

# AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION ON PREDICTORS OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT CENTRIC TO BANKING AND INSURANCE SECTOR IN AP, INDIA

\*Dr. CH. VIJAYA LAKSHMI<sup>1</sup>, M S KISHAN VARMA<sup>2</sup>, Ms. P. GIRIJASRI<sup>3</sup>

1. Assistant Professor, Andhra Loyola Institute of Engineering and Technology, A.P.

2. Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, VFSTR Deemed to be University.

3. Research scholar, HRM Department, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur.

DOI: 10.47750/pnr.2022.13.S06.260

## Abstract

Employee Engagement has arisen as a basic driver of Business Achievement today. Engagement can fundamentally influence Employee Maintenance, Efficiency, and devotion. The review endeavors to explore the degree of Employee Engagement and its indicators among the Leader level employees of a presumed Banking and Insurance Agency in Andhra Pradesh, India. The examination depends on the essential information gathered from 200 employees on various boundaries connected with Employee Engagement and its possible predictors. The investigation presumed that the degree of employee engagement in the association is very palatable. Four Factors to be specific "Employee Welfare, Empowerment, Employee Growth, and Interpersonal Relationships" were viewed as the Employee Engagement Predictors.

**Key Words:** EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT, EMPOWERMENT, INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS, EMPLOYEE GROWTH, EMPLOYEE WELFARE, RETENTION

## INTRODUCTION

Employee Engagement is the degree of responsibility and inclusion an employee has towards his association and its qualities. A Drew-in employee knows about the business setting and works with partners to further develop execution inside the gig to support the association. It is an uplifting perspective held by the employees towards the association and its qualities. Connected with employees are completely associated with, and energetic about their work. They care about the eventual fate of the organization and will contribute the optional exertion - surpassing the obligation's call - to see that the association succeeds. They are sincerely associated with the association and intellectually cautious. Kahn (1990) characterizes Employee Engagement as the saddling of an association's individuals to their work jobs. Gallup research bunch characterizes employee engagement as the singular's inclusion and fulfillment as well as energy for work Harter (2002).

To create an environment and culture conducive to this partnership, and a win-win equation. The essential parts of employee engagement as indicated by pretty much nothing and little (2006) are the employees and their own extraordinary mental and experience, the businesses and their capacity to make the circumstances that advance employee engagement, and the Collaboration between employees at all levels. Subsequently, it is to a great extent the association's liability to establish a climate and culture helpful for this organization, and a mutually beneficial condition.

The reason for this study was to decide the degree of Employee Engagement among the chief level employees of alleged Banking and Insurance Organizations in Andhra Pradesh. The Organization offers cutting-edge, thorough answers for central banking, corporate banking, riches, resources for the executives, and

protection. It is a data innovation and programming advancement organization. The organization is taken part in creating specialty programming applications for the banking, monetary, and protected areas. The paper has additionally endeavored to distinguish the predictors of Employee Engagement.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The Ten C's of employee engagement connect, career, clarify, convey, congratulate, contribute, control, and collaborate offer numerous routes for action, which are summed up by Seijts, Gerard H., Crim, Dan (2006). Employee engagement is a crucial business driver for organizational performance, according to Lockwood, Nancy R. (2007). High levels of engagement encourage employee retention, develop customer loyalty, and enhance organizational performance and stakeholder value in both domestic and international businesses. Engagement is a complicated notion that is influenced by a wide range of variables, including organizational communication, managerial styles, workplace culture, and the reputation of the company.

In their 2009 article, Schneider, Benjamin, Macey, William H., Barbera, Karen M., and Martin, Nigel discuss the relationship between staff engagement and customer satisfaction. Employee engagement is described by the author as a person's level of commitment to their work and how strongly they believe in what they are doing. The findings of a study on employee engagement are discussed by Maureen Soyars and Justin Brusino (2009). According to the report, barely one-third of workers were engaged. Contributions, connections, growth, and progress are the three factors that influence employee engagement.

Jim Trinka and Les Wallace (2006) address the significance of employee involvement in boosting productivity during difficult economic times. Employee productivity and engagement, per the research, lower turnover and boost attention by roughly 20%. According to this, effective leadership leads to more employee engagement, which improves organizational performance.

Engagement in meaningful work can result in the perception of advantages of the activity, according to research by Britt, Adler, and Bartone (2001). Other studies have connected engagement to factors including employee turnover, customer happiness and loyalty, safety, and, to some extent, productivity and profitability standards using a different measure of engagement (i.e. involvement and excitement) (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes 2002).

According to a more comprehensive definition, engagement occurs when workers have favorable feelings toward their work, believe it to be personally important, find their burden to be manageable, and have optimism for the future of their careers (Nelson & Simmons 2003). Due to research being done to develop measuring tools in this field, the notion of work engagement has been further expanded to incorporate a three-dimensional concept (May, Gilson, & Harter 2004).

A bodily component, an emotional component, and a cognitive component make up the three elements. Most frequently, it has been described as an individual's level of intellectual and emotional dedication to a company (Baumruk 2004; Richman 2006; Shaw 2005), or as their level of discretionary effort in their work (Frank et al. 2004).

Worker outcomes, organizational success, and financial performance are all predicted by employee engagement (Bates 2004; Baumruk 2004; Harter et al. 2002; Richman 2006). However, it has also been observed that employee engagement is declining and that disengagement among workers is growing in the modern workplace (Bates 2004; Richman 2006). There is what has been dubbed an "engagement gap" in the workforce because around half of all Americans are either not completely engaged or are disengaged (Bates 2004; Johnson 2004; Kowalski 2003).

The Gallup Organization's strategy in this area is one of the most widely used ones (Harter, Schmidt, &

Keyes 2003; Harter & Schmidt 2008). A 12-item Gallup Workplace Audit was created as a result of this research (Rath 2007; Rath & Conchie 2009; Wagner & Harter 2006).

The fact that employee involvement in benefits organizations is the fundamental factor in its popularity. There is a widespread perception that there is a relationship between individual employee engagement and business outcomes (Harter et al. 2002). There is therefore cause to believe that a person's beliefs, objectives, and behaviors will influence their level of employee engagement.

Kahn (1992) claimed that engagement results in both individual outcomes (i.e., the quality of people's work and their personal experiences doing that work) and organizational-level outcomes, even though May et al. (2004) and Kahn (1990) did not include outcomes in their studies (i.e. the growth and productivity of organizations).

Additionally, the Maslach et al. (2001) model views engagement as a mediating variable for the relationship between the six work-related conditions and the variety of work-related outcomes, and similarly to burnout, engagement should be related to outcomes like increased withdrawal, decreased performance, job satisfaction, and commitment (Maslach et al. 2001).

Although Kahn's definition of the engagement construct has received little attention, Britt, Adler, and Bartone (2001) discovered that involvement in meaningful work might influence perceptions of the advantages of the task. Other studies have connected engagement to factors including employee turnover, customer happiness and loyalty, safety, and to a lesser extent, productivity and profitability standards using a different measure of engagement (i.e. involvement and excitement).

(Hayes, Harter, Schmidt, 2002). Therefore, managers and researchers of businesses should be concerned with employees' interest in their work for practical reasons.

Although there is no deficiency in composing reports on Employee Engagement, there are not very many experimental examinations that utilize the term Employee Engagement as the subject of logical examination. Although Employee Engagement is affected by both individual and situational factors past examination has zeroed in fundamentally on the job of situational factors and plays disregarded the part of individual credits of the employee. The couple of studies that play inspected the part of individual elements is restricted generally to the investigation of segment factors like age, experience, etc... The position of individuality is not often investigated for EmployeeEngagement predictors.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data was gathered by managing the uncommonly planned survey to an example of 200 leaders chosen using the Quota sampling technique. The reaction rate was 90%. Data analysis has been finished with the assistance of the accompanying measurable stats tools viz., demographic analysis and Regression. A survey was so intended to grade the reactions of the employees in light of the level of their understanding. In the survey, a 5-POINT LIKERT scale was utilized to diminish the factual issues of offensiveSKEWNESS (FORNELL, 1992).

## DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

TABLE 1 - GENDER			
Gender	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
M	105	58.33	58.3
F	75	41.67	100.00
SUM	180	100.00	

From the table1 of Gender, it is clearly shown that 58.33% (105) are male and 41.67% (75) are female

with a cumulative percent of 58.3.

TABLE 2 - AGE			
AGE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
The 30s	125	69.44	69.44
The 40s	38	21.11	90.56
The 50s	17	9.44	100.00
TOTAL	180	100.00	

From table 2 of age, it is clearly shown that 69.44% (125) are in the age group of the 30s and 69.44% with the cumulative percent, 21.11% (38) are in the age group of 40s and 90.56% in the cumulative percent and 9.44% (17) are in the age group of 50s and 100% with the cumulative percent.

## REGRESSION ANALYSIS

As the criteria variable, engagement underwent multiple regression analysis. EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT, JOB PROFILE, INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS, EMPLOYEE WELFARE, EMPOWERMENT, & COMPANY INFORMATION were the predictive factors.

TABLE 3 MODEL SUMMARY – REGRESSION MODEL			
MODEL 1	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
1	.790 (a)	.624	.630

Table 4- COEFFICIENT (a)		
Variables	Standardized Coefficients	Sig.
Employee Growth	.218	.000
Job Profile	.231	.021
interpersonal relationships	.410	.000
Employee Welfare	.612	.000
Empowerment	.516	.000
Company Information	.213	.011

## RESULTS AND ANALYSIS:

The result tells us that among the six predictive factors that influence employee engagement in the banking and insurance sector. Out of six predictive factors Employee welfare, Empowerment, Employee growth, and Interpersonal Relationships has a high significance as the score is .000. It is also found that Employee Welfare and Empowerment have the maximum influence on employee engagement followed by Employee Growth and Interpersonal relationships. The other two factors Job profile and Company information have a significance of 5%. The activities found significant are considered for further study.

## CONCLUSION

This study identified Employee welfare, Empowerment, Growth, and Interpersonal relationships as the critical predictors i.e. those survey items which have a major impact on engagement. For the sample as a whole, it is evident that there is considerable scope for improvement in the level of employee engagement in the organization if annual engagement surveys are rolled out on a company-wide basis and actions are taken based on the results. Since the parameters used in the study vary from one study to another it is not possible to generalize our findings. The predictors of Employee Engagement are highly organization specific. Based on the study the following suggestions were made to enhance employees.

EMPLOYEE WELFARE, EMPOWERMENT, GROWTH, AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS were identified as significant predictors in this research, i.e. survey items that have a significant influence on the engagement. If annual engagement surveys are rolled out on a company-wide basis and actions are taken based on the results, it is clear that there is significant room for improvement in the level of employee engagement in the organization. Because the parameters used in the study differ from one study to the next, we cannot generalize our conclusion. Employee Engagement predictors are organization specific. Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made to improve employee performance.

- ✓ Because a significant number of employees believed that promotions were not handled fairly, management should investigate the source of such employee dissatisfaction and correct it.
- ✓ Because there is a shortage of confidence and support among teams, group counsel can be used to assist employees in developing confidence and collaboration.
- ✓ When making decisions that affect their work, managers should involve their subordinates in the decision-making process.
- ✓ Initiate the process to get better well-being courses and make sure that such plans benefit everyone.

#### FURTHER SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Further research should be considered to gather more information regarding the EMPLOYEES in the BANKING AND INSURANCE sectors. There are certain limitations of the study that must be acknowledged. First, the sample selected for the study involves only Andhra Pradesh. Where the sample size of 200 is very low, for further research, the researchers need to increase the number of respondents involved in the research study.

#### REFERENCES

1. Bates, S. (2004), —Getting engagedl, HR Magazine, 49 (2),44-51.
2. Baumruk, R. (2004), —The missing link: the role of employee Engagement in business successl, Workspan,47,48-52.
3. Britt, T. W., Adler, A. B., &Bartone, P. T. (2001). Deriving benefits from stressful events: The role of engagement in meaningful work and hardiness. *Journal of Occupational HealthPsychology*, 6,53–63.
4. 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 workl, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*,77, 11-37.
5. Frank, F.D., Finnegan, R.P. and Taylor, C.R. (2004), The race for talent: retaining and engaging workers in the 21st centuryl, *Human Resource Planning*,27 (3), 12-25.
6. 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*, 87,268–279.
7. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2003), Well-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes: A review of the Gallup studies. In C. L. M. Keyes &J .Haidt (Eds.), *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well-lived* (pp. 205–224). Washington, DC: American PsychologicalAssociation.
8. Kahn, W.A. (1992), —To be full there: psychological presence at workl, *Human Relations*, P45
9. Kahn,W.A. (1990), —Psychological conditions of personal engagement anddisengagement at work, *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692-724.
10. Lockwood, Nancy R (2007), Leveraging Employee Engagement for Competitive Advantage: HR's Strategic Role. *HR Magazine*, Mar 2007, Vol. 52 Issue 3, Special section p1-11,11p.
11. Schneider, Benjamin; Macey, William H; Barbera, Karen M.; Martin, Nigel. (2009), Driving Customer Satisfaction and Financial Success through Employee Engagement, *People &Strategy*, 2009, Vol. 32 Issue 2, p22-27,6p.
12. Seijts, Gerard H.; Crim, Dan (2006), What engages employees the most or The Ten C's of employee engagement. *Ivey Business Journal*, Mar/Apr2006, Vol. 70 Issue 4, p1-5,6p.
13. Soyars, Maureen; Brusino, Justin (2009, Essentials of Engagement. T+D, Mar 2009, Vol.63,Issue 3, p62-65.