

A STUDY ON ENGAGEMENT AND WELLBEING OF THE EMPLOYEES OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMPANIES IN CHENNAI

¹Mr. R. SATHYANARAYANAN

¹Assistant Professor Department of Corporate Secretaryship (Shift – II) Dwaraka Doss Goverdhan Doss
Vaishnav College Chennai – 600106 Email ID: sathyanarayanan9115@gmail.com

²Dr. M. MANIVANNAN

²Assistant Professor Department of Commerce Annamalai University Chidambaram – 608002 E-Mail ID:
drmm8989@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Employee Engagement describes the sense of employees' involvement towards their tasks. Employee wellbeing indicates the employees' physical, psychological and emotional health. The purpose of this research is to analyse the factors contributing towards the Employee Engagement and Wellbeing. Descriptive Research Design is used in this study. Primary Data were collected by using the Five-Point Likert Scale. This study mainly elaborates the factors such as Self-Efficacy, Fit and Belonging, Team Culture, Team Learning and Work Relationship, Engagement, Psychological Safety and Management influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Programmer Analysts, Project Managers and Senior Managers of IT Companies in Chennai with the sample size of One Hundred and Forty-Four. Majority of the Employees are Programmer Analysts. This study analyses the impact of Demographic Variables on the Engagement and Wellbeing of the employees, which identified that the Gender does not influence the Engagement and Wellbeing of the employees. Employees' Perception towards the factors influencing the Employee Engagement and Wellbeing remains constant regardless of the years of experience and categories of Designation. Perception of the Programmer Analysts and Senior Managers towards the factors influencing the Employee Engagement and Wellbeing varies in accordance with their income levels. It is recommended to create the awareness in the minds of the Programmer Analysts about the organizational mission. So that, they themselves become expertise in their own tasks and feel motivated to work towards the development of the Organization.

Keywords: Engagement, Efficacy, Management, Culture, Relationship

INTRODUCTION

One of the paramount significant factors in accomplishing the organizational vision is Engaging the employees by considering their wellbeing, which decreases the labour turnover rate. Kahn (1990) propounded the concept of Engagement at Work. It refers to the involvement of the members working in the organization in accordance with their respective work roles. People employ themselves cognitively, emotionally and physically while they are playing their roles. Today, employee engagement keeps the workforce in the engaged manner. Employee Engagement have come into the force with the effect of high rate of labour turnover. Csikszentmihalyi (1975) have constructed that the engagement in the organizational behaviour is the notion of flow, which states that the people have emotions when they are acting with the total involvement. Thus, Employee Engagement is the degree of involvement and commitment that an employee has

towards their organization and its values. The Engaged Employees produce outputs and does not switch over to the different organizations frequently. They are rather considered to be the ambassador of the company and it also creates a good inter-personal relationship with the colleagues and work towards the attainment of the organizational goals. Engaged employees always shows passion towards the organizational development. Employee Engagement have been categorized into three types namely, Intellectual Engagement, Affective Engagement and Social Engagement. Intellectual Engagement indicates dedication towards the performance of the task, Affective Engagement implies that the employee has the positive feelings after the accomplishment of his/her task and Social Engagement emphasizes on the discussions with others in terms of enhancing the work-related performance. From the end of the organization, the organization must strive to nurture and develop engagement by maintaining the two-way relationship between the employer and the

employee. Thus, the Employee Engagement acts as a barometer which determines the association of the people with the organization. HR Practitioners strongly believe that the engagement qualitatively measures as the way the employees perceive the work and the manner in which the employees are being treated in the organization.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Ologbo C Andrew & Sandak Sofian (2012) conducted a study on Employee Engagement on work outcomes by targeting towards 104 HR officers working at the Inland Revenue Board of Malaysia with a view to know about the impact of individual factor of employee engagement on work outcomes using the mediating variables such as job satisfaction, job engagement, employee development, relationship with the co-workers and organizational commitment. The Statistical tools such as mean, standard deviations, t-test and multiple regression analysis are employed. The result of the study indicates the relationship between the job engagement and organizational commitment along with co-employee support as a major individual factor that influence the engagement.

Lalitha Kavya & Padmavathy (2017) conducted a study on Employee Engagement in the Banking Sector by considering the factors such as Behavioural Outcome and Psychological State. This paper highlights the important models with respect to the employee engagement. This study helps the company to tap inexpensive and simple opportunities with a view to create a work-force and also studies the relationship between the engagement with the leaders and talent management. The study focuses towards the development of new practices and also improves their capacity with a view to maximize the organizational productivity.

Shashi Bharti (2018) conducted a study on the influence of Antecedents of Employee Engagement on Employee Performance with the sample size of 425 bank employees. The statistical tools such as T-Test, ANOVA, CFA and Structural Equation Modelling were used for analysing the data. The findings of the study concluded that those who have four dependents in the family are more spiritual than those employees who have no dependents. This study further highlights that the private sector employees have higher motivation mean score as compared to the public sector employees. It also highlights that lower-level employees are highly motivated than the higher-level employees.

Somveer (2021) investigated the impact of organizational climate on Employee Engagement, Retention and Performance in 30 BPO Companies located in Delhi & NCR Region from Noida by considering the factors such as role clarity, communication, respect, reward, career development, planning and decision making, relationships, commitment and morale and training and learning. It has been observed that the performance of the employees has been increased with the effect of teaching and learning as a key component. Planning and Decision-Making remains a significant aspect for deciding the level of success of the employees.

Dash & Bidya (2021) conducted an exploratory study on Employee Engagement and HR Initiatives in Public and Private Sector Banks in Bhubaneswar with 340 samples. This study revealed that the factors such as Job Involvement, Job Performance, autonomy, communication, loyalty, work environment, employee morale, self-evaluation at the work place. It has been found that the significant relationship exists between the private and public sector banks in the case of job satisfaction, job stress and loyalty. The employees of private banks showed their perception towards the employee engagement through the parameters like employee morale and job stress, whereas in public sector banks, the employees showed their perception towards employee engagement through autonomy, work environment, loyalty, communication, self-evaluation at the workplace, job performance, work culture, employee morale, job involvement and job stress.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- . To study the demographic characteristics of the employees.
- i. To analyze the impact of Demographic Variables on the Engagement and Wellbeing of the employees.

METHODOLOGY DESIGN

For the current study, the descriptive research design is used in two stages. First stage consists of the construction of the questionnaire by incorporating all the questions required for collecting the data pertinent to the objectives of the study. The second stage involves the actual survey of collecting the primary data through 'structured undisguised' closed ended questionnaire by incorporating Five-Point Likert Scale which was conducted in the Olympia Technology Park, Chennai. Secondary Data have been collected from the Books, Journals and Research Articles.

TABLE 1 NO. OF EMPLOYEES OF VARIOUS IT COMPANIES OF DIFFERENT DESIGNATIONS

S.no.	Name of the Company	No. of Employees	Programmer Analysts	Project Manager	Senior Manager
1	Alight Solutions	6	2	4	-
2	Dell	68	60	8	-
3	DXC Technology	2	-	-	2
4	HP	50	26	22	2
5	IBM	2	2	-	-
6	Jency Technologies	4	-	4	-
7	Logitech Engineering and Design	2	-	2	-
8	Natwest Group	2	-	2	-
9	Unicol Technologies	4	2	2	-
10	Wipro	4	2	2	-
	TOTAL	144	94	46	4

4.2 Sample Size: The sample size is 144 selected on the basis of stratified sampling from the category of probability sampling method.

Programmer Analysts – Ninety-Four, Project Manager – Forty-Six and Senior Manager – Four

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

TABLE 2 SUMMARY OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EMPLOYEES

Variables	Male (n= 110)	Female (n=34)	Total (n=144)	Percentage
Experience:				
<i>3-6 years</i>				
Programmer Analysts	68	12	80	55.55
Project Managers	0	0	0	0.00
Senior Managers	0	0	0	0.00
<i>6-9 years</i>				
Programmer Analysts	4	8	12	46.15
Project Managers	8	6	14	53.85
Senior Managers	0	0	0	0.00
<i>9-15 years</i>				
Programmer Analysts	2	0	2	5.88
Project Managers	26	6	32	94.12
Senior Managers	0	0	0	0.00
<i>More than 15 years</i>				
Programmer Analysts	0	0	0	0.00
Project Managers	0	0	0	0.00
Senior Managers	2	2	4	100.00
TOTAL	110	34	144	100.00
Income:				
<i>₹1,80,000 to ₹3,00,000 p.a.</i>				
Programmer Analysts	22	4	26	86.67
Project Managers	2	2	4	13.33
Senior Managers	0	0	0	0.00
<i>₹3,00,000 to ₹4,20,000 p.a.</i>				
Programmer Analysts	40	8	48	77.41
Project Managers	10	4	14	22.58
Senior Managers	0	0	0	0.00
<i>₹4,20,000 to ₹5,40,000 p.a.</i>				
Programmer Analysts	12	8	20	43.48
Project Managers	20	6	26	56.52
Senior Managers	0	0	0	0.00
<i>More than ₹5,40,000 p.a.</i>				
Programmer Analysts	0	0	0	0.00

Project Managers	2	0	2	33.33
Senior Managers	2	2	4	66.67
TOTAL	110	34	144	100.00
Designation:				
Programmer Analysts	74	20	94	65.28
Project Managers	34	12	46	31.94
Senior Managers	2	2	4	2.78
TOTAL	110	34	144	100.00

Source: Computed from Primary Data

Table 1 exhibit that a majority 65.28% of the employees are Programmer Analysts, 31.94% of the employees are Project Managers and minority 2.78% of the employees are Senior Managers. A majority 78.72% of the male employees are Programmer Analysts, 36.17% of the male employees are Project Managers and minority 2.13% of the male employees are Senior Managers respectively. A majority 58.82% of the female employees, 35.29% of the female employees and minority 5.88% of the female employees are Programmer Analysts, Project Managers and Senior Managers respectively. Experience of the

majority of the programmer analysts ranges between 3 and 6 years, major proportion of the project managers' experience ranges from 6 – 12 years and senior managers' experience is more than 15 years respectively. Majority of the Programmer Analysts' salary ranges between Rs. 3,00,000 to Rs.4,20,000 p.a. Senior Managers are earning more than Rs.5,40,000 p.a.

.Hypothesis for Gender and its impact on the Designations of the Employees

H₀: There is no significant difference between the Gender and the Categories of Designations of the Employees.

TABLE 3 GENDER AND CATEGORIES OF DESIGNATIONS OF THE EMPLOYEES

GENDER	DESIGNATIONS			
	PROGRAMMER ANALYSTS	PROJECT MANAGERS	SENIOR MANAGERS	TOTAL
MALE	74	34	2	110
FEMALE	20	12	2	34
TOTAL	94	46	4	144
Calculated Value of $\chi^2_{0.05} (O - E)^2 / E = 1.9883 < 5.99$				
df = v = (r-1) (c-1) = (2-1=1) (3-1=2) = 1*2=2				
Result	Insignificant			

Source: Computed from Primary Data

Table 3 depicts the Chi-Square test result between the Gender and the Categories of Designation of the Employees. This test has revealed the insignificant difference existing between the Gender and the Categories of Designation of the employees with the calculated χ^2 -test value of 1.9883, which is lesser than the table χ^2 -test value of 5.99 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H₀) holds true. Therefore, both the categories of designation of the employees and gender of the employees are not significantly associated with each other.

Hypothesis for Experience and its impact on Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees

H₀₁: There is no significant difference existing in the Experience of the Programmer Analysts and the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference existing in the Experience of the Project Managers and the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference existing in the Experience of the Senior Managers and the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees.

TABLE 4 EXPERIENCE AND ENGAGEMENT AND WELLBEING OF THE EMPLOYEES

EXPERIENCE							
Engagement and Wellbeing Factors	3 – 6 Years	6 – 9 Years	9 – 15 Years	More than 15 Years	Total		

Self-Efficacy					
Programmer Analysts	8	2	8	1	19
Project Managers	0	4	4	0	8
Senior Managers	0	0	0	1	1
Fit and Belonging					
Programmer Analysts	14	2	0	0	16
Project Managers	0	2	12	0	14
Senior Managers	0	0	0	1	1
Team Culture, Team Learning and Work Relationship					
Programmer Analysts	14	6	0	0	20
Project Managers	0	0	6	0	6
Senior Managers	0	0	0	1	1
Engagement					
Programmer Analysts	16	2	0	0	18
Project Managers	0	0	4	0	4
Senior Managers	0	0	0	0	0
Psychological Safety					
Programmer Analysts	24	4	0	0	28
Project Managers	0	2	0	0	2
Senior Managers	0	0	0	0	0
Management					
Programmer Analysts	4	0	0	0	4
Project Managers	0	2	0	0	2
Senior Managers	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	80	26	34	4	144
Programmer Analysts (Experience): $F_1 = 4.484 > 3.287$; $df = (3,15)$ (Engagement and Wellbeing Factors): $F_2 = 0.31 < 2.901$; $df = (5,15)$					Significant
Project Managers (Experience): $F_1 = 3.72 > 3.287$; $df = (3,15)$ (Engagement and Wellbeing Factors): $F_2 = 0.77 < 2.901$; $df = (5,15)$					Significant
Senior Managers (Experience): $F_1 = 3.75 > 3.287$; $df = (3,15)$ (Engagement and Wellbeing Factors): $F_2 = 0.75 < 2.901$; $df = (5,15)$					Significant

Source: Computed from Primary Data

Table 4 depicts the Two-Way ANOVA result among the Experience of Programmer Analysts, Project Managers and Senior Managers and the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing. (H_{01}) has revealed that the significant difference existing among the programmer analysts with the calculated value of $F_1 = 4.484$ which is greater than the table value of 3.287 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H_{01}) does not hold true. Therefore, the Experience of the Programmer Analysts significantly varies. (H_{01}) has revealed that the insignificant difference

existing among the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees with the calculated value of $F_2 = 0.31$ which is lesser than the table value of 2.901 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H_{01}) hold true. Therefore, the perception of the programmer analysts pertaining to the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees does not differ significantly.

(H_{02}) has revealed that the significant difference existing among the Project Managers with the calculated value of $F_1 = 3.72$ which is greater than the table value of 3.287 @ 95% Level of

Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H_{01}) does not hold true. Therefore, the Experience of the Project Managers significantly varies. (H_{02}) has revealed that the insignificant difference among the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees with the calculated value of $F_2 = 0.77$ which is lesser than the table value of 2.901 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H_{01}) hold true. Therefore, the perception of the project managers pertaining to the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees does not differ significantly.

(H_{03}) has revealed that the significant difference existing among the Senior Managers with the calculated value of $F_1 = 3.75$ which is greater than the table value of 3.287 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H_{01}) does not hold true. Therefore, the Experience of the Senior Managers significantly varies. (H_{03}) has

revealed that the insignificant difference among the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees with the calculated value of $F_2 = 0.75$ which is lesser than the table value of 2.901 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H_{01}) hold true. Therefore, the perception of the senior managers pertaining to the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees does not differ significantly.

Hypothesis for Designation and Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees

H_{01} : There is no significant difference existing in the Designation of the Employees.

H_{02} : There is no significant difference existing in the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees.

TABLE 5 DESIGNATION AND ENGAGEMENT AND WELLBEING OF THE EMPLOYEES

Engagement and Wellbeing Factors	Programmer Analysts	Project Managers	Senior Managers	Total
Self-Efficacy	23	8	1	32
Fit and belonging	17	17	0	34
Team Culture, Team Learning and Work Relationship	25	7	1	33
Engagement	14	2	1	17
Psychological Safety	7	9	0	16
Management	8	3	1	12
TOTAL	94	46	4	144
(Designation): $F_1 = 2.763 < 4.1028$; $df = (2,10)$			Insignificant	
(Engagement and Wellbeing Factors): $F_2 = 0.895 < 3.3258$; $df = (5,10)$			Insignificant	

Source: Computed from Primary Data

Table 5 reveals the Two-Way ANOVA result between the Employees' Designation and Engagement and Wellbeing of the employees Factors. H_{01} revealed that the insignificant difference existing in the Employees' Designations with the calculated value of $F_1 = 2.763$ which is lesser than the table value of 4.1028 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis(H_{01}) holds true. Therefore, the employees irrespective of the designations possess the similar and identical perception. H_{02} revealed that the insignificant difference existing among the perception of the employees with respect to their engagement and wellbeing with the calculated value of $F_2 = 0.895$ which is lesser than the table value of 3.3258 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H_0) holds true. Therefore, the

perception of the employees among the factors influencing the engagement and wellbeing of the employees does not differ.

Hypothesis for Ranges of Income and its impact on Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees

H_{01} : There is no significant difference existing in the Ranges of Income of the Programmer Analysts and the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees.

H_{02} : There is no significant difference existing in the Ranges of Income of the Project Managers and the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees.

H_{03} : There is no significant difference existing in the Ranges of Income of the Senior Managers and the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees.

TABLE 6 RANGES OF INCOME AND ENGAGEMENT AND WELLBEING OF THE EMPLOYEES

INCOME					
Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees	₹1,80,000 to ₹3,00,000 P.A.	₹3,00,000 to ₹4,20,000 P.A.	₹4,20,000 to ₹5,40,000 P.A.	More than ₹5,40,000 P.A.	TOTAL
Self-Efficacy					
Programmer Analysts	4	8	2	0	14
Project Managers	1	1	8	1	11
Senior Managers	0	0	0	0	0
Fit and Belonging					
Programmer Analysts	1	7	0	0	8
Project Managers	1	2	8	1	12
Senior Managers	0	0	0	0	0
Team Culture, Team Learning and Work Relationship					
Programmer Analysts	5	3	11	0	19
Project Managers	4	8	3	0	15
Senior Managers	6	2	2	1	11
Engagement					
Programmer Analysts	1	2	1	0	4
Project Managers	3	10	1	0	14
Senior Managers	1	3	0	1	5
Psychological Safety					
Programmer Analysts	1	2	0	0	3
Project Managers	0	2	4	0	6
Senior Managers	0	0	1	1	2
Management					
Programmer Analysts	1	6	3	0	10
Project Managers	1	6	2	0	9
Senior Managers	0	0	0	1	1
TOTAL	30	62	46	6	144
Programmer Analysts (Range of Income): $F_1 = 0.0316 < 3.287$; $df = (3,15)$ (Engagement and Wellbeing Factors): $F_2 = 2.98 > 2.901$; $df = (5,15)$					Insignificant
Project Managers (Range of Income): $F_1 = 1.50 < 3.287$; $df = (3,15)$ (Engagement and Wellbeing Factors): $F_2 = 2.100 < 2.901$; $df = (5,15)$					Insignificant
Senior Managers (Range of Income): $F_1 = 3.64 > 3.287$; $df = (3,15)$ (Engagement and Wellbeing Factors): $F_2 = 5.180 > 2.901$; $df = (5,15)$					Significant

Source: Computed from Primary Data

Table 6 depicts the Two-Way ANOVA result among the Range of Income of Programmer Analysts, Project Managers and Senior Managers and the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing. (H_{01}) has revealed that the insignificant difference existing among the Programmer Analysts in terms of Range of Income with the calculated value of $F_1 = 0.0316$ which is lesser than the table value of 3.287 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H_{01}) holds true. Therefore, the Range of Income of the

Programmer Analysts does not significantly vary. (H_{01}) has revealed that the significant difference existing in the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees with the calculated value of $F_2 = 2.98$ which is greater than the table value of 2.901 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H_{01}) does not hold true. Therefore, the perception of the programmer analysts pertaining to the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees differ significantly.

(H₀₂) has revealed that the insignificant difference existing among the Project Managers in terms of Range of Income with the calculated value of $F_1 = 1.50$ which is lesser than the table value of 3.287 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H₀₁) holds true. Therefore, the Range of Income of the Project Managers does not significantly vary. (H₀₂) has revealed that the insignificant difference existing among the employees with regard to the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing with the calculated value of $F_2 = 2.100$ which is lesser than the table value of 2.901 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H₀₁) holds true. Therefore, the perception of the project managers pertaining to the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees does not differ significantly.

(H₀₃) has revealed that the significant difference existing among the Senior Managers in terms of Range of Income with the calculated value of $F_1 = 3.64$ which is greater than the table value of 3.287 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H₀₃) does not hold true. Therefore, the Range of Income of the Senior Managers significantly vary. (H₀₃) has revealed that the significant difference existing in the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees with the calculated value of $F_2 = 5.180$ which is greater than the table value of 2.901 @ 95% Level of Confidence. Thus, the Null Hypothesis (H₀₁) does not hold true. Therefore, the perception of the senior managers pertaining to the factors influencing the Engagement and Wellbeing of the Employees differ significantly.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

This survey revealed that the factors pertaining to the Employees' Engagement and Wellbeing does not change in accordance with the Gender. It is being primarily suggested to motivate the Programmer Analysts to take initiative to develop in their career. It is recommended to provide adequate support for the Programmer Analysts and Project Managers towards developing their skills. It is also suggested to create the awareness in the minds of the Programmer Analysts about the organizational mission. So that, they themselves become expertise in their own tasks and feel motivated to work towards the development of the Organization. It is recommended to follow the time schedule accurately all the employees on the basis of the shifts and also suggested that the same batch of employees need not stretch for the long hours. It is advisable to synchronize the compensation package of the employees in accordance with their experience. In addition to this, it is suggested to inculcate the orientation training programme for the

new joiners. It is strongly recommended that the Companies may create the platform for the employees for undergoing the physical and mental exercises such as Yoga, Meditation and etc. with a view to refresh themselves towards the accomplishment of the Organizational Vision. As this component is the vital element for managerial success and corporate growth. It is highly recommended to appraise the performance of the employees by using 720-degree performance appraisal method and the feedback may be updated to them in regular intervals. The Company may organize extra-curricular activities such as sport, games and other competitions with a view to enhance their creativity and team spirit in the Organization. The Organization may arrange recreational facility like tourism trip on a yearly basis with a view to instil mental relaxation and enhance the social wellbeing. The Organization may arrange Management Games and Brain Storming sessions. The Project Managers of the Organization are suggested to treat all their subordinates by adopting the "Empathetic Approach" and adopt the 'Paternalistic' and 'Democratic' styles of Leadership by providing opportunities to all the employees to express their own views, thoughts, ideas and grievances regardless of their experience and designations. Strong Social Interaction should be encouraged among the employees regardless of their designations by guiding and assisting boss, peers and subordinates at the times of the complexities and difficulties experienced by them in their tasks.

CONCLUSION

This study highlights that the Employees who have more than 9 years of experience are Project Managers and Senior Managers who are highly skilled with Self-Efficacy, Fit and Belonging, Team Culture, Team Learning and Work Relationship, Engagement, Psychological Safety and Management. High Labour Turnover is existing in the designation of the Programmer Analysts. Awareness and Training are to be provided in a right manner specially by targeting towards the Programmer Analysts. This study concludes by suggesting that by identifying, understanding and addressing each and every employee's own query relating to their tasks, roles and by acknowledging their efficiencies, the organization will flourish progressively towards the achievement of the Vision as well as it ensures the wellbeing of the employees.

REFERENCES

Bakker, A. B., & Bal, M. P. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among

- starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 189-206. DOI:10.1348/096317909X402596.
- Brad Shuck, Thomas G. Reio (2013). Employee Engagement and Well-Being: A Moderation Model and Implications for Practice, *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* 2014, Vol. 21(1) 43–58, DOI: 10.1177/1548051813494240.
- Brown, S. P., & Leigh, T. W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 358-368. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.358
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 89-136. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cole, M. S., Walter, F., Bedeian, A. G., & O'Boyle, E. H. (2011). Job burnout and employee engagement: A metanalytic examination of construct proliferation. *Journal of Management*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0149206311415252.
- Demerouti, E., Mostert, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Burnout and work engagement: A thorough investigation of the independency of both constructs. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15, 209-222. doi:10.1037/a0019408
- Hakanen, J. J., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Do burnout and work engagement predict depressive symptoms and life satisfaction? A three-wave seven-year prospective study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*. Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1016/j.jad.2012.02.043
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 268-279. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 3- 30. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x
- O'Neil, B. S., & Arendt, L. A. (2008). Psychological climate and work attitudes: The importance of telling the right story. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 14, 353-370.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 617-635.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 600-619. doi:10.1108/02683940610690169
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Work engagement. What do we know and where do we go? *Romanian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 14(1), 3-10. doi:10.1177/0013164405282471
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 701-716. doi:10.1023/A:1015630930326
- Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Van Rhenen, W. (2008). Workaholism, burnout, and work engagement: Three of a kind or three different kinds of employee well-being? *Applied Psychology*, 57, 173-203. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00285.x
- Schneider, B., Parkington, J. J., & Buxton, V. M. (1980). Employee and customer perceptions of service in banks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 252-267.
- Shuck, B. (2011). Integrative literature review: Four emerging perspectives of employee engagement: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 10, 304-328. doi:10.1177/1534484311410840
- Shuck, B., Reio, T. G., Jr., & Rocco, T. (2011). Employee engagement: An examination of antecedent and outcome variables. *Human Resource Development International*, 14, 427-445. doi:10.1080/13678868.2011.601587
- Sonnentag, S., Mojza, E. J., Binnewies, C., & Scholl, A. (2008). Being engaged at work and detached at home: A week-level study on work

engagement, psychological detachment, and affect. *Work & Stress*, 22, 257-276. doi:10.1080/02678370802379440

Van Den Tooren, M., & DeJonge, J. (2008). Managing job stress in nursing: What kind of resources do we need? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 63, 75-84. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.2008.04657.x

Walton, R. E. (1974). QWL indicators: Prospects and problems. In A. H. Portigal (Eds.). *Measuring the quality of working life. A symposium on Social Indicators of Working Life*. Ottawa, March, pp:19-20.

Walton, R. E. (1975). Criteria for quality of working life. In L. E. Davis, & A. B. Cherns (Eds.), *The Quality of Working Life*, 1(2), pp:93-97.

Wollard, K. (2011). Quiet desperation: Another perspective on employee engagement. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13, 526-537. doi:10.1177/1523422311430942.

ANNEXURE

QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION – A DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

1. Name of Your Company -----
2. Age (in Years): Below
30 Between 30 and 40 Between 40 and 50 Above 50
3. Gender: Male Female
4. Marital Status: Married Unmarried Widowed
5. Educational Qualification: UG PG Professional
6. Designation: Programmer Analyst Project Manager Senior Manager Others
0. Years of Experience: 3 – 6 Years 6 – 9 Years 9 – 15 Years More than 15 Years
0. Income Per Annum: ₹1,80,000 to ₹3,00,000 P.A. ₹3,00,000 to ₹4,20,000 P.A. ₹4,20,000 to ₹5,40,000 P.A. More than ₹5,40,000 P.A.

SECTION – B

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND WELLBEING SCALE

SL NO.	STATEMENTS	SA	A	N	DA	SDA
1. SELF EFFICACY						
1	I can list concrete steps to move up in my organization within the next year.					
2	I am growing and developing gradually in my career					
3	My Company is supporting me adequately to develop my skill					
4	My Company inspires me highly in terms of Job Performance					
5	I am excited about my project work.					
6	I am provided with the good platform to do my job consistently					
0. FIT AND BELONGING						
1	I experience that the organizational goals and my goals are similar.					
2	I feel as my service is one of the major parts of the company's growth					
3	I can stay in this company for many years					
4	The Organization's mission consistently inspires me to do contribute my best					
5	My work style matches the work style of the Company					
6	I experience a clear tie between the Organization's mission and my job					
0. TEAM CULTURE, TEAM LEARNING AND WORK RELATIONSHIPS						
1	I learn a lot from my Colleagues					
2	We regularly spend time to identify the ways for improving our work process					
3	My Team has clear and prioritized objectives					
4	My supervisors, subordinates, colleagues care about me					
5	My Colleagues possess the skills and expertise to do their jobs					

6	My department is consistently provided with all the information for executing our objectives					
7	I am proud to be an employee in my Company					
8	I refer my friends or the family members to join this Company					
0. ENGAGEMENT						
1	I feel exhausted in the morning at the thought of another day at work					
2	My Workload is reasonable for my Role					
3	I am recognized for my smart work and success at my work					
4	My manager trusts me when I approach them with the problem					
5	In the absence of my manager, people are available to keep me engaged					
0. PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY						
1	I believe that at least one person is available to encourage my development					
2	Members of this team are entertained to bring up problems					
3	I am comfortable in sharing my opinions in the meeting					
4	My manager demonstrates an interest in my well-being					
5	My manager sets clear expectations for my performance					
0. MANAGEMENT						
1	I am comfortable in providing the feedback to my manager					
2	My manager has the technical expertise to manage myself effectively					
3	I am comfortable in seeking for the help if I do not possess the skills required to meet my goals					