



Editorial: Engaging Community through Content

Rahul Pratap Singh Kaurav

FORE School of Management, New Delhi, India

Di Virgilio F.

University of Molise in the Department of Economics, Italy

Dr Raturaj Baber

Symbiosis Centre for Management Studies, Nagpur (A Constituent of Symbiosis International
Deemed University, Pune), India

Dr Sumit Narula

Deputy Dean Research (Publications and Citations) at Amity University, Gwalior, India

A number of definitions of engagement in the academic literature have been given. Many scholars have explored various aspects related to engagement providing a number of insights among many disciplines. Prior research in engagement showed its relevance for organizations operating in different environments with a diversity of perspectives such as employee engagement (Milliman, Gatling & Kim, 2018; Di Virgilio et al., 2021).

According to Kahn (1990), the most commonly used definition, engagement refers to “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances” (p. 694). It is the “simultaneous employment and expression of a person’s preferred self in task behaviours that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional), and active, full role performance” (p. 700). Work engagement is associated with surplus resources, providing one with sufficient energy to perform the job well, this means that work engagement inherently represents an intrinsic work motivation (Zeijen, Peeters, & Hakanen, 2018).

To engage their employees many organizations are interested to promote the engagement of employees in creating spiritual workplaces (Pfeffer, 2010; May et al., 2004; Solima et al., 2021). In this regard, Krishnakumar and Neck (2002) suggested spirituality is recognized as one of the crucial dimensions of the human personality. Therefore, if an organization encourages

spirituality, then it is actually encouraging the people to bring their whole self to work (p. 159). Although researchers have argued that workplace spirituality and employee engagement exist as independent topics in their own right, and a small part of the literature connect them and suggest how they might be related (Macey, et al., 2009; Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Saks, 2011).

However, it is also evident that both theory and empirical research methods of this field have to be significantly extended. Although the increasing body of studies on engagement practices in various domains, substantial gaps remain about such research in to engage community. In recent years, to engage communities gradually becomes an important area in organizational behaviour research. Community engagement is the process of working collaboratively with and through groups of people to address issues affecting the well-being of those people. For firms and public policy perspective, “engaging the community offers an opportunity to gain legitimacy, manage social risk, and even co-develop innovative solutions to social problems with community members” (Bowen et al. 2008, p.1).

All types of organizations are interested in learning new and innovative ways to engage their community (Casidy et al., 2022). In the public and private environments need to enhance community engagement for better governance and dissemination of information (Cavaye, 2004) through mass media platforms (Di Virgilio et al., 2022). Social media

engagement is a major area of interest for firms, to understand the strategic role of sharing into online experiences by consumers' interactions (Khan, 2017; Dolan, Conduit, Fahy & Goodman, 2016; Sashi, 2012).

The principles and issues need to be considered if effective community engagement is to be achieved, and include many aspects such as to: analyze users' interaction, the main drivers to study the level of the engagement; recognize the context specificity of activities and information, understand the social networks that can assist with information exchange; develop a participatory contract between stakeholders outlining roles and responsibilities, ensure the use of tools and strategies at the empowerment end of the engagement continuum (Kruger et al., 2009). Aslin and Brown (2004) indicate that community engagement is not just a single event, but an ongoing process with the aim of 'engaging the community to take action' (p.3). They further stress that the community engagement process does not stand alone, but forms part of another process - that of 'decision-making for a particular purpose' (p.3). Scholars and practitioners should continue to deepen the engagement process in the communities in the world, as the researches surrounding has not kept pace with this perspective.

This special issue will solve some real-life dilemmas of decision-makers on - how to engage the community and the suitable content for engaging the community. The authors have used different methodologies - qualitative, quantitative, and mixed - to resolve the pertaining questions. The content could be anything - policy, interview, advertisement (digital or print), audio-visuals, letters, or communications (Kaurav, Suresh, Narula, & Baber, 2020; Kaurav, Narula, Baber, & Tiwari, 2021). The way of using content in such an innovative manner is the key to ultimate success (for the business or government).

REFERENCES

Aslin, H. and V. Brown (2004). Towards whole of Community Engagement: A practical toolkit. M.D. B. Commission.

Bowen, F., Newenham-Kahindi, A., & Herremans, I. (2008). Engaging the

community: A systematic review. Research Network for Business Sustainability, 1(1).

- Casidy, R., Leckie, C., Nyadzayo, M. W., & Johnson, L. W. (2022). Customer brand engagement and co-production: an examination of key boundary conditions in the sharing economy. *European Journal of Marketing*, (ahead-of-print).
- Cavaye, J. (2004). Governance and community engagement: The Australian experience. Participatory governance: Planning, conflict mediation and public decision making in civil society, 85-102.
- Di Virgilio F., Soliman M., Anwar ul Haq M., Fantini S. (2022). Analysing Users' Engagement with eSports Team: Does Covid-19 matter?. In: Mondal S.R., Di Virgilio F., Das S. (eds) HR Analytics and Digital HR Practices. Palgrave Macmillan, Singapore. (Chapter 10, pp. 243-271). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-7099-2_10.
- Dolan, R., Conduit, J., Fahy, J. & Goodman, S. (2016). Social media engagement behaviour: a uses and gratifications perspective. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 24(3-4), 261-277.
- 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.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692-724.
- Kaurav, R. P. S., Narula, S., Baber, R., & Tiwari, P. (2021). Theoretical extension of the new education policy 2020 using twitter mining. *Journal of Content, Community & Communication*, 13(1), 16-26.
- Kaurav, R. P. S., Suresh, K. G., Narula, S., & Baber, R. (2020). New education policy: qualitative (contents) analysis and Twitter mining (sentiment analysis). *Journal of Content, Community and Communication*, 12(1), 4-13.
- Khan, M. L. (2017). Social media engagement: What motivates user participation and

- consumption on YouTube? Computers in Human Behavior, 66, 236-247
- Krishnakumar, S. & Neck, C. P. (2002). The what, why and how of spirituality in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17, 153-164.
- Kruger, H., Thompson, L., Clarke, R., Stenekes, N., & Carr, A. (2009). *Engaging in biosecurity: Gap analysis*. Canberra: Bureau of Rural Sciences.
- Macey, W. H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K. M. & Young, S. A. (2009). *Employee Engagement: Tools for Analysis, Practice, and Competitive Advantage*. New York, NY: Blackwell Press.
- 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 Organizational Psychology*, 77, 11-37.
- Milliman, J., Gatling, A. & Kim, J. S. (2018). The effect of workplace spirituality on hospitality employee engagement, intention to stay, and service delivery. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 35, 56-65.
- Pfeffer, J. (2010). Business and the spirit: management practices that sustain values. In: R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz, (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Saks, A. M. (2011). Workplace spirituality and employee engagement. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 8(4), 317-340.
- Sashi, C.M. (2012). Customer engagement, buyer-seller relationships, and social media. *Management Decision*, 50(2), 253-272.
- Soliman, M., Di Virgilio, F., Figueiredo, R. & José Sousa, M. (2021). The impact of workplace spirituality on lecturers' attitudes in tourism and hospitality higher education institutions. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 38, 100826. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100826>, ISSN 2211-9736.
- Zeijen, M. E. L., Peeters, M. C. W., & Hakanen, J. J. (2018). Workaholism versus work engagement and job crafting: What is the role of self-management strategies? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 1-17.
