



Intention to Quit and Determinants of Employee Engagement: an Empirical investigation among the Banking Professionals of Guntur Region (India)

Asi Vasudeva REDDY

KLEF Business School, Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation, Guntur, India

Gummadi ANJALI

Sri Mittapalli College of Engineering Department, JNT University, Guntur, India

Abstract. *Purpose.* A descriptive cross-sectional study was carried to check effect of determinants of employee engagement on the employee attitudinal level of attrition in different private sector banks in Guntur Urban area. Four determinants, supervisory support, training and development, reward and work environment for employee engagement and three determinants job security, promotion and compensation benefits for attrition were considered. *Methodology.* A structured questionnaire was developed for the survey. A stratified random sampling based on the age group was adopted and 320 employees between 23 and 56 years participated in the survey. A total of 283 fully filled in questionnaires received from 218 male and 65 female respondents with 88.4% response rate. Correlation and regression tests were applied for analysis. *Findings.* The treatment on the data collected shows a significant negative relation between employee intention to quit and the determinants of employee engagement (-.069 to -.670). The R^2 value from the regression analysis depicts that only 18.4% of variability can be explained by the determinants of employee engagement such as work environment, supervisory support, training and development and reward on employee intention to quit from the organization. *Values of the results.* The study provides thought provoking managerial idea to reduce attrition levels by improvising employee engagement in the organizations. This paper also throws light for the researchers to carry out the study with other socio and psychological attributes influencing employee intention to quit.

Keywords: attrition, banking Industry, employee engagement, intention to quit, reward, supervisory support.

Introduction

Employee engagement has become a widely used and popular term with most of what has been written about employee engagement can be found on the basis of practice rather than theory and empirical research (Robinson, Perryman, Hayday, 2004). Several authors have worked on the topic of employee engagement within their academic community. Of all the researchers, W. A. Kahn becomes the first to coin the term engagement as he described how people can “use varying degrees of their selves, physically, cognitively, and emotionally in work role performances” (Kahn, 1990). While the other academic researchers have conceptualized employee engagement with different approaches of

well-being, burnout, and job involvement (Park, Gursoy, 2012). A recent study on ensuring well-being of the employees across the organization treated as a greatest challenge (Zigarmi et al., 2009). To ensure this, the organizations should be agile and ready for transforming the organization structure thus, providing a way for the highly engaged and satisfied employee.

A minimal research has been carried out on the constructs of employee engagement projecting the determinants like, training and development (T&D), reward (R), supervisory support (SS), work environment (WE) with employee intention to quit from the organization (EIQ).

Contextual Dimensions

Industry selected for the purpose is banking sector. India's Rs. 128 trillion (US\$ 1.97 trillion) banking industry is well at par with global standards and norms. Prudent practises and conventional framework adopted by the regulator, Reserve Bank of India (RBI), have insulated Indian banks from the global financial crisis. The country has 87 scheduled commercial banks with deposits worth Rs. 100.63 trillion (US\$ 1.54 trillion) as on 29 December, 2016. Of this, 26 are public sector banks, which control over 70 per cent of India's banking sector, 20 are private banks and 41 are foreign banks. Of the total, 41 banks are listed with a total market capitalisation of US\$ 181.2 billion as per the recent statistics (Report from IBEF.org, 2017).

For the purpose of this study, six private sector banks were selected for the survey. As the data to be kept confidential as it relates to sensitive factors like reward and employee satisfaction the categorization of the banks on the said factors was not disclosed.

Purpose of the Study

W. A. Khan (1990) stated that, to promote healthy work environment, it is the responsibility of the top management to ensure the employees are highly engaged so as to maintain the stability in achieving high productivity. Research has shown that work engagement affects work related outcomes such as job satisfaction (Harter, Schmidt, Hayes, 2002). Previous research has shown that work engagement affects work-related attitudinal and behavioral outcomes, such as job satisfaction, intention to leave and job performance (Park, Gursoy, 2012). As employees become more engaged, they find their work more meaningful, self-fulfilling and inspirational and in turn, become more dedicated and concentrated in their jobs leading to superior job performance.

Thus, enhancing the growth of job related attitudes and effectiveness of the employees in the organizations. Subsequently, the concept of employee engagement and its implications towards intention to quit appreciated and widely accepted in the present corporate world. The study is aimed to evaluate the relationship of determinants of employee engagement (T&D, R, SS, and WE), and employee intention to quit from the organization (EIQ).

Literature Review

Literature review includes definition of factors, earlier works, theories, and relationship of employee engagement (EE) with its determinants will be discussed in preceding paragraphs considering each variable one by one.

Employee Engagement (EE)

R. Wellins and J. Concelman (2005) defined as "Employee engagement is the illusive force that motivates employees to higher level of performance. This coveted energy is an amalgam of commitment, loyalty, productivity and ownership". D. Robinson and others define "engagement as a positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and values. An engaged employee is aware of the business context, works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the

benefit of the organization” (Robinson et al., 2004). It has variously been conceived as a psychological or affective state (e.g. commitment, involvement, attachment etc.), a performance construct (e.g. role performance, effort, observable behaviour, organisational citizenship behaviour etc.) or an attitude (Macey, Schneider, 2008).

Engagement is all about having a psychological commitment towards the assigned task, which is clearly reflected in his/her dedication towards the work. Employee engagement is the level of commitment and involvement an employee has towards the organization and its values. An engaged employee is aware of the business context, and works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization. Finally, engagement may be thought of as an antecedent to job involvement, in that individuals who experience deep engagement in their roles come to identify with their jobs. Engagement is a state where an individual is, not only intellectually committed, but also has a great emotional attachment with his/her job that goes above and beyond the call of duty, so as to further the interest of the company. Engaged employees care about and are loyal to the future of the organization. They are willing to put in extra efforts to ensure that the organization is led to growth and development.

Employee intention to quit (EIQ)

T. J. Kalliath and R. Beck (2001) opined that the individual who may be thinking about quitting a job, and for the manager who is faced with lack of employee continuity, impacts organizational productivity. While actual quitting behaviour is the primary focus of interest to employers and researchers, intention to quit is argued to be a strong surrogate indicator for such behaviour.

T. Oberlechner and A. Nimgade have confirmed that the level of employee mental stress increases with the reduced job security leading to occupational stress. This negative feeling on the jobs and organization result in employee withdrawal either from the job or organization or sometimes both (Oberlechner, Nimgade, 2005).

M. E. Echols (2007) confirmed that the likelihood of getting good promotion and incremental in salary, exert a strong retention activity and reduce intention to quit among employees which was also confirmed as a motivator from Herzberg’s two factor theory of motivation. B. C. Holtom et al. (2008) opined that the sense of belongingness to the job and organization with a long term association can be achieved with promotion opportunity in the organization.

A well-structured compensation and benefits plan lead to commitment to the job and organization, J. L. Cotton and J. M. Tuttle (1986) have identified compensation benefits as one of the dampening forces for the employees with the intentions to withdraw themselves either from the job or organization. Attractive pay showing inverse relationship reduces employee intention to quit from the organization.

Job engagement and lack of job satisfaction are among the factors that contribute to people’s intention to quit their jobs (Moore, 2001). However, it is important both from the manager’s and the individual’s perspective to understand the factors that mediate the relationship between employee engagement and intention to quit.

Training and Development (T&D)

The word training is used to explain the effort by an organization to promote learning among the employees (Snell, Bohlander, Vohra, 2010). Experts by and large agree that training is more related to immediate and short term performance needs; and development is more inclined towards improving an individual’s skills for future assignments, (Snell et al., 2010). Researchers also explained that the phrase, “training and development” is to recognize the combination of activities, organizations put in place to enhance the skills of their employees which in turn creates more affinity towards the job and the organization. Due to technical advancements and realization about the

multidimensional advantages of training and development, employers in many developed countries are offering implicit deals to their employees. With these implicit deals, an organization may have to let the employee go due to extreme business constraints, but will help the individuals to develop the marketable skills necessary to find the alternate job (Farell, Rusbult, 1981; Mathis, Jackson, 2002). Training and development methods contribute to increased motivation, job satisfaction and morale among employees. This improves the employee attitude to continue with the organization for long tenures. Methods, if effectively implemented imply that organizations are more employee-centric in order to improve the skills as well as increase their satisfaction in the ongoing jobs, resulting into a win-win situation. Hence a negative relationship between T&D and employee intention to quit the organization is being considered in this study.

Reward (R)

Reward is defined as intrinsic or extrinsic compensation on completion of a project or meeting performance objectives. Intrinsic reward often includes praise, while extrinsic reward is tangible and can be in the shape of direct or indirect compensation. Former includes base pay and variable pay; and later can comprise of life insurance, medical insurance, and retirement pension. For quite some time, employee's thinking of reward and its equity was considered as one of the key factors influencing degree of job involvement. Thus, the involvement of the employee reduces the intention to leave the organization. This supports the work by lot many researchers who established a decent relationship between reward and employee intention to quit from the organization (Judge, Welbourne, 1994; Lawler, 1971). In line with these studies of the renowned scholars, reward is hypothesized to have negative and inverse relationship with employee intention to quit the organization.

Supervisory Support (SS)

B. J. Jawarski and A. K. Kohli (1991), the nature of supervisory support influences the perception of employee about the work place and engagement at work place. With the increased monitoring tools and supervisor's influence on the reward, employee is more concerned about the relationship with the supervisor. Different aspects like fair treatment by the supervisor, feedback on performance and trust in the manager/supervisor have positive correlation of organizational loyalty and employee engagement. As the influence of supervisory support on employee engagement implies positive employee behaviour towards performance, and loyalty defies the employee intention to quit from the organization. On the basis of these studies, it has been hypothesized that, SS has negative impact on employee intention to quit from the organization.

Work Environment (WE)

A. S. Taiwo (2010) asserted that the ability of employees of an organization to share knowledge throughout the system depends on the conditions of their work environment. However, the survey revealed that many organizations do not fully leverage their physical work environment to enable increase collaboration, innovation and improve work effectiveness. Intention to quit also depends on the working environment, as the research states that employee quits the organization. It is also observed that employees tend to be more productive in a well-facilitated work environment. The quality of comfort derivable from work environment determines the level of satisfaction and productivity of workers. Whereas, workers productivity cannot be optimal, if the conditions of work environment are not favourable. Hence, improved work environment will enhance employee productivity and involvement towards the job entitled.

Objectives of the study

To understand the importance of determinants of employee engagement on attrition levels. To deduce empirical relation between the determinants of employee engagement and employee intention to quit from the organization.

Hypotheses

H1: Training and Development (T&D) reduces the employee intention to quit from the organization (EIQ).

H2: Reward (R) reduces the employee intention to quit from the organization (EIQ).

H3: Supervisory Support (SS) reduces the employee intention to quit from the organization (EIQ).

H4: Work Environment (WE) reduces the employee intention to quit from the organization (EIQ).

Research Methodology

Sample

A sample size of 283 from six different banks was taken for the study.

Sampling Technique

Convenience sampling technique has been used as only six banks have been surveyed for limitation of time and resources. A detailed description of participants from each bank and response rates were discussed in results and analysis section.

Instrument Development

The variables framed as Training & Development (TD), Reward(R), Work Environment (WE) and Supervisor Support (SS) on Employee Engagement (EE) have been tested by 32-items questionnaire including 5 demographic items and 12 items on employee Intention to Quit (EIQ) the company. Items relating to these variables have been adapted after changes to suit the requirements of study in hand and the local environments.

The survey questionnaire has three parts. First part is on demographics with questions about gender, age, education, marital and position. Second part of the questionnaire focus on four independent variables comprising of 15 items on a Likert Scale of one to five, with strongly disagree as one, and strongly agree rated as five. Whereas the third part of questionnaire consists of questions on a R. Likert's Scale of one to five, with strongly disagree as one and strongly agree as five for Employee intention to quit.

Methods

The determinants of employee engagement were measured by adopting four items from S. Y. Lee (2006) on Work Environment. Statements such as "My workplace is open enough to see my colleagues working" and "In general, my workspace is flexible" Employees were asked to choose a number on a five-point scale ranging from "1 — strongly disagree" to "5 — strongly agree" for each statement. Five items on Supervisory Support from S. Fukui et al., (2014), such as "Feel more positively about your job?" (.780); "Feel as if you're part of the team?" (.745); "Feel that your work was acknowledged?" (.737); Items were anchored using a 1-5 scale ("1 = Less than 10 % of the time" to "5 = 91 % and more of the time") with 5 signifying a higher percentage of time the worker perceived receiving support in supervision. Three items on Training and Development from R. A. Noe (2010) such as "I can see why the organization is interested in providing the training"; "I know enough about the training to support me when I return to work" on a five-point scale ranging from "1 — strongly disagree" to "5 — strongly agree" for each statement. Three items from M. Armstrong (2012) on reward, statements such as "I am not paid fairly in comparison with other people doing similar work in the organization"; "I feel that my pay does not reflect my performance"; "The job evaluation scheme works fairly" on a five-point scale ranging from "1 — strongly agree" to "5 — strongly disagree" for each statement.

A total of 12 items were adopted with three items from L. Firth and others (2004), such as "How often do you think about leaving the job?"; on a five point R. Likert's scale "1 — Rarely" to "5 — Very

often” “How likely are you to look for a new job within the next year?” on a five point R. Likert’s scale “1 — Very Unlikely” to “5 — Very Likely” with Cronbach’s alpha at 0.75. Two items from R. T. Mowday, C. S. Koberg, W. A. McArthur (1984), such as “All things considered, I would like to find a comparable job in a different organization” (.70); “I will probably look for a new job in the near future (.58)” were measured on five-point scales ranging from «1 — Strongly Disagree» to «5 — Strongly Agree». Three items from J. Greenberg and R. A. Baron (2008), such as “I am able to express my views about my job” and “I received the evaluation that I deserved” were measured on five-point scales ranging from «1 — Strongly Disagree» to «5 — Strongly Agree». Four items from N. Magner, G. G. Johnson, J. Elfrink (1994). Examples of the items on the scale are “For me this is the best of all possible institutions for which to work”; “I am proud to tell others that I am part of this institution,” and “This institution really inspires the very best in me in the way of performance” with Cronbach’s alpha 0.91. were measured on five-point scales ranging from «1 — Strongly Disagree» to «5 — Strongly Agree», and the items were summed for measuring employee intention to quit from the organization.

Data Collection Procedure

Data was collected through the above mentioned 32-item survey questionnaire, which was explained to the nominated representatives of the companies and got the questionnaires filled. Confidentiality of the companies and respondents is being maintained.

Data Analysis Technique

For the analysis of data, software of SPSS (version 21) has been used. Correlation and regression tests were applied for evaluation of data.

Reliability of Scale

Reliability Testing

A survey of 283 respondents from six commercial banks was conducted for confirming the reliability of scale.

Table 1. Reliability Statistics

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Work Environment	.667	4
Supervisory Support	.838	5
Training and Development	.859	3
Reward	.746	3
Intention to Quit	.773	12

The minimum value of Cronbach’s alpha came out to be 0.667 for work environment (WE) and all other variables stand over and above 0.7, against minimum acceptable limit of 0.6. Hence the scale was found reliable and fit for use.

Results, Analysis and Discussion

A total of 320 questionnaires were floated in six banks and 283 fully filled-in responses were received, with response rate of 88% mentioned in Table 2.

For analysing demographic variables, descriptive statistics, correlation and regression techniques were applied to find out the required results for analysis.

Demographic Analysis

As give in Table 3, male are 77% and female only 23% of the total respondents.

Table 2. Response Rate

Bank	No. of Participants	No. of Responses	Response Rate
Axis Bank Ltd	60	53	88%
HDFC Bank Ltd	60	55	92%
ICICI Bank Ltd	50	44	88%
Yes Bank Ltd	50	41	82%
Kotak Mahindra	50	43	86%
Karur Vysya Bank Ltd	50	47	94%
Total	320	283	88%

Table 3. Demographics

Age			Marital Status		
	Frequency	Percent		Frequency	Percent
< 25 yrs	55	19.4	Single	93	32.9
26–30 yrs	67	23.7	Married	190	67.1
31–35 yrs	52	18.4	Total	283	100.0
36–40 yrs	15	5.3	Gender		
41–45 yrs	43	15.2	Male	218	77
> 46 yrs	51	18.3	Female	65	23
Total	283	100.0	Total	283	100.0
Tenure			Education		
< 5 yrs	127	45.0	Graduation	113	39.9
6–10 yrs	47	16.7	Post-Graduation	137	48.4
11–15 yrs	9	3.3	Professional	33	11.7
16–20 yrs	14	5.0	Total	283	100.0
21–25 yrs	28	10.0			
>26 yrs	57	20.0			
Total	283	100.0			

Employees in age group 25–35 are in majority with 61.5% and those over 45 years are just 18.3%. In level of education, post graduates are leading with 48.4%, graduates with 39.9% and professionals are just 11.7%. Whereas, the service with the current organization leads to very less as 45% of the total respondents have less than five years of service with the current organization. Subsequently 20% of the respondents have more affinity towards the organization in terms of their tenure.

Descriptive Analysis

As shown in Table 4, mean is 2.9 or more for all variables except reward, which shows 3.6 on R. Likert's Scale of 1–5. It shows that most of the respondents are in agreement to the questions asked in the instrument. For data to be normal and free of negative or positive skewness, value of skewness should be between +2 to -2. In the said table all values are within range, hence no skewness is found in the data.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
				Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
EIQ	283	2.9632	.51975	-.749	.145	.742	.289
WE	283	3.9028	.60238	-.336	.145	.204	.289
SS	283	4.0219	.62406	-.867	.145	1.651	.289
TnD	283	4.0018	.70144	-.306	.145	-.313	.289
R	283	3.6042	1.10234	-.467	.145	-.580	.289

Similarly, for data to be normal, value of kurtosis should be positive. As values of four variables, less T&D and reward are positive; hence data is mostly in the range of normality.

Correlation

To find out the correlation of variables, Kendall's tau correlation test was run as the data was found to be normal from, skewness, and kurtosis. The strongest correlation is between R and EE at 0.663 and weakest between EIQ and WE at -0.670 . All correlations are significant with $p < .01$ (two tailed).

From the table 5 it is evident that there exists negative correlation between the determinants of Employee Engagement and intention to quit from the organization. The negative correlation observed denotes the impact of employee engagement on intention to quit. As they are negatively correlated, the increase in employee engagement and the organizational practices reduces the employee's intention to quit from the organization.

Table 5: Correlations

Variables		Correlations	EIQ	EE	R	WE	SS	TD
Kendall's tau_b	EIQ	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.378**	-.069	-.670**	-.577**	-.305**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	—	.000	.120	.000	.000	.002
	EE	Correlation Coefficient	-.378**	1.000	.663**	.417**	.585**	.624**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	—	.000	.000	.000	.000
	R	Correlation Coefficient	-.069	.663**	1.000	.144**	.426**	.379**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.120	.000	—	.002	.000	.000
	WE	Correlation Coefficient	-.670**	.417**	.144**	1.000	.278**	.328**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.002	—	.000	.000
	SS	Correlation Coefficient	-.577**	.585**	.426**	.278**	1.000	.337**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	—	.000
	TD	Correlation Coefficient	-.305**	.624**	.379**	.328**	.337**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.000	.000	.000	.000	—
		N		283	283	283	283	283

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

Whereas, the correlation between reward (R) and intention to quit (EIQ) stands at -0.069 , which can be termed as weak negative correlation, deduces that reward may not be the major contributor for employee's intention to quit from the organization.

Regression

To test the hypothesis, linear regression was applied. From the table 6, value of R^2 is .184, which means that model is 18.4% fit.

Table 6. Model Summary

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.429 ^a	.184	.173	.47278

a — Predictors: (Constant), TD, SS, WE, R

R^2 reflects the effect of Independent Variables on the Dependent Variable and is 18.4%. It means that all four Independent Variables combined (T&D, R, SS and WE) have only 18.4% effect on the Dependent Variable (EIQ). Adjusted R square is for total population, for which effect of all Independent Variables combined reduces to 17.3%.

Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Training and Development (T&D) reduces the employee intention to quit from the organization.

Table 7. Regression Coefficients (Dependent Variable: EIQ)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.360	.226		10.435	.000
R	.032	.032	.068	.994	.321
1 WE	-.156	.055	-.181	-2.824	.005
SS	-.306	.059	-.368	-5.221	.000
TD	-.031	.049	-.042	-.640	.523

From the Table 7, it is evident that the value of p is 0.523; hence the relationship is not significant at $p < .05$. Value of t is -0.640 . As $t < 2$, relationship is indicated as weak and negative, and shows that relationship between TD and EIQ is negative. Beta value indicates the effect of T&D on EIQ, and is -0.041 . It means that T&D brings a chance of -0.031 in EIQ. All combined, the results reflect that relationship of TD with EIQ is not significant, negative and weak. Hence $H1$ is rejected. This indicates that in banking industry, the concentration on training patterns improves employee engagement and reduces employee's intention to quit from the organization.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Reward (R) reduces the employee intention to quit from the organization.

On the lines explained for testing $H1$, table above shows that there exist no significant relationship at .321 ($p < .05$), and weak, can be treated as negligible with value of t as .994 ($t < 2$), and R effecting EIQ at .032. This concludes that relationship of R with EIQ is not significant ($p < .05$), and weak leading to mere -0.031 chance of influence on EIQ. Hence $H2$ can be rejected with its negligible percentage influence of Employee Engagement on intention to quit.

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Supervisory Support (SS) reduces the employee intention to quit from the organization.

This hypothesis like the previous two is about positive relationship of SS and EIQ. In Table above, we observe that relationship is significant with value of .000 ($p < .01$). Value of t at -2.824 shows a strong and negative relationship ($t < 2$) of SS and EIQ. Effect of SS on EIQ is $-.306$, which confirms the negative relationship. Hence the *Hypothesis 3* is accepted. This means employees of banking industry having good relationship with their supervisors show greater Employee Engagement and low intention to quit from the organization and vice versa.

Testing of Hypothesis 4 (H4)

This hypothesis is regarding positive relationship of WE with EIQ. Again referring to Table 5, relationship is significant at .005, ($p < .01$), strong and negative, with value of t as -2.824 , ($t < 2$). Value of beta is $-.181$. It confirms the strong negative relationship and effect of .156 of WE on EIQ. With this analysis, $H4$ is accepted, meaning that employees with better WE are more engaged at work with low intention to quit from the organization than those who have lower WE. With highest effect of $-.156$, WE become most significant and important determinant of EE for the employees who have been surveyed.

Regression Equation

$EIQ = 2.360 + 0.032 * R - 0.156 * WE - 0.306 * SS - 0.031 * TD$. We see that R^2 is 18.4% and that the regressors reward (R) and training and development (TD) are insignificant with $p > 0.05$, whereas work environment (WE). We see that R^2 is 18.4% and the regressors Reward (R) and Training and Development (TD) are insignificant with $p > 0.05$, whereas, Working environment (WE) and supervisory support (SS) are significant with $p < .05$ in this model, with Employee Intention to Quit (EIQ) decreases for rise in acceptable work environment (WE) conditions and supervisory support (SS) also with employee training and development (TD) process in the organization. Whereas, Reward (R) is directly proportional to employee intention to quit (EIQ) from the organization this is confirmed by Cognitive evaluation theory (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999) confirms rewarding may

be experienced as highly controlling, pressuring and stressful, and therefore will decrease intrinsic motivation leading to exit from the organization.

All Hypotheses except Hypotheses 1 and 2 have been accepted, and summary of Hypothesis Testing is as under (Table 7).

Table 7. Hypothesis Status

No	Hypothesis	Status
H1:	Training and Development (T&D) reduces the employee intention to quit from the organization.	Rejected
H2:	Reward (R) reduces the employee intention to quit from the organization.	Rejected
H3:	Supervisory Support (SS) reduces the employee intention to quit from the organization.	Confirmed
H4:	Work Environment (WE) reduces the employee intention to quit from the organization.	Confirmed

Discussion

Employee engagement, the most thrust area of research with complex literature and empirical evidence encouraged researchers to develop sound theoretical platform with empirical support for conceptualising. In addition to this, the present research attempt to support its contribution towards theory development with reference to Indian banking context. Employee engagement, with its focal point on engaging employees with the job and positive attitude towards job related outcomes by empowering them the required support, pathway to move on without hassles.

Mostly the results of the study have been discussed under relevant table of analysis or with each hypothesis testing. Reliability of scale for all factors and instrument as a whole is .836 which is greater than .7. It means that the scale is fit for use. Results of correlation showed significant relationship amongst of all the variables at $p < .01$ (two tailed). The strongest correlation is between R and EE at .663 and weakest between EIQ and WE at $-.670$. All correlations are significant with $p < .01$ (two tailed). Later in multiple regressions this weak relationship of R and EIQ and also EIQ and T&D at -0.032 and -0.031 respectively failed to be significant with ($p > .05$).

The study reveals that the employees are highly engaged when there are adequate conditions related to work environment, supervisory support, reward and training & development. Thus lessening the level of employee intention to quit from the organization. The survey supports that two out of four factors to include SS, and WE have positive and direct relationship with EIQ in the banking industry and two related hypotheses stand approved. This is in line with the earlier studies on the subject, where positive relationship of supervisor support and work environment with the construct of employee engagement has been established a low employee intention to quit from the organization. However R and T&D showed very low influence on EIQ and hypothesis got rejected.

India being an extensively diversified country in cultural perspective, shows different sets of people and variant styles provides support in the existence of practicing employee engagement to improve employee job satisfaction in Indian Banking Industry.

An engaged employee, thus, develops an environment where the employees work with utmost responsibility, supportive nature, understanding the requirements of the team members, valuing one another through collaboration can achieve mutual growth in the organization for longer tenure.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Managerial Implications

Management of banking industry should find out the reasons for low influence of Reward (R) and Training and Development (T&D) on Intention to quit (EIQ). There may be many more

reasons behind mere increase in the pay and benefits for employees to give their best and optimum productivity. In addition, to draw maximum advantage of significant relationship of SS and WE with EIQ, management should lay enhanced emphasis on these determinants so as to be employee centric. This will lead to more satisfied engaged employees, which increases involvement, commitment and increased productivity which decreases the intention to quit from the organization.

Limitations of the Study

Employee Engagement has lot many determinants, but only four of them are included to keep the study manageable. Secondly, the population includes the only six of the available banks only in the urban area of Guntur district.

Future Research

Hypothesis relating to negative relationship of Reward (R) and Training and Development (T&D) with Employee Intention to quit from the organization (EE) have been rejected, shows contradiction to earlier theories and studies. Further research can be carried out with a larger sample to explore the relationship of R and T&D on EIQ.

References

- Armstrong, M. (2012). *Armstrong handbook of reward management practice: improving performance through reward*. Kogan Page Limited.
- Cotton, J. L., Tuttle, J. M. (1986). Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implications for research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 11(1), 55–70.
- Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(6), 6–27.
- Echols, M. E. (2007). Learning's role in talent management. *Chief Learning Officer*, 6(10), 36–40.
- Farrell, D., Rusbult, C. E. (1981). Exchange variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover: The impact of reward, costs, alternatives, and investments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 28(1), 78–95.
- Firth, L., Mellor, D. J., Moore, K. A., Loquet, C. (2004). How can managers reduce employee intention to quit? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(2), 170–187.
- Fukui, S., Rapp, C. A., Goscha, R., Marty, D., Ezell, M. (2014). The perceptions of supervisory support scale. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 41(3), 353–359.
- Greenberg, J., Baron, R. A. (2008). *Behavior in organizations* (9th Ed). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- 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
- Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., Eberly, M. B. (2008). 5 Turnover and Retention Research: A Glance at the Past, a Closer Review of the Present, and a Venture into the Future. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 231–274. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19416520802211552>
- India brand equity foundation. *Banking industry report* (2017). <https://www.ibef.org/download/Banking-February-2017.pdf>
- Jaworski, B. J., Kohli, A. K. (1991). Supervisory feedback: Alternative types and their impact on salespeople's performance and satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 190–201.
- Judge, T. A., Welbourne, T. M. (1994). A confirmatory investigation of the dimensionality of the Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(3), 461–466.

- Kahn, W. A. (1990), Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724.
- Kalliath, T.J., & Beck, A. (2001), Is the path to burnout and turnover paved by a lack of supervisory support? A structural equations test. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 30(20), 72-78.
- Lawler, E. E. (1971). *Pay and organizational effectiveness: A psychological view*: McGraw-Hill New York.
- Lee, S. Y. (2006), Expectations of employees toward the workplace and environmental satisfaction, *Facilities*, 24(9), 343–353.
- Macey, W.H., Schneider B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3–30.
- Magner, N., Johnson, G. G., Elfrink, J. (1994). Evidence on the relationship between procedural and distributive justice in performance appraisal and account faculty attitudes and performance. *Journal of Accounting Education*, 12, 325–341.
- Mathis, R. L., Jackson, J. H. (2002). *Human Resource Management*: Western College Publishing Thomson Learning.
- Moore, K.A. (2001). Hospital restructuring: impact on nurses mediated by social support and a perception of challenge. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*. 23, 490–517.
- Mowday, R. T., Kobreg, C. S., McArthur, A. W. (1984). The psychology of the withdrawal process: A cross-validated test of Mobley's intermediate linkages model of turnover in two samples. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(1), 79–94.
- Noe, R. A. (2010). *Employee training and development*, 5th ed. McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Oberlechner, T., Nimgade, A. (2005). Work stress and performance among financial traders. *Stress and Health*, 21, 285–293.
- Park, J., Gursoy, D. (2012). Generation effects on work engagement among U.S. hotel employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(4), 1195–1202.
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., Hayday, S. (2004). The drivers of employee engagement. *Institute of Employment Studies. Report 408*, 1–73.
- Snell, S., Bohlander, G., Vohra, V. (2010). *Human Resource Management: A South Asian Perspective*: Cengage Learning.
- Taiwo, A. S. (2010). The influence of work environment on workers productivity: A case of selected oil and gas industry in Lagos, Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(3): 299–307.
- Wellins, R., Concelman, J. (2005). Creating a culture for engagement. *Workforce Performance Solutions*, 4, 1–4.
- Zigarmi, D., Nimon, K., Houson, D., Witt, D., Diehl, J. (2009). Beyond engagement: Toward a framework and operational definition for employee work passion. *Human Resource Development Review*, 8(3), 300–326.



Намерение уволиться и параметры вовлечённости сотрудников: эмпирическое исследование среди банковских служащих Гунтура (Индия)

РЕДДИ Аси Васудева

KLEF Business School, Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation, Guntur, India

АНЖАЛИ Гуммади

Sri Mittapalli College of Engineering Department, JNT University, Guntur, India

Аннотация. *Цель.* Цель данного описательного исследования проверить гипотезу о взаимосвязи различных параметров вовлечённости сотрудников и уровня текучести персонала в разных банках частного сектора в г. Гунтур (Индия). В исследовании рассматривались четыре параметра вовлечённости персонала: наставничество, обучение и развитие, оценка заслуг и рабочая среда; три параметра для оценки текучести персонала: безопасность работы, карьерное продвижение и уровень компенсаций. *Методы.* Для исследования была разработана структурированная анкета. Использована стратифицированная случайная выборка на основе возрастной группы. В опросе приняли участие 320 сотрудников в возрасте от 23 до 56 лет. Всего было получено 283 заполненных анкеты, полученных от 218 мужчин и 65 женщин-респондентов (доля ответивших 88,4%). Для обработки данных применялись корреляционный и регрессионный анализ. *Результаты.* Обработка собранных данных показывает значительную отрицательную связь между намерением сотрудника уволиться и параметрами вовлечённости сотрудников (от $-0,069$ до $-0,670$). Значение R^2 подтверждает, что модель соответствует 18,4% дисперсии параметров вовлечённости сотрудников и намерения уволиться с отрицательным эффектом. *Ценность результатов.* Эта статья проливает свет на то, что исследователи уже выяснили о других социальных и психологических характеристиках, влияющими на намерение сотрудника уволиться. Исследование обосновывает управленческую идею о возможности снижения уровня текучести путем управления степенью вовлечённости сотрудников в организациях. Эта статья также служит основой для последующего проведения исследований других социальных и психологических характеристик, влияющих на намерение сотрудника покинуть организацию.

Ключевые слова: текучесть кадров; банковский сектор; вовлечённость сотрудников; намерение покинуть работу; намерение уволиться; вознаграждение труда; наставничество.