
A STUDY ON EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT IN BAHOLA LABORATORIES, KUMBAKONAM

Article Particulars

Received: 25.01.2018

Accepted: 02.04.2018

Published: 28.04.2018

Dr. S. RAJARAJESWARI

*Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration**Sri Meenakshi Government Arts College for Women (A), Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India*

M. ABARNA THEVI

*Research Scholar, Sri Meenakshi Government Arts College for Women (A)**Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India*

Abstract

Employee engagement is the level of commitment and involvement an employee has towards their organization and its values. Employee engagement is a barometer that determines the association of a person with the organization. Employee Engagement is the positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its values. Employee Engagement is the property of relationship between an organization and its employees. An organization with 'high' employee engagement might therefore be expected to outperform those with 'low' employee engagement.

An organization is considered a great place to work that respects the needs of each individual employee along with motivating each of them to pursue their individual goals. The organization that is keen in understanding the needs and willing to support their employees in their development leads to better outcomes. The research was conducted in Bahola Labs, Kumbakonam with 260 employees. In the present study a survey method is applied with a sample of 108 employees to know how they are effectively engaged in their organization. Also this paper focuses on the impact of leadership, motivation and culture on employee engagement. The tools used for the study are percentage analysis, correlation and regression analysis.

Keywords: *Engagement, leadership, motivation, culture, correlation analysis, regression analysis.*

Introduction

Employee engagement called worker engagement is a business management concept. An "Engaged Employee" is one who is fully absorbed by and enthusiastic about their work and so takes positive action to further the organization's reputation and interests. The meaning of engagement can be understood as an act of engaging or state of being engaged. Many experts do not agree on what it means at the workplace, or how it can be achieved. There is no one-size-fits-all solution, to be sure, but success can be achieved if one understands the significance of engagement and moves beyond defined rules. In general while exploration, it was found that people understand employee engagement as a state of mind, where one feels satisfied,

empowered, and committed at work. Others suggested in a different way as they characterized engagement by such behaviors as persistence and initiation. Some of them described term engagement as innate personal characteristics like the right attitude, level of energy or point of view. Some define engagement as a combination of all of these.

Kahn (1990:694) defines employee engagement as "the harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances".

Reviews of Literature

Maslach and Leiter (1997) initially defined the engagement construct as the opposite of burnout (i.e., someone who is not experiencing job burnout must be engaged in their job.)

Luthans and Peterson (2002) elaborated on Kahn's work on employee engagement, which provides a convergent theory for Gallup's empirically derived employee engagement. They opined that that to be emotionally engaged is to form meaningful connections with others and to experience empathy for them. In contrast, being cognitively engaged refers to those who are acutely aware of their mission and role in their work environment.

Similarly Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002,) defined active engagement in terms of "high levels of activity, initiative, and responsibility."

According to May *et al* (2004) engagement is most closely associated with the constructs of job involvement and 'flow' (Csikszentmihalyi 1990). Job involvement is defined as 'a cognitive or belief state of psychological identification' (Kanungo 1982:342). This differs from engagement in that it is concerned more with how the individual employs him/her self during the performance of his/her job. Furthermore, whilst the focus of job involvement is on cognitions, engagement, according to most definitions, also encompasses emotions and behaviours.

Hewitt (2004) defines employee engagement as the employees desire to say (speak positively about the organization), stay (desire to be a member of the organization) and strive (go beyond the expected for the organization)

Categories of Engaged Employee

Gallup has comprehensively identified 12 questions that most effectively measure the same. They have undertaken employee engagement surveys for several client organizations. They categorize employees into 3 different types -

Engaged - "Engaged" employees are builders. They want to know the desired expectations for their role so they can meet and exceed them. They're naturally curious about their company and their place in it. They perform at consistently high levels. They

want to use their talents and strengths at work every day. They work with passion and they drive innovation and move their organization forward.

Not Engaged - “Not-engaged” employees tend to concentrate on tasks rather than the goals and outcomes they are expected to accomplish. They want to be told what to do just so they can do it and say they have finished. They focus on accomplishing tasks vs. achieving an outcome.

Employees who are not-engaged tend to feel their contributions are being overlooked, and their potential is not being tapped. They often feel this way because they don't have productive relationships with their managers or with their coworkers.

Actively Disengaged - The "actively disengaged" employees are the "cave dwellers." They're "Consistently against Virtually Everything." They're not just unhappy at work; they're busy acting out their unhappiness .They sow seeds of negativity at every opportunity. Every day, actively disengaged workers undermine what their engaged coworkers accomplish. As workers increasingly rely on each other to generate products and services, the problems and tensions that are fostered by actively disengaged workers can cause great damage to an organization's functioning.

Research Methodology

This study aims to understand the factors that influence employee engagement and whether employee engagement activities by the organization result in improved performance of the employee. The study was conducted on employees of manufacturing industry using structured questionnaire. The sampling method used for the study is stratified sampling. In this technique, the population is stratified on the basis of departments into number of non-overlapping subpopulations or strata and sample items are selected from each stratum. In this study descriptive research is used. Descriptive research includes surveys and fact-finding enquiries of different kinds. The major purpose of descriptive research is description of the state of affairs as it exists at present. The research relied entirely on primary data and pertained to demographic/ socioeconomic characteristics of the employee's opinion towards the management. A primary research was conducted on a sample of 108 employees of Bahola Labs, Kumbakonam.

Data Analysis and Findings

A total of 108 respondents completed the survey.

Table 1 Demographic Details of the Respondents

	Age (Years)			Experience (In Years)			Total
	20-35	36-45	46-55	1-5	6-10	11-15	
Percentage	70.4	28.7	.9	44.4	50.0	5.6	100

	Designation										Gender		Total
	Worker	Accountant	Sales Rep.	Trainer	Sales Executive	Purchase Officer	Quality Controller	Supervisor	Pdn. Chemist	Male	Female		
Percentage	53.7	5.6	17.6	8.3	5.6	4.6	.9	1.9	1.9	72.2	27.8	100	

Inference: Table no 1 show the demographic details of the respondents which is described in percentage analysis.

Table 2 Correlation of Culture and Employee Engagement Level

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Pearson's R	.684	.000
Spearman Correlation	.689	.000
N	108	

Inference: The table shows that the value of R is .684 at .000 significant level. This shows that the culture and employee engagement is highly correlated.

Table 3 Regression analysis for Culture and Employee Engagement Level

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	R ²	sig
Regression	17.937	1	17.937	93.265	.468	.000
Residual	20.387	106	.192			
Total	38.324	107				

Inference: R² is a measure of the variation explained by the independent variable (culture) on the dependent variable (employee engagement level).

In this case 46.8% of the variance in employee engagement is accounted by culture and its square. Clearly from the ANOVA table it shows that there is significant effect of culture on the employee engagement level.

Table 4 Correlation of Motivation Level and Employee Engagement Level

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Pearson's R	.834	.000
Spearman Correlation	.833	.000
N	108	

Inference: It is clear that the value of R is .834 at .000 significance level. This shows that the motivation and employee engagement is highly correlated.

Table 5 Regression Analysis for Motivation Level and Employee Engagement Level

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	R ²	sig
Regression	26.641	1	26.641	241.716	.695	.000
Residual	11.683	106	.110			
Total	38.324	107				

Inference: R² is a measure of the variation explained by the independent variable (motivation level) on the dependent variable (employee

engagement level). In this case 69.5% of the variance in employee engagement is accounted by motivation and its square. Clearly from the ANOVA table it shows that there is significant effect of motivation on the employee engagement level.

Table 6 Correlation of Leadership Level and Employee Engagement Level

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Pearson's R	.867	.000
Spearman Correlation	.876	.000
N	108	

Inference: The table shows that the value of R is .867 at .000 significant level. This shows that the employee engagement and the leadership are highly correlated.

Table 7 Regression Analysis for Leadership Level and Employee Engagement Level

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	R ²	sig
Regression	28.783	1	28.783	319.782	.751	.000
Residual	9.541	106	.090			
Total	38.324	107				

Inference: R² is a measure of the variation explained by the independent variable (leadership level) on the dependent variable (employee engagement level).

In this case 75.1% of the variance in employee engagement is accounted by leadership and its square. Clearly from the ANOVA table it shows that there is significant effect of motivation on the employee engagement level.

Conclusion

The employee engagement practices are found to be satisfactory in Bahola Labs. Employee engagement plays a pivotal role for any organization's success. Employee Engagement is the beneficial process for employees, managers and organization as a whole. It results in increased employee satisfaction, increased productivity and decreased turnover.

References

1. Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (1987). The support of autonomy and the control of behaviour Development Dimensions International, Inc., available www.ddiworld.com (accessed on October 30, 2011)
2. Robertson-Smith, G. Markwick, C. (2009). Employee Engagement A review of current thinking, Institute for Employment Studies, University of Sussex Campus Brighton, UK.
3. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33 (4), 692-724.
4. Kular, S., Gatenby, M., Rees, C., Soane, E. & Truss, K. (2008). Employee Engagement: A Literature Review. Kingston Business School, Kingston University Working Paper Series No 19, October 2008.
5. Macey, W.H. & Schneider, B. (2008). The Meaning of Employee Engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 3-30.
6. Bhatia, N. (2011). To study the Employee Engagement practices and its effect on employee Performance with special reference to ICICI and HDFC Bank in Lucknow. *IJSER*, 2(8).

7. Beardwell, J. and Claydon, T. (2007). *Human Resource Management, A Contemporary Approach*. 5th ed. Harlow, Prentice Hall.
8. Buchanan, D. & Huczynski, A. (2004). *Organizational Behaviour. An introductory text*, 5th ed. Harlow, FT/Prentice Hall.
9. Cooper, R. (1997). Applying Emotional Intelligence in the workplace. *Training and Development*, 51(12), 31-38.
10. Sundaray, B.K. (2011). Employee Engagement: A Driver of Organizational Effectiveness. *European Journal of Business and Management* 3(8).
11. Robinson D. Perryman S. Hayday S. (2004). *The Drivers of Employee Engagement*. IES Report 408. ISBN 1 85184 336.
12. Employee Engagement at the Organizational Level of Analysis - S. DOUGLAS PUGH & JOERG DIETZ (*Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1 (2008), pp 44–47)
15. Engaging and enabling employees to improve performance outcome: Hay Group Insight, Hay Group's survey research division, 2009
16. Bates, S. (2004) 'Getting engaged', *HR Magazine*, Vol 49, No 2, pp44-51.
17. Baumruk, R. (2004) 'The missing link: the role of employee engagement in business success', *Workspan*, Vol 47, pp. 48-52.
18. Beardwell, J. and Claydon, T. (2007) *Human Resource Management, A Contemporary Approach*. 5th ed. Harlow, Prentice Hall.
19. Buchanan, D. and Huczynski, A. (2004) *Organisational Behaviour. An introductory text*, 5th ed. Harlow, FT/Prentice Hall.
20. Gubman, E. (2004) 'From engagement to passion for work: The search for the missing person', *Human Resources Planning*, pp42-46.
21. Guthrie, J.P. (2001) 'High involvement work practices, turnover and productivity: Evidence from New Zealand' *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol 44, pp180–190.