

## **Analysis on employee's effort to show their dedication towards their respective companies**

**<sup>1</sup>Mr. Bhaghat Gurram, <sup>2</sup>Ramesh Vankadoth, <sup>3</sup>Akky Rajesh Kumar, <sup>4</sup>Kancharla Naresh**

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Assistant Professor, <sup>4</sup>PG Student, Department of Master of Business Administration-MBA, Siddhartha Institute of Engineering and Technology, Hyderabad, India.

### **ABSTRACT**

This exploratory study looked at the level of engagement across the board for workers at a public rehabilitation accommodation agency and the extent to which factors like gender, office location, job title, and years of accommodation, as well as demographic and work life variables, affected employees' levels of engagement. Burnout was contrasted with the opposing idea of engagement as a construct for gregarious work (Freeney, Y. & Tiernan, J. 2006 & Schaufli, W. B. & Bakker, A. B. 2004). Purposive non-probability sampling was used by the researcher to conduct a cross-sectional online survey of 308 workers of a state-wide rehabilitation agency in the Cumulated States' Midwest area. She asked respondents questions in order to get data on their levels of participation in both aggregate and in nominate form. Analysis was conducted utilizing t-tests and correlations. Results denote no differences in engagement scores for males and females, for individuals working in rural versus urban office environments, or for years of accommodation in the agency. Participants who supervised at least one other person scored higher than individuals who did not supervise anyone.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Involvement goes beyond commitment or even basic satisfaction. Employees who are gratified may be content but undervalue their contributions to the organization, while devoted personnel may get fixated on the wrong goals. Creating a satisfied and devoted staff is a great goal, but it is insufficient on its own. "The amount to which workers commit to something or someone in their organization, how hard they work, and how long they remain as a result of that commitment," is how employee engagement is defined. When it comes to involvement, there are disparities in posture, comportment, and results. An employee may display pride and adherence (posture), serve as a powerful spokesperson for their employer to clients, or go above and beyond to complete a piece of work (department). Results might include lower contingency rates, higher productivity, fewer conflicts, more innovation, lower numbers leaving and reduced sickness rates. But we believe all three – postures, demeanors and outcomes – are a component of the engagement story. There is a virtuous circle when the pre-conditions of engagement are met when these three aspects of engagement trigger and reinforce one another.

Engaged organisations have vigorous and authentic values, with clear evidence of trust and fairness predicated on mutual reverence, where two way promises and commitments – between employers and staff – are understood, and are consummated.

Albeit amended performance and productivity is at the heart of engagement, it cannot be achieved by a mechanistic approach which endeavors to extract discretionary effort by manipulating employees'

commitment and emotions. Employees optically discern through such endeavors very expeditiously; they lead instead to cynicism and disillusionment. By contrast, engaged employees liberatingly and disposingly give discretionary effort, not as an 'add on', but as an integral part of their quotidian activity at work. But is employee engagement something incipient, or simply old wine (long-standing management approaches) in incipient (fashionable management-verbalize) bottles? Is it just the latest management fad? We believe that while it does have clear overlaps with analytical antecedents such as commitment, 'organisational citizenship behaviour', job involvement and job gratification, there are withal crucial differences. In particular, engagement is two way: organisations must work to engage the employee, who in turn has a call about the caliber of engagement to offer the employer. Each reinforces the other. An engaged employee experiences a coalescence of job gratification, organisational commitment, job involvement and feelings of empowerment. It is a concept that is more preponderant than the sum of its components. Despite there being some debate about the precise meaning of employee engagement there are three things we know about it: it is quantifiable; it can be correlated with performance; and it varies from poor to great. Most importantly employers can do a great deal to impact on people's level of engagement.

That is what makes it so paramount, as an implement for business prosperity.

### Categories of Employee Engagement

According to the Gallup the Consulting organization there are there are variants of People

- Engaged
- Not Engaged
- Actively Disengaged

**Engaged:** "Engaged" employees are builders. They optate to ken the desired prospects for their role so they can meet and exceed them. They're naturally curious about their company and their place in it. They perform at consistently high calibers. They optate to utilize their aptitudes and strengths at work every day. They work with zealously and they drive innovation and move their organization forward

**Not Engaged:** Not-engaged employees incline to concentrate on tasks rather than the goals and outcomes they are expected to accomplish. They optate to be authoritatively mandated what to do just so they can do it and verbalize they have culminated. They fixate on accomplishing tasks vs .achieving an outcome. Employees who are not-engaged incline to feel their contributions are being overlooked, and their potential is not being tapped. They often feel this way because they don't have productive relationships with their managers or with their coworkers.

**Actively Disengaged:** The "actively disengaged" employees are the "cave dwellers." They're "Consistently against Virtually Everything." They're not just unhappy at work; they're diligent acting out their unhappiness .They sow seeds of negativity at every Opportunity. Every day, actively disengaged workers undermine what their engaged coworkers accomplish. As workers increasingly rely on each other to engender products and accommodations, the quandaries and tensions that are fostered by actively disengaged workers can cause great damage to an organization's functioning.

**Objectives of employee engagement:** Good communication within the organization can be one of the most consequential things an organization can do to foster employee engagement. Employees spend one

third of their life in their job and have an interest in what is going on within the organization. They optate to ken how the organization is doing financially, how corporate objectives are being accomplished and how what they do contributes to achieving corporate objectives. Have a well defined vision that all employees buy into. Organizational leadership is responsible for communicating the vision and keeping it in front of the employees. Employees should be able to recite the vision verbalization and why the organization does what it does. When employees are engaged they are emotionally affixed to the vision of the organization. They believe in what they do, the organization's vision and the direction the organization is peregrinated.

Employees who are engaged put their heart and soul into their job and have the energy and exhilaration to give more than is required of the job. Engaged employees are committed and loyal to the organization. Here are some tips on how to foster employee engagement.

### **NEED FOR THE STUDY**

Employee engagement avails employees to transmute their roles to better fit their aptitudes. This requires self vigilance of strengths and impuissances on the component of both the manager and employee and a disposition to be flexible and find solutions. To assess whether there is a link between employee engagement and productivity

### **SCOPE**

Evidences shown that a pragmatic shift towards more enduring partnerships rather than transitive relationships. Such enduring partnerships and strategic coalitions have a better chance of tackling some of the intractable convivial quandaries that corporates are expected to handle. Focusing activity is withal resulting in the development formal policies and procedures which are a paramount element in employee engagement programs. These policies give employee volunteers the fortification and structure they require to utilize all the time and resources they are eligible for in order to volunteer for convivial benefit.

### **CONSEQUENTIALITY**

Employees are engaged in their work and committed to their organizations give companies crucial competitive advantage. Thus, it is not surprising that organizations of all sizes and types have invested substantially in policies and practices that foster engagement and commitment in their work forces. In additament, engaged employees may be more liable to commit to staying with their current organization.

Research methodology and sample design:

### **RESEARCH DESIGN**

Research Design According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), descriptive survey is utilized to obtain information concerning the current status of the phenomena to describe what subsists with veneration to variables in a situation, by asking individuals about their perceptions, postures, demeanor or values. The researcher, to systematically and accurately describe the relationship between employee engagement and commitment at Barclays Bank of Kenya

Circumscribed utilized a descriptive approach. Population

The population of the study comprised of all the 3,500 employees of Barclays Bank of Kenya (Barclays, June 2013). Sampling Design Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) propose that a size of 30 to 500 is opportune for most academic researches. Stratified sampling technique was habituated to cull the sample. The technique engendered estimates of overall population parameters with more preponderant precision. The population was stratified into three strata

i.e. Senior Management, Middle Management and Juniors. Arbitrary sampling was then used to cull 175 respondents from the organization.

	Population	Sample (5%)
Senior Management	100	5
Middle Management	1100	55
Juniors	2300	115
<b>Total</b>	<b>3500</b>	<b>175</b>

**Table: 1 Sample Size.**

The sample size of 5% was sizably voluminous enough to detect a clinically paramount difference in the primary outcomes with the desired probability. This was due to the fact that the respondents were in the same location and could be deemed to be heterogeneous in the respective strata.

#### **Data Analysis**

Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation and frequency distribution was acclimated to analyze the data. Data presentation was done by the utilization of charts, graphs, percentages and frequency tables. Inferential statistics were utilized in drawing conclusions. Data in section one of the questionnaire was analyzed utilizing frequency distributions and percentages to determine the profile of respondents. Data in section two and three of the questionnaire was analyzed utilizing mean scores and standard deviations. Pearsons Product Moment Correlation statistic was habituated to establish the paramountcy of the correlation between employee engagement and employee commitment at Barclays Bank of Kenya. Data from the consummated questionnaires was summarized, coded and tabulated.

#### **Limitations of study:**

- ✓ Responses of the employees may be biased.
- ✓ Time is one of the limitation factors.
- ✓ The study has been done in a limited area.
- ✓ Sample size is restricted to 100 respondents.

#### **Conclusion:**

There are important variances even if there are obvious commonalities with analytical antecedents like commitment, "organisational civic behaviour," job involvement, and job pleasure. Engagement is a two-way street, specifically: organisations must endeavour to engage the employee, who may then provide the employer their level of involvement. The two support one another. A cohesive combination of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job evolution, and emotions of empowerment are experienced by an engaged employee. It is an idea that has greater weight than the combination of its parts. Although there is some disagreement on the exact definition of employee engagement, we do know three things about it: it can be measured; it can be linked to performance; and it may range from poor to excellent. Most importantly employers can do a great deal to impact on people's level of engagement. That is what makes it so paramount, as an implement for business prosperity

**References:**

1. Ana Maria, et al (2020), Work Flexibility, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance among Romanian Employees— Implications for Sustainable Human Resource Management; artikel sustainability.
2. Altindag E and Siller F, (2014), Effects of Flexible Working Method on Employee Performance: An Empirical Study in Turkey; Business and Economics Journal, Bus Eco J, 5:3 DOI: 10.4172/2151-6219.1000104, pp 1-7
3. Atkinson and Hall, (2011) “Flexible working and hapiness in the NHS,” Employee Relations, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 88-105.
4. Baard, et.al. (2014). Performance adaptation: A theoretical integration and review. Journal of Management, 40(2), 48–99.
5. Babu A.L. et al. (2020); Impact of Work Culture on Employee Engagement; TEST engineering and Management, ISSN: 0193-4120 Page No. 9758 – 9764; March – April 2020
6. Borman, W.C. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1993) Expanding the Criterion Domain to Include Elements of Contextual Performance. Personnel Selection in Organizations San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 71-98.
7. Brenyah and Darko (2017) Organisational Culture and Employee Engagement within the Ghanaian Public Sector; Review of Public Administration R and Management; 5:3 DOI: 10.4172/2315-7844.1000233
8. Christian, M. S., et al (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. Personnel Psychology, 64, 89-136
9. Conway, J.M. (1999). Distinguishing contextual performance from task performance for managerial jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84(3), 3–13