# An Empirical Study on the Level of Employee Engagement in City Group of Institutions, Bangalore, India

Dr. Ritty Francis<sup>1</sup>, Venkatesh P<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Associate professor, St Joseph's college of commerce, India <sup>2</sup>Student, St. Joseph's college of commerce, India Corresponding Author: Dr. Ritty Francis

Abstract: City group of institutions is an education institution established under the Jayanagar Education society and located in Bangalore, India. The Higher Education System in India is going through a lot of good changes which brings the need for universities management and academic staff to keep up with the rest of educational institutions around the world. The study focuses on City Group of Institutions to understand the factors influencing employee engagement in the institution and to reveal the motivating factors for the work force. Survey method was used to gather data from the employees of City institutions, Jayanagar. The study identified that leadership and training have a major influence for the employees in engaging themselves in the institution. Pay, praise and recognition also motivate the employees to a large extent. The research also gives suggestions where annual feedback from employees through employee engagement surveys can be conducted in a more precise and deep manner so the results of this report and the future reports can be compared to maintain quality, mend to the changes in the Higher Education System in India and reach the organization's goal.

Key words: Educational institution, Employee engagement, Experience, Leadership, Training.

Date of Submission: 12-03-2018

Date of acceptance: 28-03-2018

#### I. Introduction

# 1.1 City Group of institutions

City group of institutions is an education institution established under the Jayanagar Education society and located in Bangalore, India with 150 staff and 700 students.

The college offers various programs such as:

- Bachelors in Engineering (Mechanical, Computer Science, Electronics & Communication, Information Science, Electrical and Electronics, Civil).
- Bachelors in commerce, Business Management, Computer Application.
- MBA (Marketing, Finance, HR and Systems) and MCA.

The institution is committed to its vision of quality education and outstanding academic environment. With excellent infrastructure, the institution focuses on imparting objective oriented education through dedicated faculty members and research oriented programs.

City Engineering College takes a Stakeholder approach that enables the organization to capture a wide collection of individuals & groups to build a relationship with them in an action-oriented way. These stakeholders and the organizations approach towards them affect the success of the organizations goals. The organization's main goal is to be a sustainable educational institution.

This is become difficult in the past few years as the Higher Education System in India is going through a lot of good changes (Dukkipati, 2010). Although this change is suitable for keeping up with the rest of the educational systems around the world and for the development of the nation it is affecting the universities management and academic staff. Student-centered colleges like City Engineering College expect teachers to develop new and open attitudes and services. More interaction between the student and teacher is appreciated through seminars and workshops.

The freedom employees have to express their views and concerns freely and the kind of culture & working environment the management creates, gives the organization a successful and enduring future. In order to understand and explore how the employees are keeping up with the changes in the educational system, this project tries to study the feedback given by the staff of City Engineering College. Claims have been made that engaged employees average higher customer satisfaction ratings and generate increased revenues (R Wagner & Harter, 2006). Grievances arise at all workplaces across many organizations and it increases and influences the level of employee engagement when it handled suitably. When grievance-handling systems of an organization

DOI: 10.9790/487X-2003097280 www.iosrjournals.org 72 | Page

are functioning effectively it creates a sense of belonging making the employee feel respected by the origination and the employee will feel positive and say optimistic things about the organization. Since, employee engagement directly affects the people and the profits of the organization that makes it imperative to include and improve employee engagement in the organization's goals and strategy. If organizations can escalate the talent of engaged employees, then working in the near future will be a different experience from todays disengaged employee situation.

## 1.2 Factors that Drive Employee Engagement

Developed from motivational theories from the past(Kahn, 1990) argues that employees need individualism and self-employment as time passes in their work. Kahn's qualitative research on summer camp counsellors and staff which was later tested by (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004) who found that employees who were robotic, effortless and were not carrying out their duties appreciably when they were disengaged. Their research also proved that meaningfulness of the work, safety and time availability were also pointedly associated to employee engagement. Shared dignity and purpose connecting people emotionally raising their personal goals assists achieving higher levels of employee engagement (Holbeche & Springett, 2004).

#### **II.** Literature Review

In the research, "PSYCHOLOGICAL CONDITIONS OF PERSONAL ENGAGEMENT AND DISENGAGEMENT AT WORK" explains that employee differences do affect work performances. Psychological factors such as meaningfulness, safety and availability affect how much an employee will engage in some situations.

Kahn's qualitative research found that employees who were robotic, effortless and were not carrying out their duties appreciably when they were disengaged. Their research also proved that meaningfulness of the work, safety and time availability were also pointedly associated to employee engagement. (Kahn, 1990)

Inspired by the work of Kahn and Rothbard in his work "Enriching or Depleting? The dynamics of Engagement in work and Family Roles" took a slightly different perspective and defined engagement as a two-dimensional motivational construct that includes attention, the cognitive availability and the amount of time one spends thinking about a role and absorption, the intensity of one's focus on a role. It is important to note that the key reference of engagement for Kahn is the work role, whereas for those who consider engagement as the positive antithesis of burnout it is the employee's work activity, or the work itself. (Rothbard, 2001)

According to Sirota, Mischkind & Meltzer from the analysis of their research on "The Enthusiastic Employees", which was based on never before-published case studies and data from 920,000 employees from 28 multinational companies over four years, resulted in the generation of hard data to prove that the share price of organizations with highly engaged employees increased on average by 16% in 2004 in comparison to the industry average of 6%. Similarly, the stock price of organizations with high 5 morale had superior performance to comparable companies in the same industry by a ratio of 2.5:1 during 2004. Conversely the stock price of companies with low morale underperformed in relation to the industry competitors by a ratio of 5:1.(Sirota, Mischkind, & Meltzer, 2011)

Wagner, R and Harter, J combined authors of the book "The Elements of Great Managing" Claim that engaged employees average higher customer satisfaction ratings and generate increased revenues and also Managers, not top-level executives, are the most critical for motivating and guiding employees. To make their employees feel as though they belong managers must demonstrate holistic care and cultivate a work environment of camaraderie and cooperation.(R Wagner & Harter, 2006)

## III. Scope of Study

The study is conducted in City group of institutions, Bangalore and aims to understand the level of employee engagement among different institutions in the group. The study will recommend suggestions to improve the employee engagement for the work force, if any in the group helping the institution to perform better which in turn helps the institution to meet the growing demands of the higher education system.

# 3.1Need and importance of Study

Employee engagement is important to organizations because innovation, problem solving, decision-making, execution, process improvements, customer service, sales, research and development, all involve employees. Everything that happens in organizations is through people or because of people. Employees can entirely build an organization or fail an organization.

## 3.2Statement of Problem

The Higher Education System in India is going through a lot of good changes and gaining extreme importance. This requires keeping up with the rest of the educational systems around the world which is affecting the management of universities and the academic staff. Student-centered colleges among city group expect teachers to develop new and open attitudes and services.

This study focuses on City Group of Institutions to understand the level of employee engagement among different institutions in the group and also to know the factors positive and negative, which are contributing to the engagement and to recommend suggestions to improve the employee engagement for the work force.

# 3.3Research Gap

After reviewing literature, it could be noted that most of the researches conducted, measure the employee engagement in organizations and not many have been researched on educational institutions. This is the gap that has been identified.

This study focuses on City Group of Institutions to understand the level of employee engagement among different institutions in the group.

#### 3.4Objectives

- 1. To identify the factors which have a direct positive or negative influence on employee engagement
- 2. To understand the main motivating factors of employees in the City Institutions.

#### 3.5 Research Methodology

The research uses primary sources of collecting data by distribution of questionnaire.

The instrument used for this study is a structured questionnaire where a paper questionnaire will be given to respondents and the data collected will examine the level of employee engagement in City group of Institutions, the Academic staff have been chosen, as they are vital for the student satisfactions and for the progress of the institution.

The participants answering the questionnaires are informed through a consent form that their feedback would be confidential so the research finding will be more accurate.

IBM SPSS Software version 2.0 has been used for data analysis. Microsoft Excel 2010 had been used initially to capture data before importing into SPSS for analysis.

**Sample Size** – The sample size of this research is aimed at around 45 respondents.

Age group considered will be from 21-30, 30-40, 41 and above

Area of collection of sample: Academic staff of City group of institutions.

Area of study: Bangalore

Statistical tools: Chi-square, Descriptive statistics

#### 3.5 Definition of variables

Experience: Employees can have high, moderate or low number of years of experience. Greater the years of experience higher the employee engagement can be and lower the experience lower the engagement levels can be.

Job Role: Job role is described as employees Job, varying from Directors ,Dean, Head of the Department, Professor ,Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Tutors, Lab instructors, Employees from different designations can have different motivations and engagement levels.

Leadership:Leaders can help their employees outperform by building an engaging culture at the workplace, by closely working with employees, setting achievable goals, making provision for professional and personal growth. Leadership can directly impact the engagement of the employees.

Training: Training the employee'si.e. by incorporating training in organizational culture, recognizing their expertise, identifying their strengths, keeping it interesting and giving regular feedback can motivate the employees. Training can have a direct positive impact on employee engagement.

Grievance: Grievances at work place mostly cover general problems, anxieties and complaints from employees if the employee feels that they have been involved in inconvenient incidents concerning the organization, colleagues or students and the employee wants to raise the issue with the concerned people or person at the organizations who are in charge. Grievance management system can increases and influences the level of employee engagement when it is handled suitably.

#### 3.6 Limitations

Although care has been taken to conduct the research in the best possible way few factors if absent could have allowed better undertaking of the research

- The study was conducted on 45 academic staff, which is only 59% of all the staff of the college. More participants in the research would have provided a complete analysis of engagement.
- More number of participants might have responded if more time was provided.
- Questionnaire was the only data collection tool that was used because a survey on employee engagement was being conducted in the organization for the first time. So this research only aimed to gain basic understand of the level of employee and organizational engagement. If past research was already done in this area then questionnaire and interviews would have helped accomplish a better quality research as there would have been scope for comparing both results and interviewing the administrators responsible for change in the present as compared to the past.

# IV. Data Analysis

#### 4.1 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS:

A summary of the demographic profile of the respondents is presented in the table below,

| Variable   | Category            | No. of respondents | Percentage % |
|------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Age        | 21-30               | 24                 | 56           |
|            | 31-40               | 16                 | 35.55        |
|            | 41 to 50            | 3                  | 6.67         |
|            | 51 to 60            | 2                  | 4.44         |
| Gender     | Male                | 15                 | 33.33        |
|            | Female              | 30                 | 66.67        |
| Experience | Less than 12 months | 5                  | 11.11        |
| _          | 1 to 3 years        | 18                 | 40           |
|            | 3 to 10 years       | 11                 | 24.44        |
|            | 10 to 20 years      | 11                 | 24.44        |
|            |                     |                    |              |

**Table 1:** table showing the demographic profile of respondents <sup>1</sup>

#### Interpretation

The above tables shows that a total of 45 respondents were collected at random, the majority of respondents were 21-30 year olds (53.33%, n=24), Female (66.67%, n=30) where 18 respondents have 1 to 3 years of experience and 11 respondents each have 3 to 10 years and 10 to 20 years' experience.

#### Job Role of respondents.

|                        | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Head of the department | 3         | 6.66    |
| Assistant professor    | 38        | 84.44   |
| Lab instructors        | 4         | 8.88    |
| Total                  | 45        | 100     |
|                        |           |         |
| Total                  | 45        | 100.0   |

**Table 2:** table showing job role of respondents

## 4.2 Hypothesis testing

Hypothesis 1

H0: There is no significant relationship between training and employee engagement.

H1: There is significant relationship between training and employee engagement.

|                                  |                  | I understan<br>contributes organization |               |         |    |
|----------------------------------|------------------|---|---------------|---------|----|
|                                  |                  | agree                                   | tend to agree | neutral |    |
|                                  | Agree            | 13                                      | 1             | 0       | 14 |
| I magaine the tweining I mad to  | Tend to agree    | 16                                      | 1             | 0       | 17 |
| I receive the training I need to | Neutral          | 3                                       | 1             | 0       | 4  |
| do my job well                   | Tend to disagree | 2                                       | 0             | 1       | 3  |
|                                  | disagree         | 7                                       | 0             | 0       | 7  |
| Total                            |                  | 41                                      | 3             | 1       | 45 |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Primary source

-

|                                 | Value               | df | Asymp.         | Monte C           | arlo Sig. (2-si | ided)          | Monte C           | arlo Sig. (1-side | ed)            |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|----|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|
|                                 |                     |    | Sig. (2-sided) | Sig.              | 95%<br>Interval | Confidence     | Sig.              | 95% Confider      | nce Interval   |
|                                 |                     |    |                |                   | Lower<br>Bound  | Upper<br>Bound |                   | Lower<br>Bound    | Upper<br>Bound |
| Pearson Chi-<br>Square          | 17.097 <sup>a</sup> | 8  | .029           | .067 <sup>b</sup> | .062            | .071           |                   |                   |                |
| Likelihood Ratio                | 8.366               | 8  | .399           | .291 <sup>b</sup> | .282            | .300           |                   |                   |                |
| Fisher's Exact<br>Test          | 10.217              |    |                | .187 <sup>b</sup> | .179            | .194           |                   |                   |                |
| Linear-by-Linear<br>Association | .351°               | 1  | .553           | .591 <sup>b</sup> | .582            | .601           | .305 <sup>b</sup> | .296              | .314           |
| N of Valid Cases                | 45                  |    |                |                   |                 |                |                   |                   |                |

Interpretation: From the above table it can be inferred that chi square value of 17.097 (df=8, N=45), p<0.05 is significant at 8 degree of freedom. As such we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis. By the statistical analysis it can be concluded that there is significant relationship between training given to the employees and employee engagement.

## Hypothesis 2

H0: There is no significant relationship between Know-how and Employee engagement.

H1: There is significant relationship between Know- how and Employee engagement.

|                                      |                  | I understand  | directly contributes | Total |    |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------|----|
|                                      |                  | to the overal | organization         |       |    |
|                                      |                  | agree         |                      |       |    |
|                                      | Agree            | 36            | 1                    | 0     | 37 |
| I have all the information I need to | Tend to agree    | 2             | 1                    | 0     | 3  |
|                                      | Neutral          | 0             | 1                    | 0     | 1  |
| do my job effectively                | Tend to disagree | 2             | 0                    | 1     | 3  |
|                                      | Disagree         | 1             | 0                    | 0     | 1  |
| Total                                |                  | 41            | 3                    | 1     | 45 |

| Value               | df                                     | Asymp.                                       | Sig.  | (2-   |
|---------------------|--|--|---|---|
|                     |  | sided)                                       |   |   |
| 32.874 <sup>a</sup> | 8                                      | .000   |   |   |
| 14.662              | 8                                      | .066   |   |   |
| 7.817               | 1                                      | .005   |   |   |
| 45                  |  |  |   |   |
|                     | 32.874 <sup>a</sup><br>14.662<br>7.817 | 32.874 <sup>a</sup> 8<br>14.662 8<br>7.817 1 | sided       32.874a     8     .000       14.662     8     .066       7.817     1     .005 | sided           32.874a         8         .000           14.662         8         .066           7.817         1         .005 |

Interpretation: It is inferred from the table that the calculated value of chi square at 5 % level of significance with 8 df is 32.874. The p value obtained is 0.000 which is less than the standard p value of 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. By the statistical analysis it can be concluded that there is significant relationship between Training (all the information provided to the job well) and employee engagement

#### Hypothesis 3

H0: There is no significant relationship between Leaders who motivate and Employee engagement.

H1: There is significant relationship between Leaders who motivate and Employee engagement.

|                              |                     | I understand how my work directly contributes to the overall success of the organization |                |               |         |    |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--|----------------|---------------|---------|----|
|                              |                     | Agree  |                | tend to agree | neutral |    |
|                              | Agree               | 28   |                | 2             | 0       | 30 |
| Our senior management        | tend to agree       | 8  |                | 0             | 0       | 8  |
| motivates us for the work we | Neutral             | 1  |                | 0             | 0       | 1  |
| put in                       | tend to disagree    | e 2  |                | 0             | 1       | 3  |
|                              | Disagree            | 2  |                | 1             | 0       | 3  |
| Total                        | -                   | 41   |                | 3             | 1       | 45 |
|                              | Value               | df   | Asym<br>sided) |               |         | ·  |
| Pearson Chi-Square           | 18.488 <sup>a</sup> | 8  | .018           |               |         |    |
| Likelihood Ratio             | 9.161               | 8  | .329           |               |         |    |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 4.470               | 1  | .034           |               |         |    |
| N of Valid Cases             | 45                  |  |                |               |         |    |

76 | Page

Interpretation: It is inferred from the table that the calculated value of chi square at 5 % level of significance with 8 df is 18.488. The p value obtained is 0.018 which is less than the standard p value of 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. By the statistical analysis it can be concluded that there is significant relationship between leadership (motivation from leaders) and employee engagement. Hypothesis 4

H0: There is no significant relationship between senior management who demonstrate strong leadership skill and Employee engagement.

H1: There is significant relationship between senior management who demonstrate strong leadership skills and Employee engagement.

|  | I understand<br>contributes to<br>organization | Total |               |         |    |
|--|--|-------|---------------|---------|----|
|  |  | agree | tend to agree | neutral |    |
|  | Agree  | 27    | 1             | 0       | 28 |
| 0  | Tend to agree                                  | 8     | 0             | 0       | 8  |
| Our senior managers demonstrate strong leadership skills | Neutral  | 3     | 0             | 0       | 3  |
| strong leadership skins                                  | Tend to disagree                               | 2     | 0             | 0       | 2  |
|  | disagree                                       | 1     | 2             | 1       | 4  |
| Total  |  | 41    | 3             | 1       | 45 |

| Value               | df                                      | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)                         |
|---------------------|---|---|
|                     |   |   |
| 24.904 <sup>a</sup> | 8                                       | .002  |
| 14.549              | 8                                       | .069  |
| 13.431              | 1                                       | .000  |
| 45                  |   |   |
| •                   | •                                       |   |
|                     | 24.904 <sup>a</sup><br>14.549<br>13.431 | 24.904 <sup>a</sup> 8<br>14.549 8<br>13.431 1 |

Interpretation: It is inferred from the table that the calculated value of chi square at 5 % level of significance with 8 df is 24.904. The p value obtained is 0.002 which is less than the standard p value of 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. By the statistical analysis it can be concluded that there is significant relationship between senior management who demonstrate strong leadership skills and employee engagement.

#### Hypothesis 5

H0: There is no significant relationship between Grievance and Employee engagement.

H1: There is significant relationship between Grievance and Employee engagement.

| I understand how my work directly contributes to the overall success of the organization agree tend to agree neutral |                  |       |   |   |    |
|--|------------------|-------|---|---|----|
|  |                  | agree |   |   |    |
|  | Agree            | 15    | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| Lam actiofied with the colleges stoff  | Tend to Agree    | 9     | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| I am satisfied with the colleges staff grievance handling process  | Neutral          | 6     | 0 | 0 | 6  |
| grievance nandring process   | Tend to disagree | 3     | 1 | 1 | 5  |
|  | Disagree         | 8     | 0 | 0 | 8  |
| Total  |                  | 41    | 3 | 1 | 45 |

|                              | Value               | df | Asymp. sided) | Sig. | (2- |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|---------------|------|-----|
| Pearson Chi-Square           | 11.104 <sup>a</sup> | 8  | .196          |      | -   |
| Likelihood Ratio             | 8.009               | 8  | .433          |      |     |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .367                | 1  | .544          |      |     |
| N of Valid Cases             | 45                  |    |               |      |     |
|                              | •                   |    | •             |      |     |

Interpretation: It is inferred from the table that the calculated value of chi square at 5 % level of significance with 8 df is 11.104. The p value obtained is 0.196 which is greater than the standard p value of 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. By the statistical analysis it can be concluded that there is no significant relationship between Grievance and employee engagement.

#### Hypothesis 6

H0: There is no significant relationship between experience and Employee engagement.

H1: There is significant relationship between experience and Employee engagement.

|                               |                     | I understand<br>contributes to t<br>organization |               |         |    |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|--|---------------|---------|----|
|                               |                     | agree  | tend to agree | neutral |    |
|                               | less than 12 months | 6  | 0             | 0       | 6  |
| Number of years worked in the | 1 year to 3 years   | 5  | 1             | 1       | 7  |
| institution.                  | 3 year to 10 years  | 18   | 0             | 0       | 18 |
|                               | 10 to 20 years      | 12   | 2             | 0       | 14 |
| Total                         |                     | 41   | 3             | 1       | 45 |

|                    | df            | Asymp. Si sided)  | ig. (2-  |
|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|--|
| 9.408 <sup>a</sup> | 6             | .152              |  |
| 8.863              | 6             | .181              |  |
| .030               | 1             | .862              |  |
| 45                 |               |                   |  |
|                    | 8.863<br>.030 | 8.863 6<br>.030 1 | 9.408a     6     .152       8.863     6     .181       .030     1     .862 |

Interpretation: It is inferred from the table that the calculated value of chi square at 5 % level of significance with 6 df is 9.408. The p value obtained is 0.152 which is greater than the standard p value of 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. By the statistical analysis it can be concluded that there is no significant relationship between experience and employee engagement.

#### Hypothesis 7

HO: There is no significant relationship between use of social media and Employee engagement.

H1: There is significant relationship between use of social media and Employee engagement.

|   |               | I understand how my work directly contributes to the overall success of the organization |               |         | Total |
|---|---------------|--|---------------|---------|-------|
|   |               | agree  | tend to agree | neutral |       |
| Do you believe social media helps and makes your work more interesting? | agree         | 22   | 3             | 0       | 25    |
|   | tend to agree | 10   | 0             | 0       | 10    |
|   | neutral       | 5  | 0             | 1       | 6     |
|   | disagree      | 4  | 0             | 0       | 4     |
| Total   |               | 41   | 3             | 1       | 45    |

|                              | Value  | df | Asymp. sided) | Sig. | (2- |
|------------------------------|--------|----|---------------|------|-----|
|                              |        |    |               |      |     |
| Pearson Chi-Square           | 9.088ª | 6  | .169          |      |     |
| Likelihood Ratio             | 7.742  | 6  | .258          |      |     |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .005   | 1  | .943          |      |     |
| N of Valid Cases             | 45     |    |               |      |     |

Interpretation: It is inferred from the table that the calculated value of chi square at 5 % level of significance with 6 df is 9.088. The p value obtained is 0.169 which is greater than the standard p value of 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. By the statistical analysis it can be concluded that there is no significant relationship between use of social media and employee engagement.

# Factors motivating to work effectively

|       |                           | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|---------------------------|-----------|---------|
|       | , TT                      | 18        | 40.0    |
| Valid | encouragement and praises |           |         |
| vanu  | Both                      | 27        | 60.0    |
| Total |                           | 45        | 100.0   |
|       |                           |           |         |
| Total |                           | 45        |         |

The above table shows that majority of the respondents say both Awards, approval words of encouragement and praises and Pay increments and other monetary benefits are the factors motivating to work effectively and 40% of the respondents say only praise and encouragement motivate them.

## V. Summary of findings

- The data collected from the 45 respondents consists of 53.33% of 21-30 year olds, 66.67% of Female where 18 respondents have 1 to 3 years of experience and 11 respondents each have 3 to 10 years and 10 to 20 years' experience.
- The analysis reveals 82.22% of the respondents agree that they are held accountable for the quality of work produced while the rest tend to agree and none of them disagree or are neutral.
- Training given to the employees has significant relationship with employee engagement. This can also be seen that the management encourages to learn from mistakes and supports employees development.
- The statistical analysis identifies that there is significant relationship between Know- how training given (all the information provided to the job well) and employee engagement.
- The statistical analysis shows that there is significant relationship between leaders who motivate and employee engagement. Employee engagement is directly dependent on Leadership.
- The statistical analysis identifies that there is significant relationship between senior management who demonstrate strong leadership skills and employee engagement. This can also be seen that senior management communicates well with the rest of the organization.
- The statistical analysis concludes that there is no significant relationship between Grievance and Employee engagement. Employee engagement is not dependent on the college's staff Grievances handling procedures.
- The analysis identifies that there is no significant relationship between experience and employee engagement. Although literature review says employee engagement is dependent on experience, this can be further researched.
- The analysis reveals that there is no significant relationship between use of social media and employee engagement, although majority of the respondents agreed use of social media helps and makes their work interesting.
- The analysis shows that majority of the respondents say both Awards, approval words of encouragement and praises and Pay increments and other monetary benefits are the factors motivating to work effectively and 40% of the respondents say only praise and encouragement motivate them.

# **5.1Conclusion& Suggestions**

"When employee believes that their organization is concerned about them and cares about their well-being, they are likely to respond by attempting to fulfil their obligation to their organization by becoming more engaged" (Saks, 2006). Management plays an important role in developing employee engagement because it is a long-term and continuing process that builds a relationship with their employees.

Higher education in India is growing and changing at an extraordinary pace. Academic staff particularly has to keep up with the changing educational system and adapt to the changes that bring in latest methods of working with the student as well as the management.

Based on the results of the study it can be concluded from the hypothesis that there exists significant relationship between Leadership, Training and Employee engagement. The aforementioned variables have a positive influence on employee engagement, on the other hand the hypothesis claims that variables like Grievance, Experience do not influence Employee Engagement.

The data collected identifies that factors like Pay, Praise and Recognition are the motivating factors for employee engagement in the organization.

The key drivers of employee engagement are mentioned in the report so the organization can frame them as a strategy to engage employees, which will have positive impacts on the institution's outcomes and make decisions on future progress of the organizations.

As this research was the first formal staff feedback which the organization has allowed, it has been
conducted fairly. Annual feedback from employees through employee engagement surveys can be
conducted in a more precise and deep manner so the results of this report and the future reports can be
compared to maintain quality, mend to the changes in the Higher Education System in India and reach the
organization's goals.

#### **Bibliography**

• \n Saks, \nAlan M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of Managerial Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169

## An Empirical Study On The Level Of Employee Engagement In City Group Of Institutions, Bangalore,

- Aon Hewitt. (2013). 2013 Trends in Global Employee Engagement. Aon Hewitt Consulting Performance, Reward & Talent, 13(3), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cms084
- Beardwell, J., & Claydon, T. (2007). Human Resource Management A Contemporary Approach. Human Resource Management. A Contemporary Approach, 5th Ed., Pearson Education, Essex., 694.
- Childs, J. H., & Stoeber, J. (2010). Self-oriented, other-oriented, and socially prescribed perfectionism in employees: Relationships with burnout and engagement. Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health, 25(4), 269281https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2010. 518486
- Dajani, M. A. Z. (2015). The Impact of Employee Engagement on Job Performance and Organisational Commitment in the Egyptian Banking Sector. Journal of Business and Management Sciences, 3(5), 138–147. https://doi.org/10.12691/jbms-3-5-1
- Dale Carnegie Training White Paper. (2012). What drives Employee Engagement and why it matters. Retrieved from https://www.dalecarnegie.com/assets/1/7/driveengagement 101612 wp.pdf
- Dukkipati, U. (2010). Higher Education in India: Sustaining Long-Term Growth? South Asia Monitor, (141).
- Federman, B. (2009). Employee Engagement: A Roadmap for Creating Profits, Optimizing Performance, and Increasing Loyalty. Jossey-Bass, 242.
- Fleming, J. H., Coffman, C., & Harter, J. K. (2005). Manage your Human Sigma. Harvard Business Review. https://doi.org/10.1109/EMR.2006.1679076
- Gallup. (2016). Gallup Q12 Employee Engagement Survey. Retrieved from https://q12.gallup.com/public/en-us/Features
- 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, 77(1), 11–37.
  https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915892
- Development Journal Iss Journal of Managerial Psychology, 30(7), 365–385.
- Rehman, M. S., & Waheed, A. (2011). An Empirical Study of Impact of Job Satisfaction on job Performance in the Public Sector Organizations. Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 2(9), 167–181. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=58737401&site=ehost-live
- Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or Depleting? The Dynamics of Engagement in Work and Family Roles. Administrative Science Quarterly, 46(4), 655. https://doi.org/10.2307/3094827
- Schneider, B., Yost, A. B., Kropp, A., Kind, C., & Lam, H. (2017). Workforce engagement: What it is, what drives it, and why it
  matters for organizational performance. Journal of Organizational Behavior. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2244
- Seijts, G., & Crim, D. (2006). What engages employees the most or, the ten C's of employee

IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM) is UGC approved Journal with Sl. No. 4481, Journal no. 46879.

Dr. Ritty Francis "An Empirical Study on the Level of Employee Engagement in City Group of Institutions, Bangalore, India "IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM) 20.3 (2018): 72-80.