



---

## **Total Employee Engagement: Result of Powerful Leadership Style and Employee Motivation**

**Dr Smitha Pillai**

*Department of Management,  
Bhopal School of Social Sciences (BSSS College) Bhopal, (M.P).*

*(Received 15 October, 2013 Accepted 08 November, 2013)*

**ABSTRACT:** This study is aimed at to understand and analyze the factors which lead to a total engagement of the employees in their organization. While there are many research studies that point to the percentage of engaged and disengaged employees, few studies have looked at what really drives employee engagement. This research was done to study the functional and emotional elements that affect employee engagement and influence of good leaders in getting full employee engagement. A totally satisfied employee engages completely in the work area which will further leads to the complete growth of the organization in the areas like research and development which are the two terms getting so much of significance nowadays. Variables for this study were chosen by reviewing the limited data that are available regarding work engagement, followed by examining factors related to burnout. The assumption of this study is that if a factor predicts burnout, that same factor may have an opposite relationship to engagement. The factors which were explored for this study include office location, employee's years of service to the agency, gender, and whether or not the employee's job function includes supervising other staff. The results were in confirmation with the previous study results of Ayers (2006) and The Gallup Organization's research using the Q12 instrument. Influence of Leadership and leadership styles are also included in this study and this paper is a continuation of my previous research "Holistic Sensation-A feeling after Total Work Engagement."

**Key words:** Engaged employees, Not Engaged employees, Actively Disengaged, powerful leadership

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

**Engaged** employees work with fervor and experience a deep association to their company. They drive progression and move the organization forward.

**Not Engaged workers** can be difficult to spot: They are not hostile or disruptive. They show up and kill time with little or no concern about customers, productivity, profitability, waste, safety, mission and purpose of the teams, or developing customers. They are thinking about lunch or their next break. They are essentially "checked out." Surprisingly, these people are not only a part of your support staff or sales team, but they are also sitting on your executive committee.

**Actively Disengaged** employees aren't just unhappy at work; they're busy acting out their unhappiness. Every day, these workers undermine what their engaged coworkers accomplish. Actively disengaged employees are more or less out to damage their company. They monopolize managers' time; have more on-the-job accidents; account for more quality defects; contribute to "shrinkage," as theft is called; are sicker; miss more days; and quit at a higher rate than engaged employees do. Whatever the engaged do — such as solving problems, innovating, and creating new customers — the actively disengaged try to undo.

On the other hand, engaged employees are the best colleagues. They cooperate to build an organization, institution, or agency, and they are behind everything good that happens there. These employees are involved in, enthusiastic about, and committed to their work. They know the scope of their jobs and look for new and better ways to achieve outcomes. They are 100% psychologically committed to their work. And, they are the only people in an organization who create new customers.

Employees said that it is the personal relationship with their immediate supervisor that is the key. The attitude and actions of the immediate supervisor can enhance employee engagement or can create an atmosphere where an employee becomes disengaged. In addition, employees said that believing in the ability of senior leadership to take their input, lead the company in the right direction and openly communicate the state of the organization is key in driving engagement. Other factors that drive engagement are that employees are treated with respect, that their personal values are reflected and that the organization cares about how they feel.

## **II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Employee engagement researches are a good tool for soliciting ideas and opinion of employees who are the core body of any organization. Dissatisfaction of the employees can cause serious problems to the existence of the organization. Mere satisfaction should not be the employers' aim instead a complete engagement will help the organization in its long run. To rush with the fast growing economy employees not only need a shelter to earn their livelihood but socio-economic growth and research and development of self is also very inevitable. Highly engaged employees make a substantive contribution to their agency and may predict organizational success (Saks, 2006). But the reverse holds true as well. Disengaged employees can be a serious liability. Ayers (2006) compares disengagement to a cancer that can slowly erode an agency. Customer satisfaction, employee retention, and productivity are all at risk unless burnout and disengagement can be controlled. Unfortunately, some studies show that workers in general are not engaged with their jobs. Frauenhiem's (2006) review of a recent Sibson Consulting Firm survey found that satisfaction scores with all major categories of work in the U.S. have dropped, and just over half of the respondents in the study rated themselves as engaged, or highly engaged. This lack of engagement affects large and small organizations all over the world, causing them to incur excess costs, to under perform on crucial tasks, and to create widespread customer dissatisfaction (Rampersad, 2006). Disengagement can affect the financial solidarity of an agency as well. Ayers (2006) explains the potential monetary impact by estimating that if an organization has employees who are only 30% to 50% percent engaged then 50% to 70% of the payroll is an ineffective expenditure of agency resources. And not only are these disengaged staff members taking up resources in pay and benefits, they also work against the best interests of the agency and can actually turn committed employees against the organization (Ayers, 2006).

## **III. METHOD OF THE STUDY**

Demographic and work life variables were examined to determine if they impacted scores on the employee engagement scale. The exploratory research questions and hypotheses were developed following a review of the literature and the completion of a pilot study. However, empirical studies on work engagement are limited and the literature is unclear as to which variables are the strongest predictors. No identified studies have examined workers specifically in the human service fields such as social work, psychology, or rehabilitation. Therefore, variables for this study were chosen by reviewing the limited data that are available regarding work engagement, followed by examining factors related to burnout. The assumption of this study is that if a factor predicts burnout, that same factor may have an opposite relationship to engagement. The factors which were explored for this study include office location, employee's years of service to the agency, gender, and whether or not the employee's job function includes supervising other staff. The effect of leadership style is studied and correlated with the previous studies.

### **Variables**

The Dependent variable in this study was the employee's total score on the eight item employee engagement scale. The Independent variables were the location of the employee's office, his or her gender, and salary, extent of academic qualifications, age, and number of years in full-time employment and socio-economic status and supervisory job duties. Type I cutoff was set to .05.

### **Caring Managers**

The study revealed that a "caring" manager is one of the key elements that drives employee engagement. That is, employees want their managers to care about their personal lives, to take an interest in them as people, to care about how they feel and support their health and well-being. A manager's ability to build strong relationships with employees, build strong team interaction and lead in a "person-centered" way creates an engaging environment in which employees can perform at the highest possible level.

"Caring" managers and workplace environment Engaged employees more committed, dedicated and motivated to make organization a success Customer engagement Increase in sales and profit Increase in stock price.

#### IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

##### I. Organizational Environment:

In order to measure the organizational atmosphere the employees were asked the following questions:-

**Table -1**

Questions	Raw Scores	
	Yes	No
a. Do you know what is expected of you at work?	18	7
b. Do you have the equipment you need to do your work right?	16	9
c. At work, do you have the opportunity to do what you do best every day?	19	6
d. In the last seven days have you received recognition or praise for doing good work?	19	6
e. Does your supervisor or someone at work seems to care about you as a person.	16	9
f. Is there someone at work who encourages your development?	18	7
g. At work do your opinion seems to count?	17	8
h. Does the mission/purpose of your company make you feel your job is important?	20	5
i. Are your associates (fellow employees) committed to doing quality work?	19	6
j. Do you have a best friend at work?	17	8
k. In the last six months, has someone at work talked to you about your progress?	16	9
l. In the last year, have you had opportunity at work to learn and grow?	19	6
Total	214	86

**Interpretation:** All the employees in the organization are satisfied with their nature of job and the environment that they get in the organization. 40% of the employees said that mission/purpose of the organization make them feel that their job is important. 38% are agreed on the point that they get an opportunity at work to learn and grow. 32% of the employees said their supervisor seems to care about them as a person. From the scores obtained it is very obvious that the employees of Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd are very much aware of their role in the organization (54). The organizational environment of the organization has found satisfactory as the total score of “Yes” stood at 71 % ( 214/300).

Correlations were calculated to describe the relationships between employees’ level of job satisfaction and selected demographic variables. The coefficients ranged from negligible to substantial. Coefficients for females (Table II) were: age, -.06; years in current position, .01; degree status, -.12; the coefficients for males (Table II) were: age, .04; years in current position, .03; and degree status -0.07. There were no significant relationships between job satisfaction and selected demographic variables for female and male employees of “Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd. “

**Table 2. Relationship between Overall Job Satisfaction and Selected Demographic Variables.**

Variable	Female(8)		Male(17)	
	r	sig	r	sig
Years	-0.06	0.644	0.04	0.61
Years of current service	0.01	0.944	0.03	0.73
Qualification	-0.12	0.242	-0.07	0.27

##### Multiple Regression Analysis

$$Y (\text{total}) = 1.317 + .997(\text{Recognition}) + .985(\text{Salary}) + .976(\text{Academic}) + .981(\text{Service}) + .901(\text{Status})$$

Multiple regression is a statistical technique that allows us to predict someone’s score on one variable on the basis of their scores on several other variables. In order to measure how much an individual enjoys their job, variables such as recognition, salary, extent of academic qualifications, sex, number of years in full-time employment and socio-economic status might all contribute towards job satisfaction has been analyzed and the collected data on all of these variables have been analyzed using multiple regression. We might find that job engagement is most accurately predicted by type of occupation, salary and years in full-time employment, with the other variables not helping us to predict job satisfaction. The independent variables are the individual option scores and the dependent variable is the overall satisfaction total.

**Model Summary**

R	.717
R square	.514

Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(constant)	1.317	.919		1.432	.173
Recognition	.997	.008	2.465	132.284	.000
Salary	.985	.009	2.313	106.186	.000
Academic	.976	.013	.915	72.978	.000
Service	.981	.024	.356	40.845	.000
Socio-Eco status	.901	.083	.080	14.694	.000

Dependent Variable: Total Score

Here, the beta value of 2.5(Recognition) indicates that a change of one standard deviation in the predictor variable will result in a change of 2.5 standard deviations in the criterion variable. Salary has the next greatest influence on total score of employee engagement i.e 2.313. The beta values of other variables are showing a less value. Here socio-economic status shows a very less influence but the interview results revealed the high salary and recognition automatically constitute the social status. R Square (R<sup>2</sup>) is the square of this measure of correlation and indicates the proportion of the variance in the criterion variable which is accounted for by this model. Here it is .514

The output reports an ANOVA, which assesses the overall significance of our model. As  $p < 0.05$  our model is significant. The Standardized Beta Coefficients give a measure of the contribution of each variable to the model. A large value indicates that a unit change in this predictor variable has a large effect on the criterion variable. The t and Sig (p) values give a rough indication of the impact of each predictor variable – a big absolute t value and small p value suggests that a predictor variable is having a large impact on the criterion variable. Thus *the Null Hypothesis has been rejected and the alternative hypothesis that the independent variables like recognition, salary, extent of academic qualifications, age, sex, number of years in full-time employment and socio-economic status might all contribute towards high scores of employee engagement.*

## V. CONCLUSION

This research will help the organization and other researchers to boost their knowledge. This research study has enriched with experience and has given extreme knowledge about the subject. Employee Engagement is the buzz word term for employee communication. It is a positive attitude held by the employees towards the organization and its values. It is rapidly gaining popularity, use and importance in the workplace and impacts organizations in many ways. Employee engagement emphasizes the importance of employee communication on the success of a business. An organization should thus recognize employees, more than any other variable, as powerful contributors to a company's competitive position. Therefore employee engagement should be a continuous process of learning, perfection, measurement and deed.

We would hence conclude that raising and maintaining employee engagement lies in the hands of an organization and requires a perfect blend of time, endeavor, commitment and investment to craft a successful endeavor. The research evidence from across the public and private sector, points to improvements in employee engagement leading to higher productivity and transformational modification. While this is the prize, there are considerable barriers that will require competent and engaged leadership.

This employee engagement strategy is intended to help one steer this fine line of needing to drive significant changes in a way that encourages and supports local Trusts and teams to step forward and take on the challenges granted.

The results of many engagement surveys point out low levels of engagement among employees. The facts suggest social exchange at work and support are what employees would like. Therefore, organizations that wish to improve employee engagement should totally focus on employees' perceptions of the support they receive from their organization. Organizations which conduct surveys and suggestion programmes, for example, address employees' needs and concerns and those which offer supple working arrangements, for example, demonstrate caring and support; all of which may cause employees to reciprocate with higher levels of engagement.

Interventions in job design, which provide employees with more autonomy and freedom as well as career management interventions, might also be very effective.

Research evidence shows that engagement and an employee's intention to stay with their organization are inclined by the relationships held at work and the behaviors experienced. Discretionary behavior has been discovered to be an important element that is correlated with engagement. Research on emotions and happiness points to a link between positive feelings at work and levels of engagement. Furthermore, if management pays close attention to happiness at work it is obvious that giving employees the chance to feed their views and opinions upwards is a key

driver of employee engagement. Research has shown that there may be a link between levels of engagement and organizational performance.

## REFERENCES

- Ayers, K.E. (2006). Engagement is not enough. Integro Leadership Institute LLC.
- Blizzard, R. (2003) 'Employee engagement: Where do hospitals begin?' *The Gallup Poll Tuesday Briefing*, November, 2, p.91.
- Brim, B. (2002) 'The longer workers stay in their jobs, the more disheartened they become', *Gallup Management Journal*, March. Available at: <http://www.gallupjournal.com/GM/Jarchive/issue5/2002315c.asp> [Accessed 1st August 2007].
- Cooper, R. (1997) 'Applying Emotional Intelligence in the workplace', *Training and Development*, Vol. **51**, 12, pp31-38.
- Frauenheim, E. (2006). Study: Workers are disengaged but staying put. *Workforce Management*, 85(22).
- Hart, C. (1998) *Doing a literature review: releasing the social science research imagination*. London, SAGE.
- Johnson, M. (2004) 'Gallup study reveals workplace disengagement in Thailand', *The Gallup Management Journal*, 12th May. [online] Available at: <http://gmj.gallup.com/content/16306/3/Gallup-Study-Reveals-Workplace-Disengagementin.aspx>. Accessed 27th July 2007.
- Maslach, C. (2003). Job burnout: New directions in research and intervention. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, **12**, 189-192.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). The truth about burnout. San Francisco: Jossey/Bass.
- Maslach, C., Schaufelli, W. B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job Burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. **52**, 397-422.
- Rampersad, H. (2006). 'Self-examination as the road to sustaining employee engagement and Personal Happiness', *Performance Improvement*, Vol. **45**(8),18-25.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, **21**(7), 600-619.