

## The Employee Engagement Factors – A Study of PSB Employees

Mrs. Ananya Tharantha

Dr. R Shashidhar

Dr Sindu Bharath

Assistant Professor, JSS Science and Technology University, Mysore, Karnataka

Associate Professor, Institute of Management Studies, Davangere University, Karnataka

Assistant Professor, JSS Science and Technology University, Mysore, Karnataka

### ABSTRACT

**Purpose** – The present study aims to analyse various factors that influences employee engagement from *the employee's view point with special reference to banking sector.*

*Method* -The present study considers the factors that influences employee engagement based on review article for the present study. A structured questionnaire is used to collect data. The sample unit being employees of Indian PSB's. The sample size is increased to 60. Further, to get more homogeneous responses, the respondents whose age is between 35 and 50 years are considered.

**Findings** -The Result of the study confirms that the employee engagement factors identified in review such as: Rewards and Recognition, Employee Development, Organizational Climate, Fair feedback and Compensation, Job Satisfaction, Work-Life Balance, Organizational Culture, Peer Relationship, Organizational Commitment, Work Environment and Management Support and Experience influences employee engagement.

**Research limitations** – Employer Engagement is studied from PSB's employee perspective only.

**Key Words:** Employee Engagement, K-S test, Public sector bank, HR practices

### INTRODUCTION

The HR executives continue to tussle to retain talented workforce. The Employee Engagement (EE) refers to the job commitment and involvement of an employee's towards organization. An effective EE supports in creating workplace community. There is a larger need requirement to connect and engage with employees more specifically in recent times of Moreover, in times of fading loyalty EE becomes greater powerful tool.

Employee engagement is of great important in every organization, as it is very vital for any organization's competitiveness and success. Without active involvement and engagement of employees no improvement can be taken by management. Negative work environment affects EE and organizational support (OS) and also employee well-being (EW) Rasool et al (2021). There is a significant positive relationship between employee engagement, employer branding through employer attractiveness, Verčič (2021). EE mediates the relationship between green HRM practices and individual green behaviour, Omar (2021). To achieve the improved performance organisations need to engage the employees through positive motivation to provide job satisfaction, Riyanto et al (2021). Obtaining greater employee engagement is major concern for global HR practitioners, Bailey (2022).

### Sources on Employee Engagement

Rasool et al (2021) explored toxic workplace environment (TWE) on employee engagement (EE). Building on conservation of resources (COR) theory and organizational support theory (OST). Verčič (2021) attempts to develop the relationship between employee engagement and organisational communication practices with 1805 employees surveyed found that the relationship between employer brand, employee engagement as well as perceived organizational support. Omar (2021) investigated the mediation effect of EE with work environment initiative with reference to Green HR and individual green behaviour. Raza et al (2021) examined the mediating roles of organizational pride and employee engagement (EE) which reveals sequential mediation of EE on organizational pride. Riyanto et al (2021) analysed the effect of motivation and job satisfaction on EE as mediating variable. The findings indicate that motivation has direct relationship on employee performance. Alam et al 2022 investigated the relationship between employee engagement and performance-reward management and leadership. The result mentions that EE depends upon reward-performance management and also the leadership. Fulmore et al (2022) researched extensively on association

amid EE and turnover intentions were associated with each other. Nwachukwu et al (2022) opined that there exists positive relationship between psychological empowerment and EE mediated by job satisfaction. Aggarwal (2022) attempts to test antecedents and consequences of EE in the context of information technology (IT) employees and noted direct effect of EE on employees' organizational commitment (OC). Simon (2020) showed that work resources and individual differences factors effects on EE while affective factor being commitment and turnover intention. Kwon et al (2020) established association between EE and innovative behaviour with JD-R model and developed an integrated conceptual framework. Kerdpitak et al (2020) examined mediating role of EE on Learning and development practices. The results indicate that EE has influence on the cutting edge advantage on organisations.

### **Employee Engagement in banking Scenario**

Sandhu (2022), identified the factors influencing EE in banking sector specifically 14 Indian Public Sector Banks. The model indicates key EE factors such as emotional satisfaction, fairness, individual development, organisational culture, communication, and rewards. Anand (2017) explored the influence of Corporate Governance and Employee Engagement with reference to banking and insurance sector. The study developed a framework indicating corporate excellence and governance alongside employee engagement and corporate excellence. Saks (2022) opined HRM practices has positive effect on EE. The results indicated a framework containing various HR practices such as job involvement, learning, flexibility, QWL, welfare facilities and career development programmes. Mayuran et al (2022) attempts to integrate employer brand (EB), perceived organizational politics and self-efficacy were related to employee engagement. Warnabarana et al (2022) attempts to study Employee Engagement on Financial Wellbeing. Structured questionnaire was distributed through 350 banking employees. Results indicated major factors of EE are: IT support, Organisational and individual Issues and Job stress. Yadav et al (2022) indicated that for better employee engagement is work-life integration policies, and organizational effectiveness becomes the by-product of the same. Innovative and friendly WLB policies assist employees to be more productive, dedicated and committed, resulting in better employee engagement which in the long run benefits the company in terms of effectiveness.

Rakatu et al (2022) states that the banks are transforming their work circumstances as a result of globalization, with the staff performing a variety of responsibilities. Employee engagement, job performance, turnover intention, and workplace culture of employees in public and private sector banks in Chhattisgarh are investigated in this paper. A structured questionnaire was used to collect data from 412 respondents in chosen cities in Chhattisgarh. Based on the results of Student's t-test, two-way ANOVA, and correlation, it was found that employees of public sector banks scored significantly higher than those of private sector banks in terms of perceived workplace culture and they had greater levels of workplace culture and job performance. Goyal et al (2022) mentions that in Indian banking sector has negative effects of the epidemic on its employees and the community to have employee engagement. Choudhury et al (2022) identified association between happiness factor, EE and organisational commitment Indian PSB's.

### **RESEARCH GAP**

It is noted that there is a need to study the workplace environment as it impacts negatively on EE (Rasool et al ,2021).Obtaining high levels of employee engagement is a major concern for HR practitioners, Riyanto et al (2021). There is need to study which affects employee turnover intentions (Bailey, 2022).Wang et al (2020) also suggested a study on employee engagement as it has negative impact on turnover intention. Aggarwal (2022) emphasised the study of EE as it affects organizational commitment (OC) and employees' turnover intentions. Therefore, it may be noted that further studies may explore factors which employee engagement not only in the manufacturing sectors but also organizations including banking sectors (Akter et al (2021).

### **Factors that influences employee engagement**

The present study considers the Factors that influences employee engagement based on review made by Sukhmeet Kaur(2017), A review article entitled antecedents and consequences of Employee Engagement: A Literature Review for further study.

No	Factors	Sources
1	Rewards/Remuneration and Recognition,	Saks(2006),Padmakumare <i>etal.</i> (2011),Bhagawatiand Aralelimath(2012), Hulkko-Nyman <i>etal.</i> (2012),Balkrishnan <i>etal.</i> (2013),Manonmani <i>etal.</i> (2013),Muthuvelooe <i>tal.</i> (2013),GujralandJain (2013),Gummadi and Devi(2013),Mokaya and Kipyegon(2014),Al-Tit and Hunitie(2015), Joseph(2015)
2	Employee Development,	Andrew and Sofian(2012), Muthuveloo et al. (2013), Mokaya and kipyegon (2014), Joseph and Jakisa Owor (2015)
3	Job Satisfaction,	Andrew and Sofian (2012), Muthuveloo et al. (2013), Mokaya and kipyegon (2014), Joseph and Jakisa Owor (2015)
4	Fair feedback and Benefits/Compensation ,	Garg and Kumar (2012),Gowri and Mariammal (2012), Balakrishnan et al. (2013),Das et al. (2013)
5	Organizational Climate	Joshi and Sodhi (2011), Allameh et al. (2012)
6	Work-Life Balance,	Kandulpati and Manchala (2011), Das et al. (2013), Alvi et al. (2014)
7	Organizational Culture,	Bhagawati and Aralelimath (2012), Sarangi and Srivastava (2012), Das et al. (2013), Naidoo and Martins (2014), Al-Tit and Hunitie (2015), Gupta et al. (2015), and Kaliannan and Adjovu (2015)
8	Relationship with Peers and Supervisor,	Saks (2006), Karatepe et al. (2010), Kandulpati and anchala (2011), Bhagawati and Aralelimath (2012), Al-Tit and Hunitie (2015), Kaliannan and Adjovu (2015), and Patil and Ramanjaneyalu (2015)
9	Organizational Commitment	Sharma and Raina (2010), Gowri and Mariammal (2012), Agyemang and Ofei (2013), Albdour and Altarawneh (2014), Venkatesh and Lissy (2014), Khalid and Khalid (2015),
10	Training and Development,	Gujral and Jain (2013), Gummadi and Devi (2013), Banhwa et al. (2014), Patil andRamanjaneyalu (2015)
11	Working Environment	Gummadi and Devi (2013), Kaliannan and Adjovu (2015), and Patil and Ramanjaneyalu (2015)
12	Management Support and Experience.	Gummadi and Devi (2013) Kinjal (2012), Naval (2014), and Jaupi and Llaci (2015)

### OBJECTIVE OF STUDY

The present study aims to analyse various factors that encourages level of employee engagement from the employee's view point with special reference to banking sector employees.

### Operational Definition of the constructs:

The underlying constructs of the stated objective of study are defined as follows.

- i. Level: The degree of relationship of the object (job) with the subject (employee).
- ii. Employee: Any person who holds a formal position in the middle management or top management and who is hired to render services for the organization in exchange for monetary compensation.
- iii. Engagement: The association of the employee with the various attributes of the job which finally leads to job satisfaction and retention of employee in the organization

- iv. Job: A formal responsibility which an employee holds in an organization.
- v. Organization: A group of people working for a common ethical cause and whose primary motto is generating profits and sustaining in business.

**SCOPE OF STUDY**

The study is proposed to the employees working in banking sector at Mysore City, Karnataka, India.

**RESEARCH DESIGN OF THE STUDY**

The present study considers the Factors that influences employee engagement based on review made by Sukhmeet Kaur(2017), A review article entitled antecedents and consequences of Employee Engagement for further study. A structured questionnaire is used to collect data. The sample unit being employees of Indian PSB’s. The study considers at least 1 in 25 PSB employees to evaluate their opinions towards the employee engagement. The sample size for the present study is determined as below.

$$N = Z^2 [ \pi (1- \pi) ] / E^2$$

Accordingly,  $N = Z^2 [ \pi (1- \pi) ] / E^2 = (1.96)^2 [0.04 \times 0.96] / [0.05]^2 = 59$  Respondents.

However, to make the computations easy and to have the normal frequency distribution, the sample size is increased to 60. Further, to get more homogeneous responses, the respondents whose age is between 35 and 50 years are considered. The samples are selected with the help of functional heads of banks.

**ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS.**

The present research considers Non-Parametric Kolmogorov-Smirnov: D test.

**Kolmogorov-smirnov D (K-S) test:**

The Kolmogorov -smirnov D test carries out a goodness-of-fit test, a more stringent test than chi-square test.

The K-S test has following steps.

- i. Observed frequency and proportions are noted in table as shown below.
- ii. The observed cumulative frequency was tabulated.
- iii. Null proportions were noted.
- iv. Cumulative Null Proportions were computed.
- v. The absolute difference was computed.
- vi. Largest absolute difference (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D) and K-S -critical value (D) are noted.
- vii. The critical value ( $1.36 / \sqrt{n}$ ) is computed.
- viii. The K-S -critical value (D) versus Absolute difference is used for ascertaining the significant differences.

**RESULTS AND FINDINGS**

**Table 1: Remuneration and Recognition**

Remuneration and Recognition		Observed frequency	Observed frequency	Observed Cumulative proportion	Null Proportion	Null Cumulative proportion	Absolute difference
	SA	11	0.02	0.02	0.20	0.20	-0.02
	A	33	0.16	0.18	0.20	0.40	0.31
	N	7	0.11	0.29	0.20	0.60	0.22
	DS	10	0.53	0.82	0.20	0.80	0.18
	SDA	1	0.18	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00
Total	62						
K-S -Critical Value =0.172      Calculated Maximum absolute difference = 0.31							

Table 1, K-S test reveals that, K-S -Critical ( $D_{critical}$ ) = 0.172. Maximum absolute difference (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value) = 0.31. The, K-S D value is more than K-S -Critical Value ( $D_{critical}$ ) and hence no significant difference in the opinion related to Rewards/Remuneration and Recognition ratings is rejected. Therefore, Remuneration and Recognition will impact on Employee engagement.

**Table 2: Employee Development**

Employee Development		Observed frequency	Observed frequency	Observed Cumulative proportion	Null Proportion	Null Cumulative proportion	Absolute difference
	SA	12	0.19	0.19	0.20	0.20	-0.01
	A	37	0.60	0.79	0.20	0.40	0.39
	N	7	0.11	0.90	0.20	0.60	0.30
	DS	6	0.10	1.00	0.20	0.80	0.20
	SDA	0	0.00	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00
	Total	62					
K-S -Critical Value ( D) =0.172      Maximum absolute Calculated difference = 0.39							

Table 2,K-S test reveals that, K-S -Critical D Critical =0.172. Maximum absolute difference (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value) = 0.31. The, K-S D value is more than D Critical and hence no significant difference in the opinion related to the Employee Development among the respondents is rejected. Therefore, Employee Development will impact on Employee engagement.

**Table 3: Job Satisfaction**

Job Satisfaction		Observed frequency	Observed frequency	Observed Cumulative proportion	Null Proportion	Null Cumulative proportion	Absolute difference
	SA	11	0.18	0.18	0.20	0.20	-0.02
	A	42	0.68	0.85	0.20	0.40	0.45
	N	2	0.03	0.89	0.20	0.60	0.29
	DS	7	0.11	1.00	0.20	0.80	0.20
	SDA	0	0.00	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00
	Total	62					
K-S -Critical Value ( D) =0.172      Calculated Maximum absolute difference = 0.45							

Table 3,K-S test reveals that, K-S -Critical D Critical =0.172. Maximum absolute difference (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value) = 0.31. The, K-S D value is more than D Critical and hence no significant difference in the opinion related to the Job Satisfaction among the respondents is rejected. Therefore, Job Satisfaction will impact on Employee engagement.

**Table 4: Fair Feedback**

Fair Feedback		Observed frequency	Observed frequency	Observed Cumulative proportion	Null Proportion	Null Cumulative proportion	Absolute difference
	SA	10	0.16	0.16	0.20	0.20	-0.04
	A	30	0.48	0.65	0.20	0.40	0.25
	N	9	0.15	0.79	0.20	0.60	0.19
	DS	13	0.21	1.00	0.20	0.80	0.20
	SDA	0	0.00	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00
	Total	62					
K-S -Critical Value ( D) =0.172      Calculated Maximum absolute difference = 0.25							

Table 4,K-S test reveals that, K-S -Critical D Critical =0.172. Maximum absolute difference (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value) = 0.31. The, K-S D value is more than D Critical and hence no significant difference in the opinion related to the **Fair Feedback** among the respondents is rejected. Therefore, **Fair Feedback** will impact on Employee engagement.

**Table 5: Organizational Climate**

Organizational Climate		Observed frequency	Observed frequency	Observed Cumulative proportion	Null Proportion	Null Cumulative proportion	Absolute difference
	SA	8	0.13	0.13	0.20	0.20	-0.07
	A	33	0.53	0.66	0.20	0.40	0.26
	N	9	0.15	0.81	0.20	0.60	0.21
	DS	11	0.18	0.98	0.20	0.80	0.18
	SDA	1	0.02	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00
Total	62						
K-S -Critical Value ( D ) =0.172      Calculated Maximum absolute difference = 0.26							

Table 5, K-S test reveals that, K-S -Critical D Critical =0.172. Maximum absolute difference (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value) = 0.31. The, K-S D value is more than D Critical and hence no significant difference in the opinion related to the Organizational Climate among the respondents is rejected. Therefore, Organizational Climate will impact on Employee engagement.

**Table 6: Work Life Balance**

Work Life Balance		Observed frequency	Observed frequency	Observed Cumulative proportion	Null Proportion	Null Cumulative proportion	Absolute difference
	SA	20	0.32	0.32	0.20	0.20	0.12
	A	31	0.50	0.82	0.20	0.40	0.42
	N	8	0.13	0.95	0.20	0.60	0.35
	DS	3	0.05	1.00	0.20	0.80	0.20
	SDA	0	0.00	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00
Total	62						
K-S -Critical Value ( D ) =0.172      Calculated Maximum absolute difference = 0.42							

Table 6, K-S test reveals that, K-S -Critical D Critical =0.172. Maximum absolute difference (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value) = 0.31. The, K-S D value is more than D Critical and hence no significant difference in the opinion related to the **Work Life Balance** among the respondents is rejected. Therefore, **Work Life Balance** will impact on Employee engagement.

**Table 7: Organizational Culture**

Organizational Culture		Observed frequency	Observed frequency	Observed Cumulative proportion	Null Proportion	Null Cumulative proportion	Absolute difference
	SA	11	0.18	0.18	0.20	0.20	-0.02
	A	31	0.50	0.68	0.20	0.40	0.28
	N	8	0.13	0.81	0.20	0.60	0.21
	DS	11	0.18	0.98	0.20	0.80	0.18
	SDA	1	0.02	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00
Total	62						
K-S -Critical Value ( D ) =0.172      Calculated Maximum absolute difference = 0.28							

Table 7, K-S test reveals that, K-S -Critical D Critical =0.172. Maximum absolute difference (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value) = 0.31. The, K-S D value is more than D Critical and hence no significant difference in the opinion related to the **Organizational Culture** among the respondents is rejected. Therefore, **Organizational Culture** will impact on Employee engagement.

**Table 8: Relationship with peers and supervisors**

Relationship with peers and supervisors		Observed frequency	Observed frequency	Observed Cumulative proportion	Null Proportion	Null Cumulative proportion	Absolute difference
	SA	4	0.06	0.06	0.20	0.20	-0.14
	A	35	0.56	0.63	0.20	0.40	0.23
	N	8	0.13	0.76	0.20	0.60	0.16
	DS	14	0.23	0.98	0.20	0.80	0.18
	SDA	1	0.02	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00
	Total	62					
K-S -Critical Value ( D )=0.172				Calculated Maximum absolute difference = 0.23			

From the above Table 8, K-S test reveals that K-S -Critical Value ( $D_{critical}$ ) =0.172 and Calculated Maximum absolute difference (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value) = 0.23, since the Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value is more than K-S -Critical Value ( $D_{critical}$ ) =0.172 and hence no significant difference in the opinion related to **Relationship with peers and supervisors** is rejected. Therefore, **Relationship with peers and supervisors** will impact on Employee engagement.

**Table 9: Organizational Commitment**

Organizational Commitment		Observed frequency	Observed frequency	Observed Cumulative proportion	Null Proportion	Null Cumulative proportion	Absolute difference
	SA	6	0.10	0.10	0.20	0.20	-0.10
	A	42	0.68	0.77	0.20	0.40	0.37
	N	6	0.10	0.87	0.20	0.60	0.27
	DS	7	0.11	0.98	0.20	0.80	0.18
	SDA	1	0.02	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00
	Total	62					
K-S -Critical Value ( D )=0.172				Calculated Maximum absolute difference = 0.37			

From the above Table 9, K-S test reveals that K-S -Critical Value ( $D_{critical}$ ) =0.172 and Calculated Maximum absolute difference (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value) = 0.23, since the Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value is more than K-S -Critical Value ( $D_{critical}$ ) =0.172 and hence no significant difference in the opinion related to **Organizational Commitment** is rejected. Therefore, **Organizational Commitment** will impact on Employee engagement.

**Table 10: Training and Development**

Training and Development		Observed frequency	Observed frequency	Observed Cumulative proportion	Null Proportion	Null Cumulative proportion	Absolute difference
	SA	6	0.10	0.10	0.20	0.20	-0.10
	A	39	0.63	0.73	0.20	0.40	0.33
	N	5	0.08	0.81	0.20	0.60	0.21
	DS	11	0.18	0.98	0.20	0.80	0.18
	SDA	1	0.02	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00
	Total	62					
K-S -Critical Value ( D )=0.172				Calculated Maximum absolute difference = 0.33			

From the above Table 10, K-S test reveals that K-S -Critical Value ( $D_{critical}$ ) =0.172 and Calculated Maximum absolute difference (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value) = 0.23, since the Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value is more than K-S -Critical Value ( $D_{critical}$ ) =0.172 and hence no significant difference in the opinion related to **Training and Development** is rejected. Therefore, **Training and Development** will impact on Employee engagement.

**Table 11: Work Environment**

Work Environment		Observed frequency	Observed frequency	Observed Cumulative proportion	Null Proportion	Null Cumulative proportion	Absolute difference
	SA	6	0.10	0.10	0.20	0.20	-0.10
	A	38	0.61	0.71	0.20	0.40	0.31
	N	8	0.13	0.84	0.20	0.60	0.24
	DS	9	0.15	0.98	0.20	0.80	0.18
	SDA	1	0.02	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00
Total	62						
K-S -Critical Value ( D ) =0.172				Calculated Maximum absolute difference = 0.31			

From the above Table 11, K-S test reveals that K-S -Critical Value ( $D_{critical}$ ) =0.172 and Calculated Maximum absolute difference (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value) = 0.23, since the Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value is more than K-S -Critical Value ( $D_{critical}$ ) =0.172 and hence no significant difference in the opinion related to **Work Environment** is rejected. Therefore, **Work Environment** will impact on Employee engagement.

**Table 12: Management support**

Management support		Observed frequency	Observed frequency	Observed Cumulative proportion	Null Proportion	Null Cumulative proportion	Absolute difference
	SA	12	0.19	0.19	0.20	0.20	-0.01
	A	32	0.52	0.71	0.20	0.40	0.31
	N	9	0.15	0.85	0.20	0.60	0.25
	DS	9	0.15	1.00	0.20	0.80	0.20
	SDA	0	0.00	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00
Total	62						
K-S -Critical Value ( D ) =0.172				Calculated Maximum absolute difference = 0.31			

From the above Table 12, K-S test reveals that K-S -Critical Value ( $D_{critical}$ ) =0.172 and Calculated Maximum absolute difference (Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value) = 0.3331 since the Kolmogorov-Smirnov D value is more than K-S -Critical Value ( $D_{critical}$ ) =0.172 and hence no significant difference in the opinion related to **Management support** is rejected. Therefore, **Management support** will impact on Employee engagement.

**Comparative ratings of all parameters**

Comparative ratings of all parameters is prepared and summarized in a Table -13 below;



No.	Parameters of Stress among Bank employees	Very much satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very much Dissatisfied	Mean	Std.Dev.
Q1	Rewards/Remuneration and Recognition,	11	33	7	10	1	0.69	0.833
Q2	Employee Development,	12	37	7	6	0	0.89	0.942
Q3	Job Satisfaction,	11	42	2	7	0	0.92	0.959
Q4	Fair feedback and Benefits/Compensation,	10	30	9	13	0	0.60	0.773
Q5	Organizational Climate	8	33	9	11	1	0.58	0.762
Q6	Work-Life Balance,	20	31	8	3	0	1.10	1.047
Q7	Organizational Culture,	11	31	8	11	1	0.65	0.803
Q8	Relationship with Peers and Supervisor,	4	35	8	14	1	0.44	0.660
Q9	Organizational Commitment	6	42	6	7	1	0.73	0.852
Q10	Training and Development,	6	39	5	11	1	0.61	0.783
Q11	Working Environment	6	38	8	9	1	0.63	0.793
Q12	Management Support and Experience.	12	32	9	9	0	0.76	0.871

## CONCLUSION

The Result of the study confirms that the employee engagement factors identified in review such as: Rewards and Recognition, Employee Development, Organizational Climate, Fair feedback and Compensation, Job Satisfaction, Work-Life Balance, Organizational Culture, Peer Relationship, Organizational Commitment, Work Environment and Management Support and Experience influences employee engagement. Further, it is noted that participation in decision making is preferred by employees. The employees prefer to work in trustful environment. The Organizations which provides opportunities to develop their skills, knowledge and abilities will lead to effective EE. Thus, Good EE proves to be the assets of the organization.

Therefore, it is very essential for an organization to see to it that the job given to the employee matches his career goals which will make him enjoy his work and he would ultimately be satisfied with his job. Only a satisfied employee can become an engaged employee. Upskilling the talented workforce provides opportunity for personal development in turn influences EE. Leadership requires providing clarity of company values and respectful treatment to employees to increase employee engagement. If employees' relationship with their managers is fractured, then no amount of perks will persuade the employees to perform at desired levels. Fair evaluation of an employee's performance is also very important criterion for determining the level of employee engagement. Employee engagement is a direct reflection of how employees feel about their relationship with their superiors. Reinforcement of people focused policies helps to motivate employee engagement.

## REFERENCES

1. Aggarwal, A., Jaisinghani, D. and Nobi, K. (2022), "Effect of organizational justice and support on organizational commitment and employee turnover intentions: the mediating role of employee engagement", *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQSS-08-2021-0112>
2. Alam, J., Mendelson, M., Boamah, M. I., & Gauthier, M. (2022). Exploring the antecedents of employee engagement. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*.
3. Anand, G. (2017). Corporate excellence through governance and employee engagement: A brief analysis. *Journal of Commerce and Management Thought*, 8(3), 554-562.
4. Bailey, C. (2022). Employee engagement: Do practitioners care what academics have to say–And should they? *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(1), 100589.
5. Barreiro, C. A., & Treglown, L. (2020). What makes an engaged employee? A facet-level approach to trait emotional intelligence as a predictor of employee engagement. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 159, 109892.

6. Choudhury, A., Dutta, A., & Dutta, S. (2022). An analysis of employee happiness, engagement and organisational commitment in the banking sector of India. *International Journal of Economics and Business Research*, 24(1-2), 159-179.
7. Fulmore, J. A., Fulmore, A. L., Mull, M., & Cooper, J. N. (2022). Reducing employee turnover intentions in the service sector: The connection between human resource development practices and employee engagement. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*.
8. Goyal, A., & Khatri, B. (2022). Systematic Review Paper on Influence of Ingenious Human Resource Practices on Employee Engagement during Pandemic in Banking Sector. *ECS Transactions*, 107(1), 3833.
9. Kerdpitak, C., & Jermstittiparsert, K. (2020). The impact of human resource management practices on competitive advantage: Mediating role of employee engagement in Thailand. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(1), 443-452.
10. Kwon, K., & Kim, T. (2020). An integrative literature review of employee engagement and innovative behavior: Revisiting the JD-R model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(2), 100704.
11. Mayuran, L., & Kailasapathy, P. (2022). To engage or not? Antecedents of employee engagement in Sri Lanka. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 60(3), 584-607.
12. Nwachukwu, C., Vu, H.M., Chládková, H. and Agboga, R.S. (2022), "Psychological empowerment and employee engagement: role of job satisfaction and religiosity in Nigeria", *Industrial and Commercial Training*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-05-2022-0028>
13. Omar Mohammed Ali Ababneh (2021) How do green HRM practices affect employees' green behaviors? The role of employee engagement and personality attributes, *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 64:7, 1204-1226, DOI: 10.1080/09640568.2020.1814708
14. Rakatu, V. L., Chandra, A. K., & Soma, M. K. (2022). Employee Engagement, Job Performance, Turnover Intention and Workplace Culture: A Comparative Study of Private and Public Sector Banks in Chhattisgarh. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(2).
15. Rasool, S. F., Wang, M., Tang, M., Saeed, A., & Iqbal, J. (2021). How toxic workplace environment effects the employee engagement: the mediating role of organizational support and employee wellbeing. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(5), 2294.
16. Raza, A., Farrukh, M., Iqbal, M. K., Farhan, M., & Wu, Y. (2021). Corporate social responsibility and employees' voluntary pro- environmental behavior: The role of organizational pride and employee engagement. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 28(3), 1104-1116.
17. Riyanto, S., Endri, E., & Herlisha, N. (2021). Effect of work motivation and job satisfaction on employee performance: Mediating role of employee engagement. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 19(3), 162.
18. Saks (2022). Caring human resources management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(3), 100835.
19. Sandhu, N., & Sharma, S. (2022). Drivers of Employee Engagement in the Banking Industry: Empirical Evidence from Fourteen Banks. *International Journal of Project Management and Productivity Assessment (IJPMPA)*, 10(1), 1-18.
20. Simon L. Albrecht & Andrew Marty (2020) Personality, self-efficacy and job resources and their associations with employee engagement, affective commitment and turnover intentions, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31:5, 657-681, DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2017.1362660
21. Sukhmeet Kaur (2017) "Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement: A Literature Review" *The IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. XVI, No. 3, 2017
22. Verčič, A. T. (2021). The impact of employee engagement, organisational support and employer branding on internal communication satisfaction. *Public Relations Review*, 47(1), 102009.
23. Wang, C., Xu, J., Zhang, T. C., & Li, Q. M. (2020). Effects of professional identity on turnover intention in China's hotel employees: The mediating role of employee engagement and job satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 45, 10-22.
24. Warnabarana, T. D., & Randika, P. A. D. D. (2022). Influencing Factors of Employee Engagement on Financial Wellbeing: Special Reference to Bank of Ceylon, Matara District, Sri Lanka. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 7(1), 333-339.
25. Yadav, A., Pandita, D. and Singh, S. (2022), "Work-life integration, job contentment, employee engagement and its impact on organizational effectiveness: a systematic literature review", *Industrial and Commercial Training*, Vol. 54 No. 3, pp. 509-527. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-12-2021-0083>