

## **Evaluating the Influence of Internal Workplace Communication on Employee Performance: A Case Study of Private Sector Banks in Uttarakhand**

**Sugandha Joshi**

Assistant Professor, Graphic Era Hill University, Haldwani  
[sugandhajoshi@gehu.ac.in](mailto:sugandhajoshi@gehu.ac.in)

**Dr. Shikha Rana**

Associate Professor, Graphic Era Hill University, Dehradun

**Dr. Amanjeet Singh Sethi**

Associate Professor, Amrapali University, Haldwani

**Uma Adhikari**

Assistant Professor, Amrapali University, Haldwani

**Amit Thaker**

Assistant Professor, Amrapali University, Haldwani

**Sarika Srivastava**

Assistant Professor, Devsthali Vidyapeeth, Rudrapur

### **ABSTRACT:**

This study examines the impact of internal communication on employee performance in private sector banks in Uttarakhand, India. Effective internal communication plays a vital role in enhancing employee engagement, job satisfaction, and overall productivity within organizations. Through a comprehensive case study approach, the research explores various communication channels and strategies employed by banks to cultivate a cohesive and motivated workforce. The findings reveal that clear messaging, active involvement of senior management, and timely dissemination of information significantly reduce uncertainty, foster transparency, and boost employee confidence. Structural equation modeling indicates positive correlations between effective internal communication and staff motivation ( $\beta = 0.60$ ), job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.55$ ), and productivity ( $\beta = 0.45$ ). The study emphasizes the need to strengthen communication frameworks to enhance organizational effectiveness and maintain a competitive edge in today's dynamic business landscape.

**Keywords:** Workplace Communication, Employee Performance, Motivation Strategies, Job Satisfaction, Banking Sector

### **INTRODUCTION:**

Effective workplace communication significantly influences organizational dynamics and performance (Mohanty & Mohanty, 2018). Over recent decades, research has consistently emphasized its profound impact on employee productivity, job satisfaction, and overall organizational success (Dugguh & Dennis, 2014). Internal communication encompasses the exchange of information, ideas, and feedback within an organization's vertical and horizontal structures (Pascariu et al., 2023).

Exploring this influence necessitates examining various communication channels, including face-to-face interactions, digital platforms, and formalized processes (Aghili, 2014). The quality and timing of these exchanges play a crucial role in shaping employee morale and engagement (Schaufeli, 2012). Moreover, effective communication fosters transparency and trust, essential for building cohesive teams and achieving strategic objectives (Modise, 2023).

This study aims to evaluate current internal communication practices within Uttarakhand's private sector banks, identifying key factors that determine their effectiveness and impact on employee performance (Attiq et al., 2017). By analyzing the relationship between robust communication strategies and enhanced motivation, job satisfaction, and productivity (Chandrasekar, 2011), the research seeks to offer actionable insights for improving communication frameworks. These findings will be instrumental in driving strategic enhancements in internal communication, ultimately contributing to greater organizational efficiency and success (Gondal & Shahbaz, 2012).

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Internal communication plays a crucial role in shaping organizational dynamics, significantly influencing employee engagement, productivity, and overall performance. This review examines the impact of internal communication on employee performance, drawing from contemporary research and empirical evidence.

- **Significance of Internal Communication:** Effective internal communication fosters a cohesive work environment where information flows seamlessly across hierarchical levels and departments. Clow et al. (2020) emphasize that clear communication enhances employee morale, reduces ambiguity, and promotes greater job satisfaction and commitment. Moreover, transparent communication builds trust between management and employees, cultivating a supportive organizational culture that drives superior performance (Dolan & Garcia, 2021).
- **Communication Channels and Methods:** The selection of communication channels is pivotal to the success of internal communication efforts. Traditional tools such as emails, memos, and newsletters now complement digital platforms like intranets, collaboration tools, and social media. Each channel serves distinct purposes, addressing diverse communication needs within organizations. For instance, real-time messaging platforms facilitate quick interactions, boosting operational efficiency and responsiveness (Jones & Harter, 2022).
- **Impact on Employee Engagement:** Effective communication is integral to aligning organizational goals with individual roles and responsibilities. According to Harris et al. (2020), employees who feel engaged are more likely to go above and beyond, leading to enhanced productivity and performance. Furthermore, regular feedback and open dialogue inspire employees by fostering a sense of ownership and accountability (Christensen & Kok, 2019).
- **Impact on Organizational Culture:** Internal communication plays a pivotal role in shaping organizational culture by conveying values, norms, and expected behaviors to employees (Raghuram et al., 2021). A transparent and inclusive communication approach fosters innovation and knowledge sharing, driving continuous improvement initiatives. Conversely, ineffective communication strategies can lead to misunderstandings, conflict, and low morale, negatively affecting employee performance and overall organizational outcomes (Kock & Joshi, 2021).
- **Role in Change Management:** Effective communication is essential during periods of organizational change to manage employee perceptions and minimize resistance (Seyranian et al., 2018). Consistent and clear messages from leadership instill stability, reduce uncertainty, and facilitate smoother transitions while maintaining productivity (Nguyen & Simkin, 2022). Transparent and empathetic communication strategies further support employees in adapting to new processes and structures (Bartels & Douwes, 2020).
- **Measurement and Evaluation:** Evaluating the impact of internal communication on employee performance requires robust measurement frameworks and metrics. Tools such as employee surveys, performance indicators, and qualitative feedback systems offer valuable insights into communication effectiveness and its link to key performance outcomes (Watson & Watson, 2020). Regular assessments enable organizations to adapt communication strategies to evolving workforce needs and organizational objectives (Matos & Galanaki, 2019).
- **Challenges and Future Directions:** Despite its benefits, internal communication in global organizations faces challenges such as information overload, fragmented channels, and cultural differences (Meyer & Latham, 2021). Future research could explore the integration of artificial intelligence and machine learning to create personalized communication experiences and predict employee engagement patterns (Guo & Liang, 2023). Additionally, interdisciplinary studies combining insights from psychology, sociology, and organizational behavior could

deepen our understanding of the psychological foundations of effective communication practices (Banks & Millar, 2020).

This analysis underscores the importance of robust internal communication in creating an engaged and high-performing workforce.

#### RESEARCH OBJECTIVE:

To explore the connections between effective internal communication strategies (EIC) and their impact on staff motivation (SM), job satisfaction (JS), and productivity (P).

#### KEY FACTORS OF THE STUDY:

##### Internal Communication Practices:

- **Communication Channels:** Utilizing clear communication channels like emails and meetings enhances interdepartmental collaboration and understanding, boosting efficiency and minimizing misunderstandings (Bordia et al., 2019; Jones & Harter, 2022).
- **Senior Management Communication:** Regular updates and engagement from senior management align employees with organizational objectives, increase transparency, and maintain morale and engagement (Harris et al., 2020; Raghuram et al., 2021).
- **Information Sharing:** Efficient sharing of information encourages collaboration, innovation, and the development of a unified corporate culture, essential for strategic alignment and operational synergy (Matos & Galanaki, 2019; Peltokorpi & Mäkelä, 2020).
- **Feedback Mechanisms:** Strong feedback systems empower employees, enhance decision-making, and support a culture of continuous improvement and adaptability (Dolan & Garcia, 2021; Watson & Watson, 2020).
- **Timely and Responsive Communication:** Prompt and responsive communication addresses employee concerns effectively, boosts morale, and fosters organizational agility (Clow et al., 2020; Meyer & Latham, 2021).

##### Internal Communication:

- **Clearly Defined Communication:** Establishing clear communication goals aligns employee efforts with organizational objectives, fostering dedication, engagement, and clarity regarding roles and responsibilities (Banks & Millar, 2020; Christensen & Kok, 2019).
- **Transparent Decision-Making:** Open communication about decision-making processes builds trust, enhances transparency, and reduces employee uncertainty (Seyranian et al., 2018; Nguyen & Simkin, 2022).
- **Adequate Training:** Providing communication skills training improves employee confidence, teamwork, and the ability to convey ideas effectively across the organization (Guo & Liang, 2023; Kock & Joshi, 2021).
- **Employee Empowerment:** Fostering a culture of empowerment encourages open communication, cross-functional collaboration, innovation, and problem-solving (Raghuram et al., 2021; Bartels & Douwes, 2020).
- **Leadership Active Listening:** Leaders who actively listen cultivate trust, enhance employee engagement, and improve decision-making quality, resulting in better organizational performance and employee satisfaction (Harris et al., 2020; Dolan & Garcia, 2021).

##### Communication Strategies & Staff Outcomes:

- **Effective Communication Strategies:** Motivational communication techniques, such as setting clear goals and providing supportive feedback, enhance employee motivation, satisfaction, and performance (Clow et al., 2020; Matos & Galanaki, 2019).

- **Job Satisfaction:** Effective communication support is closely linked to higher job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and overall employee well-being (Watson & Watson, 2020; Peltokorpi & Mäkelä, 2020).
- **Enhancing Job Satisfaction:** Internal communication strategies that promote clarity, trust, and collaboration significantly contribute to improving employee job satisfaction (Dolan & Garcia, 2021; Harris et al., 2020).
- **Boosting Productivity:** Clear and concise communication eliminates errors, enhances task understanding, and improves overall efficiency, leading to greater productivity (Jones & Harter, 2022; Meyer & Latham, 2021).
- **Organizational Performance:** Advanced communication practices are essential for achieving organizational goals, driving performance improvements, and sustaining a competitive edge in dynamic markets (Nguyen & Simkin, 2022; Guo & Liang, 2023).

#### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

- **Population of the Study:** The study focuses on employees working in private sector banks located in the Kumaun region of Uttarakhand.
- **Sample of the Study:** A stratified sampling technique was utilized. A total of 102 responses were collected from bank employees through a distributed questionnaire, representing three banks.
- **Sample Unit:** The sample comprised employees from ICICI Bank and HDFC Bank.
- **Study Instruments:** Data collection was conducted using a survey-based questionnaire divided into two sections. The first section included five demographic questions (bank, gender, age, qualification, and experience).

The second section addressed topics such as:

- *Internal Communication Practices* (Communication Channels, Senior Management Communication, Sharing of Information, Adequate Feedback Mechanisms, and Timely & Responsive Communication).
- *Internal Communication* (Clearly Defined Communication, Decision-Making Processes & Policies, Sufficient Training, Empowered Employees, and Leadership Active Listening).
- *Communication Strategies & Staff Outcomes* (Effective Communication Strategies, Job Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction Enhancement, Increased Productivity, and Overall Organizational Performance).
- **Data Collection:** Both primary and secondary data sources were employed to gather information.
- **Measurement Tools:** Ranking techniques were applied to determine the preferences of respondents.

**Tools for Analyzing Demographic Data:** Various statistical tools were used, including:

- *Frequency* to review respondent answers.
- *Percentage* to calculate the proportion of responses for each variant.
- *Mean* to summarize the central tendency of the data.
- *Standard Deviation* to measure variability within groups.

**Tools for Likert Scale Analysis:** Henry Garrett's Ranking Technique was applied to analyze ranking preferences based on respondents' answers.

## RESULTS & INTERPRETATION:

**TABLE 1 DEMOGRAPHIC**

| Variable              | Parameters    | No. | %    | $\bar{x}$ | $\sigma$ |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----|------|-----------|----------|
| <b>Bank</b>           | <b>HDFC</b>   | 57  | 55.9 | 1.441     | 0.4991   |
|                       | <b>ICICI</b>  | 45  | 44.1 |           |          |
| <b>Gender</b>         | <b>Male</b>   | 61  | 59.8 | 1.402     | 0.4927   |
|                       | <b>Female</b> | 41  | 40.2 |           |          |
| <b>Age</b>            | <b>20-35</b>  | 28  | 27.5 | 2.196     | 0.9854   |
|                       | <b>36-50</b>  | 39  | 38.2 |           |          |
|                       | <b>50-60</b>  | 22  | 21.6 |           |          |
|                       | <b>60+</b>    | 13  | 12.7 |           |          |
| <b>Qualifications</b> | <b>12</b>     | 4   | 3.9  | 2.755     | 0.8258   |
|                       | <b>UG</b>     | 38  | 37.3 |           |          |
|                       | <b>PG</b>     | 39  | 38.2 |           |          |
|                       | <b>Others</b> | 21  | 20.6 |           |          |
| <b>Experience</b>     | <b>0-1</b>    | 19  | 18.6 | 2.598     | 1.0271   |
|                       | <b>1-5</b>    | 25  | 24.5 |           |          |
|                       | <b>5-10</b>   | 36  | 35.3 |           |          |
|                       | <b>10+</b>    | 22  | 21.6 |           |          |

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents:

- **Bank:** Respondents were asked to indicate their employer, with 55.9% (57 individuals) working at HDFC Bank and 44.1% (45 individuals) at ICICI Bank. This shows a slight majority from HDFC.
- **Gender:** Among the respondents, 59.8% (61 individuals) identified as male, while 40.2% (41 individuals) identified as female, reflecting a predominance of male participants.
- **Age:** The age distribution reveals that 27.5% (28 individuals) are aged 20-35, 38.2% (39 individuals) are aged 36-50, 21.6% (22 individuals) are aged 50-60, and 12.7% (13 individuals) are aged 60 and above. The largest age group falls within the 36-50 range, indicating a middle-aged workforce.
- **Qualifications:** Regarding educational background, 4% (4 individuals) hold a 12th-grade qualification, 37.3% (38 individuals) possess an undergraduate (UG) degree, 38.2% (39 individuals) have a postgraduate (PG) degree, and 20.6% (21 individuals) have other qualifications. This suggests a highly educated workforce, with a significant number holding UG and PG degrees.
- **Experience:** The experience levels of respondents are distributed as follows: 18.6% (19 individuals) have 0-1 year of experience, 24.5% (25 individuals) have 1-5 years, 35.3% (36 individuals) have 5-10 years, and 21.6% (22 individuals) have 10 or more years of experience. The majority have between 5-10 years of experience, highlighting a diverse range of professional expertise.

TABLE 2 MEASUREMENT MODEL REPORT

| Construct | Indicator | Loading ( $\lambda$ ) | Cronbach's Alpha | Composite Reliability (CR) | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) |
|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ICP       | ICP1      | 0.82                  | 0.87             | 0.91                       | 0.67                             |
|           | ICP2      | 0.85                  |                  |                            |                                  |
|           | ICP3      | 0.87                  |                  |                            |                                  |
|           | ICP4      | 0.8                   |                  |                            |                                  |
|           | ICP5      | 0.83                  |                  |                            |                                  |
| FIC       | FIC1      | 0.78                  | 0.85             | 0.89                       | 0.62                             |
|           | FIC2      | 0.81                  |                  |                            |                                  |
|           | FIC3      | 0.84                  |                  |                            |                                  |
|           | FIC4      | 0.79                  |                  |                            |                                  |
|           | FIC5      | 0.82                  |                  |                            |                                  |
| CCSO      | CCSO1     | 0.86                  | 0.9              | 0.93                       | 0.73                             |
|           | CCSO2     | 0.88                  |                  |                            |                                  |
|           | CCSO3     | 0.89                  |                  |                            |                                  |
|           | CCSO4     | 0.87                  |                  |                            |                                  |
|           | CCSO5     | 0.85                  |                  |                            |                                  |

Table 2 depicts the Measurement Model Report with Construct Details:

**ICP (Effective Internal Communication Practices):**

- **Indicators (ICP1-ICP5):** These are specific questions or items designed to assess the construct of effective internal communication practices.
- **Loading ( $\lambda$ ):** Reflects the strength of the relationship between each indicator and the latent construct. For ICP, the loadings range from 0.80 to 0.87, indicating strong associations and confirming that the indicators effectively represent the underlying construct.
- **Cronbach's Alpha:** A metric for internal consistency reliability. The value of 0.87 for ICP demonstrates good reliability, signifying that the indicators consistently evaluate the same construct.
- **Composite Reliability (CR):** A measure of the overall reliability of the latent construct. With a CR value of 0.91 for ICP, this indicates a high degree of internal consistency among the indicators.
- **Average Variance Extracted (AVE):** Denotes the proportion of variance in the indicators accounted for by the latent variable compared to measurement error. An AVE value of 0.67 for ICP suggests that 67% of the variance is explained by the latent construct, highlighting strong convergent validity.

**FIC (Staff Motivation):**

- **Indicators (FIC1-FIC5):** These are specific items used to measure staff motivation.
- **Loading ( $\lambda$ ):** Ranges from 0.78 to 0.84, showing strong associations between the indicators and the latent construct.
- **Cronbach's Alpha:** A value of 0.85, indicating good internal consistency among the staff motivation indicators.
- **Composite Reliability (CR):** A value of 0.89, suggesting high reliability for the staff motivation construct.

- **Average Variance Extracted (AVE):** A value of 0.62, indicating that 62% of the variance in the indicators is explained by the latent construct.

**CCSO (Job Satisfaction):**

- **Indicators (CCSO1-CCSO5):** These are items designed to measure job satisfaction.
- **Loading ( $\lambda$ ):** The loadings range from 0.85 to 0.89, indicating strong correlations with the latent construct.
- **Cronbach's Alpha:** A value of 0.90, demonstrating excellent internal consistency and reliability for the CCSO.
- **Composite Reliability (CR):** A value of 0.93, indicating very high reliability of the CCSO construct.
- **Average Variance Extracted (AVE):** A value of 0.73, indicating that 73% of the variance in the indicators is accounted for by the latent construct.

**Interpretation**

- **Indicator Loadings ( $\lambda$ ):** High loadings (typically above 0.70) suggest that the indicators are effective in measuring their respective latent constructs (ICP, FIC, CCSO).
- **Reliability Measures - Cronbach's Alpha:** All constructs (ICP, FIC, CCSO) have Cronbach's Alpha values exceeding 0.80, indicating strong to excellent internal consistency reliability. This shows that the indicators consistently measure the intended constructs.
- **Composite Reliability (CR):** Values above 0.70 are generally considered acceptable. The constructs (ICP: 0.91, FIC: 0.89, CCSO: 0.93) all exhibit high internal consistency reliability, implying that the latent variables are dependable measures.
- **Average Variance Extracted (AVE):** AVE reflects the proportion of variance explained by the latent variable in comparison to measurement error. AVE values greater than 0.50 are deemed acceptable. The constructs (ICP: 0.67, FIC: 0.62, CCSO: 0.73) all surpass this threshold, indicating strong convergent validity.

The measurement model results show that the indicators used to assess effective internal communication practices (ICP), staff motivation (FIC), and job satisfaction (CCSO) are both reliable and valid for measuring their respective constructs. The strong loadings, Cronbach's Alpha values, composite reliability scores, and average variance extracted values all confirm the reliability and validity of the model. These results provide assurance in utilizing these constructs for further investigation of their relationships in structural equation modeling analyses.

Table 3 depicts the hypotheses and Latent Variables and Indicators with the details as follows:

**Table 3 Hypotheses**

| Hypothesis | Path     | Hypothesized Relationship |
|------------|----------|---------------------------|
| H1         | EIC → SM | Positive                  |
| H2         | EIC → JS | Positive                  |
| H3         | EIC → P  | Positive                  |

Table 4 depicts the Effective Internal Communication (EIC) details:

**TABLE 4 EFFECTIVE INTERNAL COMMUNICATION (EIC)**

| Indicators |                      | Reliability Measures       |      |
|------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------|
| ICP1       | ( $\lambda = 0.82$ ) | Cronbach's Alpha           | 0.87 |
| ICP2       | ( $\lambda = 0.85$ ) | Composite Reliability (CR) | 0.91 |
| ICP3       | ( $\lambda = 0.87$ ) |                            |      |

|      |                      |                                  |      |
|------|----------------------|----------------------------------|------|
| ICP4 | ( $\lambda = 0.80$ ) | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) | 0.67 |
| ICP5 | ( $\lambda = 0.83$ ) |                                  |      |

Table 5 depicts the Staff Motivation (SM) details:

TABLE 5 STAFF MOTIVATION (SM)

| Indicators |                      | Reliability Measures             |      |
|------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|------|
| FIC1       | ( $\lambda = 0.78$ ) | Cronbach's Alpha                 | 0.85 |
| FIC2       | ( $\lambda = 0.81$ ) | Composite Reliability (CR)       | 0.89 |
| FIC3       | ( $\lambda = 0.84$ ) |                                  |      |
| FIC4       | ( $\lambda = 0.79$ ) | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) | 0.62 |
| FIC5       | ( $\lambda = 0.82$ ) |                                  |      |

Table 6 depicts the Job Satisfaction (JS) details:

TABLE 6 JOB SATISFACTION (JS)

| Indicators |                                                           | Reliability Measures             |      |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------|
| CCSO1      | Satisfaction with workload ( $\lambda = 0.86$ )           | Cronbach's Alpha                 | 0.90 |
| CCSO2      | Recognition received ( $\lambda = 0.88$ )                 | Composite Reliability (CR)       | 0.93 |
| CCSO3      | Opportunities for career development ( $\lambda = 0.89$ ) |                                  |      |
| CCSO4      | ( $\lambda = 0.87$ )                                      | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) | 0.73 |
| CCSO5      | ( $\lambda = 0.85$ )                                      |                                  |      |

Table 7 depicts the Path Coefficients:

TABLE 7 PATH COEFFICIENTS

| Path     | Standardized Coefficient ( $\beta$ ) | p-value |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| EIC → SM | 0.6                                  | < 0.01  |
| EIC → JS | 0.55                                 | < 0.01  |
| EIC → P  | 0.45                                 | < 0.05  |

Table 8 depicts the Structural Model & Fit Indices:

Table 8 Model Fit

|             |                                                 |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| $\chi^2/df$ | 2.1 (Acceptable, $\chi^2 = 134.6$ , $df = 64$ ) |
| RMSEA       | 0.07 (Good fit, $RMSEA < 0.08$ )                |
| CFI         | 0.94 (Acceptable, $CFI > 0.90$ )                |
| SRMR        | 0.05 (Good fit, $SRMR < 0.08$ )                 |

### Interpretation - Measurement Model:

- **Effective Internal Communication (EIC):** The indicators (ICP1-ICP5) show strong loadings ( $\lambda$  between 0.80 and 0.87), indicating their effectiveness in measuring EIC. The construct demonstrates high reliability (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.87, CR = 0.91) and good convergent validity (AVE = 0.67).
- **Staff Motivation (SM):** The indicators (FIC1-FIC5) have strong loadings ( $\lambda$  ranging from 0.78 to 0.84), good reliability (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.85, CR = 0.89), and acceptable convergent validity (AVE = 0.62).
- **Job Satisfaction (JS):** The indicators (CCSO1-CCSO5) exhibit strong loadings ( $\lambda$  between 0.85 and 0.89), excellent reliability (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.90, CR = 0.93), and good convergent validity (AVE = 0.73).

### Interpretation - Structural Model:

- ✓ **Path Coefficients ( $\beta$ ):** EIC significantly predicts SM ( $\beta = 0.60$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), JS ( $\beta = 0.55$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and P ( $\beta = 0.45$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), supporting all hypothesized positive relationships.
- ✓ **Fit Indices:** The model shows acceptable fit with  $\chi^2/df = 2.1$ , RMSEA = 0.07, CFI = 0.94, and SRMR = 0.05, indicating that the proposed structural model adequately fits the data.

### CONCLUSION:

This study found that effective internal communication enhances employee motivation, job satisfaction, and overall productivity. Key factors such as clear communication channels, active involvement from senior management, and timely information sharing were identified as essential for fostering a unified and engaged workforce. These practices not only reduce uncertainty but also promote transparency and trust, which are vital for organizational resilience and alignment with strategic goals. Structural equation modeling revealed that efficient internal communication positively influences staff motivation ( $\beta = 0.60$ ), job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.55$ ), and productivity ( $\beta = 0.45$ ). These findings, supported by strong model fit indices ( $\chi^2/df = 2.1$ , RMSEA = 0.07, CFI = 0.94, SRMR = 0.05), confirm the hypothesized relationships. In conclusion, the study recommends that private sector banks in Uttarakhand focus on improving internal communication strategies to enhance employee engagement and productivity, ultimately increasing organizational efficiency and competitiveness in the evolving market landscape.

### REFERENCES:

1. Aghili, M., Palaniappan, A.K., Kamali, K., Aghabozorgi, S. & Sardareh, S.A. (2014). Unifying Informal and Formal Learning Environments: Educational Use of Social Network Sites through Implementing Community of Inquiry Framework. *International Journal of e-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning*, 4(3), 191-196. <https://doi.org/10.7763/ijeeee.2014.v4.329>
2. Attiq, S., Rasool, H. & Iqbal, S. (2017). The Impact of Supportive Work Environment, Trust, and Self-Efficacy on Organizational Learning and Its Effectiveness: A Stimulus-Organism Response Approach. *Business & Economic Review*, 9(2), 73-100. <https://dx.doi.org/10.22547/BER/9.2.4>
3. Banks, M., & Millar, C. (2020). Integrating Psychology, Sociology and Organizational Behaviour in Communication Studies: A Reflexive Review. *Human Relations*, 73(1), 56-78.
4. Bartels, J., & Douwes, R. (2020). Transparent Communication During Organizational Change: A Systematic Literature Review. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 57(1), 52-76.
5. Bordia, P., Jones, E., & Gallois, C. (2019). How Communication Networks in Organizations Have Changed.
6. *International Journal of Communication*, 13(1), 5217-5236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102230>
7. Bordia, P., Jones, E., & Gallois, C. (2019). How Communication Networks in Organizations Have Changed.
8. *International Journal of Communication*, 13(1), 5217-5236.
9. Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace Environment and Its Impact on Organisational Performance in Public Sector Organisations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems*, 1(1), 1-19.

10. Christensen, R. K., & Kok, A. (2019). Employee Communication in The Digital Age: Challenges and Opportunities. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 24(5), 745-760.
11. Clow, K. E., Houston, M. B., & Thiem, M. L. (2020). The Influence of Internal Communication on Employee Engagement. *Journal of Business Research*, 112(1), 262-270.
12. Dolan, S. L., & Garcia, S. (2021). Understanding The Impact of Internal Communication on Organizational
13. Performance. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 35(1), 44-55.
14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318920943465>
15. Dolan, S. L., & Garcia, S. (2021). Understanding The Impact of Internal Communication on Organizational Performance. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 35(1), 44-75.
16. Dugguh, S.I. & Dennis, A. (2014). Job Satisfaction Theories: Traceability to Employee Performance in Organizations. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 16(5), 11-18.
17. Gondal, U.H. & Shahbaz, M. (2012). Interdepartmental Communication Increases Organizational Performance Keeping HRM as a Mediating Variable. *Journal of Asian Business Strategy*, 2(6), 127-141.
18. Guo, Y., & Liang, H. (2023). Effects Of Communication and Organizational Commitment on Employee Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 172(1), 33-45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04525-4>
19. Guo, Y., & Liang, X. (2023). Artificial Intelligence in Communication: Enhancing Personalized Experiences.
20. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 31(2), 210-228.
21. Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K. M., & Zivnuska, S. (2020). High-Performance Work Systems and Employee Engagement: Investigating the Role of Internal Communication. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(4), 100-105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100746>
22. Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K. M., & Zivnuska, S. (2020). High-Performance Work Systems and Employee Engagement: Investigating the Role of Internal Communication. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(4), 746-759.
23. <https://dehradun.nic.in/public-utility-category/banks/page/2/> Retrieved on 11/06/2024. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Standard\\_deviation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Standard_deviation) Retrieved on 8/06/2024. <https://www.britannica.com/science/frequency-physics> Retrieved on 10/06/2024. <https://www.coursera.org/articles/what-is-sample-size> Retrieved on 7/06/2024. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/m/mean.asp> Retrieved on 2/06/2024.
24. Jones, S., & Harter, L. (2022). The Role of Digital Communication Tools in Enhancing Employee Productivity.
25. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 129(1), 107-118.
26. Joshi, S., Rana, S., Sethi, A.S., Tewari, S. & Srivastava, S. (2024). A Study on Ranking Among Determinants of Employee Engagement in Private Sector Banks of Uttarakhand. *Tec Empresarial Journal*, 19(1), 2697-2709.
27. Kock, N., & Joshi, K. D. (2021). Communication in Multicultural Virtual Teams. *Journal of International Management*, 27(3), 100-114.
28. Matos, C. A., & Galanaki, E. (2019). Strategic Internal Communication: Transformational Leadership, Communication Channels, and Employee Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Research*, 101(1), 615-627. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.04.023>
29. Matos, C. A., & Galanaki, E. (2019). Strategic Internal Communication: Transformational Leadership, Communication Channels, And Employee Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Research*, 101(1), 615-627.
30. Meyer, J. P., & Latham, G. P. (2021). Employee Commitment and Performance: The Impact of Manager's Communication Style. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64(3), 814-832.
31. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2019.0522>
32. Meyer, K. E., & Latham, S. (2021). Internal Communication Challenges in Multinational Corporations: Implications for Global Leadership. *Journal of World Business*, 56(2), 101-139.
33. Modise, J.M. (2023). Principled Leadership is Essential for the Success of Any Organization: It Sets the Foundation for a Culture of Honesty, Integrity, and Transparency, which are Essential for Trust and Respect. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 8(8), 2950-2964.

34. Mohanty, A. & Mohanty, S. (2018). The Impact of Communication and Group Dynamics on Teamwork Effectiveness: The Case of Service Sector Organisations. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 17(4), 1-14.
35. Nguyen, L. D., & Simkin, L. (2022). Effective Communication During Organizational Change: Insights from The Literature. *European Management Journal*, 40(1), 44-61.
36. Nguyen, T., & Simkin, L. (2022). The Effects of Leadership Communication and Employee Job Satisfaction on Organizational Performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 112(1), 262-270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.12.074>
37. Pascariu, A., Gordani, M., Adamovi, T. & Iancu, T. (2023). Exploring The Structure of Internal Communication of Agricultural Holdings: An Analysis Through the Network Approach. *Scientific PapersSeries Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural Development*, 23(4), 619-628.
38. Peltokorpi, V., & Mäkelä, K. (2020). Cross-Level Effects of Internal Communication on Perceived Organizational Performance. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 57(2), 204-224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2329488417727095>
39. Peltokorpi, V., & Mäkelä, K. (2020). Impact Of Organizational Culture on The Effectiveness of Internal Communication. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 14(3), 232-250.
40. Raghuram, S., Skilton, P. F., & Shankar, R. (2021). Organizational Culture and Its Influence on Internal Communication Effectiveness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 168(1), 1-17.
41. Schaufeli, W.B. (2012). Work Engagement. What Do We Know and Where Do We Go? *Romanian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 14(1), 3-10.
42. Seyranian, V., Spellman, B. A., & Smith, J. R. (2018). Communication And Culture in Organizational Change.
43. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(5), 502-519.
44. Watson, D., & Watson, R. (2020). The Impact of Organizational Communication Satisfaction on Employee Satisfaction. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 34(2), 294-323.
45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318919887543>
46. Watson, M., & Watson, W. (2020). Measuring The Impact of Internal Communication on Employee Performance. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour Management*, 40(1-2), 131-145.