sceptics compared to Europe’s 15% aligned skeptics. This comparison reveals that Zimbabwean employers have a long way to go in terms of boosting employee engagement levels. The proper workplace scenario is to have more of value creators or contributors’ so that it becomes possible for organisations to realise the paybacks of employee engagement, which include low staff turnover, product quality, and increased productivity.
This study considered work outputs, employee growth, total reward, people philosophy, business alignment and wellbeing as predictors of employee engagement, and the associated outcomes being productivity, customer service, discretionary effort and employee retention and absenteeism.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

It is against the foregoing background that it become necessary to undertake this study. Managing people in an organisation is a mammoth task because human beings by nature are unpredictable in their behaviour however, there are systemic people practices within organisations that impact people in the workplace. There are a number of symptoms associated with poor people practices in companies and these include failure to meet productivity targets, high staff turnover, loss of market share, high work related accidents, to mention but a few. These symptoms are synonymous with what the building societies in Zimbabwe were facing. This in all translated to low engagement levels of the employees concerned.

Given the prevailing economic environment, attracting and retaining employees had become a major stumbling block to organisational success in all organisations including building societies. This is because any people centred initiatives in organisations is viewed as translating to increased costs hence many organisations including the Building Societies are bypassing such initiatives. This has however impacted negatively on both organisational performance and employees. Though the building societies are profitable, their income since 2013 has been declining annually implying employees are failing to meet their productivity targets for various reasons. According to Industrial Psychology Consultants, (2014), 4 in 10 working Zimbabweans experience symptoms of distress at work. These symptoms include; difficulty in thinking clearly, feeling down and depressed and easily becoming emotional. This ratio translates to an overwhelming rate of disengaged employees in organisations. Building societies for the past years have been dogged by poor service quality and delivery, inadequate innovation and initiative as well as widespread despondency and this has seen banks and independent cooperatives offering services engaging and fulfilling consumers for their housing needs.
Currently the employers of the building societies are using diverse unstructured engagement building tools in order to improve engagement; this has however lowered employee morale because there is a gap within their organisational engagement matrix. It appears that employees are withholding their capability and capacity to offering the bare minimum in effort instead of producing at the desired optimum and productive levels. The level of negative factors discussed here suggest that there is a colossal managerial challenge of disengagement which has manifested itself in high staff turnover, poor service delivery and low morale.

While it was also clear that an organisation needs an engaged workforce what also needed to be answered was whether or not rising engagement levels would result in improved or better organisational performance as well. Improved organisational performance in relation to this study was measured in terms of better customer service, improved staff retention, improved productivity and the level of discretionary effort exhibited by employees. Without this knowledge, it would be very difficult to support investment in employee engagement both from a policy point of view and from a shareholder perspective. Clearly, it would not make a lot of sense to provide the predictors employee engagement whilst at the same time not know its value to the organisation in terms of outcomes.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.3.1 General Objective

The general objective of the study is to identify the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement for the Zimbabwean Building Societies.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

1. To establish the predictors of employee engagement.
2. To establish the outcomes of employee engagement.
3. To recommend appropriate strategies of improving employee engagement levels in Zimbabwe Building Societies.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1.4.1 General Question

What are the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement amongst the Zimbabwean Building Societies?

1.4.2 Specific Research Questions

1. What are the predictors of employee engagement?
2. What are the outcomes of employee engagement?
3. What are the appropriate strategies of improving employee engagement within the Zimbabwe Building Societies?

1.5 HYPOTHESIS

There is a positive relationship between the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement.

1.6 JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

Employee engagement is a contemporary subject in the Human Resources (HR) field. There is scarce academic literature and reasonably petite is known about its predictors and outcomes. Regrettably, information on employee engagement comes from experienced HR managers and industrial psychologists. According to Robinson, (2004) cited by Bakker and Leiter, (2010) specified there is dearth academic literature on employee engagement. Therefore from a local
and international perspective, the study was one of the many efforts to improve this concept so that organisational behaviour academicians, industrial psychologist as well as Human Resource practitioners are more enlightened with concrete considerations grounded with theory on the matter. In essence the study purpose was to trigger more interest and lead to further research on employee engagement.

In Zimbabwe employee engagement surveys were and are conducted at national level. The results of these surveys are generalised and not reflective of the building societies considering the minute number of employees employed by the building societies against the thousands that take part in these surveys. These surveys are done by Industrial Psychology Consultants (IPC) and Distinctive Consultants. With regards to the foregoing, this study aimed at defining the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement for the building societies because of the pitiable people practices they employ. However in future, as a result of this study, the employers of the building societies will have a point of reference.

The national employee engagement survey of 2014 conducted by IPC revealed that most Zimbabwean employees are aligned sceptics i.e. employees who know what is expected of them but are just not keen to do what is required, hence bearing this in mind it was imperative to research on the drivers of employee engagement so that employee behaviour is directed towards the achievement of both organisational and personal goals.

There are a number of predictors of employee engagement as proposed by a number of surveys conducted regionally and internationally like the Africa’s Employee Engagement survey conducted by Emergence Growth Consultants and the annual surveys conducted internationally by the Chartered Institute of People Development (CIPD). Notwithstanding the foregoing, there is no one size fit all group of employee engagement predictors unique to a particular sector, country or region. In this case the study aimed at identifying the employee engagement drivers unique to the Zimbabwe building societies which would in-turn benefit the employers thereof.

The study was also of benefit to the employees of the building societies. This is because the survey created an avenue through which employees could anonymously and confidently state the antecedents of employee engagement that increase their engagement levels. The survey was more of a feedback forum which would assist their employers to craft and design appropriate
employee engagement strategies that drive engagement and minimise distress. It is important to note that when companies have a better understanding of the drivers of employee engagement, it is easier to create suitable engagement building tools (CIPD, 2014). According to CIPD, (2014), corporates with an indoctrinated employee engagement belief inside their work environment unsurprisingly become reckoned as best companies to work for as people are put at the heart of the business tenacity.

The results of study further helped the building societies to benchmark with other members of the financial services sector for example the Microfinance, Banking and the Insurance Institutions. It is important to state that benchmarking is essential for comparison purposes as it also fosters for a better understanding of “industry specific” engagement drivers. The study in itself will also assist upcoming and existing companies keen to implement the employee engagement concept on the best practices of employee engagement.

To sum up According to Bakker and Leiter, (2010) employee engagement is one of the top management challenges. This study in essence provided the areas or dimensions of employee engagement that should be given more priority compared to others. In other words, it revealed the key engagement drivers as well as improved the understanding of the correlation between engagement and overall organisational performance. This will help the building societies senior management to decide what level of investment to put into employee engagement and the possible results to expect in terms of overall organisational performance as measured by the customer service, productivity, discretionary effort and employee retention.

1.7 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The study was sorely hinged on all Zimbabwe building societies which include FBC Building Society, CBZ Building Society, ZB Building Society and CABS.

1.8 DISSERTATION OUTLINE
The research chapters covered the following areas:

**Chapter 1- Introduction**

This chapter covered the introduction, background of study, problem statement, research objectives, research questions, hypotheses and study scope.

**Chapter 2- Literature Review**

This chapter covered the literature review. This included all appropriate literature on employee engagement. The research theoretical framework was also reviewed, meaning all predictors and outcomes of employee engagement were unearthed and explored. All pertinent sources relating to the matters on discussion were cited.

**Chapter 3- Methodology**

This chapter mainly focused on the research methods and tools adopted by the study. Areas of concentration were the research design, research strategy, sample size, credibility of the study, ethical considerations, data analysis and data collection methods. These were all explained in great depth.

**Chapter 4- Results and Discussion**

The data collected was evaluated and were appropriate the results were tabulated and presented graphically to give an optical impression. The chapter also included the interpretation and discussion of results.

**Chapter 5- Conclusion and Recommendations**

Based on the study findings, the last chapter of the study focused mainly on concluding the study and making recommendations were appropriate. The recommendations included devising ways to increase, maintain and manage employee engagement within the building societies. Chapter five also provided the research limitations as well as the suggested areas of further study.
1.9 CHAPTER SUMMARY

Chapter one looked at the introduction of the research topic which is, an analysis of the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement amongst Zimbabwe Building Societies. A background of the Zimbabwe Building Societies and employee engagement was done, thereafter the problem statement, research objectives, research questions, and hypotheses of the study, the scope of the study and the outline of the dissertation was done.
LITERATURE REVIEW

CHAPTER 2

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter explores various scholarly views on the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement. Employee engagement as a relatively new concept has evolved from employee participation to employee involvement and ultimately employee engagement (Bhuvanaiah & Raya, 2014). Therefore the purpose of this chapter is to present and analyse the theory underpinning employee engagement, provide literature review on the variables, predictors and outcomes of employee engagement, present the conceptual framework of the study, analyse the relationship between employee engagement and its predictors as well as the influence of employee engagement on its outcomes.

2.2 THEORY UNDERPINNING THE STUDY

According to Xu and Cooper, (2011), employee engagement as a concept was put forward by Kahn in 1990. The concept is philosophical, and resolute in understanding how a person commits his/her whole self in performing work related duties (Kahn, 1990 cited in Xu and Cooper, 2011). This corresponds with similar concepts that describe emotional, perceptive and behavioural link of employees and their role in the organisation. Accordingly, scholars like Salanova, (2005) and Macey and Schneider, (2008) cited in Xu and Cooper, (2011) suggest that concepts like job
satisfaction, job involvement and motivation are a subset of employee engagement. As such, motivational theories will form the basis and will therefore underpin this study.

According to Chalofsky and Krishna, (2009) humanistic psychologists together with classic motivation theorist buttressed the concept or idea that people have a natural need for work they consider meaningful. Maslow, (1971) cited in Chalofsky and Krishna, (2009) states that employees who do not consider their work as purposeful or meaningful will short change companies in that they do not work up to the required levels. The classical theorist Alderfer (1972), McGregor (1960), Maslow (1943) and Herzberg (1959) cited in Chalofsky and Krishna, (2009) hypothesized that people are inspired or motivated to act or behave in certain ways if all their needs inherent to human beings are fulfilled.

The classical theorists all proposed that as human needs change from basic needs to higher-order needs, their needs change from physical to intangible needs (Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009). Merum, (2005) suggests that Maslow’s hierarchy of needs describes how employee engagement has evolved over the years. That is, from employee satisfaction, employee commitment to employee engagement. This is largely because psychologically, employee engagement is embedded in employee attitudes towards their job and the organisation. Bhuvanaiah and Raya, (2014) assert that as the engagement process progresses employees are either self-motivated or motivated by external drivers.

According to Maslow, (1971) cited in Chalofsky and Krishna, (2000) higher-order needs mirror life values. These values include goodness, justice, uniqueness, meaningfulness and transcendence. The highest order need in accordance with Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is self-actualisation wherein one would have achieved his or her greatest potential. Chalofsky and Krishna, (2009) suggest that the process to self-actualisation is not an end state but on-going until the end of one’s life. Maslow also inscribed that there are individuals who seemed to surpass the self-actualization level, with this he suggested “Theory Z” after McGregor’s (1960) “Theories X and Y”. A state in which individuals are dedicated to a vocation, task, or calling that surpasses the dichotomies of work and play.

2.3 LITERATURE REVIEW OF VARIABLES
There are three variables considered in this research and these are employee engagement, the predictors of employee engagement and the outcomes of employee engagement. These variables will be assessed in greater detail below. An analysis of these variables will ultimately lead to the development of the conceptual framework.

2.3.1 EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

As indicated in Chapter one, the underlying definition of employee engagement in this research is a scenario to which an employee is emotionally connected to both their job and the organisation (Industrial Psychology Consultants, 2013). Symthe, (2007) suggests that a fully engaged employee is connected to the organisations values, mission and vision – they act as part owners of the business. Bakker, Albrecht, and Leiter, (2010) suggest that engagement is offered by employees and as such cannot be demanded from them, thus organisations need to provide “acceptable” conditions to compel employees to be committed to their jobs and the organisation. In this case, employee engagement is a two way process that, necessitates employers to provide conditions necessary for engagement, whilst on the other hand employees choose their levels of engagement. Schaufeli and Bakker, (2004) state that employee engagement is neither a temporary nor a static state, but rather, it is more pervasive, persistent and emotional cognitive state which does not focus on any particular object, behaviour or event. However, Industrial Psychology Consultants, (2013) note that fostering employee engagement is not an end in itself, but rather, it becomes sustainable and meaningful for organisations if employees are psychologically connected to both the organisation and their jobs especially during difficult and trying times. Furthermore, in cases were organisations want to implement change, evaluating employee engagement levels should be carefully considered as one of the first processes of introducing change (Industrial Psychology Consultants, 2013).
The measurement of engagement usually rests on employee attitude surveys, and as such is sometimes used ‘as a novel, catchy label that covers traditional concepts’, such as satisfaction and commitment (Bakker and Leiter, 2010).

2.3.1.1 EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT LEVELS

In any working environment there are categories of employees. Gallup, (2014) identified three employee categories which include:-

1. **Engaged employees**
   These employees are the ambassadors of the company as they are emotionally connected to the organisation and their roles. They are innovative, creative, loyal and are high performers.

2. **Actively disengaged**
   This category of employees is also called the cave dwellers and are not in sync with the organisation’s values, vision and mission. Actively disengaged employees are generally very negative about everything the organisation tries to pursue and may also try to influence other employees not to perform to the required and desired engagement level.

3. **Not engaged employees**
   These believe that they are being side-lined by management and have nothing to contribute towards the achievement of the organisation’s goals.

Armstrong,(2008) suggests that it is of paramount importance to harness generational differences in terms of idiosyncrasies and the various attitudes that exist in any organisation so as to cater for the changing workplace. Bakker,*et al.* (2010) point out that companies need to manage employee diversity in a constructive manner for purposes of fostering high employee engagement levels.

Bakker, et al. (2010) also categorised employees into four classifications these in summary include;

1. The Engaged - Very productive and joyful employees who are characterized with high commitment and unrestricted effort.
2. Almost Engaged - Practically useful and content with their current job.
3. Hamsters and Honeymooners - Satisfied with the organisation and designation but their contribution to the organisation is considered very low.
4. Crash Burners - Highly productive employees but are not happy with their own success.
5. Disengaged - have high levels of negative opinion and discontentment and have negative opinion on organizational approach.

Employee engagement categories or segmentation was further explained and detailed by Watson Wyatt,(2008) as illustrated in figure 2.1
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**Figure 2.1:** Employee Engagement Categories Diagram
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Figure 2.1: Employee Segment Action Matrix


An explanation by Watson Wyatt of figure 2.1 above is contained overleaf in Table 2.1.

Line of sight is described according to Swarnalatha and Prasanna, (2013) as the measure at which employees appreciate and understand the strategic objectives of their company, whilst commitment may be described as being loyal and truthful.
### Table 2.1: Employee Segment Matrix Explanation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Individual Performance</th>
<th>Retention Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Value Creators   | • Committed and contribute highly to the success of the business.  
                   • Constitute the 20/80 performers.                                                                                                                                                                      | High                    | Low            |
| Core Contributors| • Employees always committed to the success of the organisation.  
                   • Everyday performers who are consistent and solid.  
                   • Usually constitute the majority of employees in a “normal” performing organisation.  
                   • Organisations should strive to shift them to value creators.                                                                                                                                       | Medium                  | Medium         |
<p>| Aligned Skeptics | • Employees who are neither committed to their job or the organisation.                                                                                                                                         | Medium                  | High           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lost Believers</th>
<th>They are aware of what is required of them, but they are not keen to perform as required.</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They believe that their psychological contract has already been breached.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged</td>
<td>These employees are committed but have poor line of sight.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Their commitment is frequently misdirected and is usually striving towards the wind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Watson Wyatt, Global work Attitudes Report, 2007/2008

According to Industrial Psychology Consultants, (2013) the ideal scenario for any organisation is where the majority of the workers are either core contributors or value creators. In such cases, the benefits of employee engagement maybe realised. These benefits include increased customer loyalty and satisfaction, increased productivity and reduced labour turnover.

There is a shared notion in all the above three employee segmentation models, even though their approaches are a little different. It is true that employees that are engaged are the most desired in terms of achieving organisational goals whilst disengaged employees are unsupportive and try to diminish corporate fame by means of injecting negativism to other employees.

### 2.3.1.2 THE IMPORTANCE OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

The manner in which people management practices are implemented in any organisation influence employee engagement levels(Bhuvanaiah & Raya, 2014). Cook, (2008) affirms that there are two reasons why employee engagement is important to any organisation, these are, the increasing power of clients and the increasing power of employees. As the saying goes, “the
customer is king”, and given that the world has become a global village, customers undoubtly have greater choice of where and with whom to do business with, this is because their options have become complex by the day and therefore, it has become important for organisations to engage their customers at an emotional and personal level. Cook, (2008) purports that employee willingness impacts on customer perception towards the organisation, through their preparedness and enthusiasm to provide responsive and prompt service delivery. It is of essence to note further that the power of employees plays a pivotal role in terms of organisational effectiveness and competitiveness. This is because an organisation’s human resource is the only unique asset competitors cannot replicate (Cook, 2007). Bhuvanaiah and Raya, (2014) indicated that instead of focusing on materialistic capital, companies are now focusing on intellectual capital for sustainable business success. They mentioned that organisations are now investing on employee abilities, skill and innovative behaviours to out-market their competitors.

According to Bakker, et al. (2010) for organisations to compete effectively, it must instigate and enable employees to apply their full potential. In such cases employees must be connected psychologically to their job, must be proactive and value high quality standards and willing to go an extra mile to get things done. Research findings reviewed by Cook, (2008) maintain the need of having an engaged workforce. Amongst the reviewed studies include a study conducted by Towers Perrin, wherein it found out that though there is no direct cause and effect amid employee engagement and business performance, companies that had greater engagement intensities achieved better financial returns than those with low levels of employee engagement with at least 17%. In this case, Towers Perrin accentuated on employee engagement levels that create a difference to organizational success.

2.3.1.3 THE COSTS OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

Halbesleben, Harvey, and Bolino, (2009) cited in Bakker, et al. (2010) believe that there is need to pay more attention to the possible costs of high employee engagement than it has received in literature to date. This is with regards to work-life balance. In this current era, where working hours and pressures have increased, increasing levels of work engagement would undoubtedly
aggravate the feelings of stress and overwork. George, (2011) proclaims that highly engaged workers usually have diminished energy and time available for their personal lives as such make sacrifices to sustain their engagement levels in the long run.

George, (2010) cited in Bakker, et al. (2010) suggests that, considering the prevalence or dominance of high unemployment rates and retrenchments it is of paramount importance to think through the fact that job loss might be devastating for the highly engaged employees who may have sacrificed their personal lives for the organisation. Additionally, it is of significance to consider that when employees are being innovative and creative, they are apparently engaged in their toil. Nonetheless, innovation and creativity demands a lot of hard work and sacrifice (Staw, 1995 cited in Bakker, et al. 2010).

In a study by Margolis and Molinksy, (2008) referred to by Bakker, et al. (2010), the researchers explored and questioned the level and nature of engagement of employees required to execute ‘‘necessary evils’’ for example when doctors “have to” inflict pain on patients for medical purposes, or in cases when police have to arrest criminals or rather where bosses have to fire or discipline their subordinates given the prevailing high unemployment levels across the world over. In such scenarios the essence of employee engagement maybe questioned.

2.3.2 PREDICTORS OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

A number of studies have been conducted on employee engagement. These researches have suggested critical factors that lead to employee engagement. In Zimbabwe, Industrial Psychology Consultants conduct employee engagement surveys annually, Africa wide, Emergence Growth Consultants conduct similar surveys. These surveys have in-turn distilled peculiar and unique employee engagement models. This research has considered the following independent factors as predictors to employee engagement, work output, employee growth, total reward, people philosophy, business alignment and Wellbeing.

Work output
Whilst discussing how work output leads to engagement. The areas of focus on work output will include tasks and processes, pride and the tools of trade.

According to Bhuvanaiah and Raya, (2014) several studies have revealed that there is a positive relationship between work output and employee engagement. For example skilled architects and craftsmen by virtue of seeing the good works of their hand are influenced to perform better in their future assignments. Karasek, (1979) cited in Bhuvanaiah and Raya, (2014) refers to these jobs as “active jobs” in that employees are motivated to aggressively develop and master their skill. Shuck, Reio, and Rocco, (2011) however suggested that there is need for job fit between the employee and the job so as to make the job more meaningful. Valentin, (2014) indicated that work should be constantly reviewed through employee surveys to make it meaningful, and that human resource departments must advertise opportunities for career growth. In essence work must provide a sense of achievement(Arrowsmith and Parker, 2013).

With regards to work outputs Bhuvanaiah and Raya, (2014) also advocated that psychological capital may also be a key predictor of engagement. This according to Kahn (1990) cited in Jenkins and Delbridge, (2013) are the mental resources necessary to get work done. Psychological capital involves self-efficacy, optimism, perseverance and resilience. Shuck, et al.(2011) proposed that where job demands and personal interests were in sync, employees feel that they can identify themselves with their organisations.

**Employee growth**

According to Rasheed, Khan, and Ramzan, (2013) if employees are to remain engaged within any organisation, there is need to continuously develop them. Learning and development creates opportunities for professional and personal growth as such employees need to be confident that their employer has a genuine interest in their career development (Industrial Psychology Consultants, 2015). Valentin, (2014) gave examples of developmental interventions that induce employee engagement and these include mentoring, coaching, support for professional and personal development, as well as management development programs.

Valentin, (2014) was of the opinion that whilst the employee and the line manager were responsible for crafting employee developmental plans, the ultimate beneficiary is the organisation. In such cases, one is led to assume that the goals of the employee and the
organisation are one (Fenwick 2005 cited in Valentin, 2014). In essence the needs of both the employee and the organisation may be fulfilled simultaneously through training and development. Valentin, (2014) further states that employees with developmental plans and performance assessment tools are generally propelled to be engaged to their jobs. It is essential to note that, people do not work to earn a financial return only but to also build and develop their careers (Richman, 2006). According to Robinson (2006), organisations with a learning culture are adaptive and are able retain their employees from joining competitor organisations.

Total Rewards

Rasheed, et al. (2013) defines organisational justice as fairness in the work place. This concept may also be adopted to mean, a fair days wage for a fair days work. Rasheed, et al. (2013) highlight that employee attention to fairness is a natural routine in their lives. This “fairness” relates to the allocation of benefits, resources and rewards. Industrial Psychology Consultants, (2015) assert that where remuneration and benefits are concerned, in Zimbabwe, unfortunately the social partners i.e. government, employers and labour are not working together well, there is consistent friction in trying to address the remuneration and benefits challenge. This is largely due to the fact that these parties have competing interests. According to the consultant, if these parties work together they may contribute in rebuilding Zimbabwe. It is important to note that the world has become a global village as such it has become difficult to attract and retain talent, companies need to reward employees competitively so as to attract and retain talent. This is because holding all things constant, the highest bidder in terms of pay and benefits will always get the best available talent. The Simple Human Resources Guide put forward by CIPD, (2014) specified that for companies to thrive, a compensation strategy must provide competitive salaries whilst at the same time be able to contain employee cost.

Industrial Psychology Consultants, (2015) indicated that in-order to prosper at engaging employees with regards to rewards, employers must consider performance related salaries, conduct job evaluations for equity purposes, do market surveys and be transparent on how salaries and wages are set. The consultant further implored that employees must not be forbidden
from disclosing their salaries to colleagues especially if remuneration is equitable. In this context, Townsend, Wilkinson, and Burgess, (2013) concurred that employee engagement cannot occur where there is no trust and fairness. Arrowsmith and Parker, (2013) highlight that pay and benefits must indeed create a sense of achievement. However, Valentin, (2014) was of the opinion that senior managers and executives are more engaged to their jobs and organisations because of the perquisites associated with their positions. Consultants in Zimbabwe like Distinctive Consultants and Industrial Psychology consultants recommend that the highest paid employee and the lowest paid employee in any one organisation should have a difference of seven times of the lowest salary. This concept should however propel organisations to do a self-introspection of their rewards and remuneration.

**People Philosophy**

Workplace supervisors and leaders play a pivotal role in determining employee engagement levels. Symthe, (2007) observed that the need for employee engagement is being taken at ransom by business leaders as it is not being given priority as a leadership philosophy. Townsend, *et al.* (2013) alludes that conducting and developing business strategy sessions is equally important as developing higher employee engagement levels, as they both lead to ultimate bottom line outcomes. In Zimbabwe according to Industrial Psychology Consultants, (2013) 60% of Zimbabwean employees would prefer a good boss to a high salary. This is largely because corporate leaders and managers set the atmosphere for every working environment because as mentioned by Rasheed, *et al.* (2013), employees always look up to their leaders, observe their behaviour and then interpret it for what it means to them. Townsend, *et al.* (2013) indicated that if managers coach their employees to become even better leaders than themselves, employee engagement levels would increase. In such a working environment Bhuvanaiah and Raya, (2014) state that tasks are completed effectively. This is because a supportive manager who provides performance feedback increases a subordinate’s chances of achieving work goals. Sugheir, Coco, and Kaupins, (2011) further assert that transformational leadership, influences state engagement directly and influences behavioural engagement indirectly this is mainly because transformational leadership style creates an atmosphere of trust. Arrowsmith and Parker, (2013) suggest that the key essentials to leadership as stated by CIPD, (2014) include providing feedback, creating a learning and development environment and giving employees job
autonomy. These all contribute to a respect and trust culture. In a nutshell, according to Valentin, (2014) transformational leaders change compliance to commitment.

In accordance with a study conducted by Kahn (1990) cited in Chikoko, Buitendacha, and Kanengoni, (2014), employees are generally engaged in situations characterised by psychological safety were psychological safety is determined by employee peer relations, organisational culture but mostly supervisory relations.

Kotte and Sharafinski, (1988) cited by Valentin, (2014), developed a concept of Perceived supervisor support. This, they defined as the extent to which supervisory staff or management place importance to contributions made by employees and employee well-being. As supervisors and managers act as agents of the company with the responsibility of evaluating and guiding employee performance, employees also scrutinize whether the agent is providing unfavourable or favourable orientation towards them as an icon of company support (Rasheed, et al. 2013). Macleod and Carke, (2009) cited in Valentin, (2014) speak of the “virtuous circle” where companies deliver the necessities to stimulate engagement and the results of engagement reinforce it. This also includes the manner in which managers handle employees as a stimulate of employee engagement.

**Business Alignment**

HRM practice focuses on driving and enhancing employee value proposition (Valentin, 2014). The main purpose is to ensure employees are motivated intrinsically (Shuck, et al. 2011). This is because emotional fulfilment is a very essential component of employee engagement and signifies an engaged employee (Shuck, et al. 2011). Providing platforms for employees to forward their suggestions not only motivates employees but rather creates ambassadors in the form of employees thereby fostering team work (Armstrong, 2008). Organisations with a strong employee engagement culture have authentic and strong values which are understood by all stakeholders and because of this they become employers of choice by default (Valentin, 2014). According to Lenge, (2005) cited in Valentin, (2014), if employees are nurtured, trained, developed and treated as valuable assets they become a source of economic gain. Industrial Psychology Consultants, (2015) states that organisations with strong employee value proposition:-
I. Inform employees on the organization’s vision mission and values so that employees walk the talk.

II. Inspire employees to connect to their values and vision so that they take pride in their work as well as the organisation.

III. Support and instruct employees through coaching, training and provide feedback so that employees effectively deliver the organization’s brand assurances to the customers.

IV. Involve employees when designing their jobs, improving work processes and solving problems identified through customer or employee feedback.

V. Reward performance.

Building a strong corporate brand is not an overnight event (Kotler, 2002). As defined by the American Marketing Association cited in Kotler, (2002), a brand can be a sign, a design, a name term or a combination of these, the purpose being to identify, services or goods and differentiate from competitors. Companies with a strong brand are performance oriented, have powerful and strong leaders, and ultimately have powerful employee engagement initiatives (Industrial Psychology Consultants, 2015). Resultantly most employees desire to be of these corporates because, “for them”, being part of such big and famous corporates means boosting and backing their experience whilst at the same enjoying their time at work.

Kotler, (2002) states that communication is an interactive dialogue between two parties. Communication is yet so simple but difficult to implement (Industrial Psychology Consultants, 2015). Armstrong, (2008) states that communication between management and employees goes beyond desk issues. He states that employees do not want to work in an environment wherein employees have to mysteriously discover what is taking place within the working environment. Management may view consulting employees on decision making matters a waste of time, but this may have an adverse effect to the organisation in the long run. This is so because it removes the sense of ownership from workers whilst performing their jobs, as well as reduce employee engagement levels (Industrial Psychology Consultants, 2013). Armstrong, (2008) alludes that communication promotes transparency and builds trust between employees and management. To avoid conflict between management and labour there is need for effective and timely communication (Gallup, 2014).

Wellbeing
An employee’s wellbeing may be interpreted in terms of an individual’s perception of the organisational working environment (Brown and Leigh 1996 cited in Shuck et al. 2011). The employee perception is based on role clarity, company leadership, open door policy, recognition, company location and work-life balance (Shuck, et al. 2011). These authors further point out that these silent wellbeing variables are critical constituents of how workers deduce their working environment. In cases where employees have a negative perception of their working environment, Arrowsmith and Parker, (2013) define the working environment as a “site of struggle”. This is because different groups i.e. management and workers contest to nature the social environment.

Sugheir, et al.(2011) purports that the availability of wellness initiatives like fitness centres, healthy lunch and the provision of counselling departments also enhances employee wellbeing.

According to the China Youth daily, (2014), due to excessive overtime worked by employees in China, approximately six hundred thousand employees die annually and one thousand six hundred daily. These deaths are known as “guolaosi” meaning “overwork death”. Work-life balance according to Industrial Psychology Consultants, (2014) provides a balance between work, family time, personal activities, community participation and self-care. According to Robinson,(2006), work-life balance reduces employee stress. When employees spend most of their career on work-related undertakings and feel as if they are deserting other important constituents of their lives, unhappiness and stress emanates. According to Gorgievski, Bakker, and Schaufeli, (2010) engaged employees balance both their working and personal lives. Dissimilar to workhorses, engaged workers do not work hard because of a resilient and irresistible internal drive, but because for them working is pleasurable.

2.3.3 OUTCOMES OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

If employees are not engaged to either their job or the organisation they may actually become sell outs. It was revealed that 48% of the workers in the United Kingdom would sell their work passwords for £5 (CIPD, 2014). According to Vaijayanthi, et al. (2011) engaged employees could lead to bottom-line outcomes like increased profits, satisfied customers and job
performance. The pursuit of employee engagement is a combination of both performance and employee orientation, that is hard and soft approaches to human resource management, which is a form of neo-pluralism (Arrowsmith and Parker, 2013). According to Valentin, (2014) the Human resource management soft approach emphasizes that employees work best if they are dedicated to the organization. This dedication is however created when employees are trained, trusted and developed. The hard human resource model contends with the soft approach in that employee performance is driven and controlled through stringent performance management systems. Engaged employees however behave in cooperative and positive ways that benefit the organisation and themselves (Kotzea, Westhuizena, and Nela, 2015).

**Employee Retention and Absenteeism**

Shuck, *et al.* (2011) states that an employee’s intention to leave the organisation is a powerful predictor of the employee’s future within the same organisation. It is actually believed that the intent to turnover is more reflective of actual turnover (Steel and Ovalle 1984 cited in shuck, et al. 2011). This is because several factors prohibit employees from leaving the organisation. These factors may include the availability of jobs or rather fear of the unknown. Vaijayanthi, *et al.* (2011) purports that during periods of diminished work place loyalty, employee engagement is the solution to retain employees.

An average of 2.69 sick days per year against 6.19 sick leave days are taken by engaged employees in the United Kingdom compared to the disengaged employees (Gallup, 2014). This in monetary terms means that, it is costly to have disengaged employees in organizations. Further to that, according to the Corporate Leadership Council of the United Kingdom as cited in Gallup, (2014), research has proved that disengaged employees are four times likely to leave organizations than engaged employees. In this case more money is spent recruiting and training new employees. The council further elaborated that 87% of engaged employees are less likely to leave their organizations. This in all emphasizes the importance of having engaged employees in organizations at any one time.

**Discretionary effort**
Shuck, et al. (2011) defines discretionary effort as an employee’s willingness to go an extra mile beyond their normal scope of work. They further added that a good fit between an individual and a job also provides a cognitive stimulus of going an extra. Additionally, this extra effort exhibited by some employees is a behavioural reflection of an engaged employee (Macey and Schneider, 2008 cited in Shuck, et al. 2011). Employees have a bilateral relationship with their employers, wherein they are expected to dedicate their effort and time in return for a salary. Scholars like Vaijayanthi, et al. 2011 argue that it is expected for employees to go an extra mile whilst performing their duties since they are paid to get the job done.

Kotzea, et al. (2015) suggest that such desired discretionary effort displayed by engaged employees is synonymous with organisational citizenship behaviour where employee efforts surpass the call of duty. Modern corporations need engaged employees who do not limit their level of discretionary effort (Bakker, et al. 2011). An employee’s discretionary effort may lead to a Profit chain because employees will behave more cautiously, act sensibly, go an extra mile, and even become ambassadors’ of the organisations.

**Productivity**

Engaged employees move the organisation forward through innovation hence enabling productivity (Attridge, 2009). According to Valentin, (2014), since the opposite of engagement is disengagement, Shuck, et al. (2011) indicated in their study that the estimate annual cost of disengaged employees is between $250 and $300 billion dollars in United States, $2.5 billion in Asia, $4.9 billion in Australia and approximately $263 billion in German. Meaning, organisations that foster on employee engagement benefit a handful. Disengaged employees are associated with low productivity and may also discourage engaged workers from performing their duties (Valentin, 2014). Jenkins and Delbridge, (2013) argue that, by virtue of the heightened interest exhibited by engaged employees towards their work they always seemingly tend to outperform other workers and get things done. This is evident from a study conducted by the UK government in 2007, where they reported that branches with highly engaged personal at Standard Chartered Bank had a sixteen percent higher profit margin as compared to branches with low employee engagement levels.
Employee engagement should be voluntary and not commanded (Valentin, 2014). Valentin, (2014) believes that, employee engagement is another way of manipulating employees to drive productivity.

**Customer Service**

According to Rasheed, *et al.* (2013) engaged employees work with all their power, might and devotions to provide good customer service on behalf of the organisation. Some employees though not engaged put an appearance of engagement, this can be classified as an extension of emotional labour that is exhibited through smiles and courtesy (Valentin, 2014). Valentin, (2014) further states that support and back office employees also need to provide good service to internal customers as their service may in turn affect service offered to external customers for example canteen chefs must always cook tasty and healthy food to avoid complaints and grumbling from staff.

According to CIPD, (2014), Organisations should strive to boost their employee engagement levels as research has proven that companies with engaged employees provide exceptional customer service and manage to retain their customers from migrating to competitor organisations. Studies conducted by the Corporate Leadership council of the United Kingdom reveal that engaged employees are customer focused, emotionally fulfilled, faithful and committed to the long term objectives and goals of organisations. It is imperative to note that employee engagement is not the outmost solution to organisational dilemma it is a means to an end.

### 2.4 Employee Engagement Models

A number of studies have been done in relation to the area of employee engagement. Consequently a number of employee engagement models have been developed. To gain insight of other employee engagement models, the researcher reviewed models designed by kahn, (1990), Maslach, Schaufelli and Leitter, (2001), Bhatnagar and Biswas, (2010) and Dubrin, (1978). These models will be discussed in detail below.
Dubrin 1978 Employee Engagement Model

According to Rana, et al. (2014) the Dubrin 1978 employee engagement model has three variables namely, the antecedents of employee engagement, the outcomes of employee engagement and the moderating variables of employee engagement. The antecedent units include job characteristic and design, co-worker and supervisor relationships, human resource development practices and the workplace environment. They proposed that individual characteristics and job demands are the moderating variables between the antecedents and the outcomes of employee engagement. Finally, they linked employee engagement to the following outcomes; turnover intentions, job performance and organisational citizenship behaviour.

Kahn 1990 Employee Engagement Model

Kahn, (1990) cited inKular, Gatnby, Rees, Soane, and Truss, (2008) found that three essential psychological conditions are essential for both employee engagement and disengagement. These psychological conditions are safety, meaningfulness and availability. He believed that in each role situation, employees asked themselves three fundamental questions which include,

I. How safe is it to perform the job?
II. Is the job meaningful to me?
III. Am I emotionally and physically available to perform the job.

He found that employees are more engaged in situations that offered them psychological safety and meaningfulness, whilst on the other hand being psychologically available.

Maslach et.al 2001 Employee Engagement Model

Maslach et.al(2001) found that six distinct areas of work and personal life lead to engagement or burnout. These areas include social support, workload, rewards and recognition, control, community, values and perceived fairness. They argue that employee engagement is related to feelings of control and choice, sustainable workload, a supportive work community, valued and meaningful work, justice and fairness and equitable rewards and recognition.

Bhatnagar and Biswas 2010 Employee Engagement Model
Bhatnagar and Biswas, (2010) mapped the predictors of employee engagement to reflect a degree of need satisfaction. In their model, variables of justice that include distributive and procedural fairness were considered. They asserted that, issues to do with the psychological contract impacted on employee engagement levels wherein employee behaviour was influenced by company policies and values. In essence, the model considered procedural fairness, relational contract, distributive justice and transactional contract as predictors of employee engagement.

The associated outcomes of employee engagement as prescribed by their model include organisational citizenship behaviour, employee intent to quit, organisational commitment and firm performance.

**Overview of Models.**

According to Rana, *et.al.* (2014), as reflected by the four models discussed above there is no consensus amongst scholars as to the specific predictors that increase employee engagement levels. This therefore means that the selection of employee engagement antecedents and outcomes is based on the discretion of the researcher or theorist (Dubrin, 1978 cited by Rana *et.al.*, 2014). The researcher is however guided by what he/she believes to be most appropriate in any given circumstance or environment.

With regards to the forgoing, the researcher in her framework selected variables that have been extensively investigated and discussed in literature and believes that these variables capture the most vital components of the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement.
2.5 DEVELOPMENT OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

**Work Outputs**
- Tasks and processes
- Tools of trade
- Pride

**Employee Growth**
- Training
- Career Paths
- Study

**Total Reward**
- Benefits
- Pay Flexibility

**People Philosophy**
- Leadership and Management Style
- Relationships

**Employee Engagement**

- Employee Retention and Absenteeism
- Discretionary effort
- Productivity

**Employee Engagement**
The relationship between employee engagement and its predictors

For organisational competitiveness corporations should strive for their employees’ hearts, such that when difficult times come by, employees are able to stand with their organisation regardless of circumstances beyond the organisations control. Symtho, (2007) contends that workers are the niche of engagement and resultantly should be seen as drivers of change. According to Kahn (1990) as cited in Vaijayanthi, et al. (2011) there are three psychological conditions related to employee engagement and disengagement; these include safety, meaningfulness and availability. These conditions relate to creating constructive relationship, dependable leadership and making available interesting and challenging opportunities within organisations so that employees are emotionally connected to their jobs.

Employee engagement antecedents vary from country, industry and company (Jenkins and Delbridge, 2013). Industrial Psychology Consultants, (2015) assert that Zimbabwean employees value extrinsic motivators particularly rewards and remuneration to boost their engagement levels. Meaning, according to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, most Zimbabwean employees are looking for physiological and safety needs so as to boost their engagement levels. As suggested by Emergence Growth Consultants (2014) some employee engagement predictors are more influential compared to others. According to Rees, Alfes, and Gatenby, (2013), nurturing employee engagement levels is the modern long line management strategy which is aimed at unleashing employee discretion and aligning employee interest with organisational interest with
the goal of boosting and enhancing organisational performance. Employee engagement antecedents should include aspects to do with the organisational working environment because this is where positive emotions like pride and involvement are cultivated (Vaijayanthi et al. 2011). Notwithstanding the employee engagement models discussed above, a number of these models have also been developed which include the following:-

1. **The Robinson, Perryman and Hayday Model.**
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   - Training, development and career
   - Immediate management
   - Communication
   - Pay and benefits
   - Fair treatment and equal opportunities
   - Health and safety
   - Job satisfaction
   - Family and friends
   - Cooperation
   - Performance and Appraisal

   **Feeling involved and valued** → **Engagement**

   **Figure 2.2 The Robinson, Perryman and Hayday Model.**

   Source: (Robbinson, Perryman, & Hayday, 2004) Institute of Employment Services Report

2. **The Katharine Esty and Mindy Gewirtz Model**
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   1. Feedback
   2. Trust and Leadership
   3. Career Development
   4. Understanding job roles
   5. Shared decision making

   **Culture of Engagement** → **Employee Engagement**

   1. Enhanced organisational performance,
   2. Financial success
   3. Employee retention
   4. Productivity
As indicated in figure 2.2 and 2.3, the list of employee engagement predictors are not exhaustible from an employer’s perspective, hence according to Thomas, (2009) cited in Sugheir, et al. (2011), it increases the vagueness that is associated with the exact meaning of employee engagement. In essence, employee engagement seems to be a little bit of “this and that”, as well as “some of this and that” (Kotzea, et al. 2015). This is why there is no one size fit all definition of employee engagement as well as the most appropriate employee engagement model.

The pursuit of employee engagement initiatives is based on the understanding of the problematic nature of the employment relationship between employers and employees, hence employee engagement articulates the voice of the worker (Arrowsmith and Parker, 2013). In this case, the two authors (Arrowsmith and Parker, 2013) imply that human resources initiatives concerning employee engagement involves the advocacy by employees who are able to challenge the practices surrounding both management and the organisation as a whole.

From the two models illustrated above, scholars like Truss, Shantz, Soane, Alfes, and Delbridge, (2013) argue that employee engagement initiatives take little consideration of equality and diversity. Halbesleben, (2011) cited in Truss, et al. (2013) argue that workers with chronic illness or some form of disability maybe unable to achieve the desired engagement levels because the basis of engagement is on bottom line delivery. The authors were further propelled to state that literature on engagement has remained silent on how ethnicity and gender interacts with engagement, as this may lead to deliberations on the issues of employee engagement and equality. Indeed, according to Attridge, (2009) fostering engagement is one of the biggest tasks management has to deal with. Therefore since employee engagement cannot be demanded,
employers need to make right the conditions that necessitate the desired engagement levels and this obviously means at a cost (Valentin, 2014).

2.5.2 EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND ITS INFLUENCE ON OUTCOMES

Shuck, et al. (2011) stated that there is an association between the degree of employee engagement and the associated outcomes of employee engagement. Therefore, companies should constantly evaluate and measure employee engagement levels as it is a reliable metric of gauging an organisation’s overall health climate (Industrial Psychology Consultants, 2013). This in-turn will enable business leaders to link employee engagement to other business drivers like profitability, customer satisfaction and labour productivity. According Bakker, et al. (2010) employee engagement is an emerging and contemporary concept that was developed to address organisational challenges like profitability, attrition, productivity and customer satisfaction.

The repercussions of engagement are two fold, whilst employee engagement may reduce recruitment costs and company turnover, it has also been found out that employees become less engaged the longer they stay within an organisation, they may become complacent overtime vis-a-vis the desired employee engagement outcomes (Vaijayanthi, et al. 2011). The general assumption of employee engagement is that, what is good for the organisation is ultimately beneficial to the employee as well. It is however imperative to note that according to Armstrong, (2008) employees and managers may often have conflicting interests. Employee engagement is often portrayed a win-win scenario, that is, where the organisations balance sheet increases, the employees on the other hand have a fulfilled mind, this is all “flatter” according to Bakker, et al. (2010). However, according to Vaijayanthi, et al. (2011) there is now need to shift the attention towards how employees can benefit from the outcomes of employee engagement.

According to Chalofsky and Krishna, (2009) one of the outcomes of employee engagement is that an organisation develops to become a learning organisation this is because gaining employee commitment is the foundation of a learning organisation.
Valentin, (2014) purports that it is also possible to have effective business models that exclude employee engagement initiatives, this is mainly because employee unhappiness is not a new phenomenon. Valentin, (2014) asserts that other companies without employee engagement initiatives are actually thriving. Further to that, the scholar is in disagreement with the image created in employee engagement literature on the “ideal engaged organisation” which is completely contrary to the majority of organisations found in the world today.

2.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY

In a nutshell, it is evident from the reviewed literature that engaged employees are a competitive edge for most organisations and may be a solution to some companies in difficulty. In essence no organisation can bypass employee engagement and be successful in the long-run. Organisations must henceforth consider not to ignore employee engagement initiatives because engaged employees apply both their mind and heart.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER 3

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Research methodology is the coordination of structured and clear guidelines upon which research is grounded (Nacchamius and Frankfort, 1996). In essence, it aims at explaining how data is gathered and proffers the philosophies upon which data collection and data analysis is based. The research methodology of the study encompassed the research design and philosophy, population and sampling techniques, sources of data, data collection techniques and procedure, data analysis, research limitations, research ethics and credibility of the study paradigm strategy method and sampling.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN
Research design is a comprehensive framework of how a study will be completed (Gray, 2009). The research design seeks to describe why the research is being conducted, state the research questions to be answered and explain the methods to be used for data collection and sampling, as well as describe how data will be analysed (Gray, 2009).

Cooper and Schinder, (2001) suggested eight descriptors of research design as outlined in the Table 3.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Option/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree to which research question/s have been crystallised.</td>
<td>• Formal or Exploratory study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection method/s.</td>
<td>• Interrogation or Monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher power to produce effects or properties in variables understudy.</td>
<td>• Ex post facto and experimental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research purpose.</td>
<td>• Casual or Descriptive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time dimension</td>
<td>• Longitudinal or Cross-sectional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scope of the study</td>
<td>• Statistical or Case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perception of the subjects concerning the research activity.</td>
<td>• Modified or actual routine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cooper and Schindler, 2001:135

In seeking to explain the relationship between the predictors of employee engagement, employee engagement and the outcomes of employee engagement amongst the Zimbabwean building societies the study adopted a quantitative approach. This is because the researcher’s aim was to accept or reject the formulated hypothesis, meaning, the study embraced a deductive
approach. According to Leedy and Ormrod, (2010: 95) Quantitative research seeks to create, confirm or endorse relationships and to develop generalities that enhance existing theories.

The hypothesis for the study conducted implored that there was a positive relationship amongst the predictors of employee engagement, employee engagement and the outcomes of employee engagement. This implies that, the researcher selected the quantitative approach to the qualitative approach because the researcher sought to test the foregoing hypothesis.

In essence, the researcher asked the respondents for their opinions for the three variables (predictors of employee engagement, employee engagement and outcomes of employee engagement). The questionnaire used was highly structured, as the purpose was to produce statistics and facts, in relation to the topic that was under study.

Though a research can be explanatory, descriptive and exploratory in nature, but because the study sought to establish the cause and effect relationship of the three desired variables (predictors of employee engagement, employee engagement and outcomes of employee engagement) the research turned out to be explanatory i.e. for purposes of explaining the relationship that exists amongst the three variables. It is important to explain that Descriptive research aims at exploring and explaining variables or themes whilst at the same time giving further information about the topic understudy, whilst Exploratory research is where a researcher endeavors to lay a foundation upon which future studies maybe built or tries to determine whether existing theory may be explained with what is being observed.

3.2.1 RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY

According to Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, (2003) there are two research philosophies namely positivism and phenomenological. Unlike the positivism philosophy, the phenomenological philosophy implores that the researcher must deduce and must make sense of the environment. Gray,( 2009) explains that phenomenological endeavours to appreciate the world at large from the respondents point of view, which in principle can be achieved if the researcher singles out their preconceptions. This therefore means that phenomenological approach is inductive in
nature or is a bottom up approach because researchers want to understand how humans interpret their environment. Saunders, et al. (2003) reason that the inductive approach usually gathers data, evaluates it and then deduces it to come up with theories and gain unfathomable understanding of the problems under research. The phenomenological philosophy also known as the interpretivist philosophy is synonymous with qualitative research.

The research was quantitative in nature resultantly it was based on the positivist philosophy. This is because the researcher was independent of the subject under research and preferred “science” to take precedence. The positivist philosophy assumes that the world is premised on objectivity and independence hence the researcher must be factual and emphasize on causality. This means that the sample size must be large enough to ensure representation of the study population. The results of the sample representation should be similar to those produced by the natural and physical scientist (Saunders, et al. 2003). This is because science is the back bone of positivism. Saunders et al. implores that positivism is largely deductive in that it aims at explaining causal relationships. Similarly, this study explained and justified the causal relationship that exists between the predictors of employee engagement, employee engagement and the outcomes of employee engagement. Further to that, the researcher followed a structured and stringent methodology when it came to sample selection, measurements, result analysis and arriving to the conclusion of the hypothesis. This in all is in consensus with the positivists’ philosophy. It is important to note that though one of the major shortfalls of the positivists’ philosophy is that it is not always suitable for social science, the researcher placed emphasis on numerical analysis and objectivity.

3.2.2 RESEARCH STRATEGY

According to Leedy and Ormrod, (2010), a research strategy amongst other forms may include ethnography, grounded theory, experiments or surveys. Saunders, et al. (2003) on the other hand, mentions that there are three traditional research strategies and these include experimental research, surveys and case studies.
Ethnography research, according to Leedy and Ormrod, (2010) is a research that focuses sorely on investigating a certain culture profoundly. Researches are conducted in natural settings for months or years. The two scholars in summary define grounded theory as a process in which data is gathered to produce a theory. A case study research design as defined by Gray, (2009) is a first-hand enquiry that studies a contemporary phenomenon within its natural context. Experimental research is scientific in nature and tries to establish or find the relationship between independent and dependent variables. Their major disadvantage is that the laboratory set up is far-fetched from reality.

According to (Gray, 2009) a survey is a detailed and quantified description of a population, wherein data is systematically collected through questionnaires, interviews and observations. According to Leedy and Ormrod, (2010: 95) frequencies and distributions of certain variables are easily determined especially in business research if survey research is adopted. The main advantage of survey research is that they may provide answers to what, who, where, how much and how many. Surveys are quite simple in that willing participants get to participate and a summary of the findings may be done statistically. Though a survey research may be time consuming (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010), the researcher adopted a survey research strategy on all the Zimbabwe building societies which include CBZ, FBC, ZB and CABS. This was mainly because a survey approach provides a non-restrictive environment, resultantly, participants openly responded to questions asked. The data was collected in large samples from all four building societies and proved to be quite economical because the researcher distributed and collected the questionnaires at once. Further to that, data collected was simple to collate as the researcher managed to summarize responses in frequency counts, percentages and other sophisticated indexes and resultantly managed to draw inferences from the sample respondents.

### 3.3 POPULATION AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUES

A population constitutes the entire units or elements understudy (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). These units may include physical objects or human beings. A population has certain features and individualities that are of the researcher’s interest. Examples of a population may include
university graduates, the unemployed, only to mention. A sample is a part or is a subset of the population (Diamantopoulos & Schlegelmilch, 2000). Ideally as this research was quantitative, a census could have been the preferred choice, but due limited costs and time, appropriate sampling methods and techniques were used to ensure equal representation of the population understudy.

3.3.1 POPULATION

The study population were the employees of the Zimbabwe Building Societies which included employees for FBC Building Society, ZB Building Society, CBZ Building Society and CABS Building Society. The study considered all non-managers, managers and executive employees. The total population of the research was 286 (FBC Building Society – 85 employees, CABS – 120, CBZ – 105, ZB – 76).

3.3.2 SAMPLING

As alluded to earlier, Sampling may be defined as the process of selecting or choosing the number of respondents expected in any given study. A sampling frame is a list of all the members of the population. The lists of all employees were sourced from the human resource departments of the institutions concerned. There are many sampling methods and these can be categorized as probability and non-probability sampling methods (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). The table overleaf, shows a detailed description of the sampling methods.
## Table 3.2: Sampling Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non–probability Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgemental sampling</td>
<td>Sample participants are selected on the basis of the investigator’s judgement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
<td>Members of the sample are selected on the basis of their being willingly and readily accessible and available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive sampling</td>
<td>Sample participants are selected with a specific objective or purpose in mind. The sample is deliberately selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quota sampling</td>
<td>Participants are chosen on the basis of satisfying or meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
some pre-specified criteria that is thought to apply to a population. In this case the researcher is free to select the elements to include in the sample as long as they meet the predefined characteristics.

female respondents depending on the nature of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probability Methods</th>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snowball sampling</td>
<td>Initial sample members are selected judgementally and are in-turn asked to identify others with the desired characteristic.</td>
<td>A professional body for example the Institute of People Management in Zimbabwe (IPMZ) wishing to increase its membership contacts its existing members and solicit names of other qualifying professionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple random sampling</td>
<td>For inclusion in the sample, sample participants are selected randomly. All elements have an equal opportunity of being selected.</td>
<td>Students in a class maybe randomly selected using the hat system to represent the class at a quiz show.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratified sampling</td>
<td>Sample participants may be selected randomly from diverse strata. A strata may be sampled in proportion to the population size (proportionated stratified sampling).</td>
<td>FBC Bank may split its customer population according to towns in Zimbabwe and do a sample randomly in each town. This may also be done proportionately i.e. according to the number of customers in each town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic sampling</td>
<td>Sample participants are selected at regular intervals, that is, after a random start. The sample interval is determined by a formula N/n, were N is the population and n is the sample size.</td>
<td>After a sample interval of 10 is arrived at, a researcher doing a research of care tyre used by most vehicles in Harare stationed at corner 4th and 2nd streets, randomly selects the first car, thereafter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cluster sampling

- Sample participants are selected in groups, rather than individually. There is diversity within the group and uniformity across the groups.
- A sales director randomly selects 4 districts out of five and interviews 20 people in each district.

Source: Diamantopoulos and Schlegelmilch, (2000: 14-16)

The research study adopted the simple random sampling method. This is because the sample population was small and homogenous in nature. Homogeneity in the sense that the organisational structures of the building societies were more or less similar, further to that the sample populated were all employees of the building societies. In this case the sample populations had an equal chance of being selected. The list of all employees was sourced at the respective human resources departments and employees were randomly selected in-line with the sample size. The randomness was achieved through the selection of employees who appeared first in the employee registers until the sample size was met, this was done across all the building societies.

The basic rule of thumb that applies when trying to identify a representative sample for quantitative research is that, the larger the sample size the greater the representation of the population as well as the less the margin of error. This in all increases the reliability of the research. From the population that was understudy, the following considerations were taken into account for purposes of determining the sample size and these include; the reason why the study was undertaken, population breadth and depth, the likelihood of picking a “bad” sample, and the tolerable sampling error (Diamantopoulos & Schlegelmilch, 2000). Owing to the ease of use of sample size formulas, the researcher decided to select a representative sample of size of 30% of the population (Saunders, et al. 2003). The table below illustrates how the overall sample size was arrived at.

**Table 3.3: Sample size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Sample Determination</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CABS Building Society</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30% of 120</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBZ Building Society</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>30% of 105</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBC Building Society</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30% of 85</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZB Building Society</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30% of 76</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>286</td>
<td><strong>30% of 286</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population figures adopted from Building Society HR Departments

### 3.4 SOURCES OF DATA

Research is a useful methodology to problem solving only if there is data to support and substantiate the research. Data are the pieces of information available to a researcher at a particular time and date (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). There are two sources of data namely, primary and secondary data. Primary data may be referred to as first-hand information that a researcher may get directly from respondents through questionnaires or interviews. Primary sources of data may also be acquired through the researcher’s direct observation. Secondary data can be data acquired from the internet, magazines and newspapers that have a bearing on the area under study.

This research made use of primary data only, because the research sorely searched for employee viewpoints with regards to the determinants of employee engagement hence primary data proved to be the most illuminating, and valid.

### 3.5 DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

There are various methods of collecting data from respondents and this can be done through focus groups, observation, interviews and questionnaires. This however largely depends on whether the research is qualitative or quantitative.

**Focus groups**
According to Leedy and Ormrod, (2010) a focus group, is a discussion of a group of not more than 12 people chaired by the researcher to discuss a particular issue. Focus groups are essential when time is limited or when the researcher needs the help of other people when it comes to the interpretation of something that he or she observed.

**Observations**

Observations are synonymous with qualitative research. The observer may be a relative outsider, as in the case of ethnography or be a participant observer (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). Observations may be free flowing or intentionally unstructured. The main advantage of observations is that unforeseen data sources may surface. However, there is a high degree of ambiguity associated with observations in that the researcher may not know what to qualify as important and not important (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010).

**Interviews**

A researcher may conduct interviews with respondents. The purpose being, to obtain relevant research information as specified by the objectives of the researcher. According to Leedy and Ormrod, (2010) questions asked in any interview may be related to facts, people's beliefs, feelings, motives, present and past behaviours, only to mention. Interviews may be structured or unstructured. The major advantage of interviews is that there is a platform to probe respondents on unclear responses. However, interviews maybe time consuming.

**Questionnaires**

A questionnaire is a formulated standard instrument with the same questions asked to various respondents, interpreted comparatively and then generalised to suit different situations. This research made use of a questionnaire to collect data from respondents. This is largely because a questionnaire is an inexpensive way of collecting data whilst at the same time was the most convenient method since the questionnaires were distributed at more or less the same time at any given organisation.

A questionnaire can be structured or unstructured. A structured questionnaire is a questionnaire with closed ended questions whilst an unstructured questionnaire may include open ended questions. The questionnaire designed by the researcher was highly structured and respondents
were expected to choose their most ideal answer. This was because the research was purely quantitative and hence quantitative output was needed for data analysis.

Questionnaires are well known to have a low rate of return, hence the researcher ensured that the questionnaire was not too long, had clear instructions, used simple language and administered them personally so as to boost the low rate of return.

A preliminary small survey was conducted with 30 respondents before the actual research was done. This was done to ensure that the respondents interpreted the questions correctly as well as ensuring that the overall study objectives were met from the data collected.

3.6 DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis stage generally includes data preparation where data is cleaned up and organised for analysis through frequency analysis in order to prove or disprove a view or hypothesis (Trochim, 2006). The research made use of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. This software was used for purposes of data analysis. It is important to note that quantitative data is very helpful in analysis as it provides for easy quantifiable and understandable results. In this case data was consolidated and reduced to statistical data such as correlations. The hypothesis of the study was tested through linear regression, this involved, regressing each employee engagement predictor simultaneously on employee engagement and its outcomes for predictive purposes.

3.7 RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

The survey research depended mainly on all four Building Societies in Zimbabwe. Consequently, the researcher faced challenges gaining access to one of the building societies, CABS. However,
since the researcher had been building rapport with other professional colleagues of the various financial institutions, access to the building society was permitted. Resultantly the researcher progressed with her research.

The duration of conducting the research was rather too short a time, considering that the researcher was a full time employee of another organisation. In these circumstances, the researcher drafted a timetable with specific deadlines of which the researcher adhered to, to ensure that the research was a success.

Researchers are human. Not forgoing the acts of nature, the researcher fell ill and as a result the study had to be paused for a short while. However, as the researcher was working well ahead of her research schedule, the short illness did not prohibit the researcher from completing her research well on time.

3.8 RESEARCH ETHICS AND DATA CREDIBILITY

A significant number of ethical considerations were taken in to account during the course of the research. However of special mention, include the issues to do with confidentiality and gaining access to the building societies. Due to the sensitivity of the topic researched, wherein employees’ feared victimisation, and bias for disclosing their opinions about their views of their employers, the research participants were assured that all responses given were treated confidentially, and that the questionnaires allowed for anonymous feedback. The respondents were further advised of their rights involving their participation in the research. These rights included their right to accept or withdraw from taking part in the research. No respondent however withdrew from taking part in the research after their acceptance.

It is note-stating that the researcher got the required approval from all building societies to conduct the research; hence the results of the study were authentic.

The research was also carried out in a trustworthy and honest manner. The researcher had no preconceived bias or manipulation of data to certify hence only data supplied by the respondents was used for purposes of testing the formulated hypothesis.
3.8.1 RESEARCH CREDIBILITY

VALIDITY

Leedy and Ormrod, (2010) define validity as the degree to which an instrument measures the variable it is intended to measure hence, this allows truthful and precise conclusions to be achieved on the cause and effect relationship with reference to the data (internal validity) and as well as be generalised to other situations (eternal validity).

The researcher was assisted to draft the questionnaire, with the captains of industry in the human resources field. Henceforth, the validity of the questionnaire was achieved through the consistency of results especially from employees within the same category in terms of non-managerial, managerial and executive employees. Were external validity is concerned, 30% of the employees of the building societies participated in the research, hence the results are a true representation of the employees of the Zimbabwe building societies and generalisations can be drawn upon. Cooper and Schinder, (2001) purport for any research study to be valid, the sample size selected must to a high degree represent the population.

RELIABILITY

According to Leedy and Ormrod, (2010) reliability refers to the consistency of results achieved through the use of a measuring instrument administered to the same respondents repeatedly. With reference to this research, the researcher used the same questionnaire amongst all employees of the four building societies and ensured that the instrument was issued under the conditions. The questionnaires were all distributed at lunch time during week days and were collected after three days had lapsed. With this in mind, respondents were not pressurised to respond to the questionnaire within a short period of time. Generally the results of employees within the same institution were more or less similar. Further to that, respondents were not required to disclose their names on the questionnaire, as such, they did not report what they presumed the researcher wanted to know. There were no inputting errors on all questionnaires because of the clear instructions and questions. It is however a guarantee to future researchers
performing the exact research, under the same conditions that the results generated will be more or less the same.

3.9 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The goal of the chapter as outlined and discussed was to state and discuss the research methodology adopted by researcher. The research was purely quantitative hence quantitative strategies were selected to support the survey research. The data collection technique involved the use of a structured questionnaire. The questionnaires were dispatched using the simple random sampling to a sample size of 86. Ethical considerations were taken into account during the course of the research. The research findings and the analysis thereof will be provided for in the next chapter.
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

CHAPTER 4

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter with reference to the methodology used by the researcher is to present summarised results of the study, discuss the results as well as draw inferences from the survey results. The chapter will highlight the descriptive and inferential statistics adopted by the researcher as well draw conclusions and recommendations based on both the results and research objectives as outlined in Chapter 1.

4.1.1 SURVEY RESPONSE RATE

The target respondents for the study were 86, but due to non-response by other respondents’, the researcher received back 72 questionnaires from the research conducted. This means that the overall response rate was 84%. Leedy and Ormrod, (2010) assert that a response rate of 70% plus, is an acceptable and good response rate and as such minimises chances of bias. The overall
response rate to the total population was 25%. This percentage total was 5% less of the desired 30%. All responses were acceptable; this was largely due to the pilot study conducted as it enabled the researcher to make amendments were necessary from the feedback received from the respondents. All demographic and structured questions on the questionnaire were responded to in the most appropriate way.

4.2 DESCRIPTIVE DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive data aims at defining a body of data (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). Its purpose is to acquaint the researcher with his or her data before analysing the data by providing preliminary understanding of the responses provided (Diamantopoulos & Shlegelmilch, 2000). The descriptive analysis will involve frequency analysis by gender, age, service, occupational category, department employed and education.

4.2.1 Response rate by Gender

The research participants encompassed both male and female respondents. The results presented in Table 4.1 below depict a higher response rate from the males with a percentage total of 51.4% as opposed to female respondents with a percentage total of 48.6%. The frequency counts for both females and males were 35 and 37 respectively, totalling to 72 respondents. The differences in responses by gender was meagre, this however leads to the assumption that the building societies are equal opportunity employers.

Table 4.1: Responses by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Responses rate by Age and Length of service

The Table 4.2 displays that the most common respondents were between the age of 41-50 years, with a percentage of 41.7% of the total respondents, whilst the remaining 58.3% was shared amongst the remaining three age categories as reflected in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Responses by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of length of service, the highest mode was in the 6-10 years category (33.3%) and the 11-15 years category (33.3%). These two categories had frequency counts of n=24. Table 4.3 displays the response rate by length of service.

Table 4.3: Responses by Length of Service

Length of Service
From Table 4.3 it can however be inferred that there is high staff turnover as the years of service within the building societies progress. In essence, this means that employees do not want to retire whilst under the employ of the building societies. This can also be confirmed by the response rate by age as indicated in Table 4.2; the least respondents came from employees approaching the retirement age.

4.2.4 Response rate by occupational category

As illustrated in Table 4.4, the majority of the respondents were lower and middle management. The frequency count for each of the categories was n=18 and the valid percentage was 25% respectively. The least respondents came from executives wherein the frequency count was n=8. The response rate by occupational category is reflective of a typical organisational structure because organisational head count narrows up as it approaches the climax of the structure.
### 4.2.5 Response rate by Department

The majority of the respondents came from the projects department, with a frequency of 21 against a total of 72 respondents as shown in Table 4.5. The least respondents came from the treasury department as the frequency count was n=8. The distribution of respondents in accordance to departments is a true reflection of building society structures. This is because most building societies employ more people in the projects department, as their core business involves the building of houses for mortgage purposes, whilst the least responses came from treasury, because not much money is invested in the money markets as they continuously need finance to sponsor their projects, hence the lean structure.

**Figure 4.5: Responses by Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit and Mortgages</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Banking</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Functions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.6 Response rate by Level of Education

Table 4.6 depicts that the majority of responses came from degreed respondents. This is exhibited by a frequency count of 45 against a total of 72 respondents. The lowest response was from one respondent with ordinary levels as the highest level of education. Considering the influx of local universities in Zimbabwe coupled with the relaxed criteria of enrolment by some universities which include mature entries and the bridging program for female applicants, it is justifiable why the majority of respondents are degreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.7 Descriptive statistics summary
With regards to the forgoing presentation of descriptive statistics, a snap shot of the findings is tabulated in Table 4.7 below.

**Table 4.7: Descriptive statistics summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Highest Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>Credit and Mortgages</td>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode</strong></td>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>6-10 years and 11-15 years</td>
<td>Lower and Middle Management</td>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3 NORMALITY TESTS**

Theorists advise that physical characteristics of living organisms and populations like populations of plant and trees or human beings reflect a peculiar pattern. The pattern is commonly called the normal curve or normal distribution (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). In essence the mode, mean and median all coincide, one half of the distribution is the mirror image of the other half (Diamantopoulos & Shlegelmilch, 2000). For purposes of checking the normality of the data received during the research, a normality test was conducted as illustrated in Table 4.8. The general rule that applies when checking the normality of data is as follows;

1. Normal distribution: the P value > 0.05
2. Uneven distribution : the P value < 0.05

With reference to the Table 4.8 below, the Shapiro-Wilk values are considered. It is evident from Table 4.8 that the dependent variables had statistic values exceeding 0.8, with significant values of 0.000 which in essence are all less than 0.05. The normality tests are done so as to decide
whether to use parametric or non-parametric models of testing data. The results revealed that the data is uneven as such non-parametric tests were conducted. This in essence means that the data collected had recurrent patterns, making the distribution uneven.

Table 4.8: Tests of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Effort</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention and Absenteeism</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Lilliefors Significance Correction

4.4 VALIDITY and RELIABILITY TESTS

4.4.1 Content Validity

Content validity can be defined as the extent to which a research instrument like questionnaires measures what it is supposed to measure (Diamantopoulos & Shlegelmilch, 2000). The researcher, with the assistance of independent consultants and captains of industry in the human resources field drafted the survey questionnaire. The purpose was to ensure that the questionnaire is valid.

4.4.2 Reliability

Reliability is the degree to which a measure is free from random error. A reliable measure has a Cronbach’s Alpha threshold of 0.7. The variables of the study went through a reliability check, resultantly the Cronbach’s Alpha was 0.967. This statistic reflects the consistency of responses from the respondents. Table 4.9 depicts the reliability statistics results for the 11 variables. A reliability check was also done for singular variables, the results are tabulated in Table 4.10.
### Table 4.9: Reliability Statistics for all variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.10: Reliability statistics’ for singular variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictors of Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>6 (predictors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>3 (questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes of Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>4 (outcomes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5 TESTS OF RELATIONSHIPS

Associations or relationships between variables play a significant role in data enquiry. The main purpose of testing relationships between variables is to find out whether the variables are related and if so establish the nature and strength of the relationships. The study established the relationship of variables using correlation and regression.

#### 4.5.1 CORRELATION

The statistical process in which one discovers the association between two or more variables is referred to as correlation (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). This measure of association, termed as the correlation coefficient is a number between -1 and +1, meaning -1 and +1 are the two extremes. According to Diamantopoulos and Shlegelmilch, (2000) a rough rule of thumb reveals that, a strong association measure is greater than 0.8, a moderate association is between 0.4 and 0.8,
below 0.4, the relationship is considered weak. Correlation coefficients for two variables reveal different aspects of the relationship. These aspects include the direction of the relationship, the strength of the relationship, the statistical significance and the issue to do with multi-collinearity. As the sample data was unevenly distributed, Spearman’s rank correlation was used.

4.5.1.1 Correlation of the predictors of employee engagement and employee engagement

Table 4.11 overleaf presents the correlation between employee engagement and it’s predictors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman’s rho</th>
<th>Wellbeing</th>
<th>Work Outputs</th>
<th>People philosophy</th>
<th>Employee Growth</th>
<th>Total Rewards</th>
<th>Business Alignment</th>
<th>Employee Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Outputs</td>
<td>.774**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People philosophy</td>
<td>.708**</td>
<td>.732**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Growth</td>
<td>.664**</td>
<td>.730**</td>
<td>.693**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rewards</td>
<td>.506**</td>
<td>.589**</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>.625**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Alignment</td>
<td>.661**</td>
<td>.611**</td>
<td>.591**</td>
<td>.607**</td>
<td>.474**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.625**</td>
<td>.570**</td>
<td>.576**</td>
<td>.570**</td>
<td>.569**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellbeing

From the results in Table 4.11 it is clear that there is a moderate positive one directional relationship between wellbeing and employee engagement (r=0.497**, p<0.01).

Work Output

As shown in Table 4.11 there is a positive medium directional relationship between work output and employee engagement, as the correlation coefficient is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (r=0.625**, p<0.01).

People Philosophy

There is a positive association between people philosophy and employee engagement, as the correlation coefficient is statistically significant (r=0.570**, p<0.01), the relationship between the two variables is moderate.

Employee Growth

As illustrated in Table 4.11, a moderate positive relationship exists between employee growth and employee engagement (r=0.576**, p<0.01).

Total Rewards

According to the results in Table 4.11, it is evident that there is a moderate positive one directional relationship between total rewards and employee engagement (r=0.570**, p<0.01).

Business Alignment Brand

The results in Table 4.11 display a moderate one directional relationship between business alignment and employee engagement (r=0.569**, p<0.01).

It is evident from the correlation coefficients that the predictors of employee engagement are positively related and statistically significant to employee engagement. This however reveals the diverse nature of employees and their unpredictability in terms of the variables that drive their
engagement levels. Generally all the correlation coefficients were in the medium to strong range meaning employee engagement does not occur by chance.

**4.5.1.2 Correlation of employee engagement and it’s outcomes.**

The correlation results of employee engagement and it’s outcomes are shown in Table 4.12.

### Table 4.12: Correlation of employee engagement and the outcomes of employee engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Employee Engagement</th>
<th>Customer Service</th>
<th>Employee Retention and Absenteeism</th>
<th>Discretionary Effort</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>.692**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention and Absenteeism</td>
<td>.714**</td>
<td>.661**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Effort</td>
<td>.615**</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>.565**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>.649**</td>
<td>.608**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed)
As shown in Table 4.12 employee engagement is positively skewed to discretionary effort (0.615**, p < 0.01), and the relationship is within the moderate zone.

**Productivity**

According to the results in Table 4.12, it is evident that there is a moderate, positive one directional relationship between employee engagement and productivity (0.565**, p<0.01).

**Employee Retention and Absenteeism**

The results in Table 4.12 reveal that there is a strong positive one directional relationship between employee engagement and employee retention and absenteeism (r=0.714**, p<0.01).

**Customer Service**

Employee engagement is positively correlated to customer service, as illustrated in Table 4.12, it is evident that there is a moderate positive one directional relationship between employee engagement and customer service (r=0.692** p<0.01).

All correlation coefficients for employee engagement and its outcomes are in the medium to strong range and are positively skewed towards the direction of +1. This implicitly means that the outcomes of engagement cannot be arrived at by chance. Therefore employees need to be engaged so that companies retain their employees and are more productive.

**4.5.2 REGRESSION**

It is important to note that correlation on its own does not prove causality, as a result interpreting correlation results in terms of causal relationships is misleading and erroneous (Diamantopoulos
& Shlegelmilch, 2000). In essence, correlation only measured the strength of the relationship amongst all the variables understudy. The researcher therefore proceeded to conduct regression analysis to examine how the predictors of employee engagement predict employee engagement and in-turn how employee engagement predicts its outcome variables.

4.5.2.1 Regression Analysis of Employee Engagement and its predictors

The results of the regression tests are presented in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13: Coefficients - Employee Engagement and its predictors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.453</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>-1.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellbeing</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>-1.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Outputs</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People philosophy</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Growth</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Rewards</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Alignment</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 illustrates the predictive power of the predictors of employee engagement and employee engagement on a singular basis. The beta (β) coefficients show that work outputs, total
rewards and business alignment have the most predictive power and are the most significant predictors of employee engagement. This is shown by the positive betas’ of 0.383, 0.399 and 0.313 respectively. This in-turn means that wellbeing, employee growth and people philosophy have no predictive power on employee engagement as their beta values are -0.269, -0.019 and 0.295 respectively.

Results for work outputs (p = 0.044), total rewards (p = 0.001) and business alignment (0.005) in the regression model were statistically significant as their p values were less than 0.05. This therefore nullifies the predictive power of wellbeing (p = 0.101), employee growth (p = 0.863) and people philosophy (p = 0.074) as the p values are greater than 0.05.

Table 4.14 Analysis of Variance – Employee Engagement and it’s predictors

<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>Regression</td>
<td>33.519</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.587</td>
<td>36.231</td>
<td>.000a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10.022</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43.542</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), BusinessAlignment, Total Rewards, Wellbeing, Employee Growth, People Philosophy, Work Outputs.

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement

Table 4.14 shows that the predictors of employee engagement are effective in predicting employee engagement because the significant value of 0.000 is less than 0.05.

Table 4.15 Model Summary: Employee Engagement and it’s predictors.
The model summary displayed above shows that the predictors of employee engagement which are wellbeing, work outputs, people philosophy, employee growth, total rewards and business alignment have an explanatory power of 77% to employee engagement (R square = 0.77). This means that the remaining 23% is explained by other unknown predictors of employee engagement.

4.5.2.2 Regression Analysis of Employee Engagement and it’s Outcome Variables.

Having established the causal relationships between employee engagement and its predictors, the study further tested the relationship of employee engagement and its associated outcomes.

Table 4.16: Coefficients - Employee Engagement and Customer Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients^a</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>4.153</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>12.692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 illustrates the predictive power of employee engagement on a customer service. The beta value of 0.729 reveals that employee engagement has a strong predictive power on customer service and is also significant in explaining customer service as the p value of 0.000 is less than 0.05.
Table 4.17: Analysis of Variance – Employee Engagement and Customer Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Predictors: (Constant), Employee Engagement  
<sup>b</sup> Dependent Variable: Customer Service

Table 4.17 shows that employee engagement effectively predicts customer service as the significant value of 0.000 is less than 0.05.

Table 4.18: Model Summary – Employee Engagement and Customer Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Predictors: (Constant), Employee Engagement

The results in Table 4.18 above shows that employee engagement has a 70% explanatory power on customer service (R square = 0.697). However 30% of good customer service is explained by other factors.

Table 4.19: Coefficients - Employee Engagement and Discretionary Effort
Table 4.19 illustrates the predictive power of employee engagement on discretionary effort. The beta value of 0.760 reveals that employee engagement has a strong predictive power on discretionary effort. The p value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05 also indicates that employee engagement is significant in influencing discretionary effort exhibited by employees.

Table 4.20: Analysis of Variance – Employee Engagement and Discretionary Effort

Table 4.21: Model Summary – Employee Engagement and Discretionary Effort
The results in Table 4.21 reveals that employee engagement has a 62% explanatory power on the discretionary effort ($R^2 = 0.618$). This means 38% of employee discretionary effort is explained by other variables unknown to the researcher.

As highlighted in Table 4.22, employee engagement has a beta value of 0.665 and a significant value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05, this means that employee engagement has a significant predictive power on productivity.
Table 4.23: Analysis of Variance – Employee Engagement and Productivity

<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>Regression</td>
<td>19.241</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.241</td>
<td>89.607</td>
<td>.000a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>15.031</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34.272</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Engagement
b. Dependent Variable: Productivity

Table 4.23 above shows that employee engagement effectively predicts productivity as the significant value of 0.000 is less than 0.05.

Table 4.24: Model Summary – Employee Engagement and Productivity

<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>.749a</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.46338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Engagement

As indicated in table 4.24, employee engagement has a 56% explanatory power on productivity (R square = 56%). Meaning, 44% productivity is elucidated by other factors.

Table 4.25 Coefficients - Employee Engagement and Employee Retention and Absenteeism

Coefficientsa
As shown in Table 4.25, employee engagement has a more predictive power on employee retention and absenteeism. This is indicated by the beta value of 0.892 and the p value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05. Therefore, employee engagement is significant in explaining employee retention and absenteeism.

Table 4.26: Analysis of Variance – Employee Engagement and Employee Retention and Absenteeism

The anova Table 4.26 shows that employee engagement successfully predicts employee retention and absenteeism because the significant value of 0.000 is less than 0.05.
Table 4.27: Model Summary – Employee Engagement and Employee Retention and Absenteeism

<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>.891a</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.35894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Engagement

The model summary results in Table 4.27 above shows that the goodness of fit between employee engagement and employee retention and absenteeism. Employee engagement has a 79% explanatory power on employee retention and absenteeism (R square = 0.793). Only 21% of employee retention and absenteeism is explained by other factors unknown to the researcher.

4.6 TESTS OF INDEPENDENCE

The Kruskal Wallis test is a non-parametric test used to test the difference between two or more variables on a continuous scale. In this study the researcher undertook the Kruskal Wallis test to establish whether there were significant differences in responses in relation to employee occupational levels and employee qualifications across the outcomes of employee engagement which are customer service, employee retention and absenteeism, discretionary effort and productivity. For the independent tests to be statistically significant the p value result should be less than 0.05.

Table 4.28; Kruskal Wallis test on employee occupational level

Test Statistics^a,b
Table 4.28 above shows the results as follows, Customer Service (p value =0.603), employee retention and absenteeism (p value =0.040), discretionary effort (p value = 0.032) and productivity (p value = 0.171). The results for customer service and productivity reveal that there are no statistically significant differences in responses from all employees who took part in the survey, and these include non-managers, junior management, middle management and executives. This may be due to the principle that the customer is king and because of the need to preserve jobs considering the prevailing economic environment of Zimbabwe hence employees need to be continuously productive so as to justify their existence within organisations. The results for Employee retention and absenteeism and discretionary effort reveal that there were statistically significant differences in responses across employee levels. This may be attributed to the fact that every human being has a career life cycle hence occupying different levels within organisations translates to different aspirations and goals in the long term.

Table 4.29: Kruskal Wallis test on employee educational level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Customer Service</th>
<th>Employee Retention and Absenteeism</th>
<th>Discretionary Effort</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>3.124</td>
<td>2.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: Education
Further analysis on employee educational qualifications across the outcomes of employee engagement revealed that the independent test was statistically insignificant, this was because the P values of customer service, employee retention and absenteeism, discretionary effort and productivity were well greater than 0.05 as exhibited in Table 4.29 above. This means that employee engagement has little to do with an individual’s qualifications but is nurtured by what companies offer employees (DuBrin, 2005)

4.7 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS IN RELATION TO LITERATURE

The overall objective of the study was to identify and evaluate the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement amongst the Zimbabwean Building Societies. This survey arises from the need to understand employee engagement in the context of continued economic growth in Zimbabwe. Resultantly, extensive literature was reviewed in chapter two and six predictors of employee engagement together with four outcomes variables were identified. The discussion of the results will be based on both correlation and regression.

4.7.1. Correlation: Employee Engagement and its predictors

Wellbeing

The results revealed that there is a positive association between wellbeing and employee engagement. This means that the wellbeing of employees is essential in driving employee engagement levels. The results are however confirmed by Schaufeli and Bakker, (2004) who assert that a good state of mind and a positive working experience have a positive effect on employee engagement. Clearly, it is evident that employees believe that job autonomy and greater freedom drives engagement levels.
Work Output

The spearman’s correlation results showed that work output is positively correlated to employee engagement. This suggests that corporate and individual goals need to be properly aligned for engagement levels to increase. According to Emergence Growth Consultants, (2015), in cases where individual and organisational goals are not aligned organisations need to deliver on their commitments so as to boost employee engagement levels.

People Philosophy

The results showed that there is a moderate relationship between people philosophy and employee engagement. It is vividly clear that employees require business leaders to live the values of their organisations. This is because according to Emergence Growth Consultants, (2015) it has become essential for leaders of corporates to practice ethical behaviour within and outside the working environment, as their behaviour is under scrutiny by their employees.

Employee Growth

The correlation result of employee growth and employee engagement was positive. This means that organisations that fail to avail developmental and career growth opportunities run the risk of declining engagement levels. This is because employees will look for opportunities outside their organisations. Kular et.al, (2008) confirms that organisations that provide employees with growth opportunities in terms of learning new skills and developing their abilities and capabilities influence engagement levels because when companies invest in people, their employees invest in them.

Total Rewards

The correlation results showed that total rewards is positively correlated to employee engagement. The results however imply that if employees are adequately compensated for their contributions in the organisations, employee engagement levels increase. According to Emergence Growth Consultant, (2015) organisations need to reward employees in relation to market prevailing rates so that employees stop jerking from one organisation to another.

Business Alignment
Business alignment is positively related to employee engagement as shown by the correlation results. This means that there is need for fairness in the application of polices and procedures’ within organisations for employees to be engaged. This will in turn foster the alignment of employee and organisational goals.

4.7.2. Correlation: Employee Engagement and its predictors

Discretionary Effort

The correlation results revealed that there is a moderate association between employee engagement and discretionary effort. This means that for employees to exhibit more of discretionary effort, employees must be engaged to both the company and their job. According to Rana, Ardichvili, and Tkachenko, (2014) discretionary effort is a by-product of employee engagement because when an employee is engaged he or she exerts extra effort to either make up for a negative performance gap that may be created as a result of management inability or habitually low expectations.

Productivity

Spearman’s correlation results showed that employee engagement is positively correlated to productivity. According to Bhatnagar and Biswas, (2010) engaged employees have a greater chance of meeting their objectives, whilst the opposite being true. In essence meeting objectives is synonymous to being productive hence the greater the possibility of organisations meeting their targets and goals if employees are engaged. Further to that the 2006 employee engagement global study as cited by Bhatnagar and Biswas, (2010) revealed a dramatic difference in profit between organisations with highly engaged employees and organisations with low levels of engagement. Meaning, productivity is at the heart of employee engagement.
Employee Retention and Absenteeism

The correlation results showed that employee engagement is positively correlated to employee retention and absenteeism. This means that the more employees are engaged, the less the staff turnover and the associated costs of absenteeism. Leadership Insights, (2010) reveals the importance of employee retention and absenteeism by highlighting that the “two” ensure business continuity and achievement of organisational goals.

Customer Service

As revealed by the correlation results, employee engagement is positively related to customer service. This tacitly means that, the more employees are engaged, the better the customer service offered. If companies treat their employees in an equitable manner such that employees are engaged, there are higher chances of providing good customer service and retaining customers. Leadership Insights, (2010) confirms that engaged employees understand the value of ensuring good customer service and are likely to exhibit their commitment to the organisation by delivering quality and sound products and services.

4.7.3 Analysis of Regression Results

The Predictors of Employee Engagement.

Regression analysis was conducted to establish the causal relationship between employee engagement and it’s six predictors. Of the six independent predictors, three were found to be significant and had the most explanatory power on employee engagement, these variables include total rewards ($\beta=0.399$, p value = 0.001), business alignment($\beta=0.313$, p value = 0.005) and work outputs ($\beta=0.383$, p value = 0.044 ). 80% of the respondents indicated that total rewards was the most important predictor of employee engagement. These results were however consistent with the results of the africa employee engagement survey conducted by Emergency Growth Consultants in 2014. In their report, Emergency Growth, (2014) stated that total rewards
address the basic needs of employees which include the bread and butter issues, as such total rewards serve as an important incentive for continued hard work. Dubrin, (2005) in his motivational research study indicated that no motivational plan is a substitute for adequate compensation, so indeed no employee engagement initiatives are a substitute for adequate compensation, as revealed by the study results. In contrast, a global study conducted by Towers Perin, (2003) cited by Kular et.al, (2008) reveal that rewards and benefits play a minimum role in fostering engagement, the fundamental predictors of employee engagement according to Towers Perin include, accountability, strong leadership, growth and autonomy. However, Lewis, (2014) suggests that whilst other predictors of employee engagement are ranked highly in comparison to others, organisations should not neglect the other predictors as this may in-fact affect future engagement levels.

The results also revealed that when the values and goals of both the organisation and that of an employee are properly aligned, employee engagement levels increase. 60% of the respondents believe that proper alignment of values increase engagement levels (business alignment $\beta=0.313$, p value = 0.005). According to Emergence Growth Consultants, (2015) there is a positive relationship between successful corporates and effective goal setting. In essence, employees should know how their individual goals build to the overall corporate strategy. This is because corporates that are strategically minded have an in-depth strategic insight of their employees which they use for their competitive advantage.

Where employee growth ($\beta=-0.019$, p value = 0.863) is concerned, only 30% of the employees considered employee growth as a predictor of employee engagement. In this regard, the results were not consistent with literature as the national employee engagement survey conducted by IPC in 2014 revealed that career development and advancement remained the major predictor of employee engagement. Rama, Joshi, and Sodhi, (2011), assert that an organisation with clear polices and procedures on the advancement and development of employees foster and encourage employee engagement. It has also been predicted that learning organisations are the only to survive in this global competitive environment(Rama, et.al 2011). Kular et.al, (2008), was however of the opinion that developmental courses that tend to focus on employee weaknesses result in employee disengagement. Clearly training and development according to Rama et.al,
(2011) has become a number game were emphasis is now on cost containment and not employee growth.

People philosophy was not a popular driver of employee engagement in this study (β=0.295, p value = 0.074). However, this was contrary to literature as according to Lewis, (2014) leadership is one of the key enablers of employee engagement, an organisation can never be the best employer if it does not have strong leadership. However, Kular et.al, (2008) asserts that the predictors of employee engagement are a handful as such employees respond to these in varying degrees and in response to the resources they receive from organisations.

**Employee engagement**

The results revealed that employee engagement is an emotional and rational commitment exhibited by employees to their job and the organisation. This is so because 80% of the respondents highlighted that they were committed to both their jobs and the organisation. This is supported by Lewis, (2014) contention that for engagement to take place, employees need to be intellectually and emotionally committed to their jobs and the organisation. The rational commitment is brought about by the predictors of employee engagement which were discussed above. Emotional commitment is realised when employees believe that their organisation values and cares for them. Cook, (2008) however supports formalised employee engagement models that promote employee welfare and wellbeing whilst at the same time providing concrete outcomes for the organisations benefit. Kular et.al, (2008) however confirms that employee engagement is multifaceted and that there is no one size fit all group of predictors that motivate employees to be engaged to their company.

**The Outcomes of Employee Engagement**

The results from the study revealed that employee engagement (β=0.313, p value = 0.000, R Square = 0.618)has a predictive power of 62% on discretionary effort. However the researcher’s assumption is that since most respondents occupied a managerial grade, it would appear that managerial employees are more engaged than non-managers as they are the ones permitted to exercise discretion. According to Lewis, (2014) one of the behavioural outcomes of employee engagement is the increase in discretionary effort. This is because employees that are engaged to their jobs have lower intentions to quit especially when the going gets tough (Bhatnagar &
Biswas, 2010). It is true that discretionary effort is withdrawn when employees are disengaged as employees just do the bare minimum to keep their jobs.

As evidenced from the results, employee engagement ($\beta=0.892$, p value = 0.000, R Square = 0.793) plays a pivotal role in retaining critical skills for any organisation. Considering the current economic environment, retaining talent has become one of the biggest challenges in 2015 for many organisations notwithstanding the building societies. The findings of the study were in consensus with Bhatnagar and Biswas, (2010) view that top talent is only retained if employees are engaged. However where absenteeism is concerned, engaged employees are usually exultant with their personal life and job, hence less time is spent absconding from duty (Lewis, 2014).

The study also revealed that an engaged workforce ($\beta=0.665$, p value = 0.000, R Square = 0.561) increases productivity in organisations. 75% of the respondents’ highlighted that if employees are engaged to their jobs and their organisation, there is a greater possibility that their performance is beyond satisficing. This is because as alluded to by Bhatnagar and Biswas, (2010) corporate goals and objectives are easily achieved if employees are engaged and are also likely to fall short if employees are dis-engaged. This is because disengaged employees exhibit effortless behaviour and usually display role incompetence. However other scholars like Rama, et.al (2011) assert that employee engagement is difficult to sustain within pressured work units especially during difficult economic times. Kular et.al, (2008), assert that disengaged employees can also be productive, especially if employees are paid in accordance to how productive they are. This however explains why employee engagement has a explanatory power of 56% to productivity as according to the results of this study.

4.8 HYPOTHESIS TESTING

The research conducted was based on a conceptual framework formulated as a result of reviewed literature. The model had three variables, namely the predictors of employee engagement, employee engagement and the outcomes of employee engagement. This model was in turn used to confirm whether there is a positive relationship amongst the predictors of employee
engagement, employee engagement and the outcomes of employee engagement. The result of the hypothesis test is as follows;

The regression analysis proved that the predictors of employee engagement had a contributory power of 77% to employee engagement, which was a significant high result. Employee engagement had a contributory power of 70%, 62%, 56% and 79% to customer service, discretionary effort, productivity and employee retention and absenteeism respectively. However, since the fundamental thrust of the research was to evaluate the predictors of employee engagement and its associated outcomes, the critical predictors of employee engagement that emerged are total rewards, business alignment and work outputs. This is as a result of their P values being less than 0.05. The outcome variables were all statistically significant as their p values were all less than 0.05, it is however the contributory power of employee engagement that varied across the outcomes of employee engagement as indicated above.

With regards to the forgoing and from a causal point of view, the study hypothesis which stated that; there is a positive relationship amongst the predictors of employee engagement, employee engagement, and the outcomes of employee engagement was thus partially accepted because the results are mixed.

Therefore the model can be statistically expressed as

**Predictors of employee engagement** = \(-0.453 + (0.383 \times \text{work outputs}) - (0.269 \times \text{wellbeing}) + (0.295 \times \text{people philosophy}) - (0.019 \times \text{employee growth}) + (0.399 \times \text{total rewards}) + (0.313 \times \text{business alignment})\)

**Outcomes of employee engagement** = \(0.904 + (0.729 \times \text{employee engagement}) + 1.035 + (0.760 \times \text{employee engagement}) + 1.627 + (0.665 \times \text{employee engagement}) + 0.421 + (0.892 \times \text{employee engagement})\).

**4.9 CHAPTER SUMMARY**
To summarise the chapter, the overall response rate of the study was 84%. Data collected was analysed using SPSS package, resultantly the correlation and regression of variables was conducted. All predictors of employee engagement were positively correlated to employee engagement and the coefficients were all in the medium range. Employee engagement was also positively correlated to its outcomes.

The regression analysis of the predictors of employee engagement revealed that work outputs, business alignment and total rewards were statistically significant and had a significant explanatory power on employee engagement, whilst people philosophy, wellbeing and employee growth were not statistically significant in explaining employee engagement. Employee engagement however proved to explain customer service, productivity, employee retention and absenteeism and discretionary effort. The hypothesis of the study was thus partially confirmed wherein it stated that there was a positive relationship between the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement.

Overall the results were more or less similar to literature, except that the most common globally accepted predictors of employee engagement which include wellbeing, people philosophy and employee growth proved to have a statistically insignificant explanatory power on employee engagement.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER 5

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Throughout the chapters of this research, the researcher endeavoured to knit a logical and clear thread that linked the Statement of the problem, the study objectives, the conceptual framework, the research methodology, data gathering and the results of the study. This chapter however sums up the research study by summarising the research findings in accordance to the research objectives as outlined in chapter 1. In the same vein, the researcher also offers important and significant recommendations that emanated from the survey results. This chapter will also provide the research limitations as well as suggest areas of further research.
5.2 CONCLUSIONS

The overall mandate of the research was to identify the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement of the Zimbabwe Building Societies. As revealed by the research results, a unique group of predictors were identified on behalf of the employers of the Building Societies. However, the results of the research will be summed up in accordance with the research objectives.

Objective 1: To establish the predictors of employee engagement.

The research established that total rewards, business alignment and work outputs were the main predictors of employee engagement for the employees employed by the Building Societies. In essence, the employers of the Building Societies may make use of this group of predictors to drive engagement in their respective organisations. These results were however partially the same with literature, the only point of divergence was when employee growth was dropped as one of the main predictors of employee engagement. This could be because of the prevailing economic environment in Zimbabwe, where employees are more concerned with bread and butter issues as well as job security. However, according to literature the key message on employee growth was that employees are biased towards organisations that provide and develop their skills.

The study also identified the bottom three predictors of employee engagement, this is in relation to the conceptual framework adopted by the researcher. These predictors include employee growth, people philosophy and wellbeing. Though less emphasis maybe given to these predictors, it is also important for the Building Societies not to shelve them because employees are unpredictable, unique and that times change.

Objective 2: To establish the outcomes of employee engagement.

The associated outcomes of the predictors of employee engagement in the research were customer service, productivity, discretionary effort and employee retention and absenteeism. The results were very much related to literature, this is because the outcomes of employee
engagement are known to be positive. This is why corporates with highly engaged employees are sustainably successful in comparisons with other companies were employee engagement levels are low. However, although the study established the four positive outcomes of employee engagement, some scholars were of the view that the longer an employee works for an organisation, the less engaged they become. The outcomes of employee engagement identified by the study reveal that employee engagement is closely concomitant to employee perceptions and feelings of being involved and valued. Meaning, management should move from transactional to transformational leadership style.

**Objective 3: To recommend appropriate strategies of improving employee engagement levels in Zimbabwe Building Societies.**

As outlined in objective 2 above, the benefits of employee engagement are positive in nature. However to gain the maximum benefits of employee engagement, the following strategies can be employed by the Building Societies with regards to the top three employee engagement predictors identified.

**Total Rewards**

Total rewards include benefits (both financial and non-financial) and pay flexibility, it is therefore imperative for the Building Societies to:

- Link performance with pay
- Pay market rate of salaries. This is because employees have a tendency of comparing themselves with their colleagues.

**Work Output**

As work output encompasses employee opinions of the work dynamics the Building Societies may consider;

- Aligning employee and organisational goals. This can be achieved if organisations deliver their commitment to employees.

**Business Alignment**
In a nutshell, since business alignment is the extent to which employees are committed to organisational goals, policies and procedures, the Building Societies may consider employing the following:

- Ensure fairness in the application of policies and procedures across all employees regardless of age, gender, race, position and religion. This will promote a culture of transparency, equity and equality.

5.3 THE RESEARCH PROPOSITION

As stated in the earlier chapters, the study sought to confirm whether there is a positive relationship between employee engagement and its outcome variables. The results of the survey partially confirmed the hypothesis to be true. This is because the study produced mixed results, some predictors were significant whilst others were not. The predictors that were significant were total rewards, work outputs and business alignment whilst the insignificant predictors included people philosophy, employee growth and wellbeing.

5.4 CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY

Overall, the study has added some flavour to the already existing body of knowledge on employee engagement. Similarly, the study has opened other dimensions of employee engagement that need further research.

5.5 MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The six predictors of employee engagement assessed in this survey are positively correlated to each other. It is therefore imperative to believe that the predictors of employee engagement are
all in the control of line managers. This implicitly means that every supervisor, manager and director should be an employee engagement champion always looking for means and ways for subordinates to be customer focused, productive and exert more discretionary effort.

It is important to consider that employees perceive line managers to be agents of organisations, this in-turn means that the support of these supervisors and managers shapes and moulds employee acuities. Symthe, (2007) observed that employee engagement has been taken at ransom by leaders of corporations and resultanty has not been given prominence as an important management philosophy.

There are requirements for managers to be engagement driven, these requirements include being competent communicators, results driven, technically functional in their work areas and interested in employee further development. These in all are not traits that can be developed overnight, hence in essence, there is need for management and leadership developmental programs that factor in these fundamentals into their programs.

It is imperative to state that managers need to comprehend that employee engagement is not a simple concept, this is because there are many building blocks that build towards high employee engagement levels. As revealed by the study, the many misconceptions that employee engagement is all about rewards fall away. This is because total rewards is just but one of the many predictors of employee engagement. The major challenge in the working environment is that managers assume that it is the duty of human resource departments to ensure that employees are happy. It is however the duty of line management and supervisors to enhance employee engagement, whilst at the same time reducing employee stress levels so as to produce what is termed managing for sustainable employee engagement. In summary according to Lewis, (2014) there are five behavioural themes that build on sustainable employee engagement that management should foster on and these include

1. Fairness and consistency.
2. Conflict Management.
3. Knowledge Management.
4. Building and sustaining relationships.
5. Supporting employee development.
5.6 RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

The major limitation of the study is that the study was sorely biased towards the building societies hence the results cannot be generalised to other sectors or industries. However, the study may be used for comparative purposes especially amongst the banks and the microfinance institutions as they all fall within the financial services sector.

5.7 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. As the research revealed that the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement are largely influenced by management, management must cultivate a sense of community and display favourable behaviours so as to gain employee buy-in and commitment.
2. Corporate leaders need to value employee engagement the same way they emphasize on the attainment of corporate targets. This is because vigorous business oriented measurement and evaluation is vital to identify employee engagement drivers for any organisation.
3. Measuring employee engagement. Organisations need to constantly measure their employee engagement levels, so that they improve or build on their employee engagement initiatives. These surveys help organisations to develop a benchmark against which they are able to track and monitor progress. This will also help uncover barriers to employee engagement.

5.8 AREAS OF FURTHER RESEARCH
Employee engagement though a relatively new concept promises to be an interesting phenomenon in the business environment if further investigation is undertaken. The major purpose or drive for further research is to enable organisations to take advantage of the various benefits underpinning employee engagement. Provided below is the list of the suggested areas of study;

- To conduct an explorative study on how best managers can be supported to achieve a sustainable employee engagement framework for organisations.
- To conduct a similar study, but in this case supported by contextual analysis and interviews so as to gain a holistic view on the predictors and outcomes of employee engagement.
- As indicated in the early chapters of this study, there is rational and emotional engagement, future research could include a larger range of employee engagement antecedents that are associated with the types of engagement.
- Future research could consider employee diversity as a variable that predicts employee engagement.
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QUESTIONNAIRE

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PREDICTORS AND OUTCOMES OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT
A CASE OF ZIMBABWE BUILDING SOCIETIES

Section a
Part A: Demographic information.

Section B
Part B: The predictors of employee engagement
Part C: Employee engagement
Part D: The outcomes of employee engagement

As you complete the questionnaire please share your honest opinions. Please note the information completed on this questionnaire is confidential. Do not write your name or personal contacts on this questionnaire.

SECTION A

PART A : DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Instruction: Read each statement and carefully cross out (X) or tick on the one option which best represents your view.

1. GENDER
   Male  ☐  Female  ☐
   Prefer not to answer  ☐

2. AGE RANGE
   18-30  ☐  31-40  ☐
   41-50  ☐  51-60  ☐
   Prefer not to answer  ☐

3. LENGTH OF SERVICE
   0-5 years  ☐  6-10 years  ☐
   11-15 years  ☐  16-20 years  ☐
   21-25 years  ☐  over 26 years  ☐
   Prefer not to answer  ☐

4. OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY
   Non-Manger  ☐  Lower Management  ☐
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SECTION B

Instructions: Read every statement cautiously and cross out (X) or tick on the best option which represents your view.

Choices: Strongly agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The predictors of employee engagement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WELLBEING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. My present health state (mental &amp; physical) permits me to do my job efficiently and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My organisation is environmentally and socially responsible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am generally happy at my organisation every day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am able to balance my personal and work commitments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK OUTPUTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I understand how my objectives are overall linked to the company strategic objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My goals and my supervisor’s expectations are clear to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I really enjoy my work every day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have all the resources and tools necessary for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
me to be productive.

9. The work processes within the organisation i.e. project planning, quality control and goal setting permit me to be productive.

10. I get the support I need from the organisation to develop new ideas.

PEOPLE PHILOSOPHY

11. Our leaders run the organisation very well.

12. Senior management have positioned the organisation for success in the long term.

13. The decisions made by our leaders are good for the business and myself.

14. I get the support I need from my manager.

15. Our organisation’s values are consistently demonstrated through our leaders’ behaviour and actions.

16. Our leaders are honest and open when they communicate.

17. We are all treated fairly and consistently.

EMPLOYEE GROWTH

18. There is career growth within our organisation for the high performers.

19. This company champions employee learning and development.

20. My future career opportunities within this organisation are promising.

REWARDS & RECOGNITION

21. Whenever the organisation performs well, I am rewarded accordingly.

22. My salary depends on my performance.

23. I am fairly paid in comparison with the market rates.

24. I get the necessary recognition beyond my salary and benefits for the contributions I make.

BUSINESS ALIGNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. I am happy to be part of this organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My values are aligned with the organisation’s values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. This organisation has a strong reputation in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT – PART C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Overall, I am content with my organisation and job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I am motivated to see my company succeed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Every day, I am excited and happy to go to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTCOMES OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT - PART D

CUSTOMER SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. In the event that a customer is dissatisfied, I ensure that the problem is solved to their satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. I respond timely and courteously to meet customer needs.

33. The average customer service I provide meets the required standards of the building society.

**EMPLOYEE RETENTION & ABSENTEEISM**

34. I occasionally do not come to work because of my physical and mental health.

35. I would recommend my family and friends to apply for a job at my organisation.

36. My job makes a difference to me.

**DISCRETIONARY EFFORT**

37. I go an extra mile whilst performing my duties.

38. I am determined to do my best at work each day.

**PRODUCTIVITY**

Instruction – rate your productivity level in comparison with the average employee in your position.
Options – 20% and below, 21 -30%, 50%, 51-79% & 80%+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>80%+</th>
<th>51-79%</th>
<th>Middle 50%</th>
<th>21-30%</th>
<th>20% and below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. Meeting goals and deadlines.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Productive time spent doing work related tasks.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Getting the job done.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for participating and sharing your views