Employee Engagement At Green Park Hotels And Resorts Ltd. - A Case Study

S. Venkateswara Rao[1], Prof. A. Sreeram[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Management, GITAM (Deemed to be University), GITAM-HBS,Hyderabad,Campus

[2]Professor, Department of Management, GITAM (Deemed to be University), GITAM-HBS and Hyderabad Campus.

Email ID: [1]sv@hotelgreenpark.com

ABSTRACT

Employee participation (Engagement) for any enterprise in the globalised era is a burning issue. Engaged workers are more likely to contribute to organisations' productivity. It also helps keep your commitment higher. Employee involvement means employees' level of commitment and commitment to their organisation and values. Corporate success depends on an employee's productivity, accelerated in the employee's commitment to his organisation. This article analyses the relevance and success of the employees involved in the development and growth of the company. This paper attempts to examine the various variables of employee participation. It can be used to provide an overview and references of some conceptual and practical work in the field of employee engagement in the hotel industry in India. The factors contributing to their overall impact on the organisation are measured by the data collected by means of a questionnaire in this study in the hotel industry. The study's main goal was to analyse and interpret the impact of employee commitment on the company's success through a structured questionnaire.

Introduction

In the last few millennia, Employee Engagement has become a term that has drawn the attention of HR professionals around the globe. Globally, managers agree that modern business needs higher productivity and more reliability than in previous years. All modern companies are constantly making a concerted effort to enhance their performance in order to put their organization ahead of their competing companies. Satisfied workers, happy to comply with their working experience, were at some point a good formula for success, as a satisfied employee who aspired to stay with the company contributed to the stability of both the workforce and productiveness of the company (Sanchez, P. and McCauley, D. 2006). But the scenario is no longer like that. Due to the global business climate and increasing competition, it's not enough to have satisfied and stable employee's to generate the necessary business results. Satisfied employees will only meet work requirements, but this could not actually lead to higher performance. In order for employers to compete effectively, they must do everything they can to encourage their employees, except if they do, to use their full potential and capabilities to do their job unless part of the valuable resources of the employees remain unavailable to the company. In this respect, contemporary companies want to have their employees filled with passion, excitement and ambition at work, to take responsibility for their self-development and to aspire, be motivated and committed to their work-that is, they want to engage their employees. (Bakker, A.B. and Leiter M.P., 2010).

Literature Review

Shukla, A., & Dhir, S. (2019), the study states that a thorough, comprehensive understanding is needed for employees to improve employee involvement and performance through creating a positive and consistent corporate image.

Khalaf, R., & Obeidat, B. Al-dalammeh, M. (2018), the involvement of IT employees and their three dimensions, vigour, absorption and dedication significantly affected the organisational performance as well as the positive and significant impact on job satisfaction of the involvement of IT employees, as the major contribution has been made. Moreover, satisfaction at work has had a considerable and positive impact on the performance of the organisation. Moreover, the association between IT staff engagement and organisational performance has partially only served to mediate job satisfaction.

Barik, S., & Kochar, A. (2017), on the one hand, employees receive managerial attention, satisfaction , motivation to increase their innovative and productive behaviour, a healthy environment where their skills can be improved and companies, on the other, have more efficient staff, profitability, fewer sales and thus higher productivity.

Sarangi, P., & Nayak, B. (2016), the current degree of employee participation and related aspects of work need to be improved for the purposes of effective employee engagement. But employees have different opinions and trust through their survey and analysis. They also found that employees are in agreement to increase the purposes of effective employee involvement in manufacturing companies through their 6 Cs parameters, such as I Clarity ii) Confidence iii) Convey iv) Connect v) Credentials and vi) Career.

The study carried out by **EON Consulting and Training (2015)** found that Singapore has the highest level of participation in the tourism and hospitality industry than any other industry. Involvement of employees also involves support from supervisors. Tourism and hospitality employers should therefore train supervisors in order to

support their junior personnel whenever necessary with the right skills, expertise and autonomy.

Problem Statement

The employee engagement and the problems associated with the employees in taking the sole initiative for working for the development of the company. The human resource department has a vital role in the development of the employees and their knowledge level about the organization. Human resource people have a great role in maintaining the relationships between employees and they will help in the smooth running of the organization.

Therefore, this study will focus on the human resource people's initiative taken by them in order to maintain a good relationship with the employees. The main target is to make the employees engage in the corporate policies and corporate development.

Research Gap

Based on the Literature review it is found that employment engagement related to hotel industry no studies are identified in India. So, that employment engagement in hotel industry was considered for my study to know the how effective it is, in the present competitive environment.

Objectives of the Study

1.   To understand the concept of employee engagement in context of hotel industry and how effective it is, in the present competitive environment.
2.   To study the impact of employee engagement at hotel industry.
3.   To draw conclusion and offer for further improvement of employee engagement in context of hotel industry.

Hypothesis of the Study

H1: There is a significance difference between gender and designation.
H2: There is a significance difference between education and designation.
H3: There is a significance difference between mean of male and mean of female based on their experience.
H4: There is a significance difference between age based on their experience.
H5: There is a significance impact between average of opinion variables and engagement variables.
H6: There is a significance impact between average of reporting variables and planning variables.

Research Methodology

Sample Size

The total number of employees working in the GreenPark by covering all the three branches is 802. Out of 802, 312 are working in Hyderabad, 214 are working at Visakhapatnam

and the remaining 276 employees are working in Chennai branch. The purposive sampling technique method is used to collect 310 samples based on the below procedure. Out of 310 sample respondents, 120 (39%) respondents are considered from Hyderabad, 82 (26%) are covered from Visakhapatnam and the remaining 108 (35%) respondents are considered from Chennai by using random number generation method as per the population with respective the area which was surveyed.

Scoring and Measurement of Variables:

Various scale factors are indicated by the various items in the Schedule, i.e. variables are provided on a 5-point scale of Likert.

Data Interpretation:

An attempt is to understand the employee engagement scenarios of the respondents. The tabulations and analysis were done with the help of SPSS-24.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

H1: There is a significance difference between gender and designation

Table : 1 Crosstab						Total
			Designation			Total
			1	2	3	
Gender	1	Count	194	37	28	259
		Expected Count	191.3	42.6	25.1	259.0
	2	Count	35	14	2	51
		Expected Count	37.7	8.4	4.9	51.0
Total		Count	229	51	30	310
		Expected Count	229.0	51.0	30.0	310.0

Source: Calculated from Primary data

Table : 2 Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	Df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.806[a]	2	.033
Likelihood Ratio	6.710	2	.035
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.951
N of Valid Cases	310		

a. 1 (16.7 percent) cells were expected to count less than 5. The expected minimum count is 4,94.

Source: Calculated from Primary data

From the above table 1 & 2 for the purpose of this analysis, only the Pearson Chi-Square statistic is needed because of assumption chi square test was met which is expected cell count below 20 per cent. The p-value is .000, smaller than the .05 alpha level. Therefore, to reject the null hypothesis, there is enough evidence. So, concluded that evidence from

the sample shows that there is a significant difference in the designation between male and female.

H2: There is a significance difference between education and designation

Table : 3 Crosstab

			Designation			Total
			1	2	3	
Education	1	Count	227	50	27	304
		Expected Count	224.6	50.0	29.4	304.0
	2	Count	2	1	3	6
		Expected Count	4.4	1.0	.6	6.0
Total		Count	229	51	30	310
		Expected Count	229.0	51.0	30.0	310.0

Source: Calculated from Primary data

Table: 4 Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.641[a]	2	.003
Likelihood Ratio	6.927	2	.031
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.418	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	310		

a. Three cells (50.0%) are expected to number less than 5. The expected minimum count is .58.

Source: Calculated from Primary data

From the above table 3 & 4 for the purpose of this analysis, either fisher exact or Likelihood statistic is needed because of assumption chi square test was not met which is expected cell count below 20 per cent. The p-value is .000, smaller than the .05 alpha level. Therefore, to reject the null hypothesis, there is enough evidence. So, Concluded evidence from the sample shows that there is a significant difference in the designation between educations.

H3: There is a significance difference between mean of male and mean of female based on their experience.

Non-Parametric Test

Table: 5 Ranks

	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Experience	1	259	155.63	40308.00
	2	51	154.84	7897.00
	Total	310		

Source: Calculated from Primary data

Table: 6 Test Statistics[a]

	Experience
Mann-Whitney U	6571.000
Wilcoxon W	7897.000
Z	-.060
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.952

a. Grouping Variable: Gender

Source: Calculated from Primary data

From the above table 5 & 6 shows non parametric test which sig. value 0.952, which is greater than the alpha level of .05. Therefore, no evidence is sufficient to reject the null hypothesis. So, concluded evidence from the sample shows that there is no significant difference in the mean of male and mean of female based on their experience.

H4: There is a significance difference between age based on their experience.

Table: 7 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Experience	310	2.32	1.176	1	4
Age	310	2.76	.615	2	4

Source: Calculated from Primary data

Table: 8 Ranks

	Age	N	Mean Rank
Experience	2	105	116.98
	3	175	160.41
	4	30	261.67
	Total	310	

Source: Calculated from Primary data

Table: 9 Test Statistics[a,b]

	Experience
Kruskal-Wallis H	67.712
Df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Age

Source: Calculated from Primary data

Above table 8 shows that the means ranks of age level of groups with their experience. The three categories of age has a mean of 116.98, 160.41 and 261.67 respectively.

The test statistics table 9 suggests that the significance value is less than .05 and hence there is significant difference between the experience when age status of group members changes. Hence Null hypothesis is failed to reject.

H5: There is a significance impact between average of opinion variables (AOV) and engagement variables (EV).

Table: 8 Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.587[a]	.345	.323	.37415

a. Predictors: (Constant), EV21, EV12, EV13, EV16, EV19, EV14, EV18, EV15, EV20, EV17

b. Dependent Variable: Average of Opinion (AOV)

Source: Calculated from Primary data

From the table 8 shows the model summary and overall fit statistics. It showed that the adjusted R^2 of our model is 0.323 with the R^2 = .345 that means that the linear regression explains 34.5% of the variance between dependent and independent variables.

Table: 9 ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	22.015	10	2.202	15.727	.000[b]
	Residual	41.856	299	.140		
	Total	63.871	309			
a. Dependent Variable: Average of Opinion						
b. Predictors: (Constant), EV21, EV12, EV13, EV16, EV19, EV14, EV18, EV15, EV20, EV17						

Source: Calculated from Primary data

Table 9 is the F-test, the F-test of the linear regression has the null hypothesis that the two variables do not have a linear relationship (in other words R2=0). The test is significant p < .05 with F = 15.727 and 10 degrees of freedom, so we can assume that there is a linear relationship in our model between the variables.

Table: 10 Coefficients[a]								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-.290	.460		-.631	.529		
	EV12	-.065	.039	-.086	-1.695	.091	.855	1.170
	EV13	-.034	.045	-.041	-.766	.444	.781	1.280
	EV14	.225	.039	.295	5.814	.000	.850	1.176
	EV15	.173	.044	.214	3.908	.000	.733	1.364
	EV16	.114	.043	.148	2.653	.008	.702	1.424
	EV17	.168	.046	.216	3.651	.000	.625	1.601
	EV18	.209	.042	.271	4.959	.000	.732	1.367
	EV19	.091	.043	.112	2.101	.036	.770	1.298
	EV20	.130	.043	.169	3.034	.003	.704	1.420
	EV21	.106	.044	.137	2.443	.015	.699	1.431
a. Dependent Variable: Average of Opinion								

Source: Calculated from Primary data

The results of the analysis indicate that the VIF of 10 independent variables included in the model is much lower than 10. Thus, in the model, there is no collinearity phenomenon, so the model has statistical significance.

H6: There is a significance impact between average of reporting variables (ARV) and planning variables (PV).

Table: 11 Model Summary[b]				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.627[a]	.393	.364	.38506
a. Predictors: (Constant), PV45, PV36, PV33, PV39, PV42, PV41, PV34, PV38, PV43, PV37, PV32, PV44, PV35, PV40				
b. Dependent Variable: Average of Reporting (ARV)				

Source: Calculated from Primary data

The above table 11 found that the adjusted R² of our model is 0.364 with the R² = .393 that means that the linear regression explains 39.3% of the variance between independent and dependent variables.

Table: 12 ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	28.338	14	2.024	13.652	.000[b]
	Residual	43.739	295	.148		
	Total	72.077	309			
a. Dependent Variable: Average of Reporting						
b. Predictors: (Constant), PV45, PV36, PV33, PV39, PV42, PV41, PV34, PV38, PV43, PV37, PV32, PV44, PV35, PV40						

Source: Calculated from Primary data

Table 12 is the F-test, the F-test of the linear regression has the null hypothesis that the two variables do not have a linear relationship (in other words R²=0). With F = 13.652 and 14 degrees of freedom, the test is significant P<.05, so we can assume that there is a linear relationship between the variables in our model.

Table: 13 Coefficients[a]								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-1.379	.547		-2.520	.012		
	PV32	.161	.046	.191	3.505	.001	.691	1.446
	PV33	-.103	.049	-.117	-2.109	.036	.665	1.504
	PV34	.079	.046	.090	1.724	.086	.748	1.337
	PV35	.033	.048	.040	.677	.499	.591	1.693
	PV36	.094	.043	.116	2.174	.031	.726	1.378
	PV37	.106	.045	.120	2.323	.021	.768	1.302
	PV38	.108	.042	.138	2.578	.010	.722	1.384
	PV39	.067	.047	.080	1.432	.153	.662	1.510
	PV40	.171	.050	.203	3.414	.001	.580	1.725
	PV41	.078	.046	.095	1.700	.090	.665	1.503
	PV42	.126	.042	.153	3.019	.003	.803	1.245
	PV43	.171	.043	.210	4.023	.000	.754	1.327
	PV44	.134	.048	.157	2.809	.005	.658	1.521
	PV45	.108	.047	.125	2.328	.021	.711	1.407
a. Dependent Variable: Average of Reporting								

Source: Calculated from Primary data

The results of the analysis show that the VIF of 14 independent variables included in the model is much smaller than 10. Therefore, there is no collinearity phenomenon in the model, so the model has statistical significance.

Conclusion

Employee participation attracts much interest from employers across a broad spectrum of industries. In some ways, this is a very long-standing aspiration, namely, that employers want to find ways to increase employee motivation and to achieve greater work and organisation involvement. But the lack of rigour that so far has often marked a lot of employee involvement is cause for concern. Incorporation can still be just one more "RHS" than I can be if they do not understand the potential negative implications, the fundamental conditions and the processes by which it is to be implemented, without understanding the potential negative consequences and if they cannot even agree to a clear definition of what people should work differently (the "what is involved" problem), Positively, there are now a broader range of measuring technologies for the evaluation of engagement trends and an associated range of approaches to change. Therefore, the aspiration can be made more workable. The study has shown that most demographic factors differ significantly from their designation and

experience, as well as most variables in employee involvement.

References

[1] Dhir, S., & Shukla, A. (2019). Role of organizational image in employee engagement and performance. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*.

[2] Al-dalahmeh, M., Khalaf, R., & Obeidat, B. (2018). The effect of employee engagement on organizational performance via the mediating role of job satisfaction: The case of IT employees in Jordanian banking sector. *Modern Applied Science*, *12*(6), 17-43.

[3] Barik, S., & Kochar, A. (2017). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement: A literature review. *International Journal of Latest Technology in Engineering, Management & Applied Science*, *6*(4), 33-38.

[4] Sarangi, P., & Nayak, B. (2016). Employee Engagement and Its Impact on Organizational Success – A Study in Manufacturing Company, India. IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 18(4), 52-57.

[5] Tourism, hospitality industry top in employee engagement: Survey. (2015, February 04). HR in Asia: Newsletter of the Singapore. Retrieved from http://www.hrinasia.com/hr-news/tourism-hospitality-industry-top-inemployee-engagement-survey/

[6] Employee engagement. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.open.edu/openlearn/money-business/employee-engagement/content-section-4

[7] S. (2019c, August 16). Developing and Sustaining Employee Engagement. Retrieved from https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/tools-and-samples/toolkits/pages/sustainingemployeeengagement.aspx

[8] What is Employee Engagement. (2019, September 4). Retrieved from https://engageforsuccess.org/what-is-employee-engagement

[9] Employee Engagement-The Complete Explanation. (2020, September 30). Retrieved from https://blog.vantagecircle.com/employee-engagement/

[10] What is Employee Engagement? (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.custominsight.com/employee-engagement-survey/what-is-employee-engagement.asp

[11] R, H. (2018, October 29). The Definition of Employee Engagement. Retrieved from https://inside.6q.io/the-definition-of-employee-engagement/