THE IMPORTANT FACTORS OF EMPLOYEE JOB ENGAGEMENT BASED ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE RESPONDENTS

G. Narmadha
Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, School of Management Studies, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies, Pallavaram, Chennai-600117

Dr. K. Vinayagam
Associate professor and Research Supervisor, Department of Business Administration, School of Management Studies, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies, Pallavaram, Chennai-600117

Abstract

The experience of engagement at work can vary between individuals over time and is likely to fluctuate on a daily basis within one person. This paper explores the debate about whether some people are more likely to engage at work than others, focusing on the differences between individuals, as well as how engagement is affected by job and organizational characteristics. The aim of this paper is to analyze the most predicting factors of employee's job engagement based on employment of the respondents. The sample size required for this analysis is 216. These survey respondents were chosen using a systematic random sampling technique. The data analysis procedure is carried out by means of the survey questionnaire process. It is found that Work Ethic, Locus of Control, Benefits, Career Development, Interpersonal Relationships, Job Content, Objectivity, Pay and Performance Evaluation are the Employee engagement factors significantly varied among the respondents based on the types of employed.

Keywords: Employees job engagement, Private Employed, Govt Employed, And Self Employed

DOI Number: 10.14704/nq.2022.20.13.NQ88205 Neuro Quantology 2022; 20(13):1641-1648

Introduction

Engagement is understood to be related to job involvement as well. According to the Gallup Consulting Organization, there is a positive correlation between an individual's involvement and enthusiasm for work with employee satisfaction (Gallup, 2011). Job involvement depends on need saliency, and the potential of the job to satisfy those needs. Job involvement according to Kanungo (1982) is the result of cognitive judgment and is all about need satisfying abilities of the job, whereas employee engagement entails the active use of emotions and behaviours, in addition to cognitions. Engagement is a state of involvement that implies a positive and relatively complete state of engagement of core aspects of the self in the job (Brown, 1996). Also, engagement can be distinguished from the job involvement construct as in job involvement the focus is on work alone rather than on the organisation. Thus, it can be concluded that engagement is a broader concept than job involvement as it focuses on the individual's relationship with not only work roles but the organisation as well.

Some practitioners describe engagement in terms of organizational commitment. As suggested by Wellins and Concelman (2005), "to be engaged is to be actively committed". Organisation commitment is a psychological state of attachment to the organisation, which is regarded as an antecedent of various organisationally relevant outcomes, including various forms of personal behaviour such as working hard, staying long hours and so on (Menguc and others, 2013) as organisational commitment involves a sense of belonging, personal meaning, and being part of the family (Meyer and Allen, 1997). It can be inferred that affective commitment is one of the important

facets of engagement, but not the same as engagement (Saks, 2006). Engagement also overlaps with organisational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB is believed to go beyond formal obligations and is defined as the lubricant of social machinery of the organisation, reducing friction and/or increasing efficiency (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997). OCB is a behaviour that is considered related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, but is more related with work situation than with dispositional factors (Podsakoff and Organ, 1986). Little and Little (2006) have argued that OCB is an outcome of job satisfaction and organisational commitment. Thus, OCB too can be considered as one of the facets of engagement, rather than being engagement per se. The construct flow is also related to engagement. Flow is defined as the state in which there is less distinction between self and environment. Individuals in the state of flow do not need external rewards or goals to motivate them as the work or task itself is the motivator (Csikszentmitmihalyi, 1975). Flow generally is found with the challenging tasks and successful experiences. Schaufeli and Taris (2005) asserted that flow is a peak experience of engagement. Macey and Schneider (2008) have suggested that auto-telic personality, which is a trait manifestation of flow, can be conceptualized as trait engagement. Due to the similarity between the two constructs (flow and engagement) and in the way they have been defined, there are differing viewpoints in the literature as to whether flow causes engagement or engagement results in flow; however, there is no empirical evidence as to the causality or redundancy.

There are very few studies that have examined employee engagement practices in the IT/ITES sector. The above study will help to fill the gap. Moreover, the study discusses the influence of various factors on employee engagement. The results of the study confirm that there is a significant influence of various factors on employee engagement. There are a lot of concerns related to HR policies and practices as reflected in the results of this study. Out of the six dimensions of organisationl climate, there is only one (performance evaluation) that has emerged as a predictor of organisation engagement.

Research Methodology

The aim of this paper is to analyze the most predicting factors of employee's job engagement based on employment of the respondents. Various literature and reviews are compiled and finally 11 variables framed from the literature namely job involvement, organizational engagement, work ethic, locus of control, benefits, career development, interpersonal relationships, job content, objectivity, pay, performance evaluation. Structure questionnaire was used to collect the data from the respondent those who are working in as employees. This method is being considered for this analysis. The sample size required for this analysis is 216. These survey respondents were chosen using a systematic random sampling technique. The data analysis procedure is carried out by means of the survey questionnaire process. Responses are coded and the results are entered into a statistical kit for social science (SPSS). Descriptive statistics ANOVA statistical methods were used to evaluate the variance between the variables, the statistically significant variations and the relationship between the variables.

Analysis and Results

Table 1 Employee engagement factors and type of employed

Employee engagement factors	Employment particulars	Mean	Std. Deviation	F- value	P-value.
Job involvement	Private employed	3.67	1.33	14.322	0.001*
	Government employed	3.65	0.64		
	Self employed	3.26	0.78		
Organisation Engagement	Private employed	4.49	0.44	88.463	0.001*

	Government employed	2.86	1.18		
	Self employed	3.31	0.92		
Work Ethic	Private employed	4.16	1.12	19.628	0.001*
	Government employed	3.2	1.29		
	Self employed	3.59	1.06		
Locus of Control	Private employed	4.14	1.17	3.852	0.022**
	Government employed	3.84	0.85		
	Self employed	4.04	0.74		
Benefits	Private employed	4.46	0.46	24.813	0.001*
	Government employed	3.9	0.85		
	Self employed	3.98	0.6		
Career Development	Private employed	4.44	0.52	25.184	0.001*
	Government employed	4.28	0.08		
	Self employed	4.09	0.51		
Interpersonal Relationships	Private employed	4.61	0.36	71.072	0.001*
	Government employed	4.09	0.15		
	Self employed	3.96	0.56		
Job Content	Private employed	4.07	1.06	4.723	0.009**
	Government employed	4.01	0.2		
	Self employed	4.16	0.2		
Objectivity	Private employed	4.16	0.72	77.679	0.001*
	Government employed	3.04	0.8		
	Self employed	3.27	0.65		
Pay	Private employed	4.56	0.39	48.837	0.001*
	Government employed	4.16	0.11		

	Self employed	3.85	0.79		
Performance Evaluation	Private employed	4.35	0.6	40.171	0.001*
	Government employed	4.18	0.47		
	Self employed	3.8	0.65		

Source: Primary data computed. * Significant at 1 percent level; ** Significant at 5 percent level;

Table 1, explains the respondents opinion towards Employee engagement factors based on the types of employed.

Here, types of employed of the respondents is classified into three groups, namely, private employees, government employees and self employment. On the basis of types of employed, the respondents opinion is compared with the Employee engagement factors.

Ho: Respondents' opinion towards the Employee engagement factors is not varied based on the types of employed.

In order to examine the above stated hypothesis, one way analysis of variance is applied. From the ANOVAs result, it is noted that the Employee engagement factors like Job involvement, Organisation Engagement, Work Ethic, Locus of Control, Benefits, Career Development, Interpersonal Relationships, Job Content, objectivity, Pay and Performance Evaluation are the factors found to be significant. Hence, it is inferred that like Work Ethic, Locus of Control, Benefits, Career Development, Interpersonal Relationships, Job Content, objectivity, Pay and Performance Evaluation are the Employee engagement factors significantly varied among the respondents based on the types of employed.

In the case of Job involvement, private employment respondents highly secured the mean value of 3.67 followed by government employment respondents (3.65) and self employment respondents (3.26). The calculated F-value is 14.322 and the P-value is 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Job involvement factors among the respondents based on the types of employed. It is found that private employment respondents are having the higher level of opinion towards the Job involvement employee's job engagement factors than the other types of employed respondents.

With regard to Organisation Engagement factors, the private employment respondents have highly secured the mean score of 4.49, followed by the self employment respondents (3.31) and the government employment respondents (2.86). The calculated F-value is 88.463 and the P-value is 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Organisation Engagement factors among the respondents based on the types of employed. It is noted that private employment respondents highly perceived the Organisation engagement factors in the employees job engagement.

Regarding the Work Ethic factors, private employment respondents highly secured the mean value of 4.16, followed by self employment respondents (3.59) and government employment respondents (3.20). The calculated F-value is 19.628 and P-value of 0.001 which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Work Ethic based on the types of employed. It is found that private employment respondents are having the higher level of opinion towards the Work Ethic factors.

In the case of Locus of Control, private employment respondents have highly secured the mean value of 4.07, followed by self employment respondents' (4.04) and government employed respondents (3.85). The calculated F-value is 3.852 and P-value is 0.022 which is significant at five percent level. Hence there is a significant difference of opinion towards Locus of Control based on the types of employed. It is found that private employment respondents are having the higher level of opinion towards the Locus of Control factors.

For Benefits, private employment respondents highly secured the mean value of 4.46 followed by self employment respondents

(3.98) and government employment respondents (3.90). The calculated F-value is 24.813 and P-value is 0.001 which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Benefits factors based on the types of employed. It is noted that private employment respondents are having the higher level of Benefits.

With regard to Career Development, private employment respondents have secured the mean score of 4.44, followed by government employment respondents' (4.28) and self employment respondents (4.09). The calculated F-value is 25.184 and P-value of 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Career Development based on the types of employed of respondents. It is inferred that private employment respondents are having the higher level of Career Development.

For Interpersonal Relationships, private employment respondents are secured the mean value of 4.61, followed by government employment respondents (4.09) and self employment respondents (3.96). The calculated F-value is 71.072 and P-value of 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Interpersonal Relationships factors based on the types of employed. It is noted that private employment respondents are having the higher level of opinion towards Interpersonal Relationships.

For Job Content, self employment respondents highly secured the mean value of 4.16 followed by private employment respondents' (4.07), government employment respondents (4.01). The calculated F-value is 4.723 and P-value is 0.009, which is significant at five percent level. Hence, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Job Content factors based on the types of employed. It is noted that self employment respondents are having the higher level of response towards Benefits.

With regard to Objectivity factors, private employment respondents highly secured the mean value of 4.16 followed by self employment respondents (3.27) and government employment respondents' (3.04). The calculated F-value is 77.679 and P-value is 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. So, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Benefits factors based on the types of employed. It is noted that private employment respondents are having the higher level of perception towards Objectivity factors.

For pay, private employment respondents have secured the mean value of 4.56, followed by government employment respondents (4.16), self employment respondents (3.85). The calculated F-value is 48.837 and P-value of 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. So, there is a significant difference of opinion towards pay based on the types of employed. It is noted that private employment respondents are having the higher level of opinion towards promotional display.

For Performance Evaluation, private employment respondents secured the mean value of (4.35), followed by government employment respondents' (4.18) and self employment respondents (3.89). The calculated F-value is 40.17 and P-value of 0.001, which is significant at one percent level. So, there is a significant difference of opinion towards Performance Evaluation based on the types of employed. It is explained that private employment respondents have the higher level of opinion towards the Performance Evaluation.

It is found that the Employee engagement factors are significantly varied among the respondents based on the types of employed. Private employment respondents' have higher level of importance towards the Job involvement, Organisation Engagement, Work Ethic smell, store signage, Benefits, Career Development, Interpersonal Relationships, Objectivity, promotional display boards and Performance Evaluation. Job Content factor is found to be high among the self employed respondents.

Conclusion

The well Engaged employees can help your organization achieve its mission, execute its strategy and generate important business results. This paper concluded that the employees job engagement factors significantly varied based the employment. From this report it has highlighted ways in which different HR practices, including job design, recruitment, selection, training, and compensation and performance management can enhance employee engagement. But these examples also show that employee engagement is more complex than it may appear on the surface.

Organizations define and measure engagement in a variety of different ways, suggesting there is no one "right" or "best" way to define or stimulate engagement in your workforce. The decision to invest in strengthening engagement or commitment (or both) depends on an organization's strategy and the makeup of its workforce.

References

Alderfer, C.P. (1972) Human needs in organisational settings. New York, Free Press of Glencoe.

Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P. and Kalleberg, A. (2000) Manufacturing Advantage. Why High Performance Work Systems Pay off. Ithaca and London, ILR Press.

Bates, S. (2004) 'Getting engaged', HR Magazine, Vol 49, No 2, pp44-51.

Baumruk, R. (2004) 'The missing link: the role of employee engagement in business success',Workspan, Vol 47, pp48-52.

Beardwell, J. and Claydon, T. (2007) Human Resource Management, A Contemporary Approach. 5th ed. Harlow, Prentice Hall.

Blizzard, R. (2003) 'Employee engagement: Where do hospitals begin?' The Gallup Poll Tuesday Briefing, November, 2, p.91.

Blyton, P. and Turnbull, P. (2004) The Dynamics of Employee Relations. 3rd ed. Basingstoke:Palgrave.

Bowditch, J. and Buono, A. (2001) A Primer on Organisational Behaviour. 5th ed. New York,John Wiley.

Brim, B. (2002) 'The longer workers stay in the jobs, the more disheartened they become',Gallup Management Journal, March. Available at: http://www.gallupjournal.com/GM/Jarchive/issue5/2002315c.asp [Accessed 1st August 2007]

Brown, R. (2006) Doing your dissertation in business and management: the reality of researching and writing. London, SAGE.

Buchanan, D. and Huczynski, A. (2004) Organisational Behaviour. An introductory text, 5thed. Harlow, FT/Prentice Hall.

Buckingham, M. (2001) 'What a waste', People Management, 11 October, pp36-39.

Cherryholmes, C.C. (1992) 'Notes on pragmatism and scientific realism', Educational Researcher, Vol 21, pp13-17.

Cooper, R. (1997) 'Applying Emotional Intelligence in the workplace', Training and Development, Vol 51 No 12, pp31-38.

Crabtree, S. (2005) 'Engagement keeps the doctor away; A happy employee is a healthy employee, according to a GMJ survey', Gallup Management Journal, 13th January. Available at: http://gmj.gallup.com/content/default.aspx?ci=14500&pg=1 [Accessed 4th July]

Cropanzano, R. and Mitchell, M.S. (2005) 'Social exchange theory: an interdisciplinary review', Journal of Management, Vol 31, pp874-900.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975) Beyond boredom and anxiety. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990) Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience. New York, Harper.

Cufaude, J. (2004) in Lanphear, S. (2004). 'Are Your Employees Highly Engaged?' Credit Union Executive Newsletter, 19, 1-2. Credit Union National Association, US.

Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (1987) 'The support of autonomy and the control of behaviour', Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, pp1024-1037.

Diamond, M.A. and Allcorn, S. (1985) 'Psychological dimensions of role use in bureaucratic organisations', in Kahn, W.A. (1990) 'Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work', Academy of Management Journal, Vol 33, pp692-724.

Edmondson, A. (1999) 'Psychological safety and learning behaviour in work teams', Administrative Science Quarterly, 44, pp350-383.

Emmott, M. (2006) 'Hear me now', People Management, 23rd November, pp38-39.

Ferguson, A. (2007) 'Employee engagement: Does it exist, and if so, how does it relate to performance, other constructs and individual differences?' [online] Available at:

http://www.lifethatworks.com/Employee-Engagement.prn.pdf [Accessed 20th June 2007]

Fisher, C. (2004) Researching and Writing a Dissertation for Business Students. Harlow, Prentice Hall.

Fox, A. (1974) Beyond Contract: Work, power and trust relations. London, Faber and Faber.

Frank, F.D., Finnegan, R.P. and Taylor, C.R. (2004) 'The race for talent: retaining and engaging workers in the 21st century', Human Resource Planning, Vol 27, No 3, pp12-

Freud, S. (1922) in Ferguson, A. (2007) 'Employee engagement: Does it exist, and if so, how does it relate to performance, other constructs and individual differences?' [online] Available at: http://www.lifethatworks.com/Employee-Engagement.prn.pdf [Accessed 20th June 2007]

Goffman, E. (1961) Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction. Indianapolis,

Bobbs-Merrill Co. in Ferguson, A. (2007) 'Employee engagement: Does it exist, and if so, how does it relate to performance, other constructs and individual differences?' [online] Available at: http://www.lifethatworks.com/Employee-Engagement.prn.pdf [Accessed 20th June 2007]

Goodard, R.G. (1999) 'In-time, out-time: A qualitative exploration of time use by managers in an organisation' Dissertation Abstracts International. University Microfilms International,USA.

Gopal, A. (2006) 'Worker disengagement continues to cost Singapore', The Gallup

Management Journal, 11th May. [online]. Available at: http://gmj.gallup.com/content/default.aspx?ci=22720&pg=1 [Accessed 2nd July]

Gubman, E. (2004) 'From engagement to passion for work: The search for the missing person', Human Resources Planning, pp42-46.

Guthrie, J.P. (2001) 'High involvement work practices, turnover and productivity: Evidence from New Zealand' Academy of Management Journal, Vol 44, pp180–190.

The Gallup Organisation (2004) [online] Available at: www.gallup.com. Accessed 28th June 2007.

Hart, C. (1998) Doing a literature review: releasing the social science research imagination. London, SAGE.

Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L. and Hayes, T.L. (2002) 'Business-unit level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta- analysis', Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 87, pp268-79.

Johnson, M. (2004) 'Gallup study reveals workplace disengagement in Thailand', The Gallup Management Journal, 12th May. [online] Available at: http://gmj.gallup.com/content/16306/3/Gallup-Study-Reveals-Workplace-Disengagementin. aspx. Accessed 27th July 2007.

Kahn, W.A. (1990) 'Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work', Academy of Management Journal, Vol 33, pp692-724.

Kanungo, R.N. (1982) 'Measurement of job and work involvement', Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 67, pp341-349.

Konrad, A.M. (2006) 'Engaging employees through high-involvement work practices', Ivey Business Journal, March/April, pp1-6.

Lawler, E and Worley, C.G. (2006) 'Winning support for organisational change: Designing employee reward systems that keep on working', Ivey Business Journal, March/April, pp

Lloyd, J. (2004) 'Offer empowerment to encourage engagement', Triangle Business Journal, Vol 15, No 1.

Locke, E.A. and Taylor, M.S. (1990) 'Stress, coping, and the meaning of work', in Brief, A. and W.R. Nord (Eds) Meanings of Occupational Work, pp135-170. Lexington, Lexington Books.

Lucas, R., Lupton, B. and Mathieson, H. (2006) Human Resource Management in an International Context. London, CIPD.

MacDonald, M. (2002) 'How companies can find renewed focus during uncertain times',

Journal of Communication Management, Vol 6, No 3, pp220-227.

Marchington, M., Wilkinson, A., Ackers, P. and Dundon, T. (2001) Management Choice and Employee Voice. CIPD, London.

Maslach, C. Schaufelli, W.B. and Leiter, M.P. (2001) 'Job burnout', Annual Review of Psychology, Vol 52, pp397-422.

Maslow, A. (1954) Motivation and Personality. New York, Harper and Row.

May, D.R. Gilson, R.L. and Harter, L.M. (2004) 'The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work',