

A study on impact of selected factors on employee engagement

Chilumari Varaprasad

Assistant Professor, Department of Business Management, Vennela Institute of Business Administration, Bhongir, Telangana

Abstract: *The importance of employee engagement had been explained in this paper. A structured questionnaire has been used for primary data collection and employees from different organizations have participated in survey. Employee engagement is perceived as an independent activity and it not influenced by factors like job engagement, emotional engagement and cognitive engagement.*

Keywords: *Employee engagement, cognitive engagement, job engagement, emotional engagement and perceived supervisor support.*

Date of Submission: 01-05-2018

Date of acceptance: 17-05-2018

I. Introduction

Employee engagement had gained importance in the recent years. Employee engagement leads to enhanced organizational performance. Employees who are engaged are more likely to stay with current organizations. Sometimes employees with competitive salary who are not engaged may undergo boredom and look for other jobs. The issues like employee turnover and employee conflicts can be reduced with effective employee engagement. This paper explains about influenced of selected factors on employee engagement.

1.1 Employee Engagement

There is no single definition for employee engagement. Employee engagement can be stated as combination of employee communication, reward & recognition, employee development and extended employee care (AbuKhaalifeh & Som, 2013). Engagement can be referred as positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its values. An engaged employee is aware of business context, and works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization (Robertson and Cooper, 2010). Engagement is characterized by energy, involvement, and efficacy, the direct opposite of the three burnout dimensions of exhaustions, cynicism, and inefficacy (Saks, 2006).

II. Literature Review

Wefald and Downey (2009) had explained about job engagement in organizations and stated that it helps in employee retention. Organizations have been focusing on employee outcomes in the form of retention, commitment and performance through job engagement. Job engagement is not a fad and it will be fashion and folderol for organizations in future. There is also strong correlation between job satisfaction and job engagement.

According to Saks (2006) the concepts of job engagement and organization engagement are different. The relationships between antecedents and consequences can be explained by using employee attention towards organizational commitment, intentions to quit and organizational citizenship behavior. The employees develop favorable attitudes towards their job with employee engagement practices at workplace.

Robertson et al (2012) had stated that employers should take care of psychological well-being of employees which in turn create positive work attitude and engagement. The employee engagement leads to better outcomes form employees in the long term. Full employee engagement leads to sustainable benefits for both the organizations and its employees. Further employee engagement leads to well being of employee (Robertson & Cooper, 2010).

According to AbuKhakifeh and Som (2013) explained that employee engagement influence employee and have a significant impact on the level of engagement among employees. Organizations also conduct training programs for attaining employee engagement. The dynamic business environment is demanding employee engagement activities for employee retention. The work characteristics have relationship with employee outcomes.

According to Fairlie (2011) the human resource managers can engage employees with appropriate work characteristics. The outcomes like burnout, stress, motivation and engagement are associated with

characteristics of work. Therefore it is necessary to design job roles and responsibilities for effective employee engagement. The intrinsic and extrinsic rewards influence employee behavior at workplace.

The psychological empowerment, employee engagement and job security are interrelated. Employees with empowerment feel that they are engaged and it enhances the productivity of organization from the perspective human resource development (Stander & Rothmann, 2010). Employees perceive that empowerment means ability of an individual to control work lives. Further empowerment leads to employee engagement either directly or indirectly.

Andrew and Sofian (2012) had given a model which shows relationship between individual factors, employee engagement and work outcomes. The employee engagement practices are unique in each organization and they are framed by human resource managers by coordinating with top management. After recession the organizations have been giving importance to employee engagement for attaining employee retention.

According to Nasomboon leadership commitment positively impacts employee engagement in organizations. Employee engagement is positively influenced by perceived line manager behavior and perceived HRM practices and it leads to self-report task performance (Truss, Shantz, Soane, Alfes, & Delbridge, 2013). According to Anitha (2014) employee engagement has significant impact on employee performance.

III. Research Methodology

The sample size for this study is 120 and all the respondents are working in various organizations in various positions. The respondents were selected randomly and explained about purpose of the study. The primary data is collected through structure questionnaire and it consists of four demographic variables and five constructs. The demographic variables are age group, experience, monthly income and gender. The five constructs are job engagement, perceived supervisor support, emotional engagement, cognitive engagement and employee engagement.

The items under each construct are mentioned below and they are measured using 5 point Likert-type scale anchored from “5” for strongly agree to ‘1’ for strongly disagree. The items under each construct are adopted from published scales in previous research papers. Secondary data had been procured from journals books and electronic sources. The statistical tools like descriptive statistics, frequency analysis, correlation and regression have been used for analyzing primary data.

Job engagement (JE)

I really “throw” myself into my job
Sometimes I am so into my job that I lose track of time
This job is all consuming; I am totally into it (Saks, 2006)

Perceived supervisor support (PS)

My supervisor cares about my opinion
My supervisor really cares about my well-being
My supervisor strongly consider my goals and values

Emotional engagement (EE)

I feel energetic at my job
I am proud of my job
I am excited about my job (Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010)

Cognitive engagement (CE)

At work, my mind is focused on my job
At work I am concentrated on my job
At work, I devote a lot of attention to my job

Employee engagement (EMP)

I am able to understand my company’s strategy, vision and direction.
I am encouraged to look for ways to improve processes and productivity.
I have all the resources I need to do my job effectively (Mone, Eisinger, Guggenheim, Price, & Stine, 2011)

IV. Demographic Profile

4.1 Demographic profile

The demographic variables in this study are age, occupation, gender, income level and experience. The total respondents are 120. The frequency of demographic characteristics of respondents is shown in Table 1. Most of the respondents belong to ‘26 to 35 Years’ age group. Out of total respondents 61 percent are male and 39 percent are female. Most of the respondents belong to monthly income group ‘10,000 to 20,000 INR’. Among the respondents 32 percent have experience between 2 to 4 years.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of respondents

Variable	Characteristic	Frequency (%)
Age group	18 to 25 Years	22
	26 to 35 years	38
	35 to 45 Years	29
	Above 45 Years	11
Gender	Male	61
	Female	39
Monthly Income	Less than 10,000 INR	15
	10,000 to 20,000 INR	35
	20,000 to 30,000 INR	24
	Above 30,000 INR	26
Experience	1 to 2 Years	19
	2 to 4 Years	32
	4 to 6 Years	22
	Above 6 Years	27

(Source: Prepared from primary data)

The four variables are job engagement (JE), perceived supervisor support (PS), emotional engagement (EE), cognitive engagement (CE) and employee engagement (ENG). The mean value for job engagement is high among other variable which is 4.29 and its standard deviation (S.D) is 0.85. The mean value for cognitive engagement (CE) is 3.93 with S.D of 0.62. From table 2 it is also observed that S.D for JE is high and S.D. for EE is 0.55. The value for all the variables is approximately 4.0 which means they are having positive opinion towards job engagement (JE), perceived supervisor support (PS), emotional engagement (EE), cognitive engagement (CE) and employee engagement (ENG).

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
JE	120	4.29	0.85
PS	120	4.19	0.78
EE	120	4.16	0.55
CE	120	3.93	0.62
ENG	120	4.02	0.71
Valid N (listwise)	120		

(Source: SPSS Output)

H1: There is correlation between job engagement and employee engagement.

Table 3: Correlations

		JE	ENG
JE	Pearson Correlation	1	0.015
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.871
	N	120	120
ENG	Pearson Correlation	0.015	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.871	
	N	120	120

(Source: SPSS Output)

According to 'r' value in Table 3 the hypothesis H3 is rejected. Hence there is no significant relationship between job engagement and employee engagement.

H2: There is an association between perceived supervisor support (PS) and employee engagement (ENG).

It is observed that 'p' value for perceived supervisor support (PS) is more than 0.05 therefore H2 is rejected which means there is no association between PS and ENG.

Table 4: Regression Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	4.941	0.672		7.356	0.000
	PS	-0.020	0.093	-0.021	-0.210	0.834
	EE	-0.037	0.130	-0.028	-0.282	0.778
	CE	-0.174	0.112	-0.152	-1.547	0.124

a. Dependent Variable: ENG

H3: The emotional engagement (EE) has positive impact on employee engagement (ENG).

H3 is rejected because 'p' value for EE is more than 0.05. Hence emotional engagement does not have positive impact on employee engagement (ENG).

H4: The cognitive engagement (CE) has positive impact on employee engagement (ENG).

The 'p' value for CE is more than 0.05 therefore H4 is rejected. Hence cognitive engagement does not have significant on employee engagement (ENG).

V. Discussion

There are various dimensions to understand employee engagement like job engagement, perceived supervisor support, cognitive engagement and emotional engagement. The employee engagement is not influenced by any of the factors considered in this study. Hence employee engagement is an independent factor and it is not influenced by other factors like emotional engagement and cognitive engagement. Hence organizations can educate their employees on vision, mission, objectives and goals of the organization.

VI. Conclusion

Employee engagement leads to employee retention and helps in gaining competitive advantage for organizations. The human resource managers should develop strategies for engaging employees. The employee engagement leads to employee commitment and employee loyalty towards the organizations. From this study it is evident that employee engagement can be attained by educating employees about the goals of organizations.

VII. Future Research

In this study only four factors were considered there might be some other factors leads to employee engagement. The relationship between employee engagement and turnover intentions can be analyzed by future researchers. The present study had considered employees from all age groups and at all levels have been considered. In future employees from specific industry like software or banking can be considered to explain about employee engagement. It is also essential to compare employee engagement practices between public sector organizations and private sector organizations.

References

- [1]. AbuKhaalifeh, A. N., & Som, A. P. (2013). The antecedents affecting employee engagement and organizational performance. *Asian Social Science*, 9 (7), 41-45.
- [2]. Andrew, O. C., & Sofian, S. (2012). Individual factors and work outcomes of employee engagement. *The 2012 International Conference on Asia Pacific Business Innovation & Technology Management*, 40, pp. 498-508. Pattaya: Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences.
- [3]. Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63 (3), 308-323.
- [4]. Fairlie, P. (2011). Meaningful work, employee engagement, and other key employee outcomes: Implications for human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13 (4), 508-525.
- [5]. Mone, E., Eisinger, C., Guggenheim, K., Price, B., & Stine, C. (2011). Performance Management at the Wheel: Driving Employee Engagement in Organizations. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 26, 205-212.
- [6]. Nasomboon, B. (2014). The relationship among leadership commitment, organizational performance and employee engagement. *International Business Research*, 7 (9), 77-88.
- [7]. Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job Engagement: Antecedents and Effects on Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53 (3), 617-635.
- [8]. Robertson, I. T., & Cooper, C. L. (2010). Full engagement: the intergration of employee engagement and psychological well-being. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 31 (4), 324-336.
- [9]. Robertson, I. T., Birch, A. J., & Cooper, C. L. (2012). Job and work attitudes, engagement and employee performance: Where does psychological well-being fit in? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 33 (3), 224-232.
- [10]. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21 (7), 600-619.
- [11]. Stander, M. W., & Rothmann, S. (2010). Psychological empowerment, job insecurity and employee engagement. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36 (1).
- [12]. Truss, C., Shantz, A., Soane, E., Alfes, K., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Employee engagement, organizational performance, and individual well-being: exploring the evidence, developing the theory. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24 (14), 2657-2669.
- [13]. Wefald, A. J., & Downey, R. G. (2009). Job engagement in organizations: fad, fashion, or folderol? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 141-145.

Chilumari Varaprasad "A study on impact of selected factors on employee engagement " *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)* 20.5 (2018): 60-63