IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 5, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

The Currency of Clarity: Strategic Communication as a Catalyst for Corporate Governance and Market Leadership

Dev Bansal[1] and Dr. Manju Rani[2]
Student, School of Management Science, Apeejay Stya University, Gurugram, Haryana[1]
Assistant Professor, School of Behaviour Science, Apeejay Stya University, Gurugram, Haryana[2]

Abstract: *Strategic communication connects organizational decisions with the people who must understand, evaluate, implement, or challenge them. This paper examines that connection through a secondary-data analysis and a theory-informed narrative review. It considers how communication may support corporate governance, employee alignment, stakeholder relationships, and the organizational capabilities associated with market leadership. The empirical component uses a traceable Gallup series on global employee engagement and life evaluation for 2015–2024, excluding 2017 because the source does not report a global engagement observation for that year. Contextual evidence comes from Deloitte's 2024 Gen Z and Millennial Survey and Randstad's Workmonitor 2023. Descriptive comparisons indicate that global engagement increased from 15% in 2015 to 21% in 2024, with interruptions in 2020 and 2024; these movements do not establish changes in communication quality. The theoretical discussion integrates information asymmetry, the job demands–resources model, and self-determination theory. It develops an explanatory framework in which accurate disclosure, usable information, meaningful feedback, and consistency between messages and conduct may strengthen organizational coordination. The study does not estimate a causal effect on profitability, investor confidence, or market leadership. Its contribution is a reproducible secondary database, a cautious interpretation of year-wise patterns, and a practical framework for communication governance. Limitations include aggregate data, heterogeneous source populations, self-reported measures, and the absence of direct longitudinal communication indicators. The paper concludes that clarity should be treated as a governed organizational capability rather than as a substitute for ethical conduct, adequate resources, or effective management*

Keywords: strategic communication, corporate governance, employee engagement, information asymmetry, secondary data, stakeholder relationships.

I. INTRODUCTION

Strategic communication concerns more than transmitting a message in an attractive form. In the framework developed here, it involves deciding what information people need, who is responsible for its accuracy, when it should be released, and how recipients can question or use it. This definition places communication within organizational decision processes rather than treating it only as publicity. A corporate announcement can be concise yet misleading, technically accurate yet inaccessible, or timely yet incomplete. Clarity therefore requires attention to substance, context, audience, and opportunities for response. The present paper examines these relationships through existing academic literature and published workforce evidence, while maintaining a distinction between a persuasive conceptual explanation and an empirically established effect.

The governance relevance of communication is particularly visible when managers possess information that outside stakeholders cannot directly observe. Investors may need to assess performance, employees may need to interpret a

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 5, October 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

strategic change, and boards may need to understand emerging operational risks. Healy and Palepu (2001) review disclosure research in relation to information asymmetry and capital markets, providing an established basis for examining why information quality matters. Their framework does not imply that additional disclosure is automatically useful or that a positive narrative proves sound governance. Instead, it directs attention to incentives, credibility, intermediation, and the conditions under which information helps users evaluate a business. This paper applies that distinction to both external disclosure and internal organizational communication.

The workforce dimension introduces a related but different question: how do organizational explanations, expectations, and feedback connect with employees' experience of work? Gallup's published global series provides evidence on engagement and life evaluation, while Deloitte and Randstad provide contextual evidence on purpose, belonging, values, and uncertainty (Deloitte, 2024; Harter & Pendell, 2025; Randstad, 2023). These indicators are relevant because communication occurs within relationships that involve motivation and perceived support. However, engagement is not a direct measure of communication quality, belonging is not identical to stakeholder trust, and purpose is not interchangeable with financial performance. Keeping these constructs separate is essential to the credibility of a secondary-data paper.

The original manuscript combined a qualitative comparison with numerical clarity, misinformation, decision-speed, and trust indicators whose exact measurement and provenance were not documented. This revision replaces those unsupported numerical comparisons with a transparent descriptive database. It retains the central intellectual concern—communication as a strategic organizational capability—but narrows the empirical claims to what the selected sources can support. Market leadership remains an important conceptual outcome rather than a measured dependent variable. The resulting paper is best understood as a descriptive secondary-data study with a theory-informed narrative synthesis, not as an experiment, a firm-level causal evaluation, or a systematic review claiming exhaustive coverage of the literature.

Research Objectives And Questions

The first objective is to establish a traceable year-wise comparison of workforce indicators that can contextualize discussion of strategic communication. The second is to interpret those patterns using relevant organizational and disclosure theories without relabeling the indicators as measures of clarity. The third is to identify governance practices through which communication can become more accountable, accessible, and responsive. A final objective is to identify what additional evidence would be necessary to test claims about financial performance and market leadership. Together, these objectives prioritize conceptual coherence and reproducibility over a larger but weakly documented collection of statistics.

Three research questions guide the analysis. First, what descriptive changes appear in Gallup's reported global employee engagement and thriving measures across the available observations from 2015 through 2024? Second, how do the selected findings from Deloitte and Randstad contextualize the importance of purpose, belonging, and organizational support? Third, what theory-informed communication practices follow from the combined evidence, and what limits should govern their interpretation? No statistical hypothesis is presented as tested. The paper instead distinguishes observed patterns, theoretical explanations, and proposed managerial applications throughout its findings and discussion.

Literature Review And Theoretical Framework

Strategic Communication and Information Asymmetry

Information asymmetry describes a situation in which relevant parties possess unequal information. In corporate settings, managers may know more about internal activities and prospects than investors or other external audiences. Healy and Palepu (2001) connect corporate disclosure with these informational problems and review the empirical literature on disclosure in capital markets. For the present analysis, their contribution supports a central proposition: communication has governance value when it helps recipients assess organizational actions more accurately. It does not

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 5, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

support presenting every communication campaign as a financial intervention. The distinction matters because disclosure incentives and credibility may shape whether a message reduces uncertainty or merely redistributes attention.

Applying this perspective to practice requires distinguishing availability from usability. Publishing a long report may increase the amount of information available while leaving key assumptions difficult to identify. Conversely, an oversimplified summary may hide uncertainty that users need to understand. This paper therefore proposes evaluating communication along four dimensions: factual reliability, explanatory completeness, audience accessibility, and accountability for corrections. These dimensions are analytical recommendations derived from the disclosure problem, not a validated scale. A future study could operationalize them through independently coded corporate reports and audience comprehension tests. Until such validation occurs, they should remain a structured framework for inquiry rather than a numerical clarity index.

Job Demands–Resources Perspective

Bakker and Demerouti's (2007) job demands–resources model offers a framework for examining working conditions in terms of the demands placed on employees and the resources available to meet them. Within this framework, communication can be considered a potential resource when it explains responsibilities, identifies support, or makes feedback usable. It can also become part of a demand when employees face contradictory instructions, excessive messaging, or unresolved ambiguity. These applications are theoretical interpretations of the model; the secondary database used here does not measure communication demands or resources directly. Recognizing that limitation prevents the discussion from turning a general organizational theory into an unsupported empirical finding.

A practical implication is that more communication is not necessarily better communication. A manager who sends repeated updates without clarifying priorities may increase the burden of interpretation. An employee may understand a task but still lack the time, staffing, or authority needed to complete it. Accordingly, the proposed communication framework treats role clarity as complementary to material and managerial support. It recommends that an instruction identify the required action, the reason for it, the responsible decision-maker, and the route for resolving conflicts. These suggestions follow the model's resource-oriented logic but require evaluation in particular workplaces before claims about effectiveness can be made.

Self-Determination and Meaningful Participation

Deci and Ryan (2000) explain motivation through the needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Their theory provides a useful basis for interpreting why the manner of communication may matter alongside its content. An explanation that acknowledges employees' perspectives may differ motivationally from an unexplained command, even when both describe the same task. Clear feedback may support competence, and respectful interaction may support relatedness. These are theory-informed connections rather than causal estimates produced by this paper. The framework also cautions against equating message compliance with genuine engagement, since outward agreement does not necessarily reveal whether people experience their work as meaningful or self-directed.

The contextual workforce evidence is relevant to this discussion but does not directly validate the theory. Deloitte (2024) reports that purpose is important to job satisfaction and well-being for 86% of Gen Z respondents and 89% of millennial respondents. Randstad (2023) reports that 54% of respondents would quit a job if they did not feel they belonged. These results identify stated priorities in different survey populations. They do not demonstrate that a particular leadership message satisfies psychological needs or reduces actual turnover. Their analytical value lies in showing why organizational explanations of purpose and inclusion deserve attention, while leaving the mechanisms and outcomes open to further investigation.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 5, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

An Integrated Conceptual Framework

The paper brings these perspectives together through a proposed sequence: reliable information supports understanding; understanding can support informed participation; participation and consistent conduct may strengthen coordination and credibility; and these organizational capabilities may contribute to longer-term performance. Each transition is conditional. People can understand a decision and still reasonably disagree with it. A transparent organization can face adverse market conditions. Strong engagement can coexist with problems in disclosure or oversight. Consequently, the framework is not a universal pathway from clear language to market leadership. It is a set of propositions for organizing managerial attention and designing subsequent research.

The framework also separates internal and external audiences. Employees need actionable expectations, feedback, and opportunities to raise concerns. Investors need decision-relevant disclosures and explanations of assumptions. Boards need information that permits challenge rather than merely reassurance. Customers and communities may need accessible accounts of organizational commitments and consequences. A consistent underlying evidence base can support all these audiences, but identical wording is not always appropriate. The proposed objective is consistency of substance with adaptation of explanation. This distinction helps avoid the false choice between standardized messages that ignore audience needs and customized narratives that contradict one another.

Method

Research Design and Scope

This study uses a descriptive secondary-data design combined with a purposive narrative review. It analyzes published aggregate indicators rather than collecting original responses. The empirical period is deliberately bounded at 2015–2024 to provide a historical comparison aligned with the original manuscript's concerns. A source published in 2025 is used because it reports observations through 2024; publication year and observation year are therefore recorded separately. The paper does not claim to provide the latest available global workforce estimate as of its preparation date. It also does not claim that its selected literature represents a comprehensive systematic search across all communication, accounting, and organizational behavior research.

The empirical unit of analysis is a reported global year-level percentage in the Gallup series. The contextual unit is an individual published survey finding from Deloitte or Randstad. These are not interchangeable units, and they are not merged into a pooled respondent-level dataset. The manuscript therefore uses the phrase secondary database to mean a structured extraction of published aggregate observations with source metadata. It does not imply access to confidential survey microdata or the ability to reproduce the original organizations' sampling and weighting procedures. This distinction is necessary because the analytical options available from summary percentages are substantially narrower than those available from original individual-level records.

Sources and Selection Rationale

Six sources form the evidence base: three scholarly publications and three organizational publications. The scholarly works are Bakker and Demerouti (2007), Deci and Ryan (2000), and Healy and Palepu (2001). They were selected for their relevance to demands and resources, motivation, and disclosure respectively. The organizational publications are Harter and Pendell's (2025) Gallup analysis, Deloitte's (2024) survey release, and Randstad's (2023) Workmonitor report. They provide a longitudinal global series and contextual workforce findings. Selection was purposive and relevance-based; no claim is made that a preregistered search protocol, independent dual screening, or formal evidence-quality scoring was performed.

The inclusion criteria were an identifiable author or corporate author, a traceable publication, a clearly stated indicator, and relevance to at least one research question. Numerical observations also required an identifiable population and temporal label. Excluded material included the original manuscript's unsupported clarity and misinformation measures, references described only as unspecified strategic communication reports, and numerical high-clarity versus low-clarity comparisons without operational definitions. This exclusion does not prove that no similar evidence exists elsewhere. It

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 5, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

means that the figures supplied in the original draft could not be responsibly retained as established findings on the basis of the available documentation.

Data Extraction and Comparability

The extraction sheet records source, publication year, observation or fieldwork period, indicator name, reported value, population, and interpretive restrictions. Gallup supplies global engagement and thriving percentages. Deloitte's 2024 release reports 22,841 respondents across 44 countries, comprising 14,468 Gen Z respondents and 8,373 millennials; fieldwork ran from November 24, 2023, to March 11, 2024 (Deloitte, 2024). Randstad's Workmonitor 2023 describes approximately 35,000 respondents across 34 markets, with fieldwork conducted October 18–30, 2022 (Randstad, 2023). The different fieldwork windows illustrate why a report's cover year should not automatically be treated as the year in which every response was collected.

Gallup's engagement measure and thriving measure remain separate variables. Thriving is a life-evaluation category, not a satisfaction rating of corporate communication. The year-wise table includes every available Gallup engagement observation within the selected period: 2015, 2016, and 2018–2024. The source reports no global engagement observation for 2017, so no value is interpolated. Deloitte and Randstad findings are presented as contextual entries rather than added to the Gallup time series. No cross-source average is calculated, because the indicators, respondent populations, and survey designs differ. This preserves interpretability at the cost of a less visually uniform database.

Analytical Procedure and Ethical Handling

Analysis consists of tabulation, percentage-point changes, and narrative interpretation. A percentage-point change is calculated by subtracting the earlier percentage from the later percentage. Relative percentage changes are used only where explicitly labeled and are not substituted for percentage-point differences. No regression, significance test, or causal model is estimated. The number of aggregate observations is small, and the database contains no direct annual measure of communication effectiveness. For these reasons, calculating correlations between engagement and an invented communication score would not add valid evidence. The analysis instead emphasizes transparent arithmetic and clear separation between observations and proposed explanations.

No participants were recruited for this paper, and no personal identifiers were processed. This statement describes the activities undertaken; it is not a claim of institutional ethics approval or exemption. The main research-integrity obligations concern accurate attribution, preservation of indicator meaning, disclosure of missing data, and restraint in interpretation. Published corporate reports are treated as sources that require contextual evaluation rather than as automatically neutral representations of all workers. Their findings are cited for the claims they actually report. The analysis avoids fabricated sample sizes, reconstructed respondent records, and institutional comparisons that the selected sources do not document.

Results

Year-Wise Global Workforce Comparison

Table 1 presents the extracted Gallup observations. Global engagement was 15% in 2015, 17% in 2016, 19% in 2018, and 22% in 2019. It then declined to 20% in 2020, increased to 21% in 2021, and reached 23% in both 2022 and 2023 before falling to 21% in 2024 (Harter & Pendell, 2025). The available observations show improvement over the full period but not a continuous annual increase. They also show why inserting an assumed 2017 observation would misrepresent the source. The table preserves the gap and labels changes against the preceding available observation rather than implying that every interval covers exactly one year.

Table 1: *Year-Wise Global Employee Engagement and Life Evaluation, 2015–2024*

Year	Engaged (%)	Change (pp)	Thriving (%)
2015	15	—	30
2016	17	+2	27

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 5, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

Year	Engaged (%)	Change (pp)	Thriving (%)
2018	19	+2	28
2019	22	+3	30
2020	20	-2	32
2021	21	+1	33
2022	23	+2	35
2023	23	+0	34
2024	21	-2	33

Note. Extracted from Harter and Pendell (2025). Change (pp) is the percentage-point difference from the previous available observation; the 2016–2018 interval spans two years. The source has no global engagement observation for 2017, which is omitted rather than imputed. Thriving refers to life evaluation, not communication quality. Publication year is 2025; observation years are shown in the table.

Across the endpoints, engagement increased by 6 percentage points, from 15% to 21%. Relative to the 2015 baseline, this is a 40% increase in the reported engaged share. These two descriptions use different denominators and should not be confused: the workforce did not become 40 percentage points more engaged. The 2019–2020 change was a decline of 2 percentage points, while the 2021–2022 increase was 2 percentage points. The 2023–2024 decline was also 2 percentage points. None of these comparisons identifies which management practices changed, which organizations contributed most to the movement, or how particular industries performed within the global aggregate.

The thriving series supplies a broader context rather than an alternative engagement measure. It was 30% in 2015, 27% in 2016, 28% in 2018, and 30% in 2019. It increased to 32% in 2020, 33% in 2021, and 35% in 2022 before declining to 34% in 2023 and 33% in 2024 (Harter & Pendell, 2025). The 2020 contrast is especially important: engagement fell while thriving increased. That divergence cautions against treating different indicators of worker experience as a single underlying index. A proposed communication intervention would need to specify its intended outcome rather than assuming that every favorable workforce measure moves together.

What the Temporal Comparison Can Establish

The time series establishes the reported direction and size of changes in the selected global indicators. It supports describing 2019 as higher than 2015 for engagement, 2020 as lower than 2019, and 2024 as below the 2022–2023 peak. It does not establish that communication deteriorated in precisely those years or that misinformation increased when engagement decreased. Although Harter and Pendell (2025) discuss managerial pressures and post-pandemic organizational changes, the present database cannot isolate those explanations. Temporal coincidence provides a starting point for research, not a sufficient basis for attributing causes to communication channels, leadership style, or remote-working arrangements.

The historical comparison also changes the interpretation of recovery. Engagement in 2024 was below its recent peak and 1 percentage point below its 2019 level, but it remained above the reported 2015 and 2016 levels. Thriving in 2024 was below its 2022 peak but above its 2019 level. Thus, a statement that organizational conditions had simply recovered or had uniformly worsened would compress distinct patterns into an inaccurate narrative. Communication about organizational performance should follow the same discipline: identify the baseline, preserve indicator definitions, and acknowledge when different measures support different conclusions. This is an analytical lesson drawn from the comparison, not a measured communication outcome.

Contextual Findings on Purpose and Belonging

Deloitte's (2024) findings show that purpose was important to job satisfaction and well-being for 86% of Gen Z respondents and 89% of millennials. The release also reports that 50% of Gen Z respondents and 43% of millennials had rejected assignments based on personal ethics or beliefs. These figures represent different questions and should not be collapsed into one statistic about rejecting employers. For communication strategy, they raise a substantive issue:

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 5, October 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

statements about organizational purpose need to connect with decisions employees can observe. The survey does not show whether a particular campaign changes behavior, but it gives a reason to investigate the credibility of the relationship between stated values and actual practice.

Randstad (2023) reports that 54% of respondents would quit if they did not feel they belonged at their company, while 57% said their job fulfilled their need for a sense of purpose. These are a conditional stated intention and a current perception respectively. Neither figure is an observed annual turnover rate. Moreover, the report's 2023 label refers to a publication based on fieldwork in October 2022. Recording this timing prevents the contextual table from creating a false sequence in which a Randstad percentage is compared directly with a Deloitte percentage as though both measured the same construct in consecutive years. Table 2 retains these distinctions explicitly.

Table 2: *Contextual Secondary Evidence on Purpose, Values, and Belonging*

Source / period	Indicator	Value	Interpretation boundary
Deloitte (2024); Nov. 2023–Mar. 2024	Purpose important to satisfaction and well-being	Gen Z 86%; millennials 89%	Two cohort estimates; not an engagement time series
Deloitte (2024); Nov. 2023–Mar. 2024	Rejected assignments on ethics or beliefs	Gen Z 50%; millennials 43%	Not the percentage rejecting employers
Randstad (2023); Oct. 2022	Would quit without belonging	54%	Conditional intention; not observed turnover
Randstad (2023); Oct. 2022	Job fulfills need for purpose	57%	Current perception; not purpose importance

Note. Sources: Deloitte (2024) and Randstad (2023). Different populations and questions preclude pooling. Deloitte: 22,841 respondents in 44 countries; fieldwork November 24, 2023–March 11, 2024. Randstad: approximately 35,000 respondents in 34 markets; fieldwork October 18–30, 2022.

Taken together, the contextual findings support a limited synthesis: purpose, values, and belonging are salient themes in the selected surveys. They do not establish the size of the return on communication investment, the prevalence of financial transparency, or a quantified difference between strong-communication and weak-communication firms. The revised analysis therefore does not retain the original draft's 85% versus 35% financial transparency comparison, 80% versus 30% crisis-response comparison, or 78% versus 42% employee-alignment comparison. Removing unsupported precision strengthens rather than weakens the paper, because it makes the remaining numerical evidence traceable and reduces the risk of confusing illustration with observation.

Discussion

Communication as a Governance Capability

The theoretical and descriptive evidence supports examining communication as part of governance rather than as a separate decorative function. Disclosure research places information quality within the relationship between organizations and capital-market users (Healy & Palepu, 2001). Organizational theory places expectations, resources, and motivation within employees' working conditions (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Deci & Ryan, 2000). The integration proposed here is that communication governance should define not only the message but also responsibility for evidence, approval, delivery, feedback, and correction. This is a practical framework inferred from the literature. It should not be represented as a quantitatively validated model produced by the aggregate workforce series.

For boards and executives, the implication is to ask whether reporting systems permit challenge. A polished presentation may communicate confidence without revealing uncertainty or alternative explanations. The present study's own year-wise comparison illustrates the value of showing multiple indicators and stating what cannot be inferred. An analogous corporate report could identify assumptions, distinguish achieved results from future intentions, and explain adverse outcomes alongside favorable ones. Such practices address the informational problem identified by Healy and Palepu (2001), but their effectiveness would depend on enforcement, independence, organizational

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 5, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

incentives, and the quality of the underlying records. Clarity cannot compensate for inaccurate accounting or deliberate concealment.

Employee Alignment and Psychological Interpretation

The job demands–resources perspective suggests that communication should reduce avoidable ambiguity without pretending to remove all uncertainty (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). A change announcement can identify what is known, what remains undecided, and when the next update will occur. That approach may provide a usable resource even when leaders cannot guarantee a favorable outcome. By contrast, repeated reassurance without actionable guidance may fail to address the demands employees actually face. This paper proposes treating questions, clarification requests, and conflicting instructions as diagnostic signals for management review. Their usefulness should be assessed alongside staffing, workload, access to support, and employees' opportunity to influence relevant decisions.

Self-determination theory adds that communication should not be evaluated only by how quickly it produces agreement (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Employees may need a credible explanation, meaningful choice where possible, and feedback that helps them develop competence. Deloitte's purpose findings and Randstad's belonging findings make these issues relevant to the selected workforce context, but they do not establish the motivational effects of any particular wording (Deloitte, 2024; Randstad, 2023). The proposed managerial response is therefore participatory rather than purely promotional: invite questions, explain constraints, and distinguish negotiable implementation details from fixed requirements. These practices remain recommendations for application and evaluation, not findings experimentally tested in this study.

Crisis Communication and Negotiation

Crisis communication is included as an application of the conceptual framework, not as an empirically measured outcome. The secondary database contains no crisis-response time, reputational-loss estimate, or verified comparison between organizations with different crisis strategies. Accordingly, the paper proposes a cautious protocol: identify confirmed facts, describe immediate protective actions, state important uncertainties, assign a responsible spokesperson, and provide a schedule for updates. The rationale is consistency with the paper's emphasis on evidence and accountability. An organization applying this protocol should test whether audiences understand the information and whether internal decisions are being implemented, rather than using message volume or favorable publicity as sufficient evidence of success.

Negotiation presents a similar distinction between clarity and persuasion. A party can communicate its position clearly while pursuing an unfavorable or unfair outcome. In the proposed framework, strategic negotiation requires separating verified facts, estimates, preferences, and commitments. The organization should record who has authority to make concessions and how agreements will be confirmed. These recommendations extend the disclosure and coordination logic of the paper, but no negotiation-success statistic is calculated. Future research could examine whether documented clarification procedures reduce disputes or improve agreement implementation. Until then, it would be inappropriate to claim that this study proves communication produces superior negotiated financial outcomes.

Digitalization, Inclusion, and Audience Differences

The selected sources support treating workforce concerns as heterogeneous rather than uniform. Deloitte's (2024) survey distinguishes Gen Z respondents from millennials, while Randstad (2023) reports across multiple markets and describes variation in worker priorities. These designs do not justify stereotypes about an entire generation, culture, or national workforce. For communication planning, the paper proposes checking understanding directly instead of assuming that one channel or tone suits everyone. Practical adaptations might include accessible summaries, opportunities for written questions, and explanations of unfamiliar technical terms. These are proposed design choices, not claims that a particular format has a measured universal advantage.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 5, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

Digital channels should likewise be assessed in relation to the task they support. A short notification may be suitable for announcing a deadline but insufficient for explaining a complex policy change. An archived decision note may help preserve an organizational record, while a discussion may reveal misunderstandings that a static document misses. The demands–resources perspective suggests examining whether channel design supports work or adds avoidable burden (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). This paper does not compare software platforms or estimate the effects of remote work. It recommends evaluating accessibility, message duplication, response expectations, and responsibility for maintaining an authoritative version of important information.

Financial Performance and Market Leadership

The title's reference to market leadership should be interpreted as a strategic proposition rather than an achieved empirical finding. No revenue, market-share, cost-of-capital, share-price, or profitability series is analyzed. The workforce indicators therefore cannot establish that organizations with stronger communication financially outperform others. Healy and Palepu (2001) provide relevant disclosure scholarship, but importing conclusions from that broad literature does not create a causal result in this paper's dataset. A defensible interpretation is that communication may support capabilities important to competitive performance, such as coordinated implementation and informed stakeholder assessment, while the magnitude and direction of financial consequences remain unestimated here.

A stronger future study would connect measured communication practices with independently observed firm outcomes over time. It would need to address reverse causality, since successful firms may have more resources to invest in communication. It would also need to consider confounding influences such as leadership quality, industry conditions, firm size, regulation, and organizational culture. Comparing an aggregate global engagement percentage with a separate corporate profitability statistic would not solve these problems. The present paper therefore treats market leadership as a research horizon and managerial concern, while grounding its results in the narrower descriptive evidence that is actually available.

Managerial Implications And Proposed Implementation Framework

The first proposed action is to establish ownership of important organizational information. For each major reporting process, management should identify who produces the data, who checks it, who authorizes release, and who corrects errors. A documented chain of responsibility can make the communication process reviewable. This proposal follows the paper's governance logic rather than an estimated intervention effect. It is especially relevant where several departments describe the same decision to different audiences. The objective is not identical wording in every setting, but a shared factual foundation that prevents incompatible claims about results, commitments, or responsibilities.

The second action is to design messages around decisions and comprehension. A report should explain what has happened, why it matters, what action is required, and what uncertainty remains. Managers can test comprehension by asking recipients to identify the practical implications in their own words. This is proposed as an evaluation technique, not as a validated universal assessment instrument. It should be used respectfully and with attention to the quality of the explanation rather than as a test that blames recipients for misunderstanding. A misunderstanding may indicate missing context, conflicting instructions, technical complexity, or a mismatch between the communication channel and the task.

The third action is to create a feedback-and-correction process. Organizations should specify where stakeholders can ask questions, how questions will be routed, and when a response can reasonably be expected. Repeated questions can identify unclear assumptions or missing information. Corrections should preserve a record of what changed rather than silently overwriting significant errors. These recommendations reflect the paper's emphasis on accountable information exchange. They also align conceptually with treating communication as a resource rather than a stream of instructions (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Their success should be judged through local evidence rather than assumed from the presence of a feedback channel alone.

The fourth action is to align purpose statements with observable choices. Deloitte (2024) and Randstad (2023) indicate the relevance of purpose and belonging within their respondent populations. The proposed response is to connect stated

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 5, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

organizational values with decisions about work design, training, employee support, and the treatment of concerns. Communications teams cannot independently resolve contradictions created by employment practices or executive behavior. Where policy constraints exist, explaining them honestly may be more credible than repeating broad commitments. Organizations should examine the gap between what they say and what stakeholders experience, while recognizing that survey responses alone do not reveal every cause of that gap.

Finally, organizations should evaluate communication with multiple measures. Proposed indicators include comprehension of a policy, time taken to resolve clarification requests, recurrence of contradictory instructions, accessibility of disclosures, and completion of promised updates. These should be defined before data collection, assigned clear denominators, and interpreted alongside substantive outcomes. Engagement and retention may provide contextual information but should not automatically be attributed to communication. A pilot evaluation could compare baseline and follow-up measures while documenting other organizational changes. No target percentage or guaranteed improvement is prescribed here, because the secondary evidence does not support a universal numerical benchmark for communication effectiveness.

Limitations

The most important limitation is construct validity. The longitudinal variables measure engagement and life evaluation, not strategic communication. Their inclusion provides workforce context, but using them as direct evidence of clarity would be a category error. The contextual findings also represent different constructs, including purpose importance, belonging-related intentions, and perceived purpose fulfillment. These cannot be combined into a single index without a justified measurement model. The paper deliberately declines to create that index. As a result, it offers a narrower empirical contribution than a study with validated communication measures, but a more transparent one than a comparison built from undocumented percentages.

A second limitation concerns aggregation and comparability. Global year-level percentages conceal variation between countries, occupations, firms, and individuals. They do not track the same identified employees or organizations through time. The selected organizational sources also differ in population, timing, and question wording. Randstad's 2023 publication uses 2022 fieldwork, while Deloitte's 2024 survey spans late 2023 and early 2024. These differences restrict year-to-year interpretation across sources. The dataset should therefore be reused only with its metadata and caveats intact; separating a percentage from its population and time label would remove information essential to its meaning.

A third limitation is the scope of the review. Source selection was purposive, and the paper does not report a systematic screening procedure or a formal assessment of publication bias. The theoretical publications are foundational but do not represent every relevant perspective on stakeholder communication, organizational power, or digital media. Corporate survey publications may emphasize issues aligned with their institutional interests. No attempt is made to assign a numerical quality score to the sources. The analysis instead identifies their roles and boundaries explicitly. Readers should understand the synthesis as a reasoned interpretation of selected evidence, not as a definitive summary of the entire research field.

Directions For Future Research

Future research should begin by defining communication effectiveness in observable terms. A validated instrument might distinguish accuracy, comprehension, consistency, timeliness, accessibility, and responsiveness, rather than assuming that these dimensions are identical. Researchers could combine content coding with audience tests and administrative records. Employee surveys should distinguish understanding a decision from approving it, and receiving information from trusting its source. These distinctions would permit more precise hypotheses about how communication relates to role clarity, motivation, and stakeholder assessment. They would also make it possible to evaluate whether different communication practices benefit different audiences under different organizational conditions.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 5, October 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

Longitudinal firm-level research could then examine relationships with independently measured outcomes. Stronger designs might compare similar units before and after a defined intervention, include an appropriate comparison group, and document concurrent policy changes. Researchers should distinguish short-term comprehension from longer-term outcomes such as retention, operating performance, and investor responses. Qualitative interviews could explain why a procedure works in one setting but not another. Such work would test the conditional relationships proposed here instead of assuming them. The most useful next step is therefore not a larger collection of loosely related percentages, but better alignment between theoretical constructs, measurement choices, and the unit of analysis.

II. CONCLUSION

This paper reframes strategic communication as a governed capability involving reliable information, usable explanation, meaningful participation, and accountability for corrections. Its secondary database documents changes in Gallup's available global engagement and thriving observations from 2015 through 2024, while contextual survey evidence highlights the relevance of purpose and belonging in distinct respondent populations. The evidence supports descriptive comparisons and a theory-informed discussion; it does not establish that communication caused the observed workforce changes or produced market leadership. Maintaining that boundary is central to the paper's contribution. A strategic argument becomes stronger when its empirical limits are visible rather than hidden behind precise but unsupported numbers.

The integrated framework connects disclosure scholarship with the job demands–resources model and self-determination theory. It proposes that organizations examine communication alongside incentives, resources, leadership behavior, and opportunities for challenge. Practical priorities include information ownership, audience comprehension, feedback mechanisms, and consistency between statements and conduct. These recommendations require contextual testing and cannot replace ethical governance or substantive operational improvement. The currency of clarity is therefore not eloquence alone. In the argument developed here, it is the organizational discipline of enabling people to understand what is claimed, evaluate the evidence, act on relevant information, and question decisions through accountable processes.

REFERENCES

1. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115
2. Cleveland, W. S., & McGill, R. (1984). Graphical perception: Theory, experimentation, and application to the development of graphical methods. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 79*(387), 531–554. https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1984.10478080
3. Coombs, W. T. (2007). Protecting organization reputations during a crisis: The development and application of situational crisis communication theory. *Corporate Reputation Review, 10*(3), 163–176. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550049
4. Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational information requirements, media richness and structural design. *Management Science, 32*(5), 554–571. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.32.5.554
5. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
6. Deloitte. (2024, May 15). *Deloitte's 2024 Gen Z and millennial survey finds these generations stay true to their values as they navigate a rapidly changing world* [Press release]. https://www.deloitte.com/global/en/about/press-room/deloitte-2024-gen-z-and-millennial-survey.html
7. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 5, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

8. Eppler, M. J., & Mengis, J. (2004). The concept of information overload: A review of literature from organization science, accounting, marketing, MIS, and related disciplines. *The Information Society, 20*(5), 325–344. https://doi.org/10.1080/01972240490507974
9. Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (3rd ed.). Penguin Books.
10. Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
11. Hallahan, K., Holtzhausen, D., van Ruler, B., Verčič, D., & Sriramesh, K. (2007). Defining strategic communication. *International Journal of Strategic Communication, 1*(1), 3–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/15531180701285244
12. Harter, J., & Pendell, R. (2025, April 22). *Global engagement falls for the second time since 2009*. Gallup. https://www.gallup.com/workplace/659279/global-engagement-falls-second-time-2009.aspx
13. Healy, P. M., & Palepu, K. G. (2001). Information asymmetry, corporate disclosure, and the capital markets: A review of the empirical disclosure literature. *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 31*(1–3), 405–440. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-4101(01)00018-0
14. Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
15. Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Harvard Business School Press.
16. Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 709–734. https://doi.org/10.2307/258792
17. Randstad. (2023). *Workmonitor 2023*. https://www.randstad.com/s3fs-media/rscom/public/2024-12/Randstad_Workmonitor_2023.pdf?VersionId=uKV.LUGRzOu08PLlXoZPWo0_.1szYAQw
18. Schnackenberg, A. K., & Tomlinson, E. C. (2016). Organizational transparency: A new perspective on managing trust in organization-stakeholder relationships. *Journal of Management, 42*(7), 1784–1810. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314525202
19. Welch, M., & Jackson, P. R. (2007). Rethinking internal communication: A stakeholder approach. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 12*(2), 177–198. https://doi.org/10.1108/13563280710744847