

## EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: A STUDY OF TELECOM INDUSTRY

Dr.Meenakshi Sharma

Associate Professor-Tecnia Institute of Advanced Studies, New Delhi

### ABSTRACT

*Employee engagement correlates to employee performance. The present study investigated employee engagement and commitment level of telecom sector employees in New Delhi and NCR. Three hundred (300) employees of three different organizations of New Delhi and NCR were sampled. Descriptive statistics consisted of mean and standard deviation in order to have a clear picture of study variables. Pearson product correlation, independent t-test and ANOVA were the statistical tools used in analyzing the data collected. The findings of the study revealed that employees of telecom sector have a low level of employee engagement and commitment and there is a significant positive relationship between employee engagement and employee commitment. With regard to the demographic characteristics of the employees, experience and income significantly influenced employee engagement and commitment. The findings of the study are discussed with reference to the reviewed literature. The present study points out the need for employees to be provided with resources and freedom needed to perform their work roles since it has consequential effects on employee engagement and organizational commitment.*

**Keyword head:** Employee engagement, Organizational commitment, Telecom industry, Demographic characteristics, Gallup organization.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Employee engagement has emerged as a significant driver of business success in today's competitive marketplace. Not only does engagement have the potential to considerably affect employee retention, productivity and loyalty, it is also a link to customer satisfaction, company reputation and stakeholder value. Thus, to gain a spirited edge, organizations are turning to HR to set the plan for employee engagement and commitment.

Employee Engagement is the height of commitment and involvement an employee has toward his organization. It is the optimistic attitude held by the employees towards the organizations and its values. (Mone and London 2010) employee engagement is "a state of employee who feels involved, committed, and passionate and demonstrates those feelings in job behavior". Engagement is linked to three critical forces in the organization - Attrition, Productivity & Profitability.

Organizational commitment is the extent to which an individual identifies with an organization and is dedicated to its goals. While employee engagement refers to an employee's loyalty and commitment to his job, organizational commitment refers to an employee's loyalty and dedication to his organization.. When employees are engaged in their work, they are not only proud of their work they do but of the work their colleagues, managers, and the company itself does.

### Employee Engagement and commitment- An Essential tool for Employee Retention in Telecom industry

**The exponential growth of the Telecom industry is supported by three strong pillars that lend themselves, in creating business excellence, latest technological advances and an unmatched intellectual capital. These are - employee engagement, innovation and leadership.** In the face of increasing competition for talent, while companies spread out and

grow within India and abroad, it has become increasingly essential to ensure one's existing employees are fully engaged, integrated and feel invested in developing a career with their employer.

Employee engagement is fast becoming the newest mantra for HR managers, CEOs and company executives. It is, however, a focus that has always been in existence and describes the true fabric and identity of a company. Whether an employee is truly engaged or not is determined by a few elements that make up the workplace.

## **2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

**Sreekanth and Aryasri (2013)** talked about the factors influencing employee engagement practices in IT Industry. Data was collected from 67 employees based on convenience and snowball sampling from IT companies situated in Hyderabad and listed in NASSCOM. The hypotheses were tested using SPSS software. Data was analyzed and it was found that in the IT division at all levels, employees do exercise independence. Results of the study showed that an excellent compensation plan, clearness in communication and participative decision making are the factors that are believed to infuse employee engagement.

**Tiwari (2013)** explored the level of organizational commitment in employees and reasons influencing commitment as they play a major role in the blueprint of employee development programs. The author concluded that organizational commitment is the willingness of an employee to stay and endeavor for an organization in the long run and organizations today are looking for proficient workforce and are willing to invest considerable efforts and money to preserve talented employees

**Thakur (2014)** studied about the employee engagement and the effect of Employee Engagement on Job Satisfaction in IT Sector. Descriptive research design was used in this research. The Sample size was of 120 individual comprising of employees of IT sector. Non probability sampling technique was used and Regression Analysis and Correlation Analysis was used for data analysis. The study was carried out on officers as well as the clerks of IT sector. The findings of the study showed that there is positive relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction in IT sector and employee engagement effect positively on job satisfaction. It can also be concluded that work motivation can be improved through increasing job authority and accountability and at the clerical level and rewards and sanctions are significantly associated with job involvement

**Kaliannanand Adjovu (2015)** explored the strengths and weaknesses of employee engagement strategies implemented by a telecommunication organisation in Ghana. Quantitative research approach was adopted with 137 completed responses. Mean, percentages, Pearson correlation, t test and ANOVA were used. The findings of the research showed that the engagement strategies deployed by the organization has achieved a satisfactory level which in turn indicated that all the engagement strategies of the company are in good shape and more vibrant which is why the company has an unparalleled performance in its industry of operation. The data analysis revealed the 'work environment' as the least effective engagement strategy and therefore there are areas of improvement that can be established to integrate the talent management with overall organisational corporate strategies.

## **3. NEED OF THE STUDY**

Despite evidence of how disparaging disengagement can be, studies from the human services field on the opposite condition, engagement, are limited. Surprisingly slight academic and empirical research has been conducted. To address this trouble, more research that focuses explicitly on the engagement and commitment levels of employees is necessary. Empirical data are needed so professionals can better comprehend employee engagement and use what they learn about it to develop executive interventions and alternative strategies that promote engagement for human services workers

#### **4. OBJECTIVES**

- To find out the extent of employee engagement of telecom sector employees in Delhi and NCR.
- To find out the extent of employee commitment of telecom sector employees in Delhi and NCR.
- To study the relationship between employee engagement and commitment.
- To find out the impact of income on employee engagement and commitment level of employees
- To find out the impact of length of service on employee engagement and commitment level of employees

#### **5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The study is designed as descriptive and analytical in nature since it attempts to obtain a complete and accurate description of a situation. The methodology utilized in this research is of quantitative nature.

##### **5.1 Sampling technique**

The sampling unit of the present study was telecom industry located in New Delhi and NCR. The industries selected for the study were BhartiAirtel, Vodafone and Tata communications. Respondents for the Study were made up of 300 employees from three different organizations. Non probability sampling technique i.e. convenience sampling was used to select respondents from targeted group

##### **5.2 Construction of questionnaire**

A three section standardized questionnaire was used. The questionnaire used for the study comprises of 32 items categorized into three parts namely employee engagement (12 items), organizational commitment (15 items) and demographic characteristics (4 items).

The first part relates to the employee engagement (Gallup organizations (G12) questionnaire) of the employees, the second part comprises of organizational commitment (Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) by Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979)). and the third part consist of the demographic characteristics of the employees.

##### **5.3 Collection of data**

The study is based on both primary and secondary data. The primary data was collected from the various employees working in the telecom sector with the help of a structured questionnaire.

##### **5.4 Framework for analysis**

The data collected was analyzed with the help of SPSS version 16. The following statistics were used: descriptive statistics. One sample t test, Pearson correlation and ANOVA .

#### **HYPOTHESES FRAMED**

1. There is a significant difference in the employee engagement level of employees of the telecom sector.
2. There is a significant difference in the commitment level of employees of the telecom sector
3. There is a significant relationship between employee engagement and commitment.
4. There is a significant difference across employees with different level of income in predicting overall employee engagement and commitment level of employees

5. There is a significant difference across employees with different years of length of service in the current organization in predicting overall employee engagement and commitment level of employees

**6. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

Three hundred respondents participated in this study. The participant’s background, i.e., gender, age, length of service and income is examined in the following sections

**7.1 Analysis 1: Summary of the Demographic Characteristics**

**Table 1** Showing Respondents characteristic

CATEGORY	VARIABLE	F	PERCENT
GENDER	Male	198	66
	Female	102	34
	TOTAL	300	100
AGE	20-29	30	10
	30-39	138	46
	40-49	84	28
	50 and above	48	16
	TOTAL	300	100
LENGTH OF SERVICE	Less than a year	24	8
	1-3	70	23
	3-5	150	50
	6 years or more	56	19
	TOTAL	300	100
INCOME	Less than 20,000	60	20
	20,000-30,000	80	27
	31,000-40,000	96	32
	Above 41,000	64	21
	TOTAL	300	100

Once the data is collected, it is entered into computer using SPSS version 16. Following the instructions of the SPSS program all the responses were coded under certain categories

**7.2 Analysis 2: Extent of employee engagement**

T-TEST  
/TESTVAL=3  
/MISSING=ANALYSIS  
/VARIABLES=EMPENG  
/CRITERIA=CI(.9500).

Table 2 Showing One-Sample Statistics of employee engagement

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
EMP_ENG	300	2.2117	.91798	.05300

Table 3: Showing One-Sample Test of employee engagement

	Test Value = 3					
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
EMP_ENG	-14.874	299	.000	-.78833	-.8926	-.6840

The research hypothesis 1 that is there is a significant difference in the employee engagement level of employees of the telecom sector is accepted and proven to be true

### 7.3 Analysis 3: Extent of employee commitment

T-TEST  
 /TESTVAL=3  
 /MISSING=ANALYSIS  
 /VARIABLES=EMPCOM  
 /CRITERIA=CI(.9500).

**Table 4** Showing One-Sample Statistics of employee commitment

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
EMP_COM	300	2.9595	.34570	.01996

**Table 5** Showing One-Sample Test of employee commitment

	Test Value = 3					
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
EMP_COM	-2.028	299	.043	-.04048	-.0798	-.0012

The research hypothesis 2 that is there is a significant difference in the commitment level of employees of the telecom sector is accepted and proven to be true

**7.4 Analysis 4:** Relationship between employee engagement and commitment

```

CORRELATIONS
/VARIABLES=EMPENG EMPCOM
/PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
/STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES
/MISSING=PAIRWISE.
    
```

**Table 6** Showing Descriptive Statistics of employee engagement and commitment

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
EMP_ENG	2.2117	.91798	300
EMP_COM	2.9595	.34570	300

**Table 7** Showing Correlations of employee engagement and commitment

	EMP_ENG	EMP_COM
EMP_ENG Pearson Correlation	1	.198**
EMP_ENG Sig. (2-tailed)		.001
EMP_ENG N	300	300
EMP_COM Pearson Correlation	.198**	1
EMP_COM Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	
EMP_COM N	300	300

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

p value is found to be 0.00 which is less than 0.05 which clearly shows that there is a significant relationship between employee engagement and commitment, but the relationship is weak indicating that there are the other factors influencing employee engagement and commitment level of employees which are already mentioned in the literature view. Therefore, the research hypothesis 3 that is there is a significant relationship between employee engagement and commitment is accepted and proven to be true.

### 7.5 Analysis 5: Impact of income on employee engagement and commitment

#### Income on Employee Engagement

```
ONEWAY SUMEMPENG BY INCOME
/STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES
/MISSING ANALYSIS
/POSTHOC=TUKEY ALPHA(0.05).
```

**Table 8** Showing Descriptive statistics of income on employee engagement

SUM\_EMPENG

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1	60	24.4667	8.34727	1.07763	22.3103	26.6230	16.00	50.00
2	80	25.9250	9.72114	1.08686	23.7617	28.0883	16.00	50.00
3	96	22.6667	8.35107	.85233	20.9746	24.3588	13.00	52.00
4	64	35.0625	13.62989	1.70374	31.6579	38.4671	14.00	55.00
Total	300	26.5400	11.01573	.63599	25.2884	27.7916	13.00	55.00

Table 9 Showing ANOVA of income on employee engagement

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6376.953	3	2125.651	21.039	.000
Within Groups	29905.567	296	101.032		
Total	36282.520	299			

Table 10 Showing Multiple Comparisons of income on employee engagement

SUM\_EMPENGTukey HSD

(I) INC	(J) INC	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	-1.45833	1.71662	.831	-5.8935	2.9769
	3	1.80000	1.65417	.697	-2.4739	6.0739
	4	-10.59583*	1.80624	.000	-15.2626	-5.9291
2	1	1.45833	1.71662	.831	-2.9769	5.8935
	3	3.25833	1.52162	.143	-.6730	7.1897
	4	-9.13750*	1.68569	.000	-13.4928	-4.7822
3	1	-1.80000	1.65417	.697	-6.0739	739
	2	-3.25833	1.52162	.143	-7.1897	.6730
	4	-12.39583*	1.62205	.000	-16.5867	-8.2050
4	1	10.59583*	1.80624	.000	5.9291	15.2626
	2	9.13750*	1.68569	.000	4.7822	13.4928
	3	12.39583*	1.62205	.000	8.2050	16.5867

**Table 11** Showing SUM\_EMPENG of income on employee engagement

Tukey HSD

INC	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
3	96	22.6667	
1	60	24.4667	
2	80	25.9250	
4	64		35.0625
Sig.		.209	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

**INTERPRETATION:**

ANOVA was performed and the results for different characteristics are shown in the above table. There was a statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one way ANOVA.  $F = 21.04$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . Employees were most engaged with income more than 41,000 than the other three income groups. The Tukey post hoc tests indicated that there exists no significant impact of all the other income groups on employee engagement level as the p value is greater than 0.05 in all the other cases ( $p = 0.83, 0.69, 0.14$ ). This shows that income category 1, 2 and 3 are not different from each other on their impact on employee engagement levels and hence can be dubbed as one category (0-40,000) and income 4 category is significantly higher than the other income groups. The results showed a significant outcome, which means that the employees who earn more are more engaged and significantly differ in their opinion from the employees who earn comparatively less.

**Income on Employee Commitment**

```
ONEWAY SUMEMPCOM BY INCOME
/STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES
/MISSING ANALYSIS
/POSTHOC=TUKEY ALPHA(0.05).
```

**Table 12** Showing Descriptive statistics of income on employee commitment

SUM\_EMPCOM

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1	60	43.5000	3.38241	.43667	42.6262	44.3738	36.00	51.00
2	80	42.5000	3.24525	.36283	41.7778	43.2222	35.00	49.00
3	96	42.1667	3.82971	.39087	41.3907	42.9426	32.00	52.00
4	64	50.8438	5.17693	.64712	49.5506	52.1369	41.00	61.00
Total	300	44.3733	5.19267	.29980	43.7833	44.9633	32.00	61.00

**Table 13** Showing ANOVA of income on employee commitment

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3473.416	3	1157.805	74.685	.000
Within Groups	4588.771	296	15.503		
Total	8062.187	299			

**Table 14** Showing Multiple Comparisons of income on employee commitment

SUM\_EMPCOM

Tukey HSD

(I) INC	(J) INC	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	1.00000	.67243	.447	-.7373	2.7373
	3	1.33333	.64797	.170	-.3408	3.0075
	4	-7.34375*	.70753	.000	-9.1718	-5.5157
2	1	-1.00000	.67243	.447	-2.7373	.7373
	3	.33333	.59604	.944	-1.2067	1.8733
	4	-8.34375*	.66031	.000	-10.0498	-6.6377
3	1	-1.33333	.64797	.170	-3.0075	.3408
	2	-.33333	.59604	.944	-1.8733	1.2067
	4	-8.67708*	.63538	.000	-10.3187	-7.0354
4	1	7.34375*	.70753	.000	5.5157	9.1718
	2	8.34375*	.66031	.000	6.6377	10.0498
	3	8.67708*	.63538	.000	7.0354	10.3187

**Table 15** Showing SUM\_EMPCOM of income on employee commitment

Tukey HSD

INC	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
3	96	42.1667	
2	80	42.5000	
1	60	43.5000	
4	64		50.8438
Sig.		.176	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

**INTERPRETATION:**

ANOVA was performed and the results for different characteristics are shown in the above table. There was a statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one way ANOVA.  $F = 62.94, p < 0.05$ . Employees who were earning more than 41,000 were more loyal and committed to the organization than the other three income groups. The Tukey post hoc tests indicated that there exists no significant impact of all the other income groups on the commitment level as the p value is greater than 0.05 in all the other cases ( $p = 0.94, 0.45, 0.17$ ). This shows that income category 1, 2 and 3 are not different from each other on their impact on commitment levels and hence can be dubbed as one category (0-40,000) and income 4 category is significantly higher than the other income groups. The results showed a significant outcome, which means that the employees who earn more are more committed to the organization and significantly differ in their opinion from the employees who earn comparatively less.

Therefore, the research hypothesis 4 that is there is a significant difference across employees with different level of income in predicting overall employee engagement and commitment level of employees is accepted and proven to be true.

**6.6 Analysis 6: Impact of length of service on employee engagement and commitment**

Impact of length of service on employee engagement

ONEWAY SUMEMPENG BY LENGTHOFSERVICE  
 /STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES  
 /MISSING ANALYSIS  
 /POSTHOC=TUKEY ALPHA(0.05).

**Table 16** Showing descriptive statistics of length of service on employee engagement

SUM\_EMPEG

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1	24	22.1667	8.99114	1.83531	18.3700	25.9633	16.00	50.00
2	70	27.2000	10.42238	1.24571	24.7149	29.6851	17.00	52.00
3	150	24.8267	9.82173	.80194	23.2420	26.4113	13.00	52.00
4	56	32.1786	13.37855	1.78778	28.5958	35.7614	17.00	55.00
Total	300	26.5400	11.01573	.63599	25.2884	27.7916	13.00	55.00

**Table 17** Showing ANOVA of length of service on employee engagement

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2710.279	3	903.426	7.965	.000
Within Groups	33572.241	296	113.420		
Total	36282.520	299			

**Table 18** Showing multiple comparisons of length of service on employee engagement

SUM\_EMPENG  
Tukey HSD

(I) LOS	(J) LOS	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	-5.03333	2.51915	.191	-11.5420	1.4753
	3	-2.66000	2.34136	.667	-8.7093	3.3893
	4	-10.01190*	2.59830	.001	-16.7251	-3.2987
2	1	5.03333	2.51915	.191	-1.4753	11.5420
	3	2.37333	1.54156	.415	-1.6096	6.3562
	4	-4.97857*	1.90935	.047	-9.9117	-.0454
3	1	2.66000	2.34136	.667	-3.3893	8.7093
	2	-2.37333	1.54156	.415	-6.3562	1.6096
	4	-7.35190*	1.66778	.000	-11.6609	-3.0429
4	1	10.01190*	2.59830	.001	3.2987	16.7251
	2	4.97857*	1.90935	.047	.0454	9.9117
	3	7.35190*	1.66778	.000	3.0429	11.6609

\*. The at the 0.05 level.

**Table 19** Showing SUM\_EMPENG of length of service on employee engagement

Tukey HSD

LOS	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
1	24	22.1667	
3	150	24.8267	
2	70	27.2000	27.2000
4	56		32.1786
Sig.		.088	.093

**Table 19** Showing SUM\_EMPENG of length of service on employee engagement

Tukey HSD

LOS	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
1	24	22.1667	
3	150	24.8267	
2	70	27.2000	27.2000
4	56		32.1786
Sig.		.088	.093

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

**INTERPRETATION:**

ANOVA was performed and the results for different characteristics are shown in the above table. There was a statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one way ANOVA.  $F = 3.93, p < 0.05$ . Employees having more than 6 years of work experience were more engaged than the other three groups.. The Tukey post hoc tests indicated that there exists no significant impact of all the other experience groups on employee engagement level as the p value is greater than 0.05 in all the other cases ( $p = 0.85, 0.67, 0.41, 0.19$ ). This shows that the employees having more experience were positively engaged compared to those who have less experience

**LENGTH OF SERVICE ON COMMITMENT**

ONEWAY SUMEMPCOM BY LENGTHOFSERVICE  
 /STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES  
 /MISSING ANALYSIS  
 /POSTHOC=TUKEY ALPHA(0.05).

**Table 20** Showing descriptive statistics of length of service on employee commitment

SUM\_EMPCOM

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1	24	43.3333	2.86913	.58566	42.1218	44.5449	39.00	48.00
2	70	41.9429	4.22513	.50500	40.9354	42.9503	32.00	47.00
3	150	43.9733	4.83548	.39482	43.1932	44.7535	37.00	60.00
4	56	48.9286	5.27725	.70520	47.5153	50.3418	40.00	61.00
Total	300	44.3733	5.19267	.29980	43.7833	44.9633	32.00	61.00

**Table 21** Showing ANOVA of length of service on employee commitment

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1625.474	3	541.825	24.916	.000
Within Groups	6436.712	296	21.746		
Total	8062.187	299			

**Table 22** Showing multiple Comparisons of length of service on employee commitment

SUM\_EMPCOM  
Tukey HSD

(I) LOS	(J) LOS	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	1.39048	1.10305	.589	-1.4595	4.2404
	3	-.64000	1.02520	.924	-3.2888	2.0088
	4	-5.59524*	1.13771	.000	-8.5347	-2.6558
2	1	-1.39048	1.10305	.589	-4.2404	1.4595
	3	-2.03048*	.67500	.015	-3.7745	-.2865
	4	-6.98571*	.83604	.000	-9.1458	-4.8256
3	1	.64000	1.02520	.924	-2.0088	3.2888
	2	2.03048*	.67500	.015	.2865	3.7745
	4	-4.95524*	.73026	.000	-6.8420	-3.0685
4	1	5.59524*	1.13771	.000	2.6558	8.5347
	2	6.98571*	.83604	.000	4.8256	9.1458
	3	4.95524*	.73026	.000	3.0685	6.8420

**Table 22** Showing multiple Comparisons of length of service on employee commitment

SUM\_EMPCOM  
Tukey HSD

(I) LOS	(J) LOS	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	1.39048	1.10305	.589	-1.4595	4.2404
	3	-.64000	1.02520	.924	-3.2888	2.0088
	4	-5.59524*	1.13771	.000	-8.5347	-2.6558
2	1	-1.39048	1.10305	.589	-4.2404	1.4595
	3	-2.03048*	.67500	.015	-3.7745	-.2865
	4	-6.98571*	.83604	.000	-9.1458	-4.8256
3	1	.64000	1.02520	.924	-2.0088	3.2888
	2	2.03048*	.67500	.015	.2865	3.7745
	4	-4.95524*	.73026	.000	-6.8420	-3.0685
4	1	5.59524*	1.13771	.000	2.6558	8.5347
	2	6.98571*	.83604	.000	4.8256	9.1458
	3	4.95524*	.73026	.000	3.0685	6.8420

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

**Table 23** Showing SUM\_EMPENG of length of service on employee commitment

Tukey HSD

LOS	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
1	24	22.1667	
3	150	24.8267	
2	70	27.2000	27.2000
4	56		32.1786
Sig.		.088	.093

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

## **INTERPRETATION:**

ANOVA was performed and the results for different characteristics are shown in the above table. There was a statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one way ANOVA.  $F = 17.47$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . Employees having more than 6 years of work experience were more committed and loyal to the organization than the other three groups.. The Tukey post hoc tests indicated that there exists no significant impact of all the other experience groups on employee engagement level as the p value is greater than 0.05 in all the other cases. This shows that the experience categories 1, 2 and 3 are not different from each other on their impact on commitment levels and hence can be dubbed as one category (0-5 years) and experience 4 categories is significantly higher than the other experience groups. This shows that the employees having more experience show more commitment towards their job compared to those who are having less experience

Therefore, the research hypothesis 5 that there is a significant difference across employees with different years of length of service in the current organization in predicting overall employee engagement and commitment level of employees is accepted and proven to be true

## **7. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY**

After undertaking the study, the following findings were made:

*A key finding of the research is that Engagement is largely driven by the extent to which employees feel they are appreciated by, and involved with, their organization*

- Employees of telecom sector have a low level of employee engagement which indicates that the employees of the telecom sector are disengaged and dissatisfied with their work and feel less involved and empowered at work. Employees also feel petite, insignificant, and uncared in organizations. They want to work for managers who care for them as professionals, and also as human beings.
- Employees of telecom sector have a low level of organizational commitment which indicates that majority of the employees are not loyal to their organization and would leave their existing workplace if the right opportunity came along due to the subsequent reasons such as career frustration, boredom, cynicism, indiscrimination, ample benefits, job security, and a clean and secure work environment
- There is a positive significant relationship between employee engagement and organizational commitment but the relationship is weak indicating that there are other factors influencing employee engagement and commitment level of employees such as recognition, leadership, job satisfaction, recruitment, career development opportunities, training and development, equal opportunities, fair treatment, performance management, compensation, health and security, which are already mentioned in the literature view.
- The demographic characteristics of the employees, experience and income significantly influence employee engagement and commitment. The employees who have high earnings significantly differ in their opinion from the employees who earn comparatively less i.e. the employees who earn more are more engaged and do have commitment and involvement towards their work compared to others because of the financial incentives they get like the cash bonuses, increased base pay, and stock options. The employees who have more experience significantly differ in their opinion from the employees who have less experience. That is, the employees with more experience show positive employee engagement and commitment towards their job compared to those who have less experience because of the career advancement opportunities, the work itself, opportunities to use their skills and abilities.

## **8. CONCLUSION**

Organizations and employees share a symbiotic relation, where both are dependent on each other to gratify their needs and goal. Therefore employee engagement should not be a onetime process, but a continuous process of learning, development and action. Workforce or the employees are the assets of the organization and if they are not given a space whereby they can make a perfect merge of both work and fun, optimum performance from them may be difficult. Thus organizations should realize the importance of employees, more than any other variable, and try to engage them to the utmost possible level by suitable measures. There is no secret recipe that will unexpectedly engage all your employees. Many companies do provide excellent work environments, perks and profits, recreation facilities, restaurants, fitness centers, crèche facilities, caretaker services to maternity and paternity leave, adoption leave, time offs and part-time work. While these are great strategies to keep the employees engaged, the real secret goes back to basic management practices – **know your employees.**

## **REFERENCES**

- [1] Agyemang, C. B., and Ofei, S.B. (2013). Employee work engagement and organizational commitment: A comparative study of private and public sector organizations in Ghana, *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, 1, pp. 20-33
- [2] Andrew, O.C., and Sofian, S.(2012). Individual Factors and Work Outcomes of Employee Engagement, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40, pp.498-508.
- [3] Angle H., and Perry J.(1981). An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, pp.1-14.
- [4] Balakrishnan C., and Masthan D.(2013). Impact of internal communication on employee engagement-a study at Delhi international airport, *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 3, pp.1-14.
- [5] Bhatla, N.(2011) .To study the Employee Engagement practices and its effect on employee performance with special reference to ICICI and HDFC Bank in Lucknow, *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 2, pp.1-7.
- [6] Choo et.al. (2013). Organizational practices and employee engagement: a case of Malaysia electronics manufacturing firms, *Business Strategy Series*, 14, pp. 3- 10
- [7] Corporate leadership council (2004). Driving performance and retention through employee engagement, *A quantitative analysis of effective engagement strategies*, Washington DC, the corporate executive board.
- [8] Doherty, R. (2010) Making employee engagement an end-to-end practice, *Strategic HR Review*, 9, pp. 32 -37
- [9] Gowri P., and Mariammal M.(2012). Factorial Dimensions of Employee Engagement in Public and Private Sector Banks, *Bonfring International Journal of Data Mining*, 2, pp.
- [10] Kahn, W. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, pp. 692-724.

- [11] Khalefiah A., and Som A.(2013). The Antecedents Affecting Employee Engagement and Organizational Performance, *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 9, doi:10.5539/ass.v9n7p41
- [12] Kumar, S.B.(2011). Employee Engagement: A Driver of Organizational Effectiveness, *European Journal of Business and Management*, 3, pp. 22-29.
- [13] Lockwood N.(2007).Leveraging Employee Engagement for Competitive Advantage: HR's Strategic Role, *SHRM Research Quaterly*,22,pp. 1-12.
- [14] Luthans F.,and Peterson S. J. (2002) Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy, *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 21 Is: 5, pp.376 – 387
- [15] Macey W., and Schneider B.(2008).The Meaning of Employee Engagement, *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1 , pp. 3–30.
- [16] Markos S.,and Sridevi M.(2010).Employee Engagement: The Key to Improving Performance, *International Journal of Business and Management* , 5,pp. 89-96
- [17] Mastro V.L.(1999).Commitment and Perceived Organizational Support, *National Forum of Applied Educational Resarch Journal*, 12, pp. 1-13..
- [18] Mowday, et.al. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* , 14, pp. 224-247.
- [19] Ogba, I.E. (2008) Commitment in the workplace: The impact of income and age on employee commitment in Nigerian banking sector, *Management Research News*, 31,pp. 867 – 878
- [20] Rai S.(2012).Engaging young employees (Gen Y) in a social media dominated world – Review and Retrospection, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 37,pp. 257 – 266
- [21] RamaDevi, V. (2009) Employee engagement is a two-way street, *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 17,pp. 3 – 4
- [22] Saks, A.M.(2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, pp. 600 – 619.
- [23] Seigts, G. H., &Crim,D. (2006). What engages employees the most or, the ten c's of employee Engagement, *Ivey Business Journal*,4,pp. 296-505.
- [24] Shore L.M., and Martin H.J.(1989). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in relation to work performance and turnover intentions, *Human Relations*, 42, pp. 625-638.
- [25] Singh et.al.(2013)Transformational Leadership, Employee Engagement and Performance: Mediating Effect of Psychological Ownership, *International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research* , 3, pp. 57-64.
- [26] Sreekanth, K., and Aryasari A.R.(2013). Factoral influences on employee engagement practices in IT Industry, *Journal of Banking, Information Technology and Management*,10,pp. 63-74.
- [27] Tiwari, S.(2013). An empirical study on the factors influencing organizational commitment, *Journal of MLRSM*, 6, pp. 295-314
-

[28] Tomlinson, G. (2010) Building a culture of high employee engagement, *Strategic HR Review*, 9 ,pp. 25 – 31

[29] Vance J.R.(2006). Employee Engagement and Commitment, *Society for Human Resource Management Foundation*,25, pp. 1-33.

[30] Vandenberghe et.al.. (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: A conceptual analysis and integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,89, pp. 991-1007.

[31] Whittington J.L., Timothy J. G.(2010) The engagement factor: building a high-commitment organization in a low-commitment world, *Journal of Business Strategy*, 31, pp. 14 – 24

[32] Woodruffe, C.(2006) The crucial importance of employee engagement, *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 14, pp. 3 -5