



A Study on Employee Engagement in Pravartak Technologies - with Special Reference to Chennai

Sri Ranjani. R

MBA Student, School of Management Studies, Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT

Employee engagement is the level of commitment and involvement an employee has towards their 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. It is a positive attitude held by the employees towards the organization and its values. The paper focuses on how employee engagement is an antecedent of job involvement and what should company do to make the employees engaged. The paper also looks at the Gallup 12-point questionnaire, twelve-question survey that identifies strong feelings of employee engagement and the steps which shows how to drive an engaged employee.

Employee engagement is the thus the level of commitment and involvement an employee has towards their 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. The organization must work to develop and nurture engagement, which requires a two-way relationship between employer and employee.' Thus, Employee engagement is a barometer that determines the association of a person with the organization.

INTRODUCTION

Employee engagement is a fundamental concept in the effort to understand and describe, both qualitatively and quantitatively, the nature of the relationship between an organization and its [employees](#). An "engaged employee" is defined as one who is fully absorbed by and enthusiastic about their work and so takes positive action to further the [organization's](#) reputation and interests. An engaged employee has a positive attitude towards the organization and its values.

An organization with "high" employee engagement might therefore be expected to outperform those with "low" employee engagement

Employee engagement first appeared as a concept in [management theory](#) in the 1990s, becoming widespread in management practice in the 2000s, but it remains contested. It stands in an unspecified relationship to earlier construct such as morale and [job satisfaction](#). Despite academic critiques, employee-engagement practices are well established in the management of [human resources](#) and of [internal communications](#).

Employee engagement today has become synonymous with terms like 'employee experience' and 'employee satisfaction'. The relevance is much more due to the vast majority of new generation professionals in the workforce who have a higher propensity to be 'distracted' and 'disengaged' at work. A recent statistic by Inspire One suggest that employees today are more likely (83%) to be involved in an employee listening program than ever before.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE:

- To study the Employee engagement in Pravartak Technologies, CHENNAI.

SECONDARY OBJECTIVES:

- To identify demographic factors to influence Employee Engagement
- To identify the relationship between engagement and job satisfaction
- To identify the factors influencing Employee Engagement.
- To find how attitude of work Environment affects the Engagement.
- To offer viable suggestions to improve the existing Employee Engagement in the organization.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

- The study has been conducted in Pravatak Technologies, Chennai with a sample size of 103.
- The study covers the following dimensions of Employee Engagement
 - Job satisfaction
 - Commitment
 - Supervision
 - Rewards and Recognition
 - Team work
 - Communication
 - Training
 - Motivation
 - Work Environment.
- The study has been limited to only one organization since engagement vary across organization, studying more than one organization a major constrains in arriving at definite conclusion, and the resulting suggestions will also have lesser practical applicability.
- The study has been conducted in HR, IT And FINANCE department alone, to ascertain their perceptions of Employee Engagement.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

The purpose of the study helps to get practical knowledge and experience about surrounding of the organization

Employee Engagement is the extent to which employees feel passionate about their jobs, are committed to the organization, and put discretionary effort into their work. **Employee Engagement** is not the same as employee satisfaction. It is through those characteristics that engagement has a relationship with everything the organization affects and is affected by. It gives us an idea of the satisfaction level of the employees in different area of work.

LITERATURE SURVEY

Masterson et al. (2000), Proposed that one party expects a return in the future after contributing or providing services to the other party. At the same time, the party that gets something of value will produce a sense of responsibility to return the other party. For individuals who have helped them, employees will actively give a return to gain more benefits in the future. Many scholars analyzed the relationship between organization and members based on social exchange theory. Employees are loyal to the organization and work hard in exchange for economic benefits and social rewards, establishing the organization-employee relationship.

Miles (2001), Defined Engagement as Involvement of the employees in high-engagement forces that create empathetic, negotiation, feedback and accountability, empower people to creatively support their subunits, teams and individual jobs with the major change of the enterprise. It is developing employees to work with not only their minds and body but also with 'hearts'.

Stockley (2006), Defined 'engagement' as an extent that the employee believes in the mission, purpose and values of the organization and reveals their commitment through their actions as an employee and their attitude towards the organization and the customers.

Mahendru et.al, (2006), Defined Employee engagement is the extent to which people enjoy and believe in what they do, and feel valued by doing it. It is the degree of commitment towards the hub that an individual performs and until however long the individual remains with the organization as the results of their commitment.

Piyachat, Chanongkorn, and Panisa (2014), Tested the relationships among employer branding, employee engagement, and discretionary effort via the effect of employee expectation. The results indicated that there were strong positive relationships between employer branding and employee engagement, employee engagement and discretionary effort, employer branding and discretionary effort, employer branding and employee expectation, and employee expectation and employee engagement.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Research design of a study defines the study type (descriptive, correlation, semi experimental, experimental, review, meta-analytic) and sub-type (e.g., descriptive- longitudinal case study), research question, hypotheses, independent and dependent variables, experimental design and if applicable, data collection methods and a statistical analysis plan. Research design is the framework that has been created to seek answers to research questions.

The study involves a **Descriptive Research Design**. Descriptive research can be explained as the statement of affairs as they are at present, with the researcher having no control over variable. Such studies are used to describe various aspect of a phenomenon.

Descriptive Research provides the opportunity to observe the phenomenon in a completely natural and unchanged natural environment. It is an effective way to analyze non-quantified topics and issues.

SOURCES OF DATA:

I. Primary Data:

Data was collected directly from the employees of the organization through structured questionnaires; The questionnaires were distributed to the respondents through handouts. Where necessary, the questionnaires were read out to employees to enable better understanding of questions.

II. Secondary Data:

Secondary data used in this study has already been published. Sources of such data include organization's records, books, journals, magazines, research publications, these and websites related to topic.

HYPOTHESIS

STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESIS

HO. There is no significant association between age and commitment.

Ha. There is significant association between age and commitment.

HO. There is no significant association between work environment and engagement.

Ha. There is significant association between work environment and engagement

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Age of the Respondents

Research questions are always answered with a descriptive statistic generally either percentage or mean. Percentage is appropriate when it is important to know how many of the participants gave a particular answer. Generally, percentage is reported when the responses have discrete categories.

Age of the Respondents

Age	Frequency	Percentage
18-22	6	6%
23-27	39	38%
28-32	23	22%
33-37	26	25%
38yearsabove	9	9%
Total	103	100%

Source: Primary Data

INTERPRETATION:

The above table and chart indicate that 6% of respondents belong to the age group of 18 to 22 years, 38% of respondents belong to the age group of 23 to 27 years, 22% of respondents belong to the age group of 28 to 32 years, 25% of respondents belong to the age group of 28 to 32 years, and 9% of respondents belong to the age group of 38 years above.

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.608 ^a	32	.736

Likelihood Ratio	31.998	32	.467
Linear-by-Linear Association	.039	1	.844
N of Valid Cases	103		

a. 41 cells (91.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .12.

INFERENCE

The above table shows the cross tabulation of two variables of employee engagement- age and commitment. Chi-square test shows the Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) value at 0.736, which is higher than 0.05. Therefore, there is no significant association between age and commitment. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis is rejected.

Correlations

		Employee Engagement	job satisfaction
Engagement	Pearson Correlation	1	.680**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	103	103
job satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.680**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	103	103

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

INFERENCE

Pearson Correlation has a starred positive value and the significance value holds 1 engagement and job satisfaction. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between engagement and job satisfaction.

ANOVA

To establish a relationship between work environment and engagement HO- there is no significant association between work environment and engagement.

H1- there is significant association between work environment and engagement.

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.058	4	.265	1.101	.360
Within Groups	23.539	98	.240		
Total	24.597	102			

INFERENCE

From the above table we see that the significant value is 0.360, therefore there is significant difference between Work environment and Employee Engagement. The null hypothesis is accepted and rejected in alternatives.

FINDINGS

- 38% of respondents belong to the age group 23 to 27.
- 53% of respondents are male.
- 43% of respondents have 0 to 3 years of services in the organization.
- 52% of the respondents agree that they are comfortable with working hours/timings/shifts.
- 50% of the respondents agree that there is job security is purely ensured in the organization.
- 62% of the respondents agree that there is a team work is based on mutual respect & understandings.
- 61% of the respondents agree that there is motivation to bring out the best in their performance.
- 66% of the respondents agree that they feel proud to member of the company.
- 60% of the respondents agree that they are able to keep them self-busy all the time.
- 43% of the respondents agree that they have good relationship with their supervisor at work.
- 53% of the respondents agree that their supervisor provides opportunities to develop my knowledge, skills and competencies.
- 48% of the respondents agree that their supervisor is approachable to discuss matters.
- 53% of the respondents agree that they are recognized for their good work.
- 56% of the respondents agree that they receive constructive feedback about their performance.

SUGGESTION

Based on the study conducted, the following suggestions are being made,

- A better rapport between supervisors and employees has to be achieved. This will allow the employees to approach their supervisor to discuss matters.
- Inter-department communication should be more synchronized.
- The company needs to better its career development opportunities.
- More effort should be taken to discuss the results of performance appraisal with the employees and suitable training should be provided.
- A motivated work space should be created and constructive feedback given.
- All these will in turn increase the level of job satisfaction that leads to better performance.

CONCLUSION

Employee engagement is attracting a great deal of interest from employers across numerous sectors. In some respects, it is a very old aspiration – the desire by employers to find ways to increase employee motivation and to win more commitment to the job and the organization. In some ways it is ‘new’ in that the context within which engagement is being sought is different. One aspect of this difference is the greater penalty to be paid if workers are less engaged than the employees of competitors, given the state of international competition and the raising of the bar on efficiency standards. A second aspect is that the whole nature of the meaning of work and the ground rules for employment relations have shifted and there is an open space concerning the character of the relationship to work and to organization which employers’ sense can be filled with more sophisticated approaches.

But there is reason to worry about the lack of rigor that has, to date, often characterized much work in employee engagement. If we continue to refer to ‘engagement’ without understanding the potential negative consequences, the core requirements of success, and the processes through which it must be implemented, and if we cannot agree even to a clear definition of what people are supposed to be engaged in doing differently at work (the engaged ‘in what’ question), then engagement may just be one more ‘HR thing’ that is only here for a short time. On a positive note, there is now a wider array of measurement techniques with which to assess trends in engagement and an associated array of approaches to effect some change. Thus, aspiration can more feasibly be translated into action.

References

- Archie Thomas, CMA, and Ann MacDiarmid – Encouraging Employee Engagement – CMA Management, Jun/Jul 2004.
- Ashok Mukherjee – Engagement for the mind body, and soul – Human Capital, Aug. 2005.
- Barbara Palframan Smith – Employee connection – Technology to build culture and community – Communication World – Mar / Apr 2004.
- Beverly Kaye and Sharon Jordan Evans – From Assets to Investors – Training and Development – Apr 2003.
- Charles Woodroffe – Employee Engagement – The Real Secret of Winning a Crucial Edge over your rivals – Manager Motivation – Dec. / Jan. 2006.
- Christoffer Ellehuus, Piers Hudson – Driving Performance and Retention Through Employee Engagement – Corporate Leadership Council 2004,
- Employee Engagement Survey Charlotte Garvey – Connecting the organizational pulse into the bottom line – HR Magazine society for Human Resource Management, June 2004.
- Cifton, D.O. & Hartor, J.K. (2003) – Investing in strength – positive organizational scholarship.