# A STUDY ON EFFECT OF WORK ENGAGEMENT IN BUSINESS PROCESS **ORGANISATIONS**

Dr. John E P **Assistant Professor (Sr. Gr.)** SRM Institute of Science & Technology, Chennai

#### **ABSTRACT**

Work engagement can be considered as cognitive, emotional and behavioural. Cognitive engagement refers to employees' beliefs about the company, its leaders and the workplace culture. The emotional aspect is how employees feel about the company, the leaders and their colleagues. The behavioural factor is the value added component reflected in the amount of effort employees put into their work. It is thus the level of commitment and involvement an employee has towards their organization and its values. 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. In addition, organizational culture and perceived organisational support have a significant impact on employee engagement. Taking these factors into consideration, an integrated approach to employee engagement offers a pathway toward sustaining outstanding business results. Needless to say, the era of globalisation has increased the need of addressing employee engagement along with retention of talents at a strategic level.

The research was oriented to identify if a significant relation exists between employee engagement, organisational culture and perceived organisational support including demographics. Conclusions were drawn from existing academic literature and valuable findings extracted from a qualitative analysis of responses to the questionnaire. Recommendations are put forward in this report to guide organisations how to focus on factors that influence employee work engagement.

Key words: - Work Engagement, Business Process Organisations, Vigour, Absorption, Dedication

#### INTRODUCTION

# Research background

In recent years, the area of employee work engagement has been blooming with lot of interest. It was claimed by many that employee engagement predicts employee outcomes, organizational success, and financial performance (e.g. total shareholder return) (Bates, 2004; Baumruk, 2004; Harter et al., 2002; Richman, 2006). Also, employee engagement is on decline, there is a deepening disengagement among employees today (Bates, 2004; Richman, 2006). It has even been reported that the majority of workers today, are not fully engaged or they are disengaged leading to what has been referred to as an "engagement gap" that is costing businesses huge loss a year in productivity (Bates, 2004; Johnson, 2004; Kowalski, 2003). Over the past few decades, Indian economy has evolved from one with a primarily agricultural base, manufacturing, construction, mining, oil and gas followed by exponential growth in the service sector. Combined with demographic changes, this shift in the country's economic base has presented India with some imminent challenges.

**Problem Statement:** Employee attrition is a major problem for the IT companies. It is a well known fact that the cost of hiring a new employee is ten times more than retaining a trained employee. Organisations are now focussing on addressing the issue at strategic level of retaining engaged employees, who add more value to the organisation and enhance its competitive advantage. Thus Employee Work Engagement is considered the major component which if effectively discerned can significantly increase employee retention.

**Objectives:** The objective of this study is to measure the level of components of Employee Engagement

#### LITERATURE REVIEW

Although the term "Employee Engagement" was conceptualized by William A. Kahn in 1990, but its origin could be traced back to as early as 1920s from studies of morale or a group's willingness to achieve organizational objectives. The value of morale to organizations was matured by the US Army during the World War II to predict the unity of effort and their readiness to go to any extent for the well being of the organization. A term was required to describe this emotional attachment of employees to the organization, their fellow associates and the job. This gave birth to the term "Employee Engagement". Engaged employees care about the future of the company and are willing to invest their cent percent effort for the organization.

## **Work Engagement**

Scholars define engagement as a positive, fulfilling and work-related state of mind characterized by vigour, dedication and absorption. This also refers to a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual or behaviour (Schaufeli et al., 2001). Further, the theory of engagement is described as a "positive, fulfilling, affective motivational state of work related wellbeing that is characterized by vigour, dedication and absorption" (Bakker et al. 2008).

Vigour involves high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one's work and persistence even in the face of challenges (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2001).

**Dedication** refers to strong involvement in personal work and a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride and challenge (Schaufeli et al., 2001).

Absorption factor involves being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and the person has difficulties with detaching oneself from work (Schaufeli et al., 2001). Moreover, employee engagement is a concept relevant for an employee's well-being and work behaviour for several reasons. First, work engagement is a positive experience in itself (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Second, it is related to good health and positive work effect (Schaufeli et al., 2001). Other researchers define an engaged employee as a person who is fully involved in and enthusiastic about his or her work (Seijts & Crim, 2006). Also, engaged employees care about the future of the organization and are willing to invest the optimum and ultimate effort by even doing extra-work that is normally not assigned. Expert researchers on engagement theory have concurred that engaged employees are those who are emotionally connected to the organization and cognitively vigilant.

# What is Employee Work Engagement?

Employee Work Engagement may be defined as the ability to influence the employees - their heads, hearts & souls to instil in them an intrinsic desire and passion to succeed and excel. Engaged employees develop a sense of oneness with their organization and want their organization to succeed wholeheartedly because they feel connected emotionally and socially to its mission, vision and purpose. According to the global studies three basic aspects of employee engagement are:

- The employees and their own unique psychological makeup and experience
- The employers and their ability to create the conditions that promote employee engagement
- Interaction between employees at all levels

#### **Significance of Employee Work Engagement**

Studies have shown that executives and leaders must be concerned about the level of engagement in the workplace (Seijts & Crim, 2006). Overall, engagement creates a better environment and culture in the organization. When all employees are engaged on the job, there exists no animosity because everyone is highly and fully engaged. Employees complain less about unfairness at work because their co-workers are focusing, concentrating, and engaging in specific tasks. For employees, the advantage is stability of the organization as it relates to a stimulating engagement. One study found that 84% of highly engaged employees believe they can positively impact the quality of their organization's products, compared with only 31% of the disengaged ones (Seijts & Crim, 2006). Other researchers (Bakker & Leiter, 2010) have

supported such arguments that modern organizations need energetic and dedicated employees who are frequently engaged at work. Many companies expect pro-activity, initiative and responsibility for personal development from employees. As such, workers' organizational identification and professional identification combined to influence performance behaviours and engagement. Other studies note that engaged employees outperform employees that are disengaged. Engaged employees are not just a factor that determines the success of an organization by increasing the bottom line (profits), but also execute results (Seijts & Crim, 2006). Additionally others have made the assertion that "employee engagement also affects the mindset of people" (Seijts & Crim, 2006, p. 2). Moreover, the majority of employees believe that making a difference within the organization triggers results. As a consequence of this belief, the performance level of engaged employees increases.

**Table 1 - Demographics** 

|                           | Category      | No. Of respondent | Percentage |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------|------------|
| Age                       | Below 20      | 27                | 18.4       |
|                           | 21 - 25       | 97                | 66         |
|                           | Above 25      | 23                | 15.6       |
| Experience                | Below 1 Year  | 113               | 76.9       |
|                           | Below 2 Years | 17                | 11.6       |
|                           | Below 3 Years | 10                | 6.8        |
|                           | Above 3 Years | 7                 | 4.8        |
| Number of dependents      | 1             | 63                | 42.9       |
|                           | 2             | 43                | 29.3       |
|                           | Above 2       | 41                | 27.9       |
| Educational qualification | School        | 15                | 10.2       |
|                           | UG            | 72                | 49         |
|                           | PG            | 18                | 12.2       |
|                           | ITI/Diploma   | 25                | 17         |
|                           | Professional  | 17                | 11.6       |
| Marital status            | Single        | 125               | 85         |
|                           | Married       | 22                | 15         |
| Gender                    | Male          | 79                | 53.7       |
|                           | Female        | 68                | 46.3       |

#### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research method used is survey method and the type of research is descriptive research. The sample consists of 247 operational employees, the demographic details of each o the sample was collected which does not include their names in order to protect the identity of the subjects of the study. The questionnaires were distributed to each of the employees individually.

# Sampling method

Since the sampling units are from the same operational level of the employees of the organisation, the samples were selected using non-probability sampling methods i.e. As it is directive at the discretion of the organisation.

# **Data collection procedure**

The data were collected from the respondents through questionnaire having 5 point summated scale (Likert scale). The questionnaire consists of three parts. The first part consists of the Employee engagement components (Vigour, Dedication and Absorption). The second part is of Organisational culture components (Company characteristics, Leadership, Affinity and Company value). The third part consists of the eight questions of Perceived organisational support (POS). Thus the questionnaire consists of Employee engagement, Organisational culture and Perceived organisational support. As these factors will determine the job performance, the employee commitment and further the retention of the employees with the

#### Research hypothesis

H<sub>0</sub>: There is a significant relation between demographics of the respondents and the dimensions of Employee engagement.

# **Dimensions of Employee Work Engagement (EE):**

**Vigour:** Vigour involves high levels of mental resilience and energy while working, the willingness to invest effort in one's work, and persistence even when there is adversity.

**Dedication:** Dedication refers to strong involvement in personal work and a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge.

**Absorption:** The Absorption factor involves being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and the person has difficulties with detaching oneself from work.

#### Measures and scale

For measuring the various dimensions of Employee Engagement the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) developed by Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) was used.

#### DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Reliability statistics - Cronbach's alpha is a coefficient of internal consistency. It is commonly used as an estimate of the reliability of a psychometric test for a sample of examinees. It is a measure of internal consistency, that is, how closely related a set of items are as a group. A "high" value of alpha is often used (along with substantive arguments and possibly other statistical measures) as evidence that the items measure an underlying (or latent) construct. Technically speaking, Cronbach's alpha is not a statistical test it is a coefficient of reliability (or consistency). For the present analysis, the Cronbach's alpha is to the value of 0.939 (**93.9**%) for the 41 items – the data is reliable.

# Questionnaire

**Table 2 - Vigour (Employee Engagement)** 

| Ser | Vigour  |      | Standard  |
|-----|---|------|-----------|
| No  |   |      | Deviation |
| 1.  | At my work, I feel bursting with energy                 | 3.92 | .91       |
| 2.  | At my job, I feel strong and vigorous                   | 4.02 | .89       |
| 3.  | When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work | 4.09 | .92       |
| 4.  | I can continue working for very long periods at a time  | 4.02 | .97       |
| 5.  | At my job, I am very resilient, mentally                | 4.10 | .80       |
| 6.  | At my work, I always persevere, even when things do not | 4.36 | .72       |
|     | go well   |      |           |

**Table 3 - Dedication (Employee Engagement)** 

| Ser | Dedication  |      | Standard  |
|-----|---|------|-----------|
| No  |   |      | Deviation |
| 1.  | I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose | 4.24 | .77       |
| 2.  | I am enthusiastic about my job                        | 4.32 | .80       |
| 3.  | My job inspires me                                    | 4.25 | .77       |
| 4.  | I am proud of the work that I do                      | 4.31 | .77       |
| 5.  | To me, my job is challenging                          | 4.25 | .87       |

**Table 4 - Absorption (Employee Engagement)** 

| Ser | Absorption  | Mear | Standard  |
|-----|---|------|-----------|
| No  |   |      | Deviation |
| 1.  | Time flies when I am working                          | 3.65 | 1.40      |
| 2.  | When I am working, I forget everything else around me | 3.39 | 1.38      |
| 3.  | I feel happy when I am working intensely              | 3.61 | 1.40      |
| 4.  | I am immersed in my work                              | 3.50 | 1.38      |
| 5.  | I get carried away when I am working                  | 3.33 | 1.34      |
| 6.  | It is difficult to detach myself from my job          | 3.27 | 1.38      |

# One way ANOVA Analysis

Table 5 - Respondents Age and dimensions of Employee Work Engagement

| Sl | Source     |          | Mean | Std       | F    | Significance |
|----|------------|----------|------|-----------|------|--------------|
| No |            |          |      | Deviation |      |              |
| 1. | Vigour     | Below 20 | 3.86 | 0.69      | 2.95 | 0.055        |
|    |            | 21 - 25  | 4.17 | 0.54      |      |              |
|    |            | Above 25 | 3.96 | 0.90      |      |              |
| 2. | Dedication | Below 20 | 4.07 | 0.72      | 2.12 | 0.124        |
|    |            | 21 - 25  | 4.32 | 0.50      |      |              |
|    |            | Above 25 | 4.30 | 0.69      |      |              |
| 3. | Absorption | Below 20 | 3.21 | 1.10      | 2.69 | 0.072        |
|    |            | 21 - 25  | 3.62 | 1.16      |      |              |
|    |            | Above 25 | 3.06 | 1.51      |      |              |

The results of one way ANOVA show that, there is no significant difference at (0.05 levels) amongst the different categories of age of the respondents with respect to the dimensions of employee engagement. A positive significance of 10% is shown in vigour and absorption with age category of 21-25. Both the other age categories show a lower mean that needs to be observed from the above table. This shows that the people in the age category of 21-25 need to be developed and given more opportunities to perform.

Table 6 - Experience and dimensions of EE, OC and POS

| Sl | S          | ource    | Mean | Std       | F    | Significance |
|----|------------|----------|------|-----------|------|--------------|
| No |            |          |      | Deviation |      |              |
| 1. | Vigour     | Fresh    | 4.09 | 0.61      | 0.71 | 0.975        |
|    |            | < 1 Year | 4.10 | 0.60      |      |              |
|    |            | 2-3 Year | 4.07 | 1.14      |      |              |
|    |            | > 3 Year | 3.98 | 0.54      |      |              |
| 2. | Dedication | Fresh    | 4.23 | 0.60      | 3.15 | 0.027        |
|    |            | < 1 Year | 4.53 | 0.32      |      |              |
|    |            | 2-3 Year | 4.58 | 0.35      |      |              |
|    |            | > 3 Year | 3.94 | 0.80      |      |              |
| 3. | Absorption | Fresh    | 3.53 | 1.15      | 0.87 | 0.459        |
|    |            | < 1 Year | 3.34 | 1.52      |      |              |
|    |            | 2-3 Year | 2.90 | 1.59      |      |              |
|    |            | > 3 Year | 3.38 | 1.16      |      |              |

The results of one way ANOVA show that, there is a significant difference at (0.05 levels) amongst the different categories of experience of the respondents with respect to the dedication. In specific the people with more than 3 years of experience seems to be less dedicated as compared to less service respondents, therefore due care needs to be given for the said experiencing employees with regular target fixation and proper supervision and monitoring.

Table 6 - No of Dependents and dimensions of Employee Work Engagement

| Sl | Source     |         | Mean | Std       | F    | Significance |
|----|------------|---------|------|-----------|------|--------------|
| No |            |         |      | Deviation |      |              |
| 1. | Vigour     | 1       | 4.06 | 0.55      | 1.82 | 0.166        |
|    |            | 2       | 3.98 | 0.78      |      |              |
|    |            | Above 2 | 4.24 | 0.60      |      |              |
| 2. | Dedication | 1       | 4.21 | 0.57      | 0.86 | 0.426        |
|    |            | 2       | 4.27 | 0.60      |      |              |
|    |            | Above 2 | 4.37 | 0.58      |      |              |
| 3. | Absorption | 1       | 3.27 | 1.21      | 6.95 | 0.00         |
|    |            | 2       | 3.18 | 1.34      |      |              |
|    |            | Above 2 | 4.04 | 0.92      |      |              |

The results of one way ANOVA show that, there is no significant difference at (0.05 levels) amongst the different categories of dependents of the respondents with respect to the dimensions of absorption. Respondents with more than 2 dependents seem to be more absorbed in the job and their performance.

Table 7 - Educational Qualification and dimensions of Employee Work Engagement

| Sl |            | Source       |      | Std       | F    | Significance |
|----|------------|--------------|------|-----------|------|--------------|
| No |            |              |      | Deviation |      |              |
| 1. | Vigour     | School       | 3.78 | 0.60      | 1.27 | 0.285        |
|    |            | UG           | 4.10 | 0.60      |      |              |
|    |            | PG           | 4.03 | 0.98      |      |              |
|    |            | ITI/Diploma  | 4.13 | 0.54      |      |              |
|    |            | Professional | 4.26 | 0.51      |      |              |
| 2. | Dedication | School       | 4.21 | 0.42      | 1.00 | 0.408        |
|    |            | UG           | 4.20 | 0.61      |      |              |
|    |            | PG           | 4.47 | 0.50      |      |              |
|    |            | ITI/Diploma  | 4.28 | 0.60      |      |              |
|    |            | Professional | 4.40 | 0.61      |      |              |

| 3. | Absorption | School       | 3.54 | 1.06 | 3.93 | 0.005 |
|----|------------|--------------|------|------|------|-------|
|    |            | UG           | 3.62 | 1.12 |      |       |
|    |            | PG           | 2.43 | 1.40 |      |       |
|    |            | ITI/Diploma  | 3.59 | 1.30 |      |       |
|    |            | Professional | 3.60 | 1.08 |      |       |

The results of one way ANOVA show that, there is no significant difference at (0.05 levels) amongst the different categories of education of the respondents with respect to the dimensions of employee engagement. except there is a significant relationship of dimension of absorption in the PG qualified respondents, which shows a very low mean of confidence.

Table 8 - No of Dependents and dimensions of Employee Work Engagement

| Sl | Source     |               | Mean | Std       | F     | Significance |
|----|------------|---------------|------|-----------|-------|--------------|
| No |            |               |      | Deviation |       |              |
| 1. | Vigour     | 4,000 - 6,000 | 3.98 | 0.61      | 2.57  | 0.080        |
|    |            | 6,000 - 8,000 | 4.21 | 0.68      |       |              |
|    |            | Above 8,000   | 4.27 | 0.59      |       |              |
| 2. | Dedication | 4,000 - 6,000 | 4.23 | 0.57      | 1.68  | 0.190        |
|    |            | 6,000 - 8,000 | 4.28 | 0.62      |       |              |
|    |            | Above 8,000   | 4.63 | 0.29      |       |              |
| 3. | Absorption | 4,000 - 6,000 | 3.45 | 1.18      | 0.008 | 0.992        |
|    |            | 6,000 - 8,000 | 3.47 | 1.33      |       |              |
|    |            | Above 8,000   | 3.42 | 1.13      |       |              |

The results of one way ANOVA show that, there is no significant difference at (0.05 levels) amongst the different categories of dependents of the respondents with respect to the dimensions of employee engagement, except, the dimension of vigour shows significant relationship with the income level of respondents in the category of Rs. 4,000-6,000. Therefore, it is recommended to consider the increase the starting pay packages to have a higher performance of the organisation in the context of increased employee engagement.

#### **Independent samples t-Test**

Table 9 - Income source and dimensions of Employee Work Engagement

| Sl | Source     |          | Mean | Std       | F    | Significance |
|----|------------|----------|------|-----------|------|--------------|
| No |            |          |      | Deviation |      |              |
| 1. | Vigour     | Single   | 4.16 | 0.47      | 5.22 | 0.024        |
|    |            | Multiple | 4.05 | 0.70      |      |              |
| 2. | Dedication | Single   | 4.31 | 0.54      | 0.38 | 0.537        |
|    |            | Multiple | 4.26 | 0.59      |      |              |
| 3. | Absorption | Single   | 3.32 | 1.38      | 2.66 | 0.105        |
|    |            | Multiple | 3.51 | 1.66      |      |              |

The results of one way ANOVA show that, there is no significant difference at (0.05 levels) amongst the different categories of number of income source of the respondents and the dimensions of the employee engagement, except, there is significant relationship between income source and dimension of vigour of employee engagement, as the number of income source increases the vigour of the respondent decreases.

Table 10 - Marital status and dimensions of Employee Work Engagement

| Sl | Source     |         | Mean | Std       | F     | Significance |
|----|------------|---------|------|-----------|-------|--------------|
| No |            |         |      | Deviation |       |              |
| 1. | Vigour     | Single  | 4.07 | 0.66      | 0.011 | 0.915        |
|    |            | Married | 4.13 | 0.58      |       |              |
| 2. | Dedication | Single  | 4.25 | 0.58      | 0.01  | 0.920        |
|    |            | Married | 4.39 | 0.59      |       |              |
| 3. | Absorption | Single  | 3.54 | 1.18      | 3.21  | 0.075        |
|    |            | Married | 2.98 | 1.40      |       |              |

The results of independent samples t-test show that there is no significant difference (at 0.05 levels) between the marital status of the respondents and dimensions of employee engagement, except, there is significant relationship between marital status of the respondents and dimension of absorption of employee engagement, as the married respondents show a lower mean of absorption.

Table 11 - Gender and dimensions of Employee Work Engagement

| Sl | Source     |        | Mean | Std       | F     | Significance |
|----|------------|--------|------|-----------|-------|--------------|
| No |            |        |      | Deviation |       |              |
| 1. | Vigour     | Male   | 4.22 | 0.57      | 1.13  | 0.289        |
|    |            | Female | 3.92 | 0.69      |       |              |
| 2. | Dedication | Male   | 4.28 | 0.61      | 0.33  | 0.569        |
|    |            | Female | 4.26 | 0.55      |       |              |
| 3. | Absorption | Male   | 3.46 | 1.36      | 10.32 | 0.002        |
|    |            | Female | 3.46 | 1.06      |       |              |

The results of independent samples t-test show that there is no significant difference (at 0.05 levels) between the gender of the respondents and dimensions of employee engagement, except, there is significant relationship between gender and dimension of absorption. Absorption is equally significant with both the genders.

#### FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH AND CONCLUSION

#### **Research findings**

From the analysis, the following can be inferred,

- It is inferred that 66% of the respondents belong to the age group of 21-25 years.
- With respect to the work experience, it is seen that 76.9% of the respondents have less than 1 year of experience and only 4.8% employees do have more than 3 years of experience. This point needs to be considered by the organisation, in pursue of effective human resource accounting and management.
- Regarding the number of dependents, it is seen that 42.9% of the respondents have one dependent, 29.3% of the respondents have 2 dependents and 27.9% of the respondents have more than 2 dependents.
- Based on the educational qualification, 10.2% of the respondents are having school education (SSLC/HSLC), 49% are degree qualified, 12.2% are post graduates, 17% are ITI/Diploma and 11.6% are professionally qualified (BE/BTech/BCA/MCA).
- It is found that only 15% of the respondents are married whereas a majority of 85% of them are single.
- With respect to the gender, 53.7% of the respondents are male whereas 46.3% of them are female.

# Findings related to research hypothesis

H<sub>1</sub>: This hypothesis is accepted as there is significant difference between the demographic details such as age with the dimensions of Employee engagement.

- It is observed that there is significant difference between age and the dimensions of Employee engagement like levels of Vigour and Absorption. Both the dimensions are having highest mean in the age category of 21-25.
- The category of respondents having 1-3 years of experience does have a higher mean value as compared to other categories.
- It is observed that respondents with more than 2 dependents contribute significantly in Absorption, Organisational culture and Perceived organisational support.
- It is observed that PG qualified respondents have the minimum mean as compared with other qualifications.
- Significant relation is observed between Vigour and Income level (above Rs. 8,000).
- There is a significant relation between number of income source of the respondents and Vigour, the dimensions of Employee engagement.
- There is a significant relation between marital status of the respondents and Absorption, the dimension of Employee engagement.
- There is a significant relation between gender of the respondents and Absorption, the dimension of Employee engagement and Perceived organisational support.

#### **Implications of the study:**

From the research it is found that the impact of dimensions of Employee engagement, Organisational culture and Perceived organisational support, that is as follows,

#### Vigour

The mean value of Vigour of employees is found as 4.08, with standard deviation as 0.6438. Vigour plays a positive and significant role in the age, income level and income source of the respondents. Thus it is recommended that,

- At work, the employees should be given challenging tasks and opportunities that should break the monotonous routine with lot of activities.
- Employees should be given job autonomy for their increased performance.
- On-the job training should be given due importance.
- Vigour is observed maximum with the age category 21-25 years, that implies due care should be given for other age categories.
- As the income level increases the vigour content of the employee is found increasing (directly proportional).
- Vigour is found higher with employees having single source of income.

#### **Dedication**

The mean value of Dedication shown by the respondents is 4.27, with standard deviation as 0.5819. Dedication is significant and plays a positive role with Experience. It is to note that as the experience increases the dedication increases and reduces at later stage. The management should take a note of this and should implement sufficient development programmes for the employees for their personal and professional development.

# Absorption

The mean value of Absorption of the employees is found to be 3.46, with standard deviation as 1.2265. The dimension of absorption has a positive and significant relation with number of dependents, educational qualification, marital status and gender of the respondents, that implies,

- As the number of dependents increases the level of absorption of the employees' increases.
- Except for post graduate qualified employees, all other employees with different educational qualifications are found to be more absorbed in their present job; this implies that suitable job engagement needs to be addressed for pg qualified employees.
- Married employees show low mean of absorption, this implies that a necessary counselling and guidance session needs to be organised by the management to motivate and keep the married employees engaged.
- Both male and female employees show equal amount of absorption and job engagement.

Empowerment is a precursor of pro-social behaviours such as innovation, and innovation is the key to maintaining the competitive edge of a company. Such a strategy is likely to increase the long-term financial success of the organization. By making information accessible to employees about organizational strategies and goals, employees are more apt to engage in positive deviant behaviours such as corporate innovation because of their understanding of the corporate environment.

#### **Future research**

The study can be conducted for all the employees working at MphasiS Limited, Pondicherry irrespective of their designations. The study can also be extended to organizations other than BPOs to learn the relationship of various dimensions of Employee engagement. The study can also be extended to determine the emotional intelligence of the employees with respect to their deviance behaviour which will enhance the organizational citizenship behaviour and the performance appraisal.

#### **Conclusion**

In a world that is changing both in terms of the global nature of work and the aging of the workforce, having engaged employees may be a key to competitive advantage. This will be especially true if we can show how the engagement construct produces effects at levels of analysis of concern to management. As with all good things, the challenge of establishing the conditions for state and behavioural employee engagement will be great. Research evidence shows that engagement and an employee's intention to stay with their organisation are influenced by the relationships held at work and the behaviours experienced. Therefore, management must be able to develop a sense of community and ensure favourable behaviours are displayed, such as trusting employees by giving them autonomy to make their own decisions. However, the literature indicates that it is not just what managers' do that is important; collegial relations are also important. It is evident that giving employees the opportunity to feed their views and opinions upwards is a key driver of employee engagement.

#### **REFERENCES**

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career development international*, 13(3), 209-223.

Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187-200.

Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current directions in psychological science*, 20(4), 265-269.

Bakker, A. B. (2017). Strategic and proactive approaches to work engagement. *Organizational Dynamics*, 46(2), 67-75.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Job demands—resources theory. Wellbeing: A complete reference guide, 1-28.

Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, S. (2018). Work engagement: current trends. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 4-11.

Bin, A. S. (2015). The relationship between job satisfaction, job performance and employee engagement: An explorative study. *Issues in Business Management and Economics*, 4(1), 1-8.

Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89-136.

Gupta, M., Shaheen, M., & Reddy, P. K. (2017). Impact of psychological capital on organizational citizenship behavior: mediation by work engagement. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(7), 973-983.

Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of school psychology*, 43(6), 495-513.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(2), 268.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal*, 33(4), 692-724.

Kataria, A., Rastogi, R., & Garg, P. (2013). Organizational effectiveness as a function of employee engagement. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 20(4), 56.

Keyko, K., Cummings, G. G., Yonge, O., & Wong, C. A. (2016). Work engagement in professional nursing practice: A systematic review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 61, 142-164.

Kirkpatrick, C. L. (2007, April). To invest, coast or idle: Second-stage teachers enact their job engagement. In *American Educational Research Association Annual Conference*.

Kular, S., Gatenby, M., Rees, C., Soane, E., & Truss, K. (2008). Employee engagement: literature reviews.

Leiter, M. P., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Work engagement: introduction. Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research, 1-9.

Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). Engaged in engagement: We are delighted we did it. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 76-83.

Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.

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.

Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). The drivers of employee engagement. *Report-Institute for Employment Studies*.

Rothmann, S., & Olivier, A. L. (2007). Antecedents of work engagement in a multinational company. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 33(3), 49-56.

Schaufeli, Wilmar B., and Arnold B. Bakker. "Utrecht work engagement scale." *Occupational Health Psychology Unit Utrecht University* 1 (2003).

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). Utrecht work engagement scale. *Occupational Health Psychology Unit Utrecht University*, 1.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behaviour*, 25(3), 293-315.

Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. (2007). Work engagement. *Managing social and ethical issues in organizations*, 135, 177.

Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Work engagement: What do we know and where do we go. *Romanian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 14(1), 3-10.

Schaufeli, W. B. (2013). What is engagement? *Employee engagement in theory and practice* (pp. 29-49). Routledge.

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2011). Do transformational leaders enhance their followers' daily work engagement? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 121-131.