

A Study on the Individual Differences in Employee Work Behaviour in Contemporary Business Organizations

Nisha Kumari, Neeraj Mann

Abstract: *Employee engagement is the emotional commitment the employee has to the organization and its goals. Employee engagement is actually the level of enthusiasm and dedication an employee feels toward his or her job. In recent years, employee engagement has emerged as the topmost challenge for majority of the organizations. This paper primarily focuses on determination of relationship between personality factors and employee engagement. This will enable them to understand the personality of employee's right at the time of hiring and selection process and to bring in only those employees whose personality and values are in alignment with the culture and values of the organization. Key words: Anxiety, Engagement, Extraversion, Personality, Tough poise. An engaged employee will have a strong emotional bonding with the organization he is working for. Literature also supports the fact that an employee's personality has a major influence on his behavior in the Organization. Hence this study seeks to understand the interactive effect of employee engagement and personality on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour by Using Univariate analysis and the empirical study.*

Keywords: Employee Engagement, Personality, Five Model of Personality, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Personality And Engagement

1. Introduction

"To win market place you must first win in the workplace"Doug Conant

1.1 Background of the problem

Today, the explosion of technology advances, globalization and competitive business environment continues to transform the marketplace. Now, organizations are looking to tap into the underutilised capacities and talent of individuals. Organizations depend on efficient functioning of its most valuable resource, its employees, who help to drive innovation and flourish its performance to new height. Determine what their engaged co workers try to accomplish on a daily basis.

Undisputedly, engagement impacts business outcomes. For instance, Harter, Schmidt, Killham and As plund (2006) conducted a Meta analysis that revealed business units with highest levels of engagement had an 83% chance of having high or above average composite performance as compared to 15% chance for those with the lowest levels of engagement. Clearly, engagement is an important factor of interest to the organizations. We must bring the person to the engagement debate. This was the gist of the argument made by business consultant Ed Gubman (2004) in "From Engagement to Passion for Work: The search for the Missing Person." Gubman argued that current discussions on engagement involve two components: where the person works and what the person does. As an alternative, organizations should start focusing on who the person is. Truly, William Kahn's (1990) landmark study on engagement did not focus on the person. Instead Kahn sought to understand powerful psychological conditions that could "survive the gamut of individual differences" (p. 695). Kahn identified three such conditions: meaningfulness (the perceived "worth" of engaging at work), safety (how safe it is to be oneself at work) and availability of resources both emotional and physical, to perform one's duties. Engagement

researchers, however, have acknowledged the potential impact of the person on engagement. First Kahn (1990) argued that individual differences might influence the kinds of roles employees find engaging or disengaging as well as personal experiences of meaningfulness, safety, and availability of resources. Secondly, Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) described engagement as a relatively "persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state" (p. 4). Such longer-term description of engagement seems to suggest at least some level of connection between engagement and the personality of the individual.

Every sector should work towards the cultivating and nurturing of engagement culture. we must bring the person to engagement debate.

1.2 Employee Engagement

Employee engagement was conceptualised by Kahn (1990), as he defined it as "the harnessing of organization member selves to work roles in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during performance."

Goldberg (1990) and Mecrae (1997) proposed five model of personality which play vital role in shaping Kahn psychological antecedent of employee engagement. Personality theory considered appropriate base and highly accepted model to demonstrate employee behaviour, attitude, feeling and commitment. Personality theories and its relationship with engagement have received enormous attention by researchers.

1.3 Statement of Problem

In spite of considerable interest generated by engagement discussions, there is room for more academics research on this topic such as strength of social relationship and support at work (Saks 2006), job designed and intensity of workload (Linton and Janssen 1999). Further research is needed,

Volume 9 Issue 3, March 2020

www.ijsr.net

[Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

however, to identify personal or psychological components of engagement (Kahn 1990).

This research has been **undertaken to study path analysis of predictor and predictor impacting on employee (Markos and Berlin, 2010).**

This research is an effort towards proposing model *to clarify facets and sub facets of personality are key and how these facets leads to improve work and commitment.*

To study level of engagement amongst employees and cordial relationship of employees with co-worker.

The study will **undertake to review about how enduring and stable traits associate with work engagement and how to handle disengaged employees.**

Consequently, this study will look at the individual differences in employee engagement in public and private organizations.

2. Literature Review

This literature review is examined from journal, articles, and textbooks, working paper, synopsis and readings.

Employee Work Behaviour

Kahn (1990) found that people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally engaged in organization. However, Goffman's work focused on fleeting face to face encounter to fit organization life (Diamond and Weiss, 1999). Harter 2002 reviewed person involvement with enthusiasm vigour and dedication.

Kahn examined various disciplines like psychologists (Freud 1922), sociologist (Merton 1957) and group theorist (Slater and Smith 1987). All recognised idea of being hesitant and protect them from isolation and engulfment. Kahn, Bates 2004 and Molinaro 2008 described "personal engagement and disengagement", which refers to employees behaviour during work role performance by interviewing summer camp counsellors and staff at architecture firm. Disengaged employee displayed incomplete performance and effortless (Kahn 1990).

Harter (2002 meta analysis result between employee satisfaction and engagement. He also found meaningfulness, safety, availability and (saks 2006) defined trust, social exchange theory and culture effect on engagement. He argue way for individuals to repay their organization through engagement and also differentiate between job and organization engagement. May et al's (2004) findings support Maslach et al's (2001) notion of meaningful and valued work being associated with behaviour, and therefore it is important to consider the concept of 'meaning'.

In recent years, more studies have begun to look at the antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. For example, Saks (2006) found a distinction between two types of engagement, job engagement and organization

engagement, which he argues are related but distinct constructs. In addition, he argued that the relationships between both job and organization engagement, and their antecedents and consequences differed in a number of ways, suggesting that the psychological conditions that lead to job and organization engagement, as well as their consequences, is not the same. Whilst this study has provided a new insight into employee engagement, it is important to note the survey was completed by a small sample of 102 employees in Canada. Therefore, the results may not be generalize to employees in the world, for example, as definitions of engagement vary in different countries and national differences may play a part in what leads to engagement in the first place. Nevertheless, it adds a new insight into the existing body of literature as it is the first study to make a distinction between job and organization engagement and to measure a variety of antecedents and consequences of job and organization engagement; previous research has focused primarily on engagement at the individual level. Practitioners and academics tend to agree that the consequences of employee engagement are positive (Saks 2006).

There is a general belief that there is a connection between employee engagement and business results; a meta-analysis conducted by Harter et al (2002:272) confirms this connection. They concluded that, "...employee satisfaction and engagement are related to meaningful business outcomes at a magnitude that is important to many organizations". However, engagement is an individual-level construct and if it does lead to business results, it must first impact individual-level outcomes. Therefore, there is reason to expect employee engagement is related to individuals' attitudes, intentions, and behaviours. Although neither Kahn (1990) nor May et al (2004) included outcomes in their studies, Kahn (1992) proposed that high levels of engagement lead to both positive outcomes for individuals, (e.g. quality of people's work and their own experiences of doing that work), as well as positive organizational-level outcomes (e.g. the growth and productivity of organizations). The Gallup Organization (2004) found critical links between employee engagement, customer loyalty, business growth and profitability. They compared the scores of these variables among a sample of stores scoring in the top 25 per cent on employee engagement and customer loyalty with those in the bottom 25 per cent. Stores in the bottom 25 per cent significantly under-performed across three productivity measures: sales, customer complaints and turnover.

The International Survey Research (ISR) team has similarly found encouraging evidence that organizations can only reach their full potential through emotionally engaging employees and customers (ISR 2005).

According to Holbeche and Springett (2003), people's perceptions of 'meaning' with regard to the workplace are clearly linked to their levels of behaviour and, ultimately, their performance. They argue that employees actively seek meaning through their work and, unless organizations try to provide a sense of meaning, employees are likely to quit. The research findings suggest that many people experience a greater search for meaning in the workplace (70 per cent)

than in life in general. There are numerous possible reasons for this, for example, it may be because people generally spend longer at work than on other parts of their lives.

Holbeche and Springett (2003) argue that high levels of work behaviour can only be achieved in workplaces where there is a shared sense of destiny and purpose that connects people at an emotional level and raises their personal aspirations.

Personality

Personality means “to speak through” indicate external appearance of a person. Hogan 2006 point personality theories examine variance and similarity to predict performance. (Beer and Brooks 2011) state that person traits and behaviour considered to be stable throughout the work life. Values of this type relates strongly with person organization (P-O) fit. culture determine how perfect a person “fits” in organization as “fit” represents the feeling of comfort with culture.

Personality related theories

In this literature, we reviewed some theories which considered as key theories. They are:

- Humanistic theories
- Biological theories
- Social learning theories
- Trait theories
- Psychoanalytic theories

Among all, trait theories are considered as most accepted theories which captures high propensity to lead certain behaviour. For the present research, big five personality theory was considered appropriate based on its relevance if the topic.

The five factor model of Personality

RAYMOND CATTELL (2001), the big five model demonstrate that human personality comprises of five self-determining dimensions to review individual’s dissimilarities. The big five model characterised as:

- 1) Neuroticism,
- 2) Extraversion,
- 3) Openness to experience,
- 4) Conscientiousness and
- 5) Agreeableness

These alliances of five aspects have been recognized as ‘lexical’ approach of research on personality. (Goldberg 1992; costa 1995)

Personality and engagement

The studies connected to engagement and personalities are Bakker, Langelaan and Schaufelia 2001 study on personality, temperament burn out and engagement. The researchers study job engagement design and its components and analysed personality traits. The primary objective was to develop and validate new job engagement scale measuring

kahn (1990) physical emotional and cognitive engagement components.

3. Present Study

3.1 Objectives of the Study

Keeping in view the broad aim of study, the specific objectives of the study are as follows;

- To assess level of employee engagement in organisation
- To study individual difference in employee engagement in organisation.
- To explore the combination of personality traits that predicts engagement in organisation.
- To assess personality profile of employees

3.2 Key Guiding Hypotheses

H1: There are no individual differences in employee engagement in Indian organizations.

H2: There is no relationship between Employee Engagement and Neuroticism.

H3: There is no relationship between Employee Engagement and Extraversion.

H4: There is no relationship between Employee Engagement and Openness to experience.

H5: There is no relationship between Employee Engagement and Conscientiousness.

H6: There is no relationship between Employee Engagement and Agreeableness.

3.3 Research Methodology

Research design

The present study is quantitative in nature and will use structured questionnaire to measure the variables for the Study. This study will be adopted descriptive research design.

Data collection

Primary Data: Questionnaire, survey, interview, telephone

Secondary Data: Journal, Research paper, newspapers, books and articles and other sources like company’s reports, study material and references from internet.

Sampling Method: Purposive Method

Research method: Empirical research, longitudinal research

4. Analysis and Interpretations

Select data by using tools like time based data, coded and tabulated form. Measure data by statistical techniques and review by Correlation and regression study and mapping of variables on attitudinal scale.

References

- [1] Baumruk. R. (2004) 'The missing link: the role of employee engagement till business success', *Work span*, Vol 47. pp48 -52.
- [2] Brim. B. (2002) 'The longer workers stay in their jobs, the more disheartened they become'. *Gallup Management Journal*, March.
- [3] Brown. R. (2006) *Doing your dissertation in business and management: the reality of researching and writing*. London, SAGE.
- [4] Buckingham, M. (2001) 'What a waste'. *People Management*, 11 August. pp36-39.
- [5] Cooper, R. (1997) 'Applying Emotional Intelligence in the workplace', *Training and Development*, Vol 51 No 12, pp31-38.
- [6] Crabtree. S. (2005) 'Engagement keeps the doctor away; A happy employee is a healthy employee, according to a GMJ survey', *Gallup Management Journal*, January.
- [7] Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975) *Beyond boredom and anxiety* San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.
- [8] Cufaude. J. (2004) in Lanphear. S. (2004). 'Are Your Employees Highly Engaged?' *Credit Union Executive Newsletter*, 19, 1-2. Credit Union National Association, US.
- [9] Deci. E.L. and Ryan. R.M. (1987) 'The support of autonomy and the control of behaviour' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, pp1024-1037.
- [10] Diamond. M.A. and Allcorn. S. (1985) 'Psychological dimensions of role use in bureaucratic organisations', in Kahn. W.A. (1990) 'Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work', *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol 33. p1692-724.
- [11] Edmondson, A. (1999) 'Psychological safety and learning behaviour in work teams', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 1)1)350-383.
- [12] Harter, J.K., Schmidt. F.L. and Hayes. T.L. (2002) 'Business-unit level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee and business outcomes: a meta-analysis' *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 87, pp268-79.
- [13] Bates, S. (2004) 'GETTING ENGAGED', *HR magazine*, 49 (2), 44-51
- [14] A Case study on Employee Engagement :Marriott International, , Inc.pp55-58
- [15] Baker, R.A. *Understanding Factors Influencing Engagement* :RMIT UNIVERSITY
- [16] Kataria, A.Garg, P. Rastogi, (2013)*Work Engagement In India, Asia –Pacific journal of Management Reserch*, 249-260