

# INFLUENCE OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT FOR GBP, INDIA

**Nishtha**

Research Scholar, Ph.D. (Management)  
Jayoti Vidyapeeth Women's University, Jaipur

## **Abstract**

Employee engagement is the level of commitment and involvement that an employee has towards his/her organization and its values. It is an assessable degree of an employee's emotional attachment either positive or negative to their job, colleagues and organization which intensely influences their readiness to learn & perform at work. Employee engagement has a direct influence on the employee's productivity. The most productive employees are those that are not only committed and loyal, but also those whose yields healthy and gratifying both for themselves as well as for the organization they work for. The paper aims at finding the influence of demographic variables on employee engagement across construction organization i.e. GBP. The boundaries for the data search area are restricted to the employees or staff of GBP. In this study, the perception and the attitude of the staff of GBP in relation to employee engagement is sought. It was found that the degree of employee engagement was significantly high in the organization and there is no significant difference of employee engagement on the basis of demographic variables. The main causes for a higher engagement in the organization were found to be as – the impression that the firm cares for and values the employees, free and frank communication with immediate supervisor, recognition of one's contributions towards the organizational goals, and freedom to participate in the decision making process.

**Key words:** Employee engagement, construction industry, Employee commitment, Organizational citizenship behaviour, Job satisfaction

## **1.0 Industry's profile**

The [Construction industry](#) of India is an important pointer of the development as it generates various investment opportunities across various related sectors. The construction industry has contributed an estimated ₹ 6708 billion to the national GDP in 2011-12 (a share of around 9%). The industry is fragmented, with a handful of major companies involved in the construction activities across all segments; medium-sized companies specializing in niche activities; and small and medium contractors who work on the subcontractor basis and carry out the work in the field. In 2011, there were slightly over 500 construction equipment manufacturing companies in all of India. The sector is [labor-intensive](#) and, including indirect jobs, provides employment to more than 35 million people.

## **1.1 Introduction**

Today's challenge is not to just retain talented people, but it is to fully engage them, capture their minds and hearts at every stage of their work lives. In today's competitive marketplace, employee engagement has emerged as a critical driver of business success. Further, employee engagement can act as a significant factor in organizational success. Not only does engagement have the potential to meaningfully affect employee retention, productivity and loyalty, it also acts as a key link to customer satisfaction, company reputation and overall stakeholder value. Thus, to be competitive enough in the market, organizations are turning to set the agenda for employee engagement and commitment. Employee engagement is defined as "the degree to which employees commit to something or someone in their organization, how hard they work and how long they stay as a result of that commitment." Employee engagement is a positive attitude of the employee towards the organization and its value (Robinson et al., 2004). An engaged employee is well aware of business context, and works for the benefit of the organization. The organization must work to progress and nurture engagement, which always requires a two-way relationship between employer and employee. Employee Engagement is the positive feeling of employees that they have towards their jobs and also

the enthusiasm and effort they put into it (Macey &Schneier, 2008). Employee engagement has been connected to greaterenactmentas well asadvanced stages of commitment of organization by various researchers (Woodruffe, 2006; Lockwood, 2006).Employee engagement has been determined as a significant predictor of required organizational outcomes which can be customer satisfaction, productivity, retention and profitability (Luthans and Peterson, 2002). It always provides a competitive advantage to organization if there is an engaged employee within an organization (Joo& Mclean, 2006). Employee engagement has an extensiveinfluence on employee productivity and talent retention (Lado& Wilson, 1994). Inorder to attain high performance in postindustrial, intangible work which demands modernization, flexibility, and speed, employers must engage their employees (Martel, 2003). Employee Engagement has stated to belong on the field of stress, as the converse of burnout (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004). Employee Engagement is said to be a quantity of Job Involvement (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002). Employee Engagement has also been associated with commitment (MacCashland, 1999).Engagement is an incorporation of commitment, productivity, ownership and loyalty (Wellins and Concelman, 2005). Engaged means to be emotionally and intelligently committed to one's organization (Bhatnagar, 2007).A company irrespective of its size cannot gain the advantage without an engaged workforce (Melo, 2011).

## **2.0 Research methodology**

It is a techniquefor solving the problemsmethodically. It comprisesvarious factors such as problem statement, scope, hypothesis, research objective and questions, research methods used, target population, sample design and procedure.

### **2.1 The study area**

This study assesses the demographic variables' impact on the level of employee engagement with GBP. The area for data search is limited to the employees or staff of GBP. In this study, the opinion and the approach of the staff of GBP with relation to employee engagement is sought. The sample constituted of 110 employees from various departments of the company.

### **2.3 Data collection technique:**

The data was collected from the respondents through anorganized questionnaire which wasexamined with different statistical analysis techniques for interpreting the data and draw conclusions.The data has been collected from both Primary and Secondary sources. The source of primary data is closed ended questions, observation method and personal interview. The source of secondary data is the document provided by Personnel Department such as training schedules, personnel manuals, reports regarding suggestions, scheme etc.

### **2.4 Research objective**

The objective of the study is:

- To assess the significant difference between the mean scores of the demographic variables including age, gender, marital status, experience, remuneration on employee engagement.

### **2.5 Research hypothesis**

In the light of the objectives mentioned above the following hypothesis are framed.

#### **2.6 HYPOTHESIS 1**

Significant difference of Employee Engagement on the basis of age.

**Ho: - There is no significant difference Employee Engagement on the basis of age.**

**H1: - There is significant difference Employee Engagement on the basis of age.**

### HYPOTHESIS 2

Significant difference of Employee Engagement on the basis of gender.

**Ho: - There is no significant difference of Employee Engagement on the basis of gender.**

**H1: - There is significant difference of Employee Engagement on the basis of gender.**

### HYPOTHESIS 3

Significant difference of Employee Engagement on the basis of marital status.

**Ho: - There is no significant difference of Employee Engagement on the basis of marital status.**

**H1: - There is significant difference of Employee Engagement on the basis of marital status.**

### HYPOTHESIS 4

Significant difference of Employee Engagement on the basis of experience.

**Ho: - There is no significant difference of Employee Engagement on the basis of experience.**

**H1: - There is significant difference of Employee Engagement on the basis of experience.**

### HYPOTHESIS 5

Significant difference of Employee Engagement on the basis of remuneration.

**Ho: - There is no significant difference of Employee Engagement on the basis of remuneration.**

**H1: - There is significant difference of Employee Engagement on the basis of remuneration.**

### **Measurement & Scaling:-**

Five point Likert (Interval) scaling has been used for conducting the survey to analyze the impact of non-monetary reward practices on organizational effectiveness which has been given as follows:

5-Strongly Agree, 4- Agree, 3-Neutral, 2-Disagree, 1-Strongly disagree

The statistical tool used to examine the data is Percentage method by using megastat.

### **2.7 NEED OF THE STUDY**

Employee engagement is connected with numerous necessary consequences, like work satisfaction, job performance and intention to stay. Companies having superior number of engaged employees will definitely have less operating costs, high level of consumer satisfaction and more profits. There is a tangible monetary benefit to companies who are devoting time and funds in nurturing higher level of engagement in their employees. Engaged employees believe that they are undertaking somewhat for their organizations which can be considered as valuable.

### **2.8 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

Like other studies, this study also has various limitations:

- The generalizability of the findings is restricted as a convenience sample was used for the study.
- The findings cannot be generalized to other industries as it was conducted in construction industry.
- All information generated for the study can have an element of bias as it was on the basis of participants' self-reports. Also, some respondents might have finished the instrument to get it done, while others might have shown more attention.

- The sample in this study comprised of more number of males than females, which might have had an impact on the findings.  
To assess whether there is significant difference between respondents on the basis of demographic variables including age, gender, marital status, experience and remuneration regarding employee engagement.

**Hypothesis 1: Significant difference of employee engagement on the basis of age.**

Anova: Single Factor

**SUMMARY**

<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>
A	2	7.611111	3.805556	0.013889
B	14	51.11111	3.650794	0.020621
C	40	148.4444	3.711111	0.027097
D	39	143.3333	3.675214	0.020718
E	15	55.44444	3.696296	0.038742

**ANOVA**

<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>
Between Groups	0.075157	4	0.018789	0.739339	0.567231
Within Groups	2.668418	105	0.025414		
Total	2.743575	109			

(Source: survey)

**INTERPRETATION:**

The above table depicts whether there were significant age differences in employee engagement. The test showed that ( $m=3.805556, 3.650794, 3.711111, 3.675214, 3.696296$ ) & ( $var= .013889, .020621, .027097, .020718, .038742$ ) for  $N=110$  where  $A=2, B=14, C=40, D=39, E=15$ . The results indicate that there were statistically no significant differences in engagement based on age ( $p=.567231, p>0.05$ ). As the significant value is greater than 0.05 so equal variances assumed was taken into consideration. **Hence, the hypothesis is rejected for hypothesis 1 with respect to AGE.**

**Hypothesis3: Significant difference of employee engagement on the basis of marital status.**

Anova: Single Factor

**SUMMARY**

<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>
A	26	96	3.692308	0.01981
B	84	309.9444	3.689815	0.027087

ANOVA							
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit	
Between Groups	0.000123	1	0.000123	0.004857	0.944566	3.929012	
Within Groups	2.743451	108	0.025402				
Total	2.743575	109					

Source: Survey

**INTERPRETATION:**

The above table depicts whether there were significant marital status differences in employee engagement. It showed that (m=3.692308, 3.689815 and var=.01981, .027087) for N=110 where single are 26 and married are 84. The results indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in engagement based on marital status (p=.944566, p<0.05). As the significant value is greater than 0.05 so equal variances assumed was taken into consideration. **Hence, the hypothesis is not accepted for hypothesis 3 with respect to marital status.**

**Hypothesis 4: Significant difference of employee engagement on the basis of experience.**

Anova: Single Factor

SUMMARY				
Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
A	50	185	3.7	0.021416
B	60	220.9444	3.682407	0.028572

ANOVA							
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit	
Between Groups	0.008441	1	0.008441	0.333299	0.564925	3.929012	
Within Groups	2.735134	108	0.025325				
Total	2.743575	109					

(Source: Survey)

**INTERPRETATION :**

The above table depicts whether there were significant differences of experience on employee engagement. It showed that (m=3.7, 3.682407 and var= .021416, .028572) for N=110 where A=50, B=60. The results indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in engagement based on experience (p=.564925, p<0.05). As the significant value is greater than 0.05 so equal variances assumed was taken into consideration. **Hence, the hypothesis is not accepted for hypothesis 4 with respect to experience.**

**Hypothesis 5: Significant difference of employee engagement on the basis of remuneration.**

Anova: Single  
Factor

**SUMMARY**

<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>
A	7	25.61111	3.65873	0.028219
B	17	62.5	3.676471	0.029412
C	33	121.5556	3.683502	0.030572
D	35	130.1667	3.719048	0.023229
E	18	66.11111	3.67284	0.017026

**ANOVA**

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	0.046164	4	0.011541	0.449251	0.772726	2.45821
Within Groups	2.69741	105	0.02569			
Total	2.743575	109				

(Source: Survey)

**INTERPRETATION:**

The above table depicts whether there were significant differences of remuneration on employee engagement. It showed that ( $m=3.65873, 3.676471, 3.683502, 3.719048, 3.67284$  and  $var=.028219, .029412, .030572, .023229, .017026$ ) for  $N=110$  where  $A=7, B=17, C=33, D=35, E=18$ . The results indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in engagement based on remuneration ( $p=.772726, p<0.05$ ). As the significant value is greater than 0.05 so equal variances assumed was taken into consideration. **Hence, the hypothesis is not accepted for hypothesis 5 with respect to remuneration.**

**Conclusion**

Employee Engagement is a constructive approach believed by the employees of the organization. It is quickly attaining popularity, usage as well as significance in the organization and influences it in many ways. It stresses the prominence on employee communication for the success of any business. An organization must identify employees as authoritative providers to a company's competitive situation. So employee engagement must be a constant procedure of learning, improvement, action and measurement. Nurturing and conserving employee engagement is in the hands of an organization and needs a perfect mixture of time, effort, investment and commitment to form an effective endeavor.

**3.0 References**

- Bhatnagar, J. (2007). Talent management strategy of employee engagement in Indian ITES employees: key to retention, *Employee Relations*, 29 (6), pp 640663.
- Halbesleben, J. R., B., & Buckley, M. R. (2004). Burnout in organizational life. *Journal of Management*, 30, pp 859879.

- Joo, B. K., & Mclean, G. N. (2006). Best employer studies: a conceptual model from a literature review and a case study, *Human Resource Development Review*, 5 (2), pp 228 57.
- Lado, A. A., & Wilson, M. C. (1994). Human resource systems and sustained competitive advantage: a competencybased perspective, *Academy of Management Review*, 19 (4), pp 699727.
- Luthans, F., & Peterson, S. J. (2002). Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy: implications for managerial effectiveness and development, *Journal of Management Development*, 21 (5), pp 37687.
- McCashland, C R (1999). Core Components of the service climate: Linkages to customer satisfaction and profitability. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. University Microfilms International, USA, 60 (12-A): 89.
- Macey, W.H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The Meaning of Employee Engagement, *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1 (1): pp 330.
- Martel, L. (2003). Finding and keeping high performers: best practices from 25 best companies. *Employee Relations Today*, 30 (1), pp 2743.
- Melo, J.A. (2011) *Strategic Management of Human Resources*. 3rd ed. Hampshire: Cengage Learning.
- Robinson D., Perryman S., and Hayday S. (2004). *The Drivers of Employee Engagement Report 408*, Institute for Employment Studies, UK.
- Wellins, R, and Concelman, J (2005). *Creating a culture for engagement*. Workforce Performance Solutions. Retrieved from [www.ddiworld.com/pdf/wps\\_engagement\\_ar.pdf](http://www.ddiworld.com/pdf/wps_engagement_ar.pdf), accessed during April 2011.
- Woodruffe, C. (2006). Employee engagement, *British Journal of Administrative Management*, 50: pp 289.