WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND GRIEVANCE HANDLING AMONG FIELD TECHNICIANS

Ambika Thapa

MBA Researcher, India
ambikathapa1702@gmail.com

ABSTRACT :

Employee engagement is especially important in industries that depend heavily on field operations. Day-to-day experiences can be shaped by supervisor support, clear communication, well-defined roles, safety provisions, awareness of benefits and the way workplace concerns are handled. This study explores how field technicians perceive employee engagement and grievance-handling practices in an anonymized organization operating in the power-services sector. It follows a descriptive-analytical approach and uses a structured questionnaire containing five-point Likert-scale questions, along with a small number of open-ended responses. The responses were examined through frequency and percentage distributions and item-level mean scores. To maintain confidentiality, the organization's name, operating locations, exact number of respondents and detailed internal figures have not been disclosed. The findings are therefore presented in aggregated and rounded form. Overall, respondents viewed supervisor guidance, role clarity, policy communication and knowing whom to contact for help positively. At the same time, the study identifies areas that could be improved, including awareness of benefits, consistency in welfare practices, clearer information about grievance channels and more systematic follow-up. The paper recommends regular briefings, easy-to-understand grievance escalation routes, documented case tracking, periodic refreshers on safety and benefits, and a regular way for field personnel to share feedback. Since the study uses a non-probability sample and relies on respondents' own perceptions, its findings are indicative and should not be treated as representative of all field workers.

Keywords: employee engagement; grievance handling; field workforce; field technicians; HR operations; workplace communication; employee well-being.

1. Introduction

Many organizations depend on field personnel to support daily operations and deliver services. Their work experience is influenced by how clearly instructions are given, how supervisors respond, whether safety equipment is available, how well benefits are explained and how easy it is to raise a concern. When workers are unsure where to report an issue or do not receive timely updates, even routine problems can affect trust, motivation and their sense of fair treatment.

Employee engagement generally refers to the physical, mental and emotional effort people bring to their jobs. For field-based roles, engagement depends not only on personal motivation but also on how work is assigned, how support is provided and how concerns are addressed. Grievance handling is therefore an important part of employee relations. It gives employees a clear process for raising concerns, having them reviewed fairly, receiving a response and helping prevent the same issues from recurring.

This study examines these issues among field technicians working in an anonymized power-services setting. To protect confidentiality, the organization, operating areas and exact internal data are not identified. The focus is on broader patterns and practical implications for human resource management.

2. Review of Literature

2.1 Employee engagement

Kahn (1990) explained personal engagement as the way people bring themselves into their work roles. He highlighted meaningfulness, psychological safety and personal availability as factors that influence how fully people participate in their work. Saks (2006) later examined the factors that contribute to engagement and its outcomes, noting the importance of workplace support and employees' perceptions of how they are treated. Together, these studies suggest that engagement is not simply an individual attitude; it is also shaped by the work environment and the relationship between employees and the organization.

2.2 Supervisor support and communication

Supervisors turn workplace policies into everyday practice. Clear instructions, timely feedback and respectful responses can reduce uncertainty,

particularly when employees work across different field locations. It is also important to explain policies and identify the right people to contact, so workers can understand the process and reach the appropriate person when they need help.

2.3 Grievance handling and perceived fairness

A grievance mechanism works best when employees know where to raise an issue, what will happen after they report it and when they can expect a response. Research on procedural justice highlights the value of consistent processes, opportunities to explain concerns and respectful treatment. A transparent process can also help organizations spot recurring problems instead of treating every complaint as a separate incident.

2.4 Research gap

Much of the discussion about employee engagement focuses on permanent employees. Field workers may have different reporting relationships, benefit arrangements and ways of raising concerns. This study adds an anonymized, practical perspective on their experiences and highlights HR processes that may be improved without revealing organization-specific information.

3. Objectives of the Study

- To assess field technicians' perceptions of workplace engagement and support.
- To examine perceptions of supervisor guidance, role clarity and communication of workplace policies.
- To understand how workers perceive access to grievance channels and their awareness of benefits.
- To identify practical HR measures that may strengthen employee experience, safety awareness and grievance resolution.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research design

The study used a descriptive-analytical research design. It aimed to summarize employee perceptions rather than establish causal relationships. The questionnaire included closed-ended items measured on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from strong disagreement to strong agreement, along with opportunities for brief qualitative feedback.

4.2 Population and sampling

The target population consisted of field technicians working in operational and support settings. A non-probability sampling approach, combining purposive and convenience sampling, was used. The original dataset contained more than 150 usable responses. To protect confidentiality, this version does not disclose the exact sample size, operating locations, age-by-location breakdowns or other figures that could help identify the organization or respondents.

4.3 Data collection and analysis

Responses were compiled and reviewed using frequency distributions, percentages, item-level mean scores and visual summaries. Findings were interpreted at an aggregate level. Exact counts and detailed percentages have been intentionally suppressed or rounded into broad descriptive bands. No inferential test results are claimed in this manuscript unless independently verified from the underlying dataset.

4.4 Ethical and confidentiality considerations

The organization's name, operational geography, project identifiers and granular internal metrics have been removed. The paper reports only high-level patterns and does not include names of managers, contractors or individual respondents. Before submission, the author should confirm that the applicable employer, contractor and university permissions allow publication of anonymized survey findings. Anonymization does not replace any required consent or organizational approval.

5. Results and Findings

5.1 Overall pattern

The aggregate response pattern was generally favourable across several core workplace indicators. Many respondents selected agreement or strong agreement for items relating to guidance from supervisors, clarity about job responsibilities and communication of workplace policies. These results suggest that day-to-day direction and basic role information are perceived as strengths in the surveyed context.

5.2 Supervisor guidance and role clarity

Supervisor guidance was one of the highest-rated themes in the original analysis. Respondents also generally felt that they knew whom to contact for help and understood their job responsibilities. In field-based work, these strengths can improve coordination, reduce uncertainty and help employees resolve work-related questions more quickly.

5.3 Communication and awareness

Respondents also viewed policy communication positively overall. However, favourable views of general communication do not necessarily mean that everyone understands specific benefits or knows how to escalate a concern. Benefits awareness and clear guidance on grievance channels should therefore be addressed directly, rather than assuming that general policy communication guarantees detailed understanding.

5.4 Grievance handling and employee support

The findings highlight the need to make sure workers know how to raise a concern, which channel to use and what kind of response to expect. The grievance process should be easy to find, confidential where appropriate, and supported by clear records showing who is responsible for each case, how it is escalated and when it is closed. Positive overall perceptions of workplace support do not, by themselves, prove that every grievance is handled consistently or on time.

5.5 Welfare, safety and practical working conditions

The questionnaire also covered workplace safety, personal protective equipment, allowances, leave and work-life balance. These issues are particularly relevant for field technicians, whose work may involve travel, time pressure and operational risks. This version does not include site-level results or exact response breakdowns. Instead, it recommends regular checks to ensure that safety measures, welfare practices and benefits information are communicated clearly and remain accessible.

6. Discussion

The findings support the view that employees are more likely to feel engaged when they have the practical support needed to do their jobs confidently. Positive perceptions of supervisor guidance and role clarity highlight the importance of approachable frontline leadership. However, general communication and specific benefits awareness are not the same. Employees may understand their daily tasks while still being unsure about their entitlements or the correct channel for raising a grievance.

When work involves more than one organization, responsibility for the employee experience can become unclear. This makes coordination and clear ownership especially important. Workers should not have to guess who is responsible for an issue. A simple escalation guide, shared clearly with employees, can reduce confusion and help concerns reach the right person.

The findings should be read with some caution. Because the study used non-probability sampling, the results may not represent the wider workforce. Responses are self-reported and may also be influenced by personal bias or the conditions in which the questionnaire was completed. The study describes perceptions but cannot show that a particular HR practice directly causes higher engagement. Future research could compare results over time, include interviews and examine relationships between variables using a clearly documented analysis plan.

7. Recommendations

1. Introduce short, recurring briefings on workplace policies, benefits, leave, allowances, safety requirements and available support.
2. Provide a simple grievance escalation chart that identifies the first point of contact, the next escalation level and expected response timelines.
3. Maintain a confidential grievance register recording the issue category, responsible owner, date received, action taken and closure status; use aggregated trends for improvement.
4. Conduct periodic checks on the availability, condition and appropriate use of personal protective equipment and required field tools.
5. Use short comprehension checks after policy briefings so that awareness is measured by understanding, not merely attendance.
6. Set up regular supervisor check-ins and a consistent method for sharing operational changes with field personnel.
7. Review recurring concerns with contractor representatives and relevant internal stakeholders, while protecting individual confidentiality.
8. Repeat the engagement pulse survey periodically using consistent questions and report only aggregated results that do not identify individuals, locations or small groups.

8. Limitations and Future Research

This study draws on a non-probability sample from one anonymized operational setting, so the findings should not be generalized to all field workers or industries. The responses reflect participants' own perceptions at the time of data collection. Detailed internal figures have been withheld to protect confidentiality, which limits independent examination of the exact response distributions. Future studies could use stratified sampling across several organizations, combine surveys with confidential interviews and explore whether improvements in grievance tracking or benefits communication are

associated with better outcomes over time.

9. Conclusion

This study explored employee engagement and grievance-handling perceptions among field technicians in an anonymized power-services setting. Overall, responses were positive on several practical indicators, especially supervisor guidance, role clarity and communication. The findings also show why benefits information and grievance procedures need to be clear, accessible and consistently followed. Organizations can improve the employee experience through regular short briefings, straightforward escalation routes, documented case tracking, routine safety checks and a structured way to gather feedback. Together, these steps can turn general workplace support into a more transparent and reliable employee-relations process.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2020). Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice (15th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33(4), 692–724. https://doi.org/10.2307/256287
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). The drivers of employee engagement. Institute for Employment Studies.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21(7), 600–619. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 386–400. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386