

## **A Study on Employee Engagement with special reference to Steel casting manufacturing company, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu.**

<sup>1</sup>P.Manonmani, <sup>2</sup>Prof. Mark J, <sup>3</sup>R.Karthikeyan, <sup>4</sup>V.Uma

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor, PPG Business School, Coimbatore

<sup>2</sup>Director, PPG Business School, Coimbatore

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor, Karpagam University, Coimbatore

<sup>4</sup>Assistant Professor, PPG Institute of Technology, Coimbatore.

**ABSTRACT:** *Employee engagement is level of involvement and commitment on behalf of an employee's level of participation in their organization and its values. Engaged an employee is aware of business context, and works with Colleagues for the benefit of the organization to improve performance within the job. This is a positive attitude towards the organization and its values held by employees. This research study is an effort to understand how employee engagement is associated with employee job satisfaction and how on employee loyalty leads to better work force and affect its loyalty. The results shown that majority of employees are compliance with the organization which brings maximum involvement of the employees and in turn retaining is not impossible.*

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Engagement at work was conceptualized by Kahn, (1990) as the 'harnessing of organizational members' selves to their work roles. In engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances. The second related construct to engagement in organizational behavior is the notion of flow advanced by Csikszentmihalyi (1975, 1990). Csikszentmihalyi (1975) defines flow as the 'holistic sensation' that, people feel when they act with total involvement. Flow is the state in which there is little distinction between the self and environment. When individuals are in Flow State little conscious control is necessary for their actions.

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.

Engagement is most closely associated with the existing construction of job involvement (Brown 1996) and flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Job involvement is defined as 'the degree to which the job situation is central to the person and his or her identity (Lawler & Hall, 1970). Kanungo (1982) maintained that job involvement is a 'Cognitive or belief state of Psychological identification. Job involvement is thought to depend on both need saliency and the potential of a job to satisfy these needs. Thus job involvement results form a cognitive judgment about the needs satisfying abilities of the job. Jobs in this view are tied to one's self image. Engagement differs from job in as it is concerned more with how the individual employees his/her self during the performance of his / her job. Furthermore engagement entails the active use of emotions. Finally engagement may be thought of as an antecedent to job involvement in that individuals who experience deep engagement in their roles should come to identify with their jobs.

When Kahn talked about employee engagement he has given important to all three aspects physically, cognitively and emotionally. Whereas in job satisfaction importance has been more given to cognitive side.

HR practitioners believe that the engagement challenge has a lot to do with how employee feels about the about work experience and how he or she is treated in the organization. It has a lot to do with emotions which are fundamentally related to drive bottom line success in a company. There will always be people who never give their best efforts no matter how hard HR and line managers try to engage them. "But for the most part employees want to commit to companies because doing so satisfies a powerful and a basic need in connect with and contribute to something significant".

## **II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT**

**Alan M. Saks**(2006)A study on " Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement" he conducted a survey among by 102 employees working in a variety of jobs and organizations. The average age was 34 and 60 percent were female. Participants had been in their current job for an average of four years, in their organization an average of five years, and had on average 12 years of work experience. The survey included measures of job and organization engagement as well as the antecedents and consequences of engagement. Results indicate that there is a meaningful difference between job and organization engagements and that perceived organizational support predicts both job and organization engagement; job characteristics predicts job engagement; and procedural justice predicts organization engagement. In addition, job and organization engagement mediated the relationships between the antecedents and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intentions to quit, and organizational citizenship behavior.

**Fred luthansed** (2001) A study an "employee engagement and manager self-efficacy"

According to this study first examine the theoretical understanding of the employee engagement. Then an empirical investigation is made of the role that a wide variety of the managers psychological a state of self – efficacy play in the relationship between the employees measured engagement and multiple measure of the manager effectiveness. Results of the statistical analysis indicate that the manager’s self-efficacy is a partial mediator relationship between his and her employer’s engagement and the manager rated effectiveness. Over all the finding and suggestion that the both employee engagement and self-efficacy are important antecedents that together may more positively influence manager effectiveness then either predictor by itself.

**Dow Scott** (2010) A study an "The impact of reward programs on employee engagement" According to this study world at work is a global is a human resource association focused on compensation ,benefit ,work life and integrated total reward to attract, motivate and retain a talent workforce ,Founded in 1955 world at work provided network of nearly 30000 members in more than 100 countries with training certification , research, conference, and community .

**Patricia Soldati** (2008) A study an" employee engagement" According to this report, twelve major studies on employee engagement had been published over the prior four years by top research firms such as Gallup, Towers Perrin, Blessing White, the Corporate Leadership Council and others. Each of the studies used different definitions and, collectively, came up with 26 key drivers of engagement. For example, some studies emphasized the underlying cognitive issues, others on the underlying emotional issues. Finally, there is some evidence that companies are responding to this employee engagement challenge - by flattening their chains of command, providing training for first-line managers and with better internal communications. Changes won't happen overnight, but with such significant upside to the bottom line - they might happen more quickly than you think

**Dr. P. Vaijyanthi** (2011) A study an " Employee Engagement predictors: A study at GE Power & Water " The findings of the study confirm infrastructure , cross functional discussions , communication & interaction with the corporate office employees , reflection on the feedbacks and proper support and orientation through induction programs, to foster employee engagement, and inadequate interaction with peers from other locations/offices, lack of accountable response from the corporate office for issues including dearth of personnel, employee facilities , deficient communication regarding seminars, workshops, and other training sessions from the corporate office , and inadequate visits by the business team to be the stumbling blocks to better employee engagement.

## **III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

- To study the various factors that determines employee engagement in organization.
- To provide suitable suggestions for improving Employee Engagement in organization

The study is conducted at steel casting manufacturing company at Coimbatore. The sample size is 50 selected using simple random sampling. The data is collected through questionnaire has been tabulated and analyzed by using simple Percentage and correlation.

## **IV. ANALYSIS, FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION**

- \* 30% of the respondents belong to the age group between 36-40 years.
- \* 32% of the respondents are Diploma holders.
- \* 24% of the respondents having more than 16-20 years of experience.
- \* 54% of the respondents getting remuneration of above 10000.
- \* 28% of the respondents are satisfied with the infrastructure in their company.

- \* 38% of the respondents are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied about recognition in their company.
- \*56% of the respondents opine that their suggestions are considered in decision making.
- \*32% of the respondents opine that frequently chance has been given to improve skill and knowledge.
- \*60% of the respondents agreed that training programs are conducted in their company.
- \* 86% of the respondents are agree to adequate information in their company.
- \*76% of the respondents opine that they are happy with the co-workers.
- \* 82% of the respondents are feeling happy to come to workplace.
- \* 79% of the respondents are highly satisfied with the overall functioning of the organization.

**Table showing the Relationship between Remuneration and the Recognition given by the Management.**

Correlation		Remuneration	what is your suggestion about the recognition given by the management
<b>Remuneration</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>.139</b>
	<b>Sig. (2-tailed)</b>		<b>.335</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>what is your suggestion about the recognition given by the management</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	<b>.139</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>Sig. (2-tailed)</b>	<b>.335</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>

### Interpretation

The above table shows the result of the correlation calculated to find whether significant relationship between Remuneration and the recognition given by the management is. As the  $p=0.139$ , greater than level of significance of 0.05 There is no relationship between Remuneration and recognition of the respondents.

### Recommendations

- The management provides sufficient training to employees. A few measures can be taken to develop and organize the training program.
- The employees' works are being recognized by the management and appreciated. It can be maintained in such a way that the employees morale will be improved.
- Need to improve the working environment
- A few measures can be taken to revise regarding pay and benefits.
- Team performance must be highly encouraged and recognized.

## V. CONCLUSION

Employee engagement is the buzz word term for employee communication. It is a positive attitude held by the employees towards the organization and its values. It is rapidly gaining popularity, use and importance in the workplace and impacts organization in many ways. Employee engagement emphasizes the importance of the communication on the success of the business. An organization should thus recognize employees more than any other variable, as powerful contributors to a company's competitive position. Therefore employee engagement should be a continuous process of learning, improvement, measurement and action.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1]. \*Seijts, Gerard H. and Dan Crim (2006). "The Ten C's of Employee Engagement". *IveyBusinessJournal*.
- [2]. \*BlessingWhite (December 2010). *Employee Engagement Report 2011*.
- [3]. \*Konrad, Alison M. (March 2006). "Engaging Employees through High-Involvement Work Practices". *Ivey Business Journal*. "Engage Employees and Boost Performance". Hay Group. 2002. Archived from the original on 2006-11-23.
- [4]. \*Robinson, Dilys and Sue Hayday (2003). "Employee Engagement". *In Brief* (129).
- [5]. C.R. Kothari " Research Methodology" Wishva prakashnan 2001

### WEBSITE

- [6]. \*<http://www.employment-studies.co.uk/news/129theme.php>. Retrieved 2006-11-06.
- [7]. \*[http://www.blessingwhite.com/eee\\_report.asp](http://www.blessingwhite.com/eee_report.asp). Retrieved 2010-12-12.
- [8]. \*<http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=18&hid=109&sid=21a25099-6e82-4e66-849c->