

Effect Of Perceived Organisational Support And Job Characteristics On Employee Engagement

Dr. BENITA. S. MONICA, Asst. Professor, Saveetha School of Management,
SIMATS, Chennai , benisrj@gmail.com

Ms. FEBA ELSA JOSEPH, MBA Student, Saveetha School of Management,
SIMATS, Chennai , feba.elsajoseph@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Employee engagement brings out a whole new interest in every employee in any organization. The study is to understand the effect of antecedents of employee engagement, Job Characteristics and Perceived Organization Support (POS) on Employee engagement. Around 70 samples of employees were taken for the study. The primary purpose of the study is to understand, how each organization is approaching the employees to retain them through various techniques. Each and every management should work hard and they should think that all the employee is a great asset to the organization, they all play an important role in the entire functions. The MLR technique has been used to analyze the data. The results conclude that Job Characteristics is the significant predictor of employee engagement rather than Perceived organizational support.

Keywords: Employee Engagement, Job Characteristics, Perceived organization support, manufacturing sector

INTRODUCTION:

Employee engagement is very important component in corporate world because retaining an employee in any organization is a very big challenge. There are two components which is supposed to affect employee engagement namely, Job Characteristics and Perceived Organization Support. These two components highly influence the employee engagement in the organization. Job characteristics which highly represents the core job, critical psychological states, and the best outcomes. The employees will not be engaged according to

the willingness, those people are forced to do their works, not much fruitful to the productivity and effectiveness in the workplace. Perceived Organization Support (POS) is the factor where the employee himself feels that the organization is really cares about the well-being of them and which gives the impact on the work of the employees. The employee feels that the organization is the support system overall. The study is to check whether the POS or Job Characteristics highly influences the employee engagement which reduces the attrition rate of the employees in the organization.

One of the factors in achieving employee engagement is job characteristics. There are five dimensions in job characteristics (autonomy, feedback, skill variety, task identity and task significance) (Hackman & Oldham, 1974). This research was conducted to find out whether there is an influence of job characteristics on employee engagement. Job characteristics are inherent in a job, where the characteristics of this work have aspects or components that can lead to a full understanding of a job, a sense of responsibility for work results, a sense of concern for the impact of work, and also produce courtesy norms positive for employees. The attrition will become very less and retaining the employees will be easiest task. Through the POS and Job Characteristics, the employee engagement can be predicted to reduce the attrition rate of the organization. The primary objective of the study is to examine the effect of Perceived Organization Support and Job Characteristics on Employee Engagement. The study also attempts to identify the level of Employee Engagement in employees working in manufacturing sector.

Generally in manufacturing sector, more opportunities are provided for job enhancement but retaining employees is one of the most challenging issues, because of high turnover and low performance. Knowing which drives employee engagement illuminates the path leaders can take to enhance employee retention, performance and motivation in their organizations. The framework for enhancing the engagement and retention of these professionals. The study will help the organization to know the current levels of engagement of their employees, and will allow them to take necessary actions to motivate them to perform better and enhance their satisfaction and intention to stay in the organization.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Dernovsek (2008) says, the employee engagement is included in retaining the employees in any organization. An optimistic environment at work will boost up the productivity in the

organization. The employee commitment and emotional attachment is very much important for the work. There should be always a foster engagement of relationship, between employee-employer. This is a kind of two way communication, which can sort out all the solutions and also development of the organization. Robinson et al., (2004) have suggested that management should know the real context of the employee engagement, while working together with the colleagues, which results in the benefit of the organization and these activities, held up positive attitudes, giving way for the organization and its values/morale and simultaneously improves the performance of the individual.

Blessing White (2008) have examined that the perks would highly influences the world of the individual employee. The job satisfaction, and basic prior loyalty has to come into the frame of the every employer (Erickson 2005, Macey and Schnieder, 2008). Out of ten major organization, almost 3/4th of the management are looking for the employees well-being and challenging job and finest decision making authority. Robinson et al., (2004) suggest that the key driving factors for the employee, is sense of feeling valued/valuable and engaged with the work, with high piece of determination and courage, to put forth for the good result.

According to the development dimensions international (DDI, 2005), there are five parameters, which creates a high engagement for the employees which are Proper recognition and support, Help people to grow and develop, Empower, Align effects with strategy and Encourage Teamwork and collaboration. Coffmann (2000) and Ellis and Sorensen (2007) have shared about the optimistic relationship, between the employee engagement and the organizational performance results; employee engagement, is exceeding the industry revenue overall, which results in the High customer satisfaction.

Rhoades & Eisenberger (2002), have concluded that the organization support helps the employee to be smarter and they can able to do all the things in very quick manner in order to help the organization throughout, it could easily raise the new innovative and creative ideas for the betterment of both the individual and organizational goals.

Kahn (1992) examined the sense in which psychological safety helps to show the employee to deal with any negative issues. And the employee should develop the trust in organization, that they will be supported by the organization. A kind of openness and overall support

system will enhance the trust. The organization should leave the employees to try something very new ideas which improve the wellness of the organization.

Robinson et al., (2004) has defined Engagement as a dualistic affiliation between the employer and employees. The researchers have suggested that employee engagement is an optimistic attitude, perceived by the employees towards the organization and its values. To enhance the performance in the work and the involvement of employees the organization need to focus on nurturing the employees.

Mone and London (2010) have studied the level of involvement and the engagement of the employee is tend to be high when productivity is highly focused in any organization. There is always a necessity to build relationship between the employer and the employee in the organization.

Saks (2006) have concluded that there is a consequential difference between job and organization engagements. He has also proved that perceived organizational support forecasts both job and organization engagement. The study also proved that job characteristics predicts job engagement; and procedural justice predicts organization engagement. Markos and Sridevi (2010) stated that if personnel is not taken care of in pertinent way, employees will fail to get engaged to their job. The construct employee engagement is built on the foundation of earlier concepts like job satisfaction, employee commitment and Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB).

Grumana and Saks (2011) propose that advancement in performance can be best achieved by concentrating on performance management system which in turn will promote employee engagement. Inceoglu and Warr (2011) suggest that the affective-motivational state of job engagement has been shown to differ between jobs with different characteristics, and they also examined the links with workers' personal attributes. Engagement was predicted to be a primary function of personality factors and sub-factors which match its affective and motivational elements, namely Emotional Stability, Extraversion and Conscientiousness

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The data for this study was collected from the employees of manufacturing industry. The survey included a cover letter that informed participants about the purpose of the study. Participation

was voluntary and participants were informed that their responses would remain undisclosed and confidential. The structured questionnaire was given to 100 employees and total of 70 surveys were returned with complete response representing a response rate of 70 percent. The demographic profile of the respondents are tabulated in Table 1

TABLE 1: Demographic profile of the respondents

Variables	Frequency	Valid Percent
Gender:		
Male	50	71.4
Female	20	28.6
Age:		
18-25 years	30	42.9
26-40 years	29	41.4
41-55 years	11	15.7
Educational Qualification		
Under Graduate	46	65.7
Post Graduate	24	34.3
Annual Income		
6-10 lakhs	51	72.9
>10 lakhs	19	27.1

Employee Engagement

Table 2: Mean Analysis of Employee Engagement

S. No	Employee Engagement	Mean	Rank
1	Intensity	5.0000	1
2	Effort	4.0143	12
3	Hardest to Perform well	5.0000	1
4	Strive Hard	4.5000	9
5	Exert Energy	4.5143	6
6	Enthusiasm	5.0000	1
7	Feel Proud	5.0000	1

8	Feel positive	4.0143	12
9	Excited	4.5000	9
10	Focused	4.5143	6
11	Attention	5.0000	1
12	Absorbed with my job	4.0143	12
13	Concentrate	4.5000	9
14	Devote	4.5143	6

Employee

engagement is

measured using the JES Scale developed by Rich et. al. (2010). The table 2 reports the mean values and the respective ranking of factors in employee engagement. The result suggests that the intensity with which the employees work, the employees take extra measure to perform their best, the enthusiasm the employees show in their job, the proud feeling of employees in working in manufacturing sector and the attention they give to the job are the major factors which lead to employee engagement in manufacturing sector. Whereas the effort they put in the job, feeling positive towards the task and getting absorbed in job while performing are the least contributing factors towards employee engagement. Overall, employees in manufacturing sector are highly engaged in their job.

Table 3: Mean analysis of POS

S.No	POS	Mean	Rank
1	Strongly Considers My Goals And Values	3.5143	1
2	Cares About My Opinions	2.7714	4
3	Willing To Help Me If I Need A Special Favor	3.5143	1
4	Help Is Available When I Have A Problem	3.5143	1
5	Forgive A Honest Mistake On My Part	2.4857	6
6	Cares About My Well-Being	2.7714	4

Perceived Organization support is measured with shorter eight item measure developed by Rhoades et al. (2001). Table 3 states the mean values and the ranks of factors contributing to Perceived Organization Support (POS). The major contributing factor is the readiness of the organization to provide help whole heartedly without any sort of hindrance, that boost up their interest in working for the organization, and they ultimately feel that the organization

cares for their well-being. Whether the organization pardons the previous mistakes done by the employees is the least contributing factor towards POS.

Table 4: Mean Analysis of Job Characteristics

S.No	Job Characteristics	Mean	Rank
1	Decide Regarding How To Do My Job	1.6857	7
2	Clear Job Goals/Objectives	2.7714	5
3	Flexibility In Schedule/Work Hours	3.5143	3
4	Balance Family/Personal Life With Work	2.7714	5
5	I Am Provided Adequate Resources	3.5143	3
6	I Have Time To Carry Out All My Work	4.5143	1
7	I Get Recognition For The Good Work	4.5143	1

Job Characteristics is measured using the scale developed by Hackman and Oldham (1980). Table 4 indicates the mean values and priority ranks of the employee towards the job they perform. The time provided to them to carry out all the work is the major factor of defining job characteristics. When the employees receive good recognition for the works they do, it motivates them to perform their best. On the other hand the least contributing factor is that the freedom provided to employees to perform their.

DATA ANALYSIS:

The study have attempted to measure the determinants of employee engagement by using regression analysis

$$\text{Employee Engagement} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ POS} + \beta_2 \text{ Job Characteristics}$$

Table 5: Coefficient values

Model No.	Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	β Coefficient	Standard Error
1	Employee Engagement	POS	.236	.130
		Job Characteristics	.496**	.164
2	Physical Engagement	POS	.236	.101
		Job Characteristics	.496**	.127
3	Affective Engagement	POS	0.003	0.164
		Job Characteristics	0.187	0.205
4	Cognitive Engagement	POS	0.004	0.058
		Job Characteristics	0.924**	0.073

Effect POS and Job Characteristics on Employee Engagement

R, the multiple correlation coefficient, specifies the significance of prediction of the predicted variable. In model 1, R value of 0.345 indicates POS and Job characteristics are good predictors of employee engagement. R², coefficient of determination, represents the level of variation in predicted variable explained by predictor variable. In this model, 11.90% of variance in employee engagement is explained by POS and Job characteristics. Job characteristics is the only significant ($p < 0.000$) predictor of employee engagement with beta value of 0.496 which means Job characteristics is a positive predictor of employee engagement. Whereas POS failed to predict Employee engagement.

Effect POS and Job Characteristics on Physical Engagement

R, the multiple correlation coefficient, specifies the significance of prediction of the criterion variable. In model 2, R value of 0.375 indicates POS and Job characteristics are good predictors of physical engagement. R², coefficient of determination, represents the level of variation in criterion variable explained by covariate variable. In this model, 13.90% of variance in physical engagement is explained by POS and Job characteristics. Job characteristics is the only significant ($p < 0.000$) predictor of physical engagement with beta value of 0.496 which means Job characteristics is a positive predictor of physical engagement. POS continue to be an insignificant predictor.

Effect POS and Job Characteristics on Affective Engagement

In Model 3, the values are insignificant and hence the whole model is not significant. Hence POS and Job characteristics do not predict Affective engagement. This maybe because the task characteristics and support extended by the organization do not affect the emotional regards of employees towards the organization.

Effect POS and Job Characteristics on Cognitive Engagement

R, the multiple correlation coefficient, specifies the significance of prediction of the criterion variable. In model 4, R value of 0.920 indicates POS and Job characteristics are good predictors of cognitive engagement. R², coefficient of determination, represents the level of

variation in criterion variable explained by covariate variable. In this model, 84.70% of variance in cognitive engagement is explained by POS and Job characteristics. Job characteristics is the only significant ($p < 0.000$) predictor of cognitive engagement with beta value of 0.924 which means Job characteristics is a positive predictor of cognitive engagement. POS continue to be an insignificant predictor.

CONCLUSION:

There are many things that we can change in the organization, while it comes to Manufacturing Company, the employees will be dealing with the machines and they will be highly tuned to work with the machines. For a time being lot more has to come out for the employees to stay in the organization for longer period. The employees should boost up themselves for the everyday challenge. The employees should be flexible to get the task done. Employee engagement is very much important for every company to maintain the harmony between the employees in the organization and to yield the best out of them. This study is highly beneficial for future researchers. Through this study, we shall comprehend that job Characteristics is very much important for the employee engagement in any organization. This study is mainly helpful for the improvisation of any activities in the organization. Job Characteristics is one of the most important things in achieving employee engagement in a company and goals because the company's main driving factor is employees. Employee engagement refers to the energy that employees have to be directed to organizational goals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Blessing White. (2008). The Employee Engagement Equation in India. Presented by BlessingWhite and HR Anxi. [Online] Available: www.blessingwhite.com (November 15, 2008)
- Coffman C. (2000). Is Your Company Bleeding Talent? How to become a true “employer of choice”. The Gallup Management Journal, 2000. The Gallup Organization, Princeton, NJ
- Dernovsek, D. (2008). Creating highly engaged and committed employee starts at the top and ends at the bottom line. *Credit Union Magazine*, 5.
- Development Dimensions International. (2005). (Predicting Employee Engagement MRKSRR12-1005 Development Dimensions International, Inc., MMV. [Online] Available:www.ddiworld.com (October 30,2008)

- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of applied psychology*, 75(1), 51.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 71(3), 500.
- Ellis C. M., and Sorensen A. (2007). Assessing Employee Engagement: The Key to Improving Productivity. Perspectives, vol .15, Issue 1 The Segal Group, Inc.
- Erickson, T.J. (2005). Testimony submitted before the US Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labour and Pensions, May 26.
- Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human resource management review*, 21(2), 123-136.
- Hackman, J.R. and Oldham, G.R. (1980), *Work Redesign*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Inceoglu, I., &Warr, P. (2011). Personality and job engagement. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*.
- Kahn, W.A. (1992), "To be full there: psychological presence at work", *Human Relations*, Vol. 45, pp. 321-49.
- Macey W.H and Schneider B. (2008). The Meaning of Employee Engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1 (2008), 3-30.
- Markos, S., &Sridevi, M. S. (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. *International journal of business and management*, 5(12), 89.
- Markos, S., &Sridevi, M. S. (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. *International journal of business and management*, 5(12), 89.
- Mone, E. M., & London, M. (2010). *Employee engagement through effective performance management: A practical guide for managers*. New York: Routledge
- Rhoades, L., &Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(4), 698.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., &Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(5), 825.
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of management journal*, 53(3), 617-635.
- Robinson D., Perryman S., and Hayday S. (2004). *The Drivers of Employee Engagement Report 408*, Institute for Employment Studies, UK
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.