

## Understanding Employee Engagement Strategies Of Demos Project Pvt Ltd, Chennai

Dr A Sarasu<sup>a</sup>, S.Madhumitha<sup>b</sup>, K.Abarna<sup>c</sup> And N.Jeyasuryaa<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Associate Professor, School of Management, Sri Krishna College of Engineering and Technology, Coimbatore, India

<sup>b,c,d</sup>PG Student, School of Management, Sri Krishna College of Engineering and Technology, Coimbatore, India

**Article History:** Received: 10 January 2021; Revised: 12 February 2021; Accepted: 27 March 2021; Published online: 20 April 2021

**Abstract:** Employee engagement is progressively more viewed as one constituent in determining the health of any business concern, along with the conventional methods of sales, profit, cash flow, and customer satisfaction. Four out of every five employees worldwide do not deliver their full potential to help their organization succeed and thus understanding the employees has become very important for any organisation (Gebauer et al., 2008). Other researchers state that employee engagement is the best tool in the company's efforts to gain competitive advantages and stay competitive. Therefore, the construct of employee engagement has been an area of interest among many researchers and consultancy firms, and received its recognition in the management literature and among practitioners. To have an advantage over other organizations and to be on top in the market it is very much essential to involve high employee engagement strategies. This project discusses the various employee engagement strategies used in Demos Project Pvt. Ltd.,

### Introduction

In this project the assorted process for hiring procedure and new engagement strategy model for the model which helps in creating the ideas and innovation for the corporate are discussed. It also helps in creating the profit, reducing the absenteeism and attrition of the corporate status.

The engagement strategies changes from organization to organization where the leadership priority was constantly looking for strong engagement. So, that they are in need of the new strategic model for the corporate. Employee engagement is often defined in several ways creating the strong engagement among the workers to be able get the strong base and ready to reduce the attrition within the company. Where the corporate should be creating the connection bond (between company and employee) should be wiped out the hiring process.

Employee engagement is counted as a main field of concern in the industry sector. Employee Engagement refers to the extent of commitment and involvement of the staff towards their organization and its values. Where the corporate can create the engagement within the sort of career development, ethical behavior, performance appraisal, empowerment, payroll benefits, policies and procedure, taking care of medical expenses and safety care, recognizing the worker employee talents and help in creating the personality development for the worker.

Employee engagement is to extent the workers within which they feel obsessed with their workplace, and in their commitments in organization. Employee engagement isn't the same as employee satisfaction. Where the worker satisfaction was indicating their happiness and content the workers were involved. Where it had been not handling the motivation and also involvement and their connection towards the emotional connectivity engaged employees check out the entire of the corporate and understand their purpose, where, how they slot in the further commitments. Where the engaged employee makes the higher deciding in their work.

Organizations with an engaged workforce and their competition and reputation of the organization are improved. In terms of that they're going to be having higher earnings in their work progress and a quick recession and financial setbacks are going to be improved. Engagement may be an initial differentiator when it involves growth and innovation. To raise and understand the wants of your organization, administering an employee engagement survey is vital which isn't the same for worker satisfaction. A company that has an efficient employee engagement strategy and a highly engaged workforce is more likely to retain top performers also as attract new talent. Employee engagement was one the foremost important for the success and reputation of the organization

**Employees will be broadly classified into three categories:-**

#### Engaged

Engaged employees are hooked in to their jobs, loyal, motivated, committed and productive. They need a robust emotional allegiance to their workplace and are driven to succeed.

#### Not Engaged

Not engaged employees don't seem to be totally psychologically connected to their companies. They work flat out and contribute but are less driven to succeed than their engaged counterparts and are more likely to have interaction in absentee behavior and/or leave the corporate.

#### Actively Disengaged

Actively disengaged employees are emotionally and cognitively divorced from their work, they need during a sense "checked out" although they're physically there. They're disgruntled, unhappy to be there and their negativity is palpable, infectious and disruptive for the organization.

### OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To analyse the various factors that align employees with Organization Goals and Values using Employee Engagement strategies.
- To give suggestions related to employee engagement initiatives by compiling the data collected.
- To study the socio economic profile of the respondents.
- To know the level of top management and employee involvements towards their work.

#### **Factors affecting employee engagement:**

- Communication
- Engagement index
- Compensation and Benefits
- Employee Recognition
- Workplace Wellness
- Personal and Professional Development
- Work environment
- Work life balance

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

As novelty, speedy swiftness to market, and the need for ever-increasing competency defines the competitive edge that various business organizations around the globe are totting up on their motivated workforces to help them succeed. However, it has been noted that employee engagement is on the declining tone and there is a intensifying disengagement among workforces today because of lack of top management backup and Human Resources policies that are not up to the mark, lack of acknowledgment and advancement and insufficient resources support (Bates, 2004; Richman, 2006). Therefore, the present study is undertaken to measure the various employee engagement strategies in the Demos Project.

#### **SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

The employee engagement is nothing but how employees are emotionally and strongly engagement with the organization. By this study we will know about the degree of engagement in finite skill and by this we are able to imply the new strategic model to the company by which company and employee engagement will be improved.

#### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

##### **Area of the study**

The sample area chosen for conducting the study in Demos project to know about the employee engagement strategies for the company in Chennai.

##### **Research design**

A research design is a plan specifying the methods and procedures for collecting and analyzing the needed data. This was set as the framework for the research plan. Where a descriptive research design technique was employed using a survey method and the primary data was collected for this project.

##### **Sampling:**

The sample has been tested with the employee in the company with the maximum sample collected was 94.

##### **Data collection:**

The data is collected using the structured questionnaire that contains both closed end and open end questions. The data was collected from the employee in the workplace, managers, supervisors, etc. To know about the process of employee engagement strategy using the 5 point Likert scale.

##### **Data analysis tool**

In this study the data is performed with the help of the latest version of statistical package of social science (SPSS). The hypothesis was tested using the 0.05 level of significance.

#### **TEST OF NORMALITY**

The above mentioned table is to test the normality and the table shows 0.00, 0.20, 0.001, 0.000, 0.001, 0.004, 0.000, 0.0001 reveal the factors are normally distributed. Except workplace wellness factor which is 0.80 which is not normally distributed.

#### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

##### **Demographic variables of the respondents**

Demographic variables	Particulars	Frequenc y	Percent
Age	20-25	52	55.3
	26-30	26	27.7
	31-35	6	6.4
	36-40	9	9.6
	41 above	1	1.1

	Total	94	100
Employee type	Private	46	48.9
	Public	17	18.1
	Self	31	33
	Total	94	100
Employee Years	Less than 2 years	54	57.4
	2-5 years	25	26.6
	Above 5 years	15	16
	Total	94	100

Tests of Normality						
Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>				Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
EIF	.169	94	.000	.933	94	.000
CF	.101	94	.020	.970	94	.028
LF	.122	94	.001	.978	94	.115
BCF	.237	94	.000	.895	94	.000
ERF	.128	94	.001	.964	94	.011
VWVF	.086	94	.080	.977	94	.097
PPDF	.114	94	.004	.971	94	.032
WEF	.131	94	.000	.964	94	.011
WLF	.125	94	.001	.966	94	.014

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Out of 94 respondents, 55.3% of the respondents belong to the age group of 20-25years, 27.7% of the respondents belong to the age group of 26-30 years, 6.4 % of the respondents belong to the age group of 31-35 years and 9.6 % of the respondents belong to the age group of 36-40 and above 40 years 1.1%. 48% of the respondents belong to private type, 18.1% of the respondents belong to public type and 33.0% of the respondents belong to self type in the company. 57.4% of the respondents have less than 2 years, 26.6% of the respondents have 2-5 years of experience and 16.0% of the respondents have above 5 years of experience in the company.

### CORRELATION

Correlation Analysis is a statistical method used to evaluate the strength of relationship between two quantitative factors. Normally the correlation coefficient value between two factors must lie between -1 to +1. Factors having correlation value nearing +1 are said to be highly correlated with each other and those having value nearing -1 are said to be weakly correlated with each other.

Correlations											
		Age	EIF	CF	LF	BC F	ERF	W WF	PPD F	WE F	WL F
A ge	Pearson Correlation	1	.025	.098	.232 *	.217 *	.089	.135	.152	.267 **	.241 *
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.809	.348	.024	.035	.394	.194	.143	.009	.019
	N	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94
EI F	Pearson Correlation	.025	1	.176	.424 **	.305 **	.314 **	.201	.324 **	.231 *	.110
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.809		.090	.000	.003	.002	.052	.001	.025	.289
	N	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94
C F	Pearson Correlation	.098	.176	1	.496 **	.170	.339 **	.340 **	.390 **	.253 *	.361 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.348	.090		.000	.102	.001	.001	.000	.014	.000

	N	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94
L F	Pearson Correlation	.232 *	.424 **	.496 **	1	.250 *	.489 **	.306 **	.503 **	.469 **	.410 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.024	.000	.000		.015	.000	.003	.000	.000	.000
	N	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94
B C F	Pearson Correlation	.217 *	.305 **	.170	.250 *	1	.201	.243 *	.156	.209 *	.215 *
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.035	.003	.102	.015		.053	.018	.134	.043	.037
	N	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94
E R F	Pearson Correlation	.089	.314 **	.339 **	.489 **	.201	1	.461 **	.482 **	.320 **	.388 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.394	.002	.001	.000	.053		.000	.000	.002	.000
	N	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94
W W F	Pearson Correlation	.135	.201	.340 **	.306 **	.243 *	.461 **	1	.504 **	.454 **	.493 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.194	.052	.001	.003	.018	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94
P P D F	Pearson Correlation	.152	.324 **	.390 **	.503 **	.156	.482 **	.504 **	1	.627 **	.599 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.143	.001	.000	.000	.134	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94
W E F	Pearson Correlation	.267 **	.231 *	.253 *	.469 **	.209 *	.320 **	.454 **	.627 **	1	.505 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.025	.014	.000	.043	.002	.000	.000		.000
	N	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94
W L F	Pearson Correlation	.241 *	.110	.361 **	.410 **	.215 *	.388 **	.493 **	.599 **	.505 **	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.019	.289	.000	.000	.037	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).											
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).											

From the above mentioned correlation table all the demographic variables are positively correlated with each other and the significant values are greater than 0.05.

#### CHI-SQUARE TEST

The chi square test is an important test among the several tests of significance. It can also be used to make comparison between theoretical population and actual data when categories are used. By comparing a calculated value with the table value of  $\chi^2$  for degrees of freedom at a given level of significance. We may either accept or reject the null hypothesis. If the calculated value of  $\chi^2$  is less than the value, the null hypothesis is accepted, but if the calculated value is equal or greater than table value, the null hypothesis is rejected.

**Null Hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no significant difference between age and the engagement index factor.

**AGE \*EIF**

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	48.574 <sup>a</sup>	36	.079
Likelihood Ratio	42.309	36	.217
Linear-by-Linear Association	.060	1	.807
N of Valid Cases	94		
a. 46 cells (92.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.			

The above mentioned chi-square table is to find the significant difference between age and engagement index factor, and it is found that the chi-square value is 0.079 which is less than level significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

**QUALIFICATION \* PPDF**

**Null Hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no significant difference between qualification and professional and personal development factor.

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.132 <sup>a</sup>	15	.063
Likelihood Ratio	27.813	15	.023
Linear-by-Linear Association	.900	1	.343
N of Valid Cases	94		

The above mentioned chi-square table is to find the significant difference between qualification and professional and personal development factor, and it is found that the chi-square value is 0.063 which is less than level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

**EMPLOYEE TYPE \*CF**

**Null Hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no significant difference between employee type and CF.

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	45.452 <sup>a</sup>	32	.058
Likelihood Ratio	52.681	32	.012
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.285	1	.022
N of Valid Cases	94		
a. 49 cells (96.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .18.			

The above mentioned chi-square table is to find the significant difference between employee type and CF, and it is found that the chi-square value is 0.058 which is less than level significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

**EMPLOYEE TYPE \*LF**

**Null Hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no significant difference between employee type and LF.

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	50.246 <sup>a</sup>	30	.012
Likelihood Ratio	52.426	30	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.168	1	.141
N of Valid Cases	94		
a. 45 cells (93.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .18.			

The above mentioned chi-square table is to find the significant difference between employee type and LF, and it is found that the chi-square value is 0.012 which is less than level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

#### EMPLOYEE YEARS \*EIF

**Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ):** There is no significant difference between employee years and employee index factor.

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.604 <sup>a</sup>	18	.014
Likelihood Ratio	34.143	18	.012
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.577	1	.209
N of Valid Cases	94		

a. 26 cells (86.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .16.

The above mentioned chi-square table is to find the significant difference between employee years and EIF, and it is found that the chi-square value is 0.014 which is less than level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

#### EMPLOYEE YEARS \*CF

**Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ):** There is no significant difference between employee years and CF

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	45.563 <sup>a</sup>	32	.057
Likelihood Ratio	51.191	32	.017
Linear-by-Linear Association	.019	1	.890
N of Valid Cases	94		

a. 49 cells (96.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .16.

The above mentioned chi-square table is to find the significant difference between employee years and CF, and it is found that the chi-square value is 0.014 which is less than level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

#### EMPLOYEE YEARS \*ERF

**Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ):** There is no significant difference between employee years and employee recognition factor

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	48.554 <sup>a</sup>	32	.031
Likelihood Ratio	51.840	32	.015
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.172	1	.279
N of Valid Cases	94		

a. 48 cells (94.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .16.

The above mentioned chi-square table is to find the significant difference between employee years and employee recognition factor , and it is found that the chi-square value is 0.031 which is less than level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

#### EMPLOYEE YEARS \*WWF

**Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ):** There is no significant difference between employee years and workplace wellness factor.

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	d f	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	43.220 <sup>a</sup>	3 2	.089
Likelihood Ratio	46.688	3 2	.045
Linear-by-Linear Association	.450	1	.502
N of Valid Cases	94		

a. 47 cells (92.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .16.

The above mentioned chi-square table is to find the significant difference between employee years and workplace wellness factor, and it is found that the chi-square value is 0.089 which is less than level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

## SUGGESTION

There are various types of factors which make the employees get engaged in their work. The factors depend upon each individual so the organisation should focus on all the employee engagement factors. Demo's project follows a good employee engagement model. There are some factors like employee index factors, personal and professional factors, communication factors, work life factor and employee recognition and work environment factors are positively significant with demographic variables. By focusing on those factors a better employee engagement model can be developed.

## CONCLUSION

There is a link between employee engagement and management. As it is the top priority and important objective for any organisation is to boost engagement. The result shows a positive relationship between the various factors and reveals that the employee engagement strategies used in the Demos Project are highly satisfactory to the employees. A happy and healthy environment and work for all employees is maintained inside the Demos Project.

## References

1. Byrne, Z. S. (2014). *Understanding employee engagement: Theory, research, and practice*. Routledge.
2. Fletcher, L., & Robinson, D. (2013). Measuring and understanding employee engagement.
3. Markos, S., & Sridevi, M. S. (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. *International journal of business and management*, 5(12), 89.
4. Men, L. R., O'Neil, J., & Ewing, M. (2020). Examining the effects of internal social media usage on employee engagement. *Public Relations Review*, 46(2), 101880.
5. Na-Nan, K., Pukkeeree, P., & Chaiprasit, K. (2020). Employee engagement in small and medium-sized enterprises in Thailand: the construction and validation of a scale to measure employees. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*.
6. Sandhya, S., & Sulphay, M. M. (2020). Influence of empowerment, psychological contract and employee engagement on voluntary turnover intentions. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*.
7. Shuck, B. (2011). Integrative literature review: Four emerging perspectives of employee engagement: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 10(3), 304-328.
8. Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human resource development review*, 9(1), 89-110.
9. Tucker, E. (2020). Driving engagement with the employee experience. *Strategic HR Review*.