

Determinants Of Employee Engagement Among Health Care Professional In Puducherry

S. Robin* and Dr. C. Kumaran**
and Dr. S. Praveen Kumar***

*Ph.D. (Part-Time) Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Chidambaram Tamil Nadu – 608 002.

**Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Chidambaram Tamil Nadu – 608 002.

***Co-Guide, Professor and Head, School of Management Studies, BIHER, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

Abstract

Employees engagement is the extent that an employees believes in the mission, purpose and values of an organization. Thus, this study aimed to analyses the factors influencing the employees engagement. There are lot factors influencing the employees engagement. However, this research, work inventory, self efficacy, organizational support, job characteristics and organizational justice are the factors considered as the determinants of employees engagement. The determinants variables are taken as the independent variable and employees engagement taken as the dependent variable. For above said variables structured questionnaire has been constructed based on this previous research work available in the area. Questionnaire has been used to collect the primary data. Descriptive type of research is applied. Convenience sampling technique is used to select the sample size. 200 health care professional such as doctors, nurses and paramedical staff have been approached for primary data collection. The collected data are analysed with correlation and regression. The results shows that work inventory, self efficacy, organizational justice have been related and influenced the health care professional job engagement.

Keywords : Employees engagement, work inventory, self-efficacy, organizational support, job characteristics,

organizational justice.

Introduction

Employee engagement has become a popular term in recent times. Employee engagement can be found in practitioner journals where it has its basis in practice rather than theory and empirical research. There has been surprisingly little academic and empirical research on a topic that has become so popular. As a result, employee engagement has the appearance of being somewhat faddish or what some might call, old wine in a new bottle (Robinson et al., 2004).

Employee engagement has been defined in many different ways and the definitions and measures often sound like other better known and established constructs like organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (Robinson, et al, 2004).

Rothbard (2001) defines engagement as psychological presence but goes further to state that it involves two critical components. Such as attention and absorption. Attention refers to cognitive availability and the amount of time one spends thinking about a role. Absorption means being engrossed in a role and refers to the intensity of one's focus on a role. Employee engagement is the extent that an employee believes in the mission, purpose and values of an organization and demonstrates that commitment through their actions as an employee and their attitude towards the employer and customers. Employee engagement is high when the statements and conversations held reflect a natural enthusiasm for the company, its employees and the products or services provided.

Review of Literature

Tiwari and Lenka (2016) psychological safety as an employees ability to work freely without any anxiety or fear of retribution to career, status and self-image. It is that there is direct impact of psychological safety on employee engagement and commitment to the organization.

Priyadarshni Nidan (2016) mentioned that worker engagement drivers have an effect on the motivation and performance of staff sector. There are many factors that

influence the worker performance and motivation within the organization. However worker engagement play a vital role in achieving organizational objective, building effective work groups, healthy social relationships among coworkers and managers and conducive atmosphere in the organization that enhance motivation and results in better organizational performance.

Bailey et al. (2017) distinguished five groups of engagements determinants such as leadership, job design, team and organizational factors, organizational interventions, and psychological states. Engagement was found to be positively associated with four work-related aspects namely individual morale, individual task performance, organizational performance and extra-role performance.

Jena et al. (2017) understand the linkage between trust, employee engagement, transformational leadership and wellbeing at work place. It is found that there is positive linkage between trust, transformational leadership and wellbeing with meaningful engagement.

Saks and Gruman (2017) stated that there is a clear trend toward recognizing that HRM practitioners need to move beyond the routine administration of annual engagement surveys and need to embed engagement in HRM policies and practices such personnel selection, socialization, performance management and training and development.

Steidle et al. (2017) found that respite interventions helped employees replenish and build energy resources at work and using a non randomized, matched control group, pre-test, post-test design showed that a participatory action intervention increased work engagement in nursing staff.

Akhavan Sarraf et al. (2017) proves that there are significant inequalities in employee engagement levels between generations, and also that individual engagement constructs can differ based on employees' age. As a result, effective management of employee engagement can lead not only to its growth in all workers' age groups, but also reduce the common lack of mutual understanding between generations in their approach to work and expectations toward employer.

Sahu, et al. (2018) suggested that transformational leadership and employer branding is mediated by employee

engagement. Transformational leadership, employee engagement, employer branding, and psychological attachment were assessed in an empirical study based on a sample of 405 full-time employees working in information technology (IT) organizations in India. The results reveal that transformational leadership style directly influences employee intention to leave. Transformational leadership and employer branding is mediated by employee engagement. The leadership relation with psychological attachment is mediated by employer branding.

Sasmita Choudhury and Manoj Kumar Mohanty (2018) stated that employee engagement is associated with many desirable outcomes such as job satisfaction, intention to stay, high productivity, job performance and customer satisfaction.

Vidya Shree and Lucas (2019) stated that employee engagement practices in an organization has increased as the companies tend to work with a global workforce. Organizations are on look for people who are generally enthusiastic about their work and to come to work regularly.

Research Problem

People are the primary source of competitive advantage. If the people or employees of the organization can be effectively engaged then achieving the organizational goals becomes an easy task. The widely-used term employee engagement, embraces two attempts of management, motivating the employees and focusing their commitment to achieve the organizational objectives. Engagement at work was conceptualized as the 'harnessing of organizational members' selves to their work roles. In engagement people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during role performances.

Different resources will be linked to engagement. The researcher formulated the research question such as what organisational variables are linked to these phenomena. The main research problem concerns identifying the nature of the interrelation to engagement. It is also assume that engagement is correlated with each other as are independent constructs.

Objectives of the study

This study aimed to investigate the employee opinion towards determinants of job engagement in health care sector at Puducherry.

Hypotheses of the study

H₁ : Determinants of engagement have been related to employees engagement.

H₂: Determinants of engagement have been influenced the employees engagement.

Research Methodology

Type of Research

Descriptive research type is applied for this research work.

Variable considered for this study.

Meaningful work, intrinsic reward, extrinsic reward, self efficacy, perceived organizational support, supervisory support, co-worker support, job autonomy, job security, job feedback, procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, showing genuine concern, enabling, being open and accessible and physical environment are considered as the independent variable, employee engagements, such as cognitive, affective and behavioural are taken as depending variable.

Sampling Procedure

This study health care profession such a doctors, nurses and paramedical staff are considered as population, from this population 200 sample respondents taken as sample size through convenience sampling on previous research work. Questionnaire have been distributed to the sample respondents.

Statistical Tools Used

Pearson correlation and regression analysis have been applied to that the stated hypothesis.

Results and Discussion

The researcher presents the profile of the employees, employee perception towards the study variables, factors influencing drivers for employee engagement.

Table -1 : Relationship between employee engagement factors and cognitive engagement

Employee engagement factor	Cognitive engagement	
	r- value	P-value
Meaningful Work	0.930	0.001*
Intrinsic Rewards	0.686	0.001*
Extrinsic Rewards	0.773	0.001*
Self-efficacy	0.758	0.001*
Perceived Organizational Support	0.882	0.001*
Supervisory Support	0.960	0.001*
Co-worker Support	0.903	0.001*
Job Autonomy	0.902	0.001*
Job Security	0.885	0.001*
Job Feedback	0.934	0.001*
Procedural Justice	0.863	0.001*
Distributive Justice	0.833	0.001*
Interpersonal Justice	0.887	0.001*
Informational Justice	0.913	0.001*
Showing Genuine Concern	0.901	0.001*
Enabling	0.859	0.001*
Being Open and Accessible	0.927	0.001*
Physical Environment	0.835	0.001*

Source: Primary data computed.

*Significant at One percent level

It is hypothesized of employee engagement factors such as meaningful work intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, supervisory support, co-worker support, job autonomy, job security, job feedback, procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, showing genuine concern, enabling, being open and accessible, physical environment are having relationship with cognitive engagement factors of employees.

Pearson correlation test was applied to verify the above stated hypothesis. The result is posted in the table -1. The calculated R-values are between 0.686 and 0.960. The P-

values are found to be 0.001, which are significant at one percent level. Hence, the stated hypothesis is rejected.

It is inferred that employee engagement factors are having the relationship with employee cognitive engagement factors. From r-values, it is observed that the supervisory support is having strong (0.960) and positive relationship with cognitive engagement in employee followed by, job feedback (0.934), meaningful work (0.930), being open and accessible (0.927), informational justice (0.913), co-worker support (0.903), job autonomy (0.902), showing genuine concern (0.927), interpersonal justice (0.887), job security (0.855), perceived organizational support (0.882), procedural justice (0.863), enabling (0.859), physical environment (0.835), distributive justice (0.833), extrinsic rewards (0.773), self-efficacy (0.758) and intrinsic rewards (0.686).

Table -2 : Relationship between employee engagement factors and affective engagement

Employee engagement factors	Affective engagement	
	r- Value	P-value
Meaningful Work	0.841	0.001*
Intrinsic Rewards	0.798	0.001*
Extrinsic Rewards	0.773	0.001*
Self-efficacy	0.772	0.001*
Perceived Organizational Support	0.947	0.001*
Supervisory Support	0.979	0.001*
Co - worker Support	0.895	0.001*
Job Autonomy	0.965	0.001*
Job security	0.892	0.001*
Job Feedback	0.976	0.001*
Procedural Justice	0.943	0.001*
Distributive Justice	0.833	0.001*
Interpersonal Justice	0.885	0.001*
Informational Justice	0.925	0.001*
Showing Genuine Concern	0.964	0.001*
Enabling	0.958	0.001*

Being Open and Accessible	0.952	0.001*
Physical Environment	0.872	0.001*

Source: Primary data computed.

*Significant at One percent level

It is hypothesized that employee engagement factors such as meaningful work intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, supervisory support, co-worker support, job autonomy, job security, job feedback, procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, showing genuine concern, enabling, being open and accessible, physical environment are not having relationship with affective engagement factors of employees.

Pearson correlation test was applied to verify the above stated hypothesis. The result is posted in the table -2. The calculated R-values are between 0.772 and 0.979. The P-values are found to be 0.001, which are significant at one percent level. Hence, the stated hypothesis is rejected.

It is inferred that employee engagement factors are having the relationship with employee affective engagement factors. From r-values, it is observed that the supervisory support is having strong (0.979) and positive relationship with affective engagement in employee followed by, job feedback (0.976), showing genuine concern (0.964), job autonomy (0.965), showing genuine concern (0.964), enabling (0.958), being open and accessible (0.952), perceived organizational support (0.947), procedural justice (0.943), informational justice (0.925), co-worker support (0.895), interpersonal justice (0.885), physical environment (872), meaningful work (0.841), distributive justice (0.833), intrinsic rewards (0.798), extrinsic rewards (0.773) and self-efficacy (0.772).

Table – 3 : Employee engagement factors and Behavioural engagement

Employee engagement factors	Behavioural engagement	
	r- Value	P-value
Meaningful Work	0.757	0.001*
Intrinsic Rewards	0.647	0.001*

Extrinsic Rewards	0.615	0.001*
Self-efficacy	0.630	0.001*
Perceived Organizational Support	0.888	0.001*
Supervisory support	0.896	0.001*
Co worker Support	0.743	0.001*
Job Autonomy	0.966	0.001*
Job security	0.766	0.001*
Job Feedback	0.897	0.001*
Procedural Justice	0.965	0.001*
Distributive Justice	0.649	0.001*
Interpersonal Justice	0.734	0.001*
Informational Justice	0.852	0.001*
Showing Genuine Concern	0.972	0.001*
Enabling	0.881	0.001*
Being Open and Accessible	0.962	0.001*
Physical Environment	0.695	0.001*

Source: Primary data computed.

*Significant at One percent level

It is hypothesized that employee engagement factors such as meaningful work intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, supervisory support, co-worker support, job autonomy, job security, job feedback, procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, showing genuine concern, enabling, being open and accessible, physical environment are having relationship with behavioral engagement factors of employees.

Pearson correlation test was applied to verify the above stated hypothesis. The result is posted in the table - 3. The calculated R-values are between 0.772 and 0.979. The P-values are found to be 0.001, which are significant at one percent level. Hence, the stated hypothesis is rejected.

It is inferred that employee engagement factors are having the relationship with employee behavioral engagement factors. From r-values, it is observed that the employee genuine concern is having strong (0.972) and positive relationship with behavioral engagement in

employee followed by, job autonomy (0.966) procedural justice (0.965), being open and accessible (0.962), job feedback (0.897), supervisory support (0.896), perceived organizational support (0.888), enabling (0.881), informational justice (0.852), job security (0.766), meaningful work (0.757), co-worker support (0.743), interpersonal justice (0.734), physical environment (0.695), distributive justice (0.649), intrinsic rewards (0.674), self-efficacy (0.630) and extrinsic rewards (0.615).

Table – 4 : Employee engagement factor on cognitive engagement

Model summary	R	R ²	Adj R ²	F-value	P-value
	0.997	0.994	0.914	4192.634	0.001*

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-Value	P-value
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	0.216	0.024	--	-8.838	0.001*
Meaningful Work	0.732	0.035	0.738	20.985	0.001*
Intrinsic Rewards	0.591	0.052	0.540	11.461	0.001*
Extrinsic Rewards	-0.069	0.082	-0.058	-0.847	0.397**
Self-efficacy	0.286	0.114	0.238	2.517	0.012*
Organizational Support	-1.409	0.151	-1.108	-9.334	0.001*
Supervisory Support	0.611	0.115	0.560	5.291	0.001*
Co-worker Support	0.557	0.064	0.531	8.668	0.001*
Job Autonomy	-0.217	0.125	-0.191	-1.733	0.084*
Job security	-0.550	0.064	-0.502	-8.612	0.001*
Job Feedback	2.184	0.185	1.774	11.788	0.001*
Procedural Justice	-0.432	0.091	-0.383	-4.752	0.001*
Distributive Justice	0.047	0.057	0.042	0.824	0.410**
Interpersonal Justice	-1.286	0.107	-1.177	-12.079	0.001*
Informational Justice	-0.148	0.048	-0.122	-3.119	0.002*
Showing Genuine Concern	-0.754	0.188	-0.682	-4.017	0.001*
Enabling	0.521	0.064	0.434	8.099	0.001*
Being Open and Accessible	0.960	0.065	0.896	14.684	0.001*

Physical Environment	-0.586	0.057	-0.503	-10.339	0.001*
----------------------	--------	-------	--------	---------	--------

Source: Primary data computed. *Significant at One percent level **Significant at five percent level

It is hypothesised that employee engagement factors have influencing the cognitive engagement factors in the chemical company employees. In order to examine the above stated hypothesis, linear regression is applied. Here, employee engagement factors namely meaningful work intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, supervisory support, co-worker support, job autonomy, job security, job feedback, procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, showing genuine concern, enabling, being open and accessible, physical environment factors have been taken as influencing variables. Employee engagement due to cognitive engagement has been taken as a dependent variable. Further, linear regression analysis has been carried out. The result is displayed in the table - 4. From the regression model summary result, the calculated adjusted R^2 value is found to be 0.994. Corresponding F-value is 4192.634, which is significant at one percent level (0.001). It shows that regression model is fit. From this information, it is inferred that independent variables such as employee engagement factors namely meaningful work intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, supervisory support, co-worker support, job autonomy, job security, job feedback, procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, showing genuine concern, enabling, being open and accessible, physical environment are influencing the cognitive engagement employees in chemical companies , Where, adjusted R^2 value indicates that independent variables significantly influenced the employee cognitive engagement factors at 99.4 percent level. Further the regression coefficient value indicates the strength of relationship between the independent variables and dependent variable. This is expressed by the following equation:

Cognitive Engagement = constant (0.216) + Job feedback (2.184) + being open and accessible (0.960) + meaningful work (0.732) + Supervisor support (0.611)+ intrinsic rewards

(0.591) + co-worker support (0.557) + enabling (0.521) + self-efficacy (0.286) + distributive justice (0.047) -organizational support (1.409) - interpersonal justice (1.286) – showing genuine concern (0.754) - physical environment (0.586) - job security (0.550) - procedural justice (0.432), job autonomy (0.217) - informational justice (0.148) - extrinsic rewards (0.069).

From the regression equation, it is inferred that Job feedback, open accessible, meaningful work, supervisor support, intrinsic rewards, co-worker support, enabling, self-efficacy, distributive justice are positively influenced the drivers of employee engagement in the chemical industries. But, organization support, interpersonal justice, showing genuine concern, physical environment, job security, procedural justice, autonomy, informational justice and extrinsic rewards are negatively influenced the drivers of employee engagement in the chemical industries in case of cognitive engagement of the chemical company. However, distributive justice does not influenced the drivers of employee engagement in the chemical industries in case of cognitive engagement of the chemical company. Further in the regression equation, the unstandardised beta coefficient explains the relative importance of each independent variable on the dependent variable. From the beta value, it is inferred that to have one unit increase or decrease in the drivers of employee engagement in the chemical industries in case of cognitive engagement of the chemical company. To have one unit increase in the cognitive engagement, job feedback is influenced at 2.184 level, while other factors remains constant.

Table – 5 :Effect of employee engagement factor on Affective Engagement

Model summary	R	R ²	Adj R ²	F-value	P-value
	0.999	0.997	0.917	4735.444	0.001*

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-Value	P-Value
	B	Std. Error	Beta		

(Constant)	0.002	0.014	--	-0.125	0.100*
Meaningful Work	0.267	0.021	0.318	13.026	0.001*
Intrinsic Rewards	0.013	0.030	0.014	0.425	0.671**
Extrinsic Rewards	-0.051	0.048	-0.050	-1.050	0.294*
Self-efficacy	0.164	0.067	0.161	2.457	0.014*
Organizational Support	0.209	0.089	0.194	2.349	0.019*
Supervisory support	0.357	0.068	0.386	5.254	0.001*
Co-worker Support	0.286	0.038	0.322	7.579	0.001*
Job Autonomy	-0.247	0.074	-0.257	-3.360	0.001*
Job security	-0.328	0.038	-0.354	-8.742	0.001*
Job Feedback	0.865	0.109	0.828	7.932	0.001*
Procedural Justice	-0.534	0.053	-0.558	-9.985	0.001*
Distributive Justice	-0.278	0.034	-0.289	-8.246	0.001*
Interpersonal Justice	-0.328	0.063	-0.353	-5.226	0.001*
Informational Justice	-0.174	0.028	-0.168	-6.214	0.001*
Genuine Concern	0.076	0.110	0.081	0.689	0.491*
Enabling	0.833	0.038	0.818	22.000	0.001*
Open and Accessible	0.188	0.038	0.207	4.878	0.001*
Physical Environment	-0.324	0.033	-0.328	-9.715	0.001*

Source: Primary data computed. *Significant at One percent level **Significant at five percent level

It is hypothesised that employee engagement factors have influencing the affective engagement factors in the chemical company employees. In order to examine the above stated hypothesis, linear regression is applied. Here, employee engagement factors namely meaningful work intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, supervisory support, co-worker support, job autonomy, job security, job feedback, procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, showing genuine concern, enabling, being open and accessible, physical environment factors have been taken as influencing variables. Employee engagement due to affective engagement has been taken as a dependent variable. Further, linear regression analysis has been carried out. The result is displayed in the table - 5. From the regression model summary result, the calculated adjusted R^2 value is found to be 0.997. Corresponding F-value is 4735.444, which is significant at one percent level (0.001). It shows that regression model is fit. From this information, it is

inferred that independent variables such as employee engagement factors namely meaningful work intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, supervisory support, co-worker support, job autonomy, job security, job feedback, procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, showing genuine concern, enabling, being open and accessible, physical environment are influencing the affective engagement employees in chemical companies. Where, adjusted R^2 value indicates that independent variables significantly influenced the employee affective engagement factors at 99.7 percent level. Further the regression coefficient value indicates the strength of relationship between the independent variables and dependent variable. This is expressed by the following equation:

Affective engagement level = constant (0.02) + Job feedback (0.865) + enabling (0.833) + supervisor support (0.357) + co-worker support (0.286) + meaningful work (0.267) + organizational support (0.209) + open accessible (0.184) + self-efficacy (0.164) + good concern (0.076) + intrinsic reward (0.013) - Procedural Justice (0.543) - Job security (0.328) - Interpersonal Justice (0.328) - Physical Environment (0.324) - distributive justice (0.278) - Informational Justice (0.174) - extrinsic rewards (0.051).

From the regression equation, it is inferred that Job feedback, enabling, supervisor support, co-worker support, meaningful work, organizational support, open accessible, self-efficacy, good concern, intrinsic reward are positively influenced the drivers of employee engagement in the chemical industries. But, Procedural Justice, Job security, Interpersonal Justice, Physical Environment, distributive justice, Informational Justice, extrinsic rewards are negatively influenced the drivers of employee engagement in the chemical industries in case of affective engagement of the chemical company. However, distributive justice does not influenced the drivers of employee engagement in the chemical industries in case of affective engagement of the chemical company. Further in the regression equation, the unstandardised beta coefficient explains the relative importance of each independent variable on the dependent variable. From the beta value, it is inferred that to have one

unit increase or decrease in the drivers of employee engagement in the chemical industries in case of affective engagement of the chemical company. To have one unit increase in the affective engagement, job feedback is influenced at 0.865 level, while other factors remains constant.

Table – 6 : Effect of employee engagement on Behavioural engagement

Model summary	R	R ²	Adj R ²	F-value	P-value
	0.997	0.995	0.992	4823.068	0.001*

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-Value	P-Value
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	0.104	0.021	--	4.891	0.001*
Meaningful Work	0.006	0.030	0.007	0.214	0.831**
Intrinsic Rewards	-0.047	0.045	-0.047	-1.061	0.289**
Extrinsic Rewards	0.472	0.071	0.423	6.661	0.001*
Self-efficacy	-0.253	0.098	-0.227	-2.573	0.010*
Organizational Support	0.010	0.131	0.008	0.073	0.942**
Supervisory support	0.591	0.100	0.584	5.915	0.001*
Co-worker Support	-0.288	0.056	-0.296	-5.176	0.001*
Job Autonomy	-0.264	0.108	-0.250	-2.435	0.015*
Job security	0.303	0.055	0.299	5.486	0.001*
Job Feedback	0.605	0.160	0.530	3.773	0.001*
Procedural Justice	0.107	0.079	0.102	1.363	0.174**
Distributive Justice	-0.487	0.050	-0.462	-9.823	0.001*
Interpersonal Justice	-0.151	0.092	-0.148	-1.633	0.103*
Informational Justice	-0.250	0.041	-0.221	-6.076	0.001*
Genuine Concern	-0.294	0.162	-0.287	-1.810	0.071*
Enabling	0.697	0.056	0.626	12.519	0.001*
Open and Accessible	0.684	0.057	0.688	12.088	0.001*
Physical Environment	-0.480	0.049	-0.444	-9.786	0.001*

Source: Primary data computed. *Significant at One percent level **Significant at five percent level

It is hypothesised that employee engagement factors have influencing the behavioural engagement factors in the chemical company employees. In order to examine the above

stated hypothesis, linear regression is applied. Here, employee engagement factors namely meaningful work intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, supervisory support, co-worker support, job autonomy, job security, job feedback, procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, showing genuine concern, enabling, being open and accessible, physical environment factors have been taken as influencing variables. Employee engagement due to behavioral engagement has been taken as a dependent variable. Further, linear regression analysis has been carried out. The result is displayed in the table - 6. From the regression model summary result, the calculated adjusted R^2 value is found to be 0.997. Corresponding F-value is 4735.444, which is significant at one percent level (0.001). It shows that regression model is fit. From this information, it is inferred that independent variables such as employee engagement factors namely meaningful work intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, supervisory support, co-worker support, job autonomy, job security, job feedback, procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, showing genuine concern, enabling, being open and accessible, physical environment are influencing the affective engagement employees in chemical companies. Where, adjusted R^2 value indicates that independent variables significantly influenced the employee behavioral engagement factors at 99.7 percent level. Further the regression coefficient value indicates the strength of relationship between the independent variables and dependent variable. This is expressed by the following equation:

Behavioral engagement level = constant (0.02) + Job feedback (0.865) + enabling (0.833) + supervisor support (0.357) + co-worker support (0.286) + meaningful work (0.267) + organizational support (0.209) + open accessible (0.184) + self-efficacy (0.164) + good concern (0.076) + intrinsic reward (0.013) - Procedural Justice (0.543) - Job security (0.328) - Interpersonal Justice (0.328) - Physical Environment (0.324) - distributive justice (0.278) - Informational Justice (0.174) - extrinsic rewards (0.051).

From the regression equation, it is inferred that Job feedback, enabling, supervisor support, co-worker support, meaningful work, organizational support, open accessible, self-efficacy, good concern, intrinsic reward are positively influenced the drivers of employee engagement in the chemical industries. But, Procedural Justice, Job security, Interpersonal Justice, Physical Environment, distributive justice, Informational Justice, extrinsic rewards are negatively influenced the drivers of employee engagement in the chemical industries in case of behavioral engagement of the chemical company. However, distributive justice does not influenced the drivers of employee engagement in the chemical industries in case of behavioral engagement of the chemical company. Further in the regression equation, the unstandardised beta coefficient explains the relative importance of each independent variable on the dependent variable. From the beta value, it is inferred that to have one unit increase or decrease in the drivers of employee engagement in the chemical industries in case of behavioral engagement of the chemical company. To have one unit increase in the behavioral engagement, job feedback is influenced at 0.865 level, while other factors remains constant.

Findings

- Supervisory support, job feedback, meaningful work and being open and accessible factors are having strong relationship with employee cognitive engagement factors. However, distributive justice, extrinsic rewards, self-efficacy and intrinsic rewards factors are having weak relationship with employee cognitive engagement factors.
- Supervisory support, job feedback, meaningful work and being open and accessible factors are having strong relationship with employee cognitive engagement factors. However, distributive justice, extrinsic rewards, self-efficacy and intrinsic rewards factors are having weak relationship with employee affective engagement factors.
- Employee genuine concern, supervisory support, job feedback, meaningful work and being open and

accessible factors are having strong relationship with employee cognitive engagement factors. However, distributive justice, extrinsic rewards, self-efficacy and intrinsic rewards factors are having weak relationship with employee behavioral engagement factors.

- It is inferred that job feedback, open accessible and meaningful work are the factors which influence the drivers of cognitive engagement.
- It is noted that job feedback, enabling and supervisor supportive the factors which influence the drivers of in the chemical industries in case of affective engagement.
- It is inferred that job feedback, enabling and supervisor support are the factors which influence the drivers of behavioral engagement.

Conclusion

This research aimed to analyses the determinants of employees engagement. The result shows that job autonomy, organizational support, justice, leader behavior have been determines the employee engagement. So, engagement is a perception that places conveneous improvement, changes and flexibility at the empathy of what it means. Engagement is a conditions of intellectual and emotional pledge to group that will assist accomplish on organization.

References

- Ahmad Reza Akhavan Sarraf, Mehdi Abzari, Ali Nasr Isfahani and Saeed Fathi, 2017. Generational differences in job engagement: a case study of an industrial organization in Iran. *Industrial and Commercial Training* 49(3):106-115.
- Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2017). The Meaning, Antecedents and Outcomes of Employee Engagement: A Narrative Synthesis. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19, 31-53.
- Binita Tiwari and Usha Lenka, 2016. Building psychological safety for employee engagement in post-recession. *Development and Learning in Organizations* 30(1):19-22.
- Lalatendu Kesari Jena, Sajeet Pradhan and Np Panigrahy, 2018. Pursuit of Organisational Trust: Role of Employee Engagement, Psychological Well-being and Transformational Leadership. *Asia Pacific Management Review* 22(3):1-17.

- Manoj Kumar Mohanty and Sasmita Choudhury, 2018. Employee Engagement and Productivity – Linking connectivity from manufacturing industry perspective. *Research Review International Journal of Multidisciplinary*, 3, 592-602.
- Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2021). Employee engagement. In V. I. Sessa and N. A. Bowling (Eds.), *Essentials of job attitudes and other workplace psychological constructs* (pp. 242–271).
- Sangeeta Sahu, Avinash Pathardikar and Anupam Kumar, 2018. Transformational leadership and turnover: Mediating effects of employee engagement, employer branding, and psychological attachment. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 39(31):82-99.
- Steidle, A., Gonzalez-Morales, M. G., Hoppe, A., Michel, A., & O'shea, D. (2017). Energizing respites from work: A randomized controlled study on respite interventions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(5), 650–662.
- Vidya Shree and Lucas, 2019. Effective employee engagement in workplace. *International journal of applied management and technology*, 16(1), 192-208.