EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT: A NEW PARADIGM SHIFT FOR WORKFORCE

Deepti Dubey, Research Scholar
Himalayan School of Management Studies
Swami Rama Himalayan University, Dehradun
deepty.varanasi@gmail.com

Dr. Geeta Rana, Associate Professor
Himalayan School of Management Studies
Swami Rama Himalayan University, Dehradun
geetarana@srhu.edu.in

ABSTRACT
Employee engagement is now a key factor in organizational growth. In order to gain a competitive edge, business organizations must play a crucial part in luring and keeping the top talent in the sector. Employee engagement has recently got a lot of focus from industry leaders, HR professionals, and research experts. As competition intensified employers recognized the significance of employees to survive and develop in the knowledge economy. In an international setting where constant change is making it challenging to compete, businesses must continue to increase competent employees and productivity. As the only factor remaining to make this happen, employees, this desire to do more is coupled with the mandate to work on employee engagement. Because their performance means to them more than corporate loyalty, engaged employees are more apt to prioritize being able to perform well. Employee engagement has been found to increase when leaders give clear instructions for job performance, giving the workers a feeling of control and clarity over what is expected of them. The purpose of this paper was to identify the essential determinants and effects of employee engagement, as well as the significance of the employee personality traits that assist greater levels of engagement. The main theories of employee engagement were also covered in the report. Every organization is releasing cutting-edge and doable strategies to guarantee that workers are involved to the fullest extent. The strategies, work environment, senior support, career growth, demanding roles, and other variables that affect employee engagement
Keywords: Employee Engagement, Organization, Dimensions, Performance, Relationship, factors, theory, significance.

Introduction

It requires more time, effort, commitment, and investment to improve engagement levels at higher levels and to maintain them. As a result, the employee develops a constructive point of view toward the company and its principles. An engaged employee is aware of the business environment and works well with others to improve efficiency at work for the benefit of the company. The business must encourage engagement, which necessitates a cooperative link between employer and employee. Employee engagement is the emotional dedication an employee has to the company and its objectives (Kevin, 2012). Employee engagement is an emotional state in which workers are enthusiastic, committed, and driven to do their best job. This turns into staff members who contribute their hearts, minds, spirits, and hands to the organization in order to perform at a high level.

Higher or lower levels of employee engagement can have a remarkable impact on a variety of factors, including productivity, ethical conduct, including dishonesty and corruption, customer service, transformation, cost management, and the success or failure of the talent management strategy. It is possible to make a compelling business argument for spending money to raise employee engagement. One of the most recent terms that have attracted enough interest from business organizations in the process of adopting new employee productivity strategies is employee engagement. Even in the unavailability of a common definition and clear conceptualization, business houses have started developing strategies to encourage employee engagement as a result of its rapid rise in popularity (Shanmugam 2012). When employees are engaged and motivated, they are more likely to increase organizational productivity and keep a higher degree of dedication, which increases customer satisfaction. When it comes to employee engagement, revenue, company perception, and business reputation are all on the line. Employee engagement refers to the concept of measuring how satisfied workers are with their jobs, work environments, and performance levels. Because motivated employees are more productive and devoted to their employers, managing high employee morale can be extremely beneficial for any company. High employee engagement levels increase an organization's productivity and success compared to poor employee engagement levels. (Mehta 2013). This study on employee engagement attempted to review different research studies on the topic that were published in a variety of sources. Numerous articles have noted that while workers generally have a high level of engagement, some of them can sometimes seem to be completely disengaged. Numerous studies have concluded that high employee engagement has good cascading

 Copyright © The Online Journal of Distance Education and e-Learning

effects or associations with employee achievement and the accomplishment of anticipated business goals. The review aims to pinpoint the essential elements and drivers of engagement. The importance of addressing potential critical gaps and engagement drivers would be emphasized. The impacts of numerous interventions on employee engagement are outlined. The current research work has extensively examined the medium of engagement, character traits of specific employees, research in progressive and underdeveloped countries, a bird's eye view of the current investigation areas, and results. Most study findings have shown a direct correlation between highly engaged workers and high rates of execution, low attrition, and presentation of greater productivity. It is acknowledged that employee engagement investigation is still in its infancy and needs in-depth investigation to reveal its important proportions.

Objectives of the study

1. To analyse the key drivers of employee engagement.
2. Models and theories of employee engagement.
3. To evaluate the main effects of employee engagement.
4. To analyse the key factors that influence employee engagement.

Methodology of the study

The method integrates a researcher's past findings and relevant studies to gain insight into the subject under study. Based on the knowledge gleaned from previous ongoing studies and other researchers' points of view on the subject, it methodically outlines the actions required throughout the research investigation.

Literature Review

Defining Employee Engagement

Employee engagement has been defined by Kahn (1990) as “the use of one’s personal by team members in their roles; involvement includes participants using it and showing their own bodies, thoughts and sentiments while they execute their assigned responsibilities". Employee involvement is characterized as a ones’ intellectual and psychological commitment to a business. (Baumruk 20004, Richman 2006, & Shaw 2005). It speaks of how much control workers have over decisions and actions affecting their jobs. (Frank 2004). "Passion for work" is a definition of employee engagement (Truss 2006). Employee engagement is defined as Corporate responsibility and corporate commitment (Robinson 2004). Research consulting firms have described employee engagement as the desire an employee has to contribute to the success of the business even when it is not asked or mentioned in the employment contract (CIPD, 2007). Employee engagement is the potential of some of them to identify the employee to assume company’s possession and work towards the attainment of the goals (PHRPS Research, 2002). Employee engagement, in plain English, is defined as "going the extra mile" (Roffey Park Institute, 2008).

Finally, a variety of researchers, business organizations, and consultancies have offered their opinions on staff engagement. Some of them only considered the benefits the organization would receive when interpreting the idea. Others concentrate on the reciprocal benefit or the depth of the association made among the individual and the organization. The cognitive state of association and output rate of the employees were two other factors that researchers closely examined. By interpreting the levels of participation at the individual, organisational, and departmental levels, the significance of the idea was increased.

Rheem (2017) there are three levels of employee engagement that could be found at mostly every organization i.e. highly engaged employee, engaged employees, actively disengaged employees. It's interesting to note that various researchers have defined engagement in terms of similar components like participation, degree of dedication, devotion, passion, attitude, and employee behaviour (Macey , Schneider, 2008).

Employee Engagement Factors

Important factors in employee engagement include organizational commitment, people's attitudes, commitment, and voluntary and informal behaviours (Saks, 2006). Work involvement and flow are components of employee engagement (May 2004). A person's level of attachment or detachment will affect their level of involvement. A wide range of specialties and their expertise frequently have a substantial impact on many aspects of employee engagement (Kahn, 1990). Engagement is integrated with the concepts of self-expression and self-employment in motivational theories. Employees who are disengaged put forth mediocre outcomes that are more akin to routine than new ideas and interventions. Employees typically find that they are highly engaged in circumstances that are mentally more comfortable and conducive to adequate psychic protection. Career development, leadership, empowerment, and company image are four highly important global relevant variables, which were described by International Survey Research (ISR) in 2004.

The connection between the engagement and meaningfulness, safety, and availability was favourable. (May 2004). Meaningfulness was benefited by job enhancement and position fit. Co-worker rewards and positive boss relationships frequently have an impact on safety. According to the team standards, self-consciousness has a bad relationship with safety. Resources and psychological accessibility have a favourable relationship. Burnout at work typically results in a steady decline in job involvement. (Maslach 2001). Depending on their degrees of engagement, employees frequently like or dislike their workplaces. (Holbeche & Springett, 2003). Employees have been found to display souring extent of emotional engagement when they have certain evidence about their job development, reliability, and accomplishment of their personal goals. Employee and company relationships are based on engagement. (Robinson 2004). When compared to other sectors, non-profit sectors typically show high levels of involvement. (Perrin, 2003).

Due to the generational change in belief systems, employees in the current era have diverged from earlier era practices. Many years ago, the prevalent trend was lifetime employment with the same company, but this is no longer the case with the younger population. They are adamant about joining a company for a brief period, learning from it, and then moving on to another for greater opportunities. Therefore, for improved outcomes, leaders must abandon their autocratic methods of management, promote employee empowerment, and foster a culture of win-win cooperation.

Impact of Employee Engagement

It's a good notion to encourage employee engagement, and it's always linked to the growth and expansion of the business organization. Better employee engagement levels almost always come at a cost, beginning with the best talent being hired and the time and effort put into nurturing and developing that talent (Johnson, 2004). The purpose of this section is to describe the various effects of investing money in order to increase employee engagement levels within the company. Saks (2006) asserts that there are two main categories for engagement: organizational engagement and work engagement. High levels of engagement have a beneficial effect on involvement levels at the individual and organisational levels (Kahn, 1990). Strong employee engagement is positively correlated with anticipated outcomes like customer loyalty and the company's development chances. Earnings per share increase when engagement levels are greater (Gallup study, 2004).

One of the most important new obstacles in the current environment is getting employees interested in their roles in the organization. It is anticipated that the human resources department will need to develop creative interventions to maintain workers' interest in their work. (Johnson, 2004). Employee involvement has become a crucial idea for the financial success of any business organization that develops moral and open systems. (Levinson, 2007). Increased involvement would improve the company's financial health (Baumruk, 2006). A culture that encourages a high degree of engagement is nurtured in order to build a great organization brand. (Martin , Hetrick, 2006). Numerous studies have shown that higher levels of employee engagement result in higher levels of positive outcomes for the company organization. However, most business organizations have not been successful in putting effective engagement systems into place. Around 400 HR professionals acknowledge that putting employee engagement into practice is a major challenge. (Tasker, 2004). Numerous works have shown that higher employee engagement increases employee productivity. (Lockwood, 2007; Wyatt,2007; Balain , Sparrow, 2009). Higher levels of involvement in business organizations would result in successful employee holding and higher levels of organizational commitment (White, 2008; Sonnentag, 2003). Whether workers are effective brand ambassadors for their employers is a topic of general discussion. It's intriguing that many researchers have concluded that highly engaged workers advocate for or interpret the organization favourably (Scottish Executive Social Research, 2007). Disengaged employees are perceived as corporate terrorists because they frequently criticize the company, its leaders, its goods, and potential recruits for employment. (Penna, 2006).

The traits of a highly engaged and aggressive team made up of outstanding leaders and team members serve as the ultimate litmus test for whether engagement systems have been successfully implemented in the organization. The characteristics of a great team include taking the initiative, exerting constant effort, having an effective and efficient work environment, and modelling and exhibiting synergistic behaviour as a result of the role that involvement plays as a catalyst (Luthans , Peterson, 2002; Bandura,1986). Higher employee engagement levels are readily seen in organizations' higher sales, productivity, and profitability (Hewitt Associates, 2004, Towers Perrin, 2007, Crush, 2007). Change is the norm in virtually every aspect of our lives. Organizational change is very common in today's fast-paced, internationally integrated market. It is generally agreed that greater employee participation would help management and important leaders make the necessary adjustments to the company's policies, procedures, and culture. (Green, 2008).
Employees' overall health and wellbeing, which includes their physical and emotional health, are better at work, which is marked by effective leaders, supportive management, and helpful coworkers. (Mauno 2007).

 Copyright © The Online Journal of Distance Education and e-Learning

Dimensions of Employee Personality for Higher Levels of Engagement

Employee personality traits and its many facets frequently have an impact on the general levels of employee engagement. Numerous scholars have investigated the relationship between personality traits and engagement. It has been discovered that proactive and autotelic personalities display greater levels of engagement. (Macey , Schneider, 2008). A significant correlation exists between greater engagement and work self-discipline, locus of control and affective commitment (Maddi 1979). Individuals with low levels of neuroticism who are flexible and adaptable by nature and temperament are more likely to demonstrate greater levels of engagement. (Schaufeli, 1996).

Key Drivers of Employee Engagement

Researchers, business professionals, and academics all offer various explanations for the factors that influence employee engagement. There are differences because there are differences in the market environment, industry alliance, size of the business, legal environment, type of rivalry, etc. It is generally acknowledged that there is no one approach that works for all situations when it comes to researching and applying employee engagement. Organizational culture, leadership development, efficient communications, leadership styles, the extent to which trust and respect have been fostered within the organisation, the company's reputation among various stakeholders, and the emotional commitment of its employees all play a significant role in employee engagement (Lockwood, 2007). Additionally, it is frequently noted that the most important elements are those that foster strong coordination and relationships among co-workers, leaders, and management, as well as faith, honesty, the kind of the job, positioning of sole and organizational performance, the presence of good career development opportunities, and the effectiveness of learning and development programs (Conference board, 2006). The working environment and its features, such as varied work processes, job-related challenges, organisational values, the degree of work-life balance, motivation of a strong and formal instruction flow mechanism, reward/recognition system, and effective and dynamic management, are thought to promote greater employee engagement (Glen, 2006). The type of work that workers do, their relationship with their manager, and the amount of autonomy they have as part of their duties tend to have an impact on how engaged they are at work. (Cleland 2008). The key factors influencing employee engagement include having the ability to provide feedback to higher levels of management, having an effective system for consultation and communication, and the ability and level of dedication of managers and leaders. (CIPD, 2007).

According to research from various nations, the most important factor influencing employee involvement is leadership. The behaviour of managers who have an inborn behavioural culture of respecting and showing positive appreciation for the accomplishments of the employees, assigning the exhilarating and demanding work responsibilities to the employees with adequate training, and the sincere concern and fealty of the leaders have been identified as the four universal drivers of engagement related to leadership. (Kenexa Research Institute, quoted by Wayne, 2008).

Employee engagement levels would rise as a result of organizations' sustained commitment to CSR initiatives, which would give the perception that their business is reliable and considerate of societal needs. (Smith, 2007). Additionally, setting personal development objectives for each employee and providing them with the appropriate chances to achieve them would improve the organization's reputation and increase employee engagement. (Robinson, 2007). An effective policy that supports the attainment of work-life balance is positively correlated with higher levels of employee engagement (Lockwood, 2007).

Theories of Employee Engagement

The two-factor theory

It asserts that certain workplace variables affect job satisfaction while other variables, all which function independently of one another, affect job dissatisfaction by Frederick Herzberg. Employee engagement was strongly correlated with employee motivation and happiness, which has a knock-on effect on both. According to the theory, there are two essential job characteristics that affect work pleasure, while other factors can make a person disconsolate at work. Renowned for being a motivator and a hygiene element. Herzberg has outlined the elements that contribute to job pleasure as well as those that will result in job dissatisfaction.

Self Determination Theory (SDT)

The theory of job engagement Researchers Deci and Ryan developed SDT in 1985, which examined the variables affecting employee motivation. The relationship between employee engagement, human behaviour, and self-determination theory is described as existing naturally. The degree to which an employee has control over their own actions and objectives affects the level of employee involvement. It has been demonstrated that the level of engagement significantly affects the pace of production.

 Copyright © The Online Journal of Distance Education and e-Learning

Existence-Relatedness-Growth (ERG Theory)
Alderfer formulated this theory in 1969. According to this theory, availability, meaningfulness, and safety were all related to involvement factors. The frustration-regression principle was introduced to explain how employees behave when their current positions don't meet their needs, such as considering coming back to their previous jobs and authorities. According to the ERG theory, a substantial change in motivation levels will result if an employee's needs are not met because they will either advance or regress, depending on their needs.

Job Characteristics Theory (JCT)
In 1980, Hackman & Oldham created the Job Characteristics Theory. The key workplace traits that raise employee motivation levels were conceptualized in this paradigm. JCT theory's central work dimensions—skill variety, task significance, task identity, autonomy, and feedback—are covered in detail. The JCT strongly emphasizes several crucial psychological ideas, such as the significance of employee accountability, meaningfulness, and produced results. It increased the importance of job redesign, which changed the workplace and further impacted employees' motivation, satisfaction, and success.

Path Goal Theory of Employee Engagement
This hypothesis was created by Robert House in 1996. The corporate lifestyle, employee characteristics, and ways of guidance are all explained by this hypothesis. A huge quantity of engagement is responsible for the leadership's impact on the entire organization. Objectives are attained by the productive workplace.

Models of Employee Engagement
Katz and Kahn's Model (1990)
There are three levels of employee engagement, including hiring the employee and trustworthy behaviour, which guarantees that the employee's conduct exceeds the expectations for performance. Additionally, in the current situation of invention, a comprehensive new set of proactive employee behavioural standards is necessary for the accomplishment of organizational objectives.

The Gallup Q12 Survey Model (1936)
Their level of success and level of engagement were closely linked. Some of the employees are engaged, even though the bulk of them are visibly disengaged. The results of the Gallup study show that highly engaged workers are more likely to be devoted, take on responsibility, put forth great effort to accomplish customer satisfaction goals, and uphold high achievement levels. The Gallup model states that when people's requirements are met, their engagement levels will be high.

David Sirota Engagement Model (2013)
This model explains how to establish unbiased systems and policies that support an equity pay matrix based on employees' performance as well as equal chance for career advancement for all qualified employees. It also discusses how to determine the organization's goals and foster great relationships among the workforce.

Robinson et al. Model (2004)
This model stressed the emergence of a work environment that strongly supports each employee's unique behavioural characteristics, such as encouraging involvement and pride in one's work, which improves performance and increases an employee's wealth.

Saks Model (2006)
Social Exchange theory served as the foundation for the creation of this paradigm. There are significant differences between organizational commitment and work engagement. Job characteristics, organizational and supervisor support, rewards, and procedural fairness are all factors that have a significant impact on engagement.

Say-Stay-Strive Model of Engagement (Aon Hewitt) (2001)
This model stressed how six key factors, including work, people, opportunities, total rewards, business practices, and quality of life, shape employee engagement experiences. Say, Stay, and Strive are three crucial engagement results. Business results like talent, operational, customer, and financial outcomes are among the three crucial components for total employee engagement.

Schmidt Model of Employee Engagement (2004)
The model covers the employee life cycle in the company and goes into detail about factors like physical wellness and giving enough resources to encourage work engagement.

 Copyright © The Online Journal of Distance Education and e-Learning

Findings

- Strong organizational dedication, attitude, attachment and detachment, voluntary and involuntary behaviours, work involvement, self-expression, self-employment, meaningfulness, safety, and availability will lead to high levels of employee engagement. A positive supervisor-employee relationship, cognitive drivers, emotional engagement, value creation, behavioural engagement, an engaged leadership team, the nature of the work, chances for career advancement, and change management would also contribute to this outcome.
- Two-factor theory, ERG theory, Self-determination theory, Job characteristics theory and Path goal theory were the key employee engagement theories.
- Katz and Kahn's model, David Serota model, Gallup Q12 survey model, Robinson model, Saks model, Say-Stay-Strive model, Schimdt model played an important role in the conceptual model development for employee engagement.
- Employee engagement significantly influenced the organization's growth prospects in terms of loyalty, high earnings per share, moral and open systems, financial wellness, brand image, favourable outcomes, increased employee productivity, support for positive interpretation, and crucial change management.
- Employee engagement is primarily influenced by cognitive factors, emotional and behavioural engagement, trust and integrity, the nature and characteristics of the work, opportunities for career advancement, and change management.

Conclusion

There is no question that the HR division and the entire business organization are focusing heavily on employee engagement. Performance, contribution, personality, and working styles of engaged workers have changed the organization and led to greater advancements. Engagement takes place at several levels, including the organizational, job, and individual levels. Numerous organizations have implemented the best workplace practices and policies to support their workers' on-going engagement motivation. Experts, stakeholders, employees, and management work together to create and execute effective employee engagement programs. Engaging employees at the highest levels and ensuring that all required interventions will encourage engagement and effective performance is the best way to manage employees and their performance. It is common knowledge that it is challenging to replace a seasoned employee's core skill set.

References

Baumruk, R. (2004), "The missing link: the role of employee engagement in business success", Work span, Vol 47, pp 48-52.

Frank, F.D., Finnegan, R.P. and Taylor, C.R. (2004), "The race for talent: retaining and engaging workers in the 21st century", Human Resource Planning, Vol 27 No.3, pp 12-25.

Glen C (2006), "Key skills retention and motivation: the war for talent still rages and retention is the high ground", Industrial and Commercial Training, Vol 38 No.1, pp 37– 45.

Goel, AK. Rana, G., & Chanda,N. (2014), "Antecedents and Consequences of Knowledge Sharing in Indian Knowledge Intensive Firms". Amity Global Business Review, Vol 4 No. 2, pp 32-47.

Hewitt Associates (2004), "Hewitt Associates study shows more engaged employees drive improved business performance and return" Press Release, May Green,2008

Johnson, G. (2004), "Otherwise engaged", Training, Vol 41 No.10, pp 4-8. (Gallup study, 2004).

Kahn, W.A. (1990), "Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work". Academy of Management Journal, Vol 33, pp 692-724.

Luthans F, Peterson SJ (2002), "Employee engagement and manager self- efficacy: implications for managerial effectiveness and development", Journal of Management Development, Vol 21 No.5, pp 376–387.

Macey WH, Schneider B (2008a), "The meaning of employee engagement", Industrial and Organisational Psychology Vol 1, pp 3–30.

Mauno S, Kinnunen U, & Ruokolainen M (2007), "Job demands and resources as antecedents of work engagement: a longitudinal study", Journal of Vocational Behaviour, Vol 70, pp 149–171.

May, D.R., Gilson, R.L., & Harter, L.M. (2004), "The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work". Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, Vol 77, pp 11-37. International Survey Research (ISR), 2004

Rana, G., , Goel, AK (2015), "Birla milks its employees for the creamiest leaders of the future: Internal talent has a vital role in company development". Human Resource Management International Digest, Vol 23 No. 2, pp 9-11.

Rana, G., , Goel, AK (2014), "Ethan learns to be a learning organization: Culture change prompts greater openness and empowerment". Human Resource Management International Digest, Vol 22 No.6, pp. 12-14.

Rana, G., , Goel, AK (2017), "Knowledge management process at BHEL: a case study". International Journal of Knowledge Management, Vol 8 No.2, pp 115-130.

Richman, A. (2006), "Everyone wants an engaged workforce, how can you create it?" Workspan, Vol 49, pp 36-39.

Saks, A.M. (2006), "Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement".

Shaw, K. (2005), "An engagement strategy process for communicators". Strategic Communication Management, Vol 9 No.3, pp 26-29.

Sonnentag S (2003), "Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behaviour: anew look at the interface between non-work and work". Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 88 No.3, pp 518–528.

 Copyright © The Online Journal of Distance Education and e-Learning