RE-EXPLORE THE VIABILITY AND AUTHENTICITY OF GALLUP WORKPLACE AUDIT IN PRIVATE UNIVERSITY

Ruchi KHANNA ID *

School of Management, Babu Banarsi Das University, Lucknow, India

Abstract. *Purpose* – Employee productivity is directly affected by the employee engagement. Researchers have continuously been focused on whether people working in the organisation are satisfied with the work or not. The Gallup 12 Workplace Audit is an instrument used to measure employee engagement. The purpose of this study is to re-explore the viability of this instrument in an educational context. The secondary objective of this study is to find out if The Gallup Work Audit instrument, which is an international survey, can be used in the educational sector in the context of India for measuring faculties' engagement.

Research methodology – A cross-sectional analysis with grab sampling was used. Descriptive statistics, such as frequency counts, were used to describe the sample. Acceptable internal consistency was reached through exploratory factor analysis.

Findings – First results showed that none of the items needed to be eliminated from the scale and that the scale had very high reliability. Acceptable internal consistency was reached through an exploratory factor analysis which resulted in a one-factor model of work engagement.

Research limitations – The data collection for the study was limited to one major university, therefore generalisation the results must be done with great care.

Implications – This study helps universities to identify their critical drivers of employee engagement, and gives them a clear understanding of their construct.

Originality – This study is one of the first attempts to re-explore the viability and authenticity of Gallup Workplace Audit in educational institution (university level).

Keywords: Gallup, employee engagement, private university, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity.

JEL Classification: M00, M1, M10, M12.

Introduction

Today's organisations are facing the challenge of remaining competitive (Koyuncu et al., 2006). This creates performance pressure on the organisation to introduce technological advances in their operations and management, progressively increase workforce diversity and

---

*Corresponding author. E-mail: *khannaruchi8080@gmail.com*

business globalisation (Burkea & Ngbe, 2006). Organisation leaders clearly have seen that human resources are vital in improving organisational productivity in comparison to other resources like money, merchandises and technology (Lawler, 2003; Burke & Cooper, 2005). Traditionally organisation measures their performance on the basis of financial and business measures. (Koyun-cu et al., 2006). No doubt such financial measures like revenue, cash flow and profitability were an important index of measuring the performance of the business. Apart from these so-called "soft" leaders who are people-oriented and measures like employees' attitude, their perception and well-being are also widely recognised (Müller & Turner, 2010). That is employee engagement becomes a part of strategic management in an organisation. Deloitte conducts a survey of 531 employees of South African descent around the world to identify the staff issues faced by the companies (De Beer, 2007). Majority of the respondents said that employees were very important for the organisations' performance, especially in strategic challenges. According to Demerouti and Cropanzano (2010), job satisfaction is associated with employee engagement. A Gallup organisation conducted a meta-analysis and deduces that companies profitable work units have people who do what they do best, they work with those people whom they like and have a good sense of psychological ownership of the outcomes of their work (Shuck, 2011). The concept of employee engagement basically measures the happiness of employees with their respective jobs, the environment of work and performance level efficiency. To manage high morale among employees can be beneficial to any organisation. High morale leads to loyalty among workers towards the organisation. Dynamically engaged workers are productive for the company. Those organisations that have a high level of employee engagement are more productive and profitable than those who do not have high levels of employee engagement.

Every organisation wants that their employees gave their best to the organisation and remained in the organisation; for that purpose a conducive environment is developed and created, where every employee gives his/her best to the organisation and contributes to the overall success of the organisation.

As per the Gallup Institute, merely 15% of employees can be called completely engaged in their work worldwide, and the remaining 85% are disengaged or we can say that actively not engaged in their work (Gallup, 2017). As per Forbes 2014, the reason for "disengagement crisis" depends on the lack of support to employees in accomplishing which they perceive they get for themselves when they get meaningful results. Company returns and profitability declined due to low level of employee engagement, Teresa Amabile of the Harvard Business School, cited in Forbes (2014). In Great Britain, it has also been confirmed by The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (2009) that low level of engagement of employees negatively affect the UK economy. Therefore there is a need to understand employee engagement and its impact.

Employee engagement is a key factor which contributes to organisational productivity, performance and long term survival (e.g., Nowack, 2006; Hewitt Associates, 2004). Employee productivity and overall productivity of the organisation is directly affected by the engaged employees. This is also true for the educational institution because they are profoundly human resource-driven.

Engaged and qualified teachers are an asset in any educational system. Teachers are helpful in transforming an individual. Teachers are lampposts for the future generation. They contribute to making learned individual, and these individuals contribute to creating India.

1. Employee engagement: a perspective

There are the various authors who define employee engagement from various perspectives. One of them, Goffman (1961), lay out that the notion of engagement is embedded in the role theory. He defined engagement as the "spontaneous involvement in the role" and the "visible investment of attention and muscular effort" (as cited in Wildermuth & Pauken, 2008).

Csikszentmihalyi (1982) defined a flow concept of employee engagement, wherein flow is a complete consciousness which employees experience when they are fully involved in their work.

Kahn (1990) postulated three aspects of employee engagement (1) cognitive aspect (employee satisfaction, belief in the value system of the organisation), (2) emotional aspect (type of attitude towards the organisation and its leadership/top management level, pride), and (3) behavioural aspect (commitment towards the discretionary aspects of the job, willingness to work overtime). The demand for the author is extensively acknowledged in academic literature. Various researcher use this particular definition in their research work (Alfes & Truss, 2013; Badal & Harter, 2014; Kim & Koo, 2017; Rahman et al., 2017; Zhong et al., 2016).

According to Schaufeli et al. (2002) engagement means "an affirmative, satisfying, work-related state of mind that is categorised by vigour, dedication and absorption". Several researchers have used the particular definitions in their research work (Akhtar et al., 2016; Bal & De Lange, 2015; Eldor & Harpaz, 2016; Eldor, 2017, etc.). Kahn's model has been tested by May et al. (2004) and they found that the psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability are positively connected to engagement.

In the words of Robinson et al. (2004), engagement is one step forward of commitment. Employee engagement means employees' positive approach towards their organisation and its values, where employees know very well the business context and what work they perform which improves job and effectiveness of the organisation. His study focused the two-way nature of employee engagement.

An 18-item scale developed by Hewitt Associates (2004) is used to measure employee engagement. They measured three primary behaviours and described engagement as "the condition in which individuals are intellectually and emotionally dedicated to the organisation or group. The three primary measures are: Say (Employees speak or communicate positively about the organisation from inside and outside), Stay (Employees show strong wish to be a member of the organisation) and Strive (Employees put additional effort and involve those behaviours that add to business success)". Say, Stay and Strive these three behaviours are demonstrated by engaged employees.

Fleming and Asplund (2007, p. 2) went one step further and introduced engagement as an employee: "ability to capture the head, heart and souls of your employees, to create an inner desire and passion for excellence", further noting that the employees who want their organization to succeed feel emotionally, socially, and even spiritually attached to its mission, vision, and purpose.

In the words of Newman and Harrison (2008) engagement is the concurrent existence of three behaviours in employees, namely, the job performance, involvement and citizenship behaviour. Robertson-Smith and Markwick (2009) define engagement as an important however complex challenge, but in spite of this, there is a greater chance of the discussion of various approaches. Simpson (2009) reviewed various literature and highlighted the four lines of engagement research and concentrated on the determinants and significances of engagement at work.

Bijaya Kumar Sundaray (2011) concentrated on several features or issues which lead to employee engagement and what company should do to elicit engagement in employees. Appropriate consideration on strategies of engagement will increase the effectiveness of organisation in terms of higher productivity, quality, profits, employee retention, customer satisfaction, and increased adaptability.

Cook (2012) defines engagement as "how positively the employee thinks about the organisation, feels about the organisation and is proactive in relation to achieving organisational goals for customers, colleagues and other stakeholders".

2. Literature review

Extensive literature is found which shows the benefits of employee engagement. Purcell et al. (2003) underlined that if there is a proper sharing of responsibility among workers and management over the issues of substance then only employee engagement is meaningful. Their study also shows that the job is affected by the involvement of employees in decisions making, and was highly related or connected with high levels of employee engagement thus indicating it is an important driver.

Harter, Schmidt and Hayes (2002) found in their study that productivity, profitability and customer satisfaction is positively influenced by the employee engagement and also discovered that employee turnover is reduced through employee engagement. In 2004, Harter, Asplund and Flemming found in their study that there is a positive correlation between employee engagement and business revenue. Perrin (2007) found in his study that there is a positive association between employee engagement and company financial performance that is operating income and per share earnings. Earlier in 2004 the same kind of study published by Hewitt Associates and by the American Society for Training and Development in 2007 exhibited there is positive impact of employee engagement on shareholder return. Evidence is also available that suggests that higher levels of organisational profits achieved as a result of employee engagement get translated into higher pay, perks and promotions for the employees (Konrad, 2006). Therefore, employee engagement benefits all stakeholders – shareholders, top management and employees.

In 2000, Klein and Kozlowski revealed that role played by a supervisor creates an environment of belief, open communication, respect and cordiality. This study shows that an environment significantly increases employee engagement. Pinto and Prescott (1988) conducted a study and their results confirmed by the Labianca et al. (2000) and they included role clarity in the driver list of employee engagement. Harter et al. (2002) found in their study that employee satisfaction was significantly hypothesised with employee engagement. They

also found that safety measures have a significant impact on employee engagement. Harter et al. (2004) subsequently conducted a study and recognised that industry to industry the drivers of employee engagement differ and significantly dependent on the type of job performed and the image of the organisation. Further, Pfeffer (2003) advised that a community culture be nurtured by teamwork and association. In such a culture, employees are expected to develop a sense of belonging that increases involvement and engagement (Pfeffer, 2003). Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) found out in their study that quality of supervision, trust in leadership, job components, pay system and reward all of these drivers engaged employees. In the year 2005, Latham and Pinder recognised fairness of the reward system and cooperation of employer as important factors of employee engagement. Heger (2007), identified in their study supervisor and leadership support, personal recognition, career and skill advancement opportunities, teamwork and an ethical work culture as key drivers of employee engagement (Heger, 2007).

Ruck and Trainor (2012) considered that open and clear communication can foster employee engagement. Bakker, Demerouti and Ten (2012) separated the emotional drivers (personal influence) of employee engagement from its rational drivers (pay, perquisites, promotions). Witemeyer (2013) figured out quality of supervision, rational communication, belief amongst employees and management, security of job, training and development, recognition, and satisfaction of job as determinants of employee engagement. Rasheed, Khan and Ramzan (2013) found in their study that organisational justice, supervisor support and organisational support significantly increase employee engagement in service industry.

A. A. Albdour and I. I. Altarawneh (2014) finding showed that employees of frontline who possess high level of engagement in job and organisation have high level of emotional and normative commitment. Meanwhile employees who have high level of job engagement evocatively affect maintenance commitment of employees. In their study they examine the connectivity between the two measurements of employee engagement that is job engagement and organisational engagement, and organisational commitment assessed by three important measurements that are as follows: affective (emotional) commitment; continuance (maintenance) commitment; and normative commitment. Badal and Harter (2014) found in their study that at the business unit level, employee engagement and gender diversity forecast financial performance individualistically. Anitha (2014) found in her study that all the recognised factors were forecasters of employee engagement and relationship between team and co-worker and working environment had major effect on employee engagement.

Shuck and Zigarmi (2015) found in their study that there was a positive association between self-determination theory (SDT) and engagement. Benn et al. (2015) showed in their study that involvement in environmental activities is related directly with employee engagement at greater level with the organisation, higher grading of their organisation's environmental performance, and minimal desire to leave the organisation. This study also emphasised on other aspects of ecological initiatives that may affect attitudes of employees. Bal and De Lange (2015) found in their study that engagement mediated the associations between accessibility of flexibility in human resource management and job performance. Besides, their study partially support the moderating role of age of workers in the connection of human resource management flexibility with the outcomes.

Mozammel and Haan (2016) found in their study that there is a positive impact on resources and compensation on employee engagement. These results are mirrored in the work of Ghosh, Rai, Chauhan, Baranwal and Srivastava (2016). Mishra and Mohanty (2016) found in their study that there is an impact of company reputation, work environment, senior leadership, process and manager on employee engagement. Jaewon (2016) found in his study that there is a significant positive correlation between perceived customer participation and employee engagement.

Osman and Mehmet (2016) found in their study that there is positive impact of support of organisation and mission fulfilment of organisation on employee engagement. Akhtar et al. (2016) found in their study all the variables positively related with each other. High performance work practices had positive and significant effect on the engagement and performance of employees. It also shows that employee engagement mediated the association between employee performance and high performance work practices. Eldor and Harpaz (2016) found during their work that employee engagement mediates the association between the perceived learning climate and extra role performance behaviours. Obeidat (2016) found in his study, organisational performance positively and significantly associated with internal and external corporate social responsibility and employee engagement (potency, attentiveness, and commitment). It was also revealed that there was a significant positive association between employee engagement and internal/external corporate social responsibility. Lin et al. (2016) showed that engagement mediated the associations amongst future work self-salience and both supervisor-rated and archival sales performance. It was also found that FWSS was positively associated with employees' report of engagement, and which was positively associated with employees' supervisor-rated performance and sales performance records of company.

Reijseger et al. (2017) showed a direct negative connectivity between engagement and counter productivity and indirectly positive connectivity through open mindedness, here open mindedness act as a mediator. Eldor (2017) conducted his study in Israel organisation and found that organisational politics' perceptions strengthen the associations between employee engagement and their behaviours. Engaged employees are more innovative, adaptive and practical when they recognise their workplace to be political, and they are ready to share their knowledge with their peers. For some employees who are actively indulged and engaged in their jobs, politics becomes opportunity and a challenge for them. Bailey et al. (2017) found in their study there were five factors – leadership, organisational and team factor, psychological states, organisational intervention, and job design – that served as antecedents. It was also found that morale of the individual, performance of the task, extra-role performance and performance of the organisation are positively related with engagement but at the same time it was also seen that evidence was most vigorous in relation to task performance. Kim and Koo (2017) showed that innovative behaviour and job engagement is significantly influenced by LMX, but organisation engagement was not significantly affected by LMX. Innovative behaviour and organisation engagement significantly affected by job engagement, but job performance was not significantly influenced by job engagement. Job performance significantly influenced by organization engagement, but innovative behaviour was not significantly affected by organisation engagement. Innovative behaviour significantly influence job performance.

Suhartanto and Brien (2018) conducted his research study in front line retail employees and his result showed that organisational engagement and job engagement are key determinants of retail store performance and he also found the relationship between these engagements.

Salahudin et al. (2019) research results showed no significant differences amongst the different demographics of the bankers, in relations of employee engagement and intentions of employees turnover, except income level. It was also found that there was a significant impact of employee engagement on turnover intentions among the respondents.

2.1. Measuring employee engagement

In the year 2002 the phrase employee engagement was used to convey that it is not only the case of being satisfied with the work and the organisation, but also gives best effort on day to day or regular basis and planning to stay (Branham, 2006). Consulting firms like Gallup, Hewitt and others used this definition and developed survey of employee engagement. This survey gives insight to companies to know or assess what percentage of employees are actually enthusiastic, devoted and loyal – in other words how engaged they are in the company. From 2006 number of companies replace old concept of "satisfaction" survey to "engagement" surveys (Branham, 2006). Branham (2006, p. 1) is convinced that as a tool of measuring "employee engagement" is much better as compared to "employee satisfaction", because it fixed a more advance standard of what the companies wish and hope to receive from the employees".

There are two methodologies on the subject of employee engagement as per The Employee Engagement Report 2006 (BlessingWhite, 2006), which included research on 714 surveys across North America, Europe, and Asia-Pacific:
  – Programmatic – employee engagement is done through committed programmes. Surveys of employee engagement and distinctive index scores are used, that concentrate on the items of the lowermost performing surveys.
  – Philosophical – employee engagement is a management philosophy. Its concerns are human resource practices. It emphasises bringing results in definite business primacies.

It has been seen that the companies who have devoted, engaged employees are using custom made surveys of engagement for measuring engagement level of employees (46%) rather than those who opine that engagement is an overall philosophy (10%). 8% of the first group said that probably they do not assess levels of engagement. In comparison to small organisations big organisations (above ten thousand employees) properly measure employee engagement. 81% of respondents of big organisations said that for measuring employee engagement levels either they used custom made employee engagement survey or usual employee survey. 60% of respondents of small organisations said that they are using surveys for this objective.

The Employee Engagement Report (2006) found that respondents who measured engagement were more likely to report higher engagement levels. One-quarter said that their employees were, on average, "highly engaged", compared to only half that percentage of those who did not measure engagement. Similarly, 32% of respondents who did not measure engagement estimated their engagement levels as low; only 15% of those measuring did the same.

It is clear from the above discussion, it can be stated that those organisations who have hard facts are more likely to see high engagement levels, and less likely to see low engagement levels. If the organisations want to engage their employee, it is advisable to measure employee engagement levels.

2.2. The development of the workplace audit (GWA)

The Gallup organisation decided in the mid 1980s that an exceptional opinion-based feedback process needs to be designed for employers of big and small organisation. The main objective of this tool was to find out and measure the employees' engagement factors, which were associated with the better organisation outcomes like productivity, value generations, sales, etc. It started with focus group interviews in different companies across different industries. Employees of productive departments were involved in every focus group. From above Gallup has been conducting thousands of such group interviews.

Comprehensive surveys were developed through the focus group interview, which comprises of questions, associated with all facets of employees work experience. Then these surveys were conducted to over a million of workforce (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999). Firstly five elements were developed:

1. *Work environment/procedures:* it is concerned with the physical condition of organisation such as office temperature, equipment, salary, companies guidelines, health and safety, and welfare facilities.
2. *Immediate supervisor:* it concerns those issues related to the employees' behaviour toward their immediate supervisor, such as selection, acceptance, faith, development, consideration and discipline.
3. *Team/co-worker:* it concerns issues related to the views of employees towards their team members, like teamwork, faith, confidence, shared goals and communication.
4. *Overall company/senior management:* it concerns those issues related to the initiative taken by the company leaders, like the employees' trust in the mission and policy of the company's, or leader's competence.
5. *Individual commitment/service intention:* it concerns issues related to the commitment of employees towards their company and its stakeholders, like the employees' wish to stay the entire career period in the organisation, take pride in the company, wish to provide outstanding services to their customers and suggest the company as a place to work to friends and relatives.

Afterwards numerous regression analyses were completed on the figures, the purpose being to find certain influential questions from the data set. As a result, 12-question surveys were developed. Through this 12-question survey, respondents are requested to rate their feedback to every question on one to five Likert scale (see Buckingham & Coffman, 1999). Then confirmatory factor analyses are applied to these 12 questions. These questions look like a cliff in which employees want to rise from the moment (time) employee expects a current role or performance and to the time or stage when they are fully indulged in or committed to that role or performance. The mount has four stages:

1. *Base Camp:* "What do I get?" In this phase employees want to know what the company expects from them when they start a new role and what they will get in return for this role.
2. *Camp 1:* "What do I give?" In this phase employees concentrate more or put an effort to a singular input and are more concerned with others' perception about themselves, meaning whether others give importance to their work or not.

3. *Camp 2:* "Do I belong here?" In this phase employees ask themselves whether they are suitable for the role or job or performance or not.
4. *Camp 3:* "How can we all grow?" this is one of the most progressive phases of the employees. In this phase employees become impatient for learning and growth. They learn, grow and innovate, emphasising on making things better.

Gallup has empirically proven that employee engagement is a significant predictor of needed outcome of organisation (Luthans & Peterson, 2002, p. 377), like satisfaction of customers, customers retention, output and viability (see Buckingham & Coffman, 1999).

3. Objective of the study

– The purpose of this study is to re-explore the viability of this instrument in educational context.
– The objective of this study is to find whether The Gallup Work Audit instrument, which is an international survey, can be used in educational sector in the context of India for measuring faculties' engagement.

4. Research methodology

4.1. Participants

The target population of this study was the faculties of Private University in Uttar Pradesh. A total of 328 faculty members from different departments were selected using simple random sampling.

4.2. Procedures or data collection

Questionnaire were distributed electronically to the faculties engaged in graduates, postgraduate and doctoral courses and having internet access. They returned their responses through the mail. It gives assurance to the respondents that their identity is hidden and no one can change their responses. Those faculties that did not have their email ids, were given printed questionnaire and the responses were collected. Then all the responses are collected into one set of data. It is used for analysis purpose.

4.3. Measuring instrument

The variable measured in this study is Employee Engagement and the tool used was the Gallup Q12. The questionnaires for this study included a five-point Likert-type scale with strongly disagree to strongly agree.

4.4. Data analysis technique

All statistical analyses were performed with the 20.0 version of the SPSS. To define the sample descriptive statistics were used. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity were used to measure sampling adequacy and sphericity The underlying structure of the questionnaire was determined by principal component analyses with varimax rotation.

4.5. Reliability

To determine the reliability of measurement, a reliability analysis of the GWA was conducted. To measure the internal consistency reliability of the instruments Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used. If the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is 0.70 or greater than it is considered to be satisfactory (Cortina, 1993). The Table 1 clearly demonstrated that Cronbach's alpha is .82. It shows the reliability of Gallup instrument. The Table 2 also shows that all the items of the Gallup had acceptable alphas because all the items have greater than .70 alphas.

Table 1. Reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items	N of Items
.818	.816	12

Table 2. Item-total statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Q 5. I know what is expected of me at work.	39.09	38.970	.275	.162	.818
Q 6. I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right.	39.58	36.046	.431	.307	.808
Q 7. At work I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day.	39.59	34.632	.556	.446	.797
Q 8. In the last seven days I have received recognition or praise for doing good work.	40.20	33.103	.562	.426	.796
Q 9. My Head or someone at work seems to care about me as a person.	39.52	36.466	.363	.276	.814
Q 10. There is someone at work who encourages my development.	39.55	35.137	.521	.335	.800
Q 11. At work my opinions seem to count.	39.71	34.936	.574	.385	.796
Q 12. The mission or purpose of my institutions makes me feel my job is important.	39.66	34.359	.582	.416	.795
Q 13. My associates or fellow employees are committed to doing quality work.	39.55	35.582	.494	.332	.803
Q 14. I have a best friend at work.	39.66	37.694	.250	.161	.824
Q 15. In the last six months someone at work has talked to me about my progress.	39.76	35.800	.443	.306	.807
Q Last year I have had opportunities at work to learn and grow.	39.67	33.272	.574	.449	.795

5. Results

All employees of the University were targeted. A total of 328 questionnaires were returned, with all found usable for data analysis. As for the demographic analysis of the company, the questionnaire only made provision for the insertion of information on the individual's gender, designation, qualification and department. This analysis is shown in the Table 3.

Table 3. Characteristics of the participants

		Frequency	Percentage
Q.1 Gender			
Valid		43	13.1
	Female	144	43.9
	Male	141	43.0
	Total	328	100.0
Q 2. Designation			
Valid		2	.6
	Assistant Professor	257	78.4
	Associate Professor	61	18.6
	Professor	8	2.4
	Total	328	100.0
Q 3. Qualification			
	Assistant Professor	3	.9
	Graduation	24	7.3
	Others: Net/Gate/SLET	27	8.2
	Ph.D.	68	20.7
	Post-Graduation	206	62.8
	Total	328	100.0
Q 4. Department			
	Applied Science	28	8.5
	Architecture	1	.3
	B. Arch	18	5.5
	BCA	6	1.8
	Biotechnology	1	.3
	BJMC	6	1.8
	Civil Engineering	27	8.2
	Computer Science	32	9.8
	ECE	11	3.4
	Education	3	.9
	Electrical	2	.6
	Hotel Management	2	.6
	Legal Studies	15	4.6
	Mechanical Engineering	17	5.2
	Pharmacy	20	6.1
	School of Management	139	42.4
	Total	328	100.0

Before factor analysis can continue it is essential to execute the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of sampling Adequacy (MSA) and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Coetsee, 2006). KMO and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity outcome are shown in the Table 4. It is clear from the Table 4 Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) is .82 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is 1, making it significant. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of sampling Adequacy (MSA) must be higher than .70 and here it is .82, deeming it acceptable. In this case a reasonable basis factor analysis is present.

Table 4. KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.823
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1007.051
	Df	66
	Sig.	.000

Firstly, a matrix of intercorrelations was set up amongst the 12 items. A principal component analysis was conducted on the next level. The result is shown in the Table 5. The Table 5 of the total variance showed that there are four components whose eigenvalues is larger than 1. The first component explains 34.29% of total variance; second component explains 10.42% of total variance, and third component explains 8.92% of total variance and fourth component explain 8.42% of total variance.

Table 5. Total variance explained

Com-ponent	Initial Eigen-values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumula-tive %	Total	% of Variance	Cumu-lative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumula-tive %
1	4.114	34.287	34.287	4.114	34.287	34.287	2.578	21.480	21.480
2	1.250	10.416	44.703	1.250	10.416	44.703	1.830	15.254	36.734
3	1.070	8.917	53.620	1.070	8.917	53.620	1.688	14.067	50.801
4	1.010	8.419	62.040	1.010	8.419	62.040	1.349	11.238	62.040
5	.840	7.001	69.040						
6	.791	6.595	75.635						
7	.638	5.316	80.951						
8	.631	5.260	86.211						
9	.471	3.925	90.136						
10	.440	3.669	93.806						
11	.378	3.150	96.955						
12	.365	3.045	100.000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

In this study it was decided to specify the four components because earlier studies (Langford, 2009; Havenga et al., 2011) confirmed a four-factor solution for Gallup work instrument. A principal component analysis with a varimax rotation with Kaizer normalisation was used to analyse the factor structure of the GWA. The result is shown in the Table 6. The Table 6 makes it clear that four components were extracted. On the basis of clustering of the items classification may be done.

1. *First component comprising of the following items (Clarity of company mission and acknowledgement towards individual growth)*: In the last six months someone at work has talked to me about my progress .760; In the last seven days I have received recognition or praise for doing good work .723; The mission or purpose of my institutions makes me feel my job is important .676; At work, my opinions seem to count .489.

2. *Second component comprising of the following items (Role and work clarity)*: I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right .748; I know what is expected of me at work .744; At work I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day .670.

3. *Third component comprising of the following items (Quality and Growth Concern)*: My Head, or someone at work seems to care about me as a person .873; Last year I have had opportunities at work to learn and grow .639. My associates or fellow employees are committed to doing quality work .504.

4. *Fourth component comprising of the following items (Advancement and relation oriented)*: I have a best friend at work .890; There is someone at work who encourages my development .570

Table 6. Rotated Component Matrix[a]

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Q 15. In the last six months someone at work has talked to me about my progress.	.760			
Q 8. In the last seven days I have received recognition or praise for doing good work.	.723			
Q 12. The mission or purpose of my institutions makes me feel my job is important.	.676			
Q 11. At work my opinions seem to count.	.489			
Q 6. I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right.		.748		
Q 5. I know what is expected of me at work.		.744		
Q 7. At work I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day.	.438	.670		
Q 9. My Head or someone at work seems to care about me as a person.			.873	
Q 16. Last year I have had opportunities at work to learn and grow.	.507		.639	
Q 13. My associates or fellow employees are committed to doing quality work.			.504	
Q 14. I have a best friend at work.				.890
Q 10. There is someone at work who encourages my development.				.570
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.				

Note: a. Rotation converged in 5 iteration.

6. Discussion

The objective of this study was to Re-explore the Viability and Authencity of Gallup Workplace Audit as a measure of employee engagement in educational context. A cross-sectional analysis study with grab sampling N = 328 was used. Exploratory factor analysis was used in this study which resulted in a one factor model of employee engagement. It showed adequate internal reliability. Through the literature review it was clear that construct itself has a number of explanations or meanings, measurement approaches and model. As per Verwey (2007), the level of engagement is where the employees are committed to the organisation emotionally or logically, to something or someone in the organisation and as a result of this commitment how long they stay in the organisation and work hard. To understand employee satisfaction and dimensions of organisational performance, employee engagement is one of the most important and significant variable. This research was done in a single university in India; it was good because it eliminate the impact of those factors on employee engagement which may be created the variations due to the differences in organisational culture, leadership style and other factors. Firstly the reliability of the item was done. The result made it clear that none of the items required removing from the scale because the scale has high reliability (.82 Cronbach's alpha) and it has been confirmed through earlier studies (Harter, 1999; Janse van Rensburg, 2005; Vale, 2011). The next factor analysis was done to determine if it is really the items reflected GWA four-factor model. Analysis of the questionnaire revealed that it is based on only one factor and has not provided any rationale for GWA. Therefore four components extracted. Result showed that the four components singled out in this study are quite different from four factors measured by Gallup Workplace Audit. They were clarity of company mission and acknowledgement towards individual growth, role and work clarity, quality and growth concern and advancement and relation oriented.

Conclusions and practical implication

The first objective of the study is to re-explore the viability of this instrument in educational context. It is clear that Gallup Workplace Audit can be used effectively in educational context in India. It is reliable and valid instrument for measuring employee engagement. The second objective of this study is to find if The Gallup Work Audit instrument, which is an international survey, can be used in educational sector in the context of India for measuring faculties' engagement. It also confirms the study that an international survey can be applied or use effectively in Indian educational context. This study was the leading possibility in India in educational context. It formed an important point of leaving for related research in this country. It is not just that the results merely approve the construct validity of the GWA approach to the definition and measurement of employee engagement; but it shows the possibility or opportunities for further research and makes it interesting and hypothetically valuable. From a researcher viewpoint, it also suggested that any methodology to employee engagement call for more thinking which confirm that the measurement and definition of employee engagement are appropriate to the educational institutions and context in question. For educational institution that desire to assess employee engagement, the practical implications of the results are that on the first level there is a need for them to have a clear

understanding of their own construct, and on the second level it is good that institute itself find the key drivers of employee engagement because the national culture is quite different, even institutional culture too. The notion that employee engagement is a universal concept with the same sense across the entire organisation or institutions or universities may not be true, because the measurement of engagement with an international instrument possibly will not give an accurate explanation of engagement in India. Therefore organisation must consider their key drivers of employee engagement. For this it is necessary that they have a clear understanding of their own construct.

Recommendation for future research

After commenting on the practical implication of the study there is a need for more research which compares or analyses different measurement methods of employee engagement. What is more identifying the extent or factors through which employee engagement is influenced by institutional practices, their culture and national culture is advisable. Through this it may be clear that employee engagement is an institutional construct and it is a function of institutional culture or national culture. In this study there is only one factor of Gallup Workplace Audit has identified in one Sample University, therefore the recommendations are as follows:

– For determining whether the construct of engagement is similar across universities or not it should be suggested to test the consistency and rationality of the GWA in various universities.

– A quantitative study should be conducted to accumulate an engagement survey more pertinent to the context of India.

Limitation

Firstly the sample size is small and it limits the generalisation of results. It is advisable that future studies should be done with larger sample size, which increases the generalisation of results. Secondly, there is a need for more research which compare or analyse different measurement methods of employee engagement and more than one university should be taken. It is a good idea to consider both public and private universities. Thirdly, identifying the extent or factors through which employee engagement is influenced by institutional practices, their culture and national culture is necessary.

References

Akhtar, A., Nawaz, M. K., Mahmood, Z., & Shahid, M. S. (2016). Impact of high performance work practices on employees' performance in Pakistan: Examining the mediating role of employee engagement. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce Social Sciences*, *10*(3), 708–724.

Albdour, A. A., & Altarawneh, I. I. (2014). Employee engagement and organisational commitment: Evidence from Jordan. *International Journal of Business*, *19*(2), 192–212.

Alfes, K., & Truss, C. (2013). The relationship between line manager behavior, perceived HRM practices, and individual performance: Examining the mediating role of engagement. *Human Resource Management*, *52*(6), 839–859. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21512

Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity & Performance Management*, *63*(3), 308–323. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0008

Badal, S., & Harter, J. K. (2014). Gender diversity, business-unit engagement, and performance. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *21*(4), 354–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051813504460

Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2017). The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *19*(1), 31–53. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12077

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Ten, B. L. L. (2012). Work engagement, performance, and active learning: The role of conscientiousness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*(2), 555–564. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.08.008

Bal, M., & De Lange, A. (2015). From flexibility human resource management to employee engagement and perceived job performance across the lifespan: A multisampling study. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, *88*(1), 126–154. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12082

Benn, S., Teo, S., & Martin, A. (2015). Employee participation and engagement in working for the environment. *Personnel Review*, *44*(4), 492–510. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-10-2013-0179

BlessingWhite. (2006). *Employee Engagement Report 2006*. Skillman, N J.

Branham, F. L. (2006). *E-Letter*, *8*, 1–3.

Buckingham, M., & Coffman, C. (1999). *First, break all the rules: What the world's greatest managers do differently*. Simon and Schuster.

Burke, R. J., & Cooper, C. L. (2005). *Reinventing human resource management: Challenges and new directions.* Routledge.

Burkea, R. J., & Ngbe, E. (2006). The changing nature of work and organisations: Implications for human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, *16*(2), 86–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2006.03.006

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1982). *Beyond boredom and anxiety*. Jossey Bass.

Coetsee, J. H. C. (2006). *Barriers-to-change in a Governmental Service Delivery Type Organisation* [Unpublished PhD Thesis]. University of Johannesburg (RAU), Johannesburg.

Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of the theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(1), 98–104. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.1.98

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, *31*(6), 874–900. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602

Cook, S. (2012). *The essential guide to employee engagement.* Kogan Page.

De Beer, G. (2007). People issues – top the strategic agenda. *Management Today, 23*(7), 40–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0015-1882(07)70057-5

Demerouti, E., & Cropanzano, R. (2010). From thought to action: Employee work engagement and job performance. In A. B. Baker & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 147–163). Psychology Press.

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. (2009). *Engaging for success: Enhancing performance through employee engagement.* London.

Eldor, L., & Harpaz, I. (2016). A process model of employee engagement: The learning climate and its relationship with extra-role performance behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *37*(2), 213–235. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2037

Eldor, L. (2017). Looking on the bright side: The positive role of organisational politics in the relationship between employee engagement and performance at work. *Applied Psychology*, *66*(2), 233–259. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12090

Flemming, J. H., & Asplund, J. (2007). Where employee engagement happens. *The Gallup Management Journal.* Retrieved February 15, 2013, from http:/gmj.gallup.com/content/102496/where-Employee-Engagement-Happens.aspx

Forbes. (2014). *The crisis in worker engagement: The 2 things you should do about it.* Retrieved January 17, 2014, from http://www.forbes.com/sites/karlmoore/2014/01/17/the-crisis-in-worker-engagement-the-2-things-you-should-do-about-it.htm

Gallup, Inc. (2017). *State of the global workplace report.* Washington.

Ghosh, P., Rai, A., Chauhan, R., Baranwal, G., & Srivastava, D. (2016). Rewards and recognition to engage private bank employees: Exploring the 'obligation dimension'. *Management Research Review*, *39*(12), 1738–1751. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-09-2015-0219

Goffman, E. (1961). *Encounters.* Penguin University Books.

Harter, J. K. (1999). The meta-analysis. In M. Buckingham & C. Coffman (Eds.), *First, break all the rules: What the world's greatest managers do differently.* Simon and Schuster.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta- analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 268–279. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268

Harter, J. K., Asplund, J. W., & Flemming, J. H. (2004). Human sigma: A meta-analysis. The relationship between employee engagement, customer engagement, and financial performance. *The Gallup Management Journal.* Retrieved May 6, 2016, from http://www.gallup.com/businessjournal/101956/humansigma-metaanalysis-relationship-between-employee-engag.aspx

Havenga, W., Wait, K., & Stanz, K. (2011). Evaluating the difference in employee engagement before and after business and cultural transformation interventions. *African Journal of Business Management*, *5*, 22. https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM10.1436

Heger, B. K. (2007). Linking the employee value proposition (EVP) to employee engagement and business outcomes: Preliminary findings from a linkage research pilot study. *Organizational Development Journal*, *25*(2), 121–132.

Hewitt Associates LLC. (2004). *Research Brief: employee engagement higher at double digit growth companies.* Retrieved March 25, 2013, from www.hewitt.com

Janse van Rensburg, N. (2005). *Leadership styles and work-related attitudes in subordinates* [Unpublished PhD Thesis]. University of Johannesburg (RAU), Johannesburg.

Jaewon, Y. (2016). Perceived customer participation and work engagement: The path through emotional labor. *The International Journal of Bank Marketing*, *34*(7), 1009–1024. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-09-2015-0139

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *33*, 692–724. https://doi.org/10.5465/256287

Klein, K. J., & Kozlowski, S. (2000). *Multilevel theory research and methods in organisations.* Jossey-Bass.

Konrad, A. M. (2006). Engaging employees through high-involvement work practices. *Ivey Business Journal*, *70*(4), 1–7.

Kim, M. S., & Koo, D. W. (2017). Linking LMX, engagement, innovative behavior, and job performance in hotel employees. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *29*(12), 3044–3062. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-06-2016-0319

Koyuncu, M., Burke, R. J., & Fiksenbaum, L. (2006). Work engagement among women managers and professionals in a Turkish bank: Potential antecedents and consequences. *Equal Opportunities International*, *25*(4), 299–310. https://doi.org/10.1108/02610150610706276

Labianca, G., Gray, B., & Brass, D. J. (2000). A grounded model of organisational schema change during empowerment. *Organization Science*, *11*(2), 235–257. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.2.235.12512

Lawler, E. E. (2003). *Treat people right.* Jossey-Bass.

Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of twenty-first century. *Annual Review Psychology*, *56*(1), 485–516. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142105

Lin, W., Wang, L., Bamberger, P. A., Zhang, Q., Wang, H., Guo, W., & Zhang, T. (2016). Leading future orientations for current effectiveness: The role of engagement and supervisor coaching in linking future work self-salience to job performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *92*, 145–156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.12.002

Langford, P. H. (2009). Measuring organisational climate and employee engagement: Evidence for a 7 Ps model of work practices and outcomes. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 61*(4), 185–198. https://doi.org/10.1080/00049530802579481

Luthans, F., & Peterson, S. J. (2002). Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy: implications for managerial effectiveness and development. *Journal of Management Development*, *21*(5), 37687. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710210426864

May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, *77*, 11–37. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915892

Müller, R., & Turner, R. (2010). Leadership competency pro-files of successful project managers. *International Journal of Project Management*, *28*(5), 437–448. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2009.09.003

Mishra, S., & Mohanty, J. K. (2016). The predictors of employee engagement: A study in a ferro alloys company of India. *Global Business Review*, *17*(6), 1441–1453. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150916660429

Mozammel, S., & Haan, P. (2016). Transformational leadership and employee engagement in the banking sector in Bangladesh. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, *50*(6), 43–55. https://doi.org/10.1353/jda.2016.0127

Newman, D. A., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Been there, bottled that: are state and behavioral work engagement new and useful construct; wines'. *Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, *1*, 31–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.00003.x

Nowack, K. (2006). *Employee engagement, job satisfaction, retention and stress*. Retrieved April 2011, from www.envisialearning.com

Obeidat, B. (2016). Exploring the relationship between corporate social responsibility, employee engagement, and organizational performance: The case of Jordanian mobile telecommunication companies. *International Journal of Communications, Network and System Sciences*, *9*, 361–386. https://doi.org/10.4236/ijcns.2016.99032

Osman, K., & Mehmet, A. (2016). The effects of organisation mission fulfilment and perceived organisational support on job performance: the mediating role of work engagement. *The International Journal of Bank Marketing*, *34*(3), 368–387. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-12-2014-0171

Pinto, J. K., & Prescott, J. E. (1988). Variations in critical success factors over the stages in the project life cycle. *Journal of Management*, *14*(1), 5–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638801400102

Pfeffer, J. (2003). Business and spirit: Management practices that sustain values. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *The handbook of workplace spirituality and organisational performance* (pp. 29–45). M. E. Sharpe.

Perrin, T. (2007). *Closing the engagement gap: A road map for driving superior business performance*. Retrieved May 6, 2016, from https://engageforsuccess.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Closing-the-engagement-gap-TowersPerrin.pdf

Purcell, J., Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., Rayton, B., & Swart, J. (2003). *Understanding the people and performance link: Unlocking the black box.* CIPD.

Rahman, U. U., Rehman, C. A., Imran, M. K., & Aslam, U. (2017). Does team orientation matter? Linking work engagement and relational psychological contract with performance. *Journal of Management Development*, *36*(9), 1102–1113. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-10-2016-0204

Rasheed, A., Khan, S., & Ramzan, M. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement: The case of Pakistan. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, *4*(4), 183–200.

Robertson-Smith, G., & Markwick, C. (2009). *Employee engagement: A review of current thinking*. Institute for Employment Studies.

Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). *The drivers of employee engagement*. Institute for Employment Studies.

Ruck, K., & Trainor, S. (2012, July). *Developing internal communication practice that supports employee engagement* [Conference presentation]. 19th International Public Relations Symposium, Bled, Slovenia.

Reijseger, G., Peeters, M. C., Taris, T. W., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). From motivation to activation: Why engaged workers are better performers. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *32*(2), 117–130. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-016-9435-z

Salahudin, S. N., Ramli, H. S., Alwi, M. N. R., Abdullah, M. S., & Rani, N. A. (2019, July). Employee engagement and turnover intention among Islamic bankers in Brunei Darussalam. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, *8*(2 Special Issue), 643–651.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: a two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *3*, 71–90. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326

Simpson, M. R. (2009). Engagement at work: A review of the literature International. *Journal of Nursing Studies*, *46*(7), 1012–1024. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2008.05.003

Shuck, B. (2011). Integrative literature review: Four emerging perspectives of employee engagement: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, *10*(3), 304–328. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484311410840

Shuck, B., & Zigarmi, D. (2015). Psychological needs, engagement, and work intentions: A Bayesian multi-measurement mediation approach and implications for HRD. *European Journal of Training and Development*, *39*(1), 2–21. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-08-2014-0061

Suhartanto, D., & Brien, A. (2018). Multidimensional engagement and store performance the perspective of frontline retail employees. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *67*(5), 809–824. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-03-2017-0065

Sundaray, B. K. (2011). Employee engagement: A driver of organizational effectiveness. *European Journal of Business and Management*, *3*(8), 53–59.

Vale, F. (2011). *A measurement of employee engagement using the Gallup Q12 workplace audit* [Unpublished Honours Dissertation]. National College of Ireland.

Verwey, A. (2007). *Employee engagement*. Unpublished.

Wildermuth, C., & Pauken, P. D. (2008). A Perfect math: decoding employee engagement – Part I: Engaging cultures and leaders. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, *40*(3), 122–128. https://doi.org/10.1108/00197850810868603

Witemeyer, H. A. (2013). *Employee engagement construct and instrument validation* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Georgia State University, USA.

Zhong, L., Wayne, S. J., & Liden, R. C. (2016). Job engagement, perceived organisational support, high-performance human resource practices, and cultural value orientations: A cross-level investigation, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *37*(6), 823–844. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2076