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ABSTRACT

The BPO industry is one of the services that contribute to our Indian economy. It enhances growth, productivity, employment and strengthens the service sector. Astronomical Growth in Global Distribution Systems and IT ITES has led to significant growth in the global service sector, aiming to take advantage of cost-effective - though efficient workforce in India. A descriptive study was carried out by collecting data through a questionnaire through a survey of 124 working with BPO Company in Bangalore. Demographic profiling is done by percent analysis and average calculation. Accordingly, Chi-Square, Correlation and Regression tests were performed. This study found that "there is a significant correlation between employee commitment, team and colleagues with a positive correlation of the scale r = 0.558 and" Employee Commitment is a statistically significant positive correlation scale r = 0.697 for commitment and participation. "There will always be no people who never have the strength, no matter how hard it is for people and leaders to try to involve them. It has a lot to do with the emotions that are basically related to the success of the company. The survey will help you understand the actions of commitment to staffing, employee involvement factors, employee involvement practices, and employee-engagement benefits.
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INTRODUCTION:

BPO or outsourcing of business processes is part of a timing that simply means a system in which the responsibility of a particular business process can be assigned to a third party provider. This system was originally related to manufacturing companies, but over the years this scenario has changed. BPO is currently one of the fastest growing industries and has become an integral part of the ITES industry. Among the various South Asian countries where the BPO industry is different, India is very important. Some factors such as cost advantage, time factors, large numbers of English speakers, competence, economy, and government help BPO industry in India and the best BPO companies. A detailed explanation of these points will help to better understand the subject.

1. Cost advantage is very high in all areas of life and business is no exception. If a US company relocates its business to an Indian company, it will not only get the best BPO services but save thousands of dollars each
year if they bring more to their profits. Outsourcing an outsourced process reduces costs without affecting
profits. In fact, this is very useful for the company.
2. Time is always a determining factor in business and India and the United States are about half a mile away,
making it easier for a company to operate 24 × 7 if it has an active base in both countries.
3. It may be surprising, but the Indians are very familiar with English communication. Much of the population
speaks English. This helped the English-speaking countries continue their work in India, leading to the boom
in the Indian BPO industry.
4. Most people join the BPO sector after finishing their upper secondary education. They are therefore
competent, able, motivated, learned and willing. This has helped the industry grow phenomenally.
5. Over the years, the Government of India has been promoting and cooperating with various multinational
companies and contributing to the growth of the Indian BPO industry.
It is true that companies are looking for benefits from the start and have come to India, but over the years, India,
especially the younger generation, has enjoyed the benefits. This is a mutual process of broadcasting and
acceptance, which will continue in the future, adding that the economy of both countries.

Understanding Employee Engagement:
There are many definitions in the scientific literature. Kahn (1990 p. 694) defines personal engagement as
"utilizing the members of the organization to work their roles, commitment, people to apply and express
themselves physically, cognitive and emotional role performances." Personal liberation applies to "separating
yourself from a worker rollers, in the absence of this, people move away and protect their physical, cognitive or
emotional role-playing role "(p.694), according to Kahn (1990, 1992), the psychological presence of a
connecting device when occupied and ultimately organizational.
Employee-engagement has become a widely used and popular expression (Robinson et al., 2004). However,
most of the writing of employee-engagement is found in journals specialists, where based on these, it is
practically not theory and empirical research. As described by Robinson et al. (2004), surprisingly few scientific
and empirical research on the topic that is so popular. As a result, employee engagement seems a bit confusing
or what some people call "old wine in a new bottle." Being things worse, employee engagement is determined
by many ways and definitions of actions often sound like other well-known and permanent structures, such as
organizational engagement and organizational behavior of citizens (Robinson et al., 2004). Most commonly,
this is defined as the emotional and intellectual commitment of the organization (Baumruk, 2004, Richman,
2006; Shaw, 2005) and the discourse-led efforts of their employees (Frank et al., 2004).
Rothbard (2001, p. 656) also determines the psychological presence of commitment, but goes on to say that it
has two important components: attention and absorption. Warning refers to "cognitive availability and time
spent on people to think about the role" and absorption "means absorbing the role and intensity of the emphasis
on the role." The researchers of Burnout are determined to be committed to, or the positive, anthesis of
combustion ( Maslach et al., 2001). Maslach et al. (2001), commitment to energy, involvement and efficiency,
the direct opposite of the three burning dimensions of exhaustion, cynicism and efficiency. The study of burning
and engagement was that the main dimensions of combustion (exhaustion and cynicism) and commitment
(strength and engagement) are mutually opposed (Gonzalez-roma et al., 2006).

Employee-Engagement Categories:
According to Gallup Consulting, there are three different types of people
- **Engaged**: Employees are builders. They want to know their wishes about their role so that they can meet and
surpass them.
- **Not Engaged**: Non-engaged workers focus on tasks rather than on goals and achievements to be achieved.
- **Actively Disengaged**: "Actively excluded" employees are "cave dwellers". They "consistently do almost
anything". They are not only unhappy at work; they take their misery.

Schaufeli et al. (2002, p. 74) Determine commitment as a "positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind
characterized by vitality, commitment, and absorption". They also claim that commitment is not an important
and special state, but "a more permanent and permeable emotional-cognitive condition that does not focus on a
particular subject, event, individual, or behavior."
Employee commitment is the level of commitment and commitment of employees to the organization and
values. A committed employee knows the business environment, collaborates with staff to improve his work for
the benefit of the organization. This is a positive attitude of employees to the organization and its values.
OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:
1. Explore the various factors that contribute to employee engagement in the organization
2. Explore the relationship between employee engagement and the various factors contributing to employee engagement
3. Find a link between demographic variables and employee engagement in an organization

Research Design:
This study is a descriptive study. The purpose of this study is to understand the commitment of BPO companies to employees and to answer questions such as why, when, where and how they work in their work.

Sample size and Population:
- Target population: Employees in BPO Company
- Sampling unit: Individual Employees
- Sample size: 124

Data collection:
The survey was conducted using a census method to collect basic data from the entire target group using the tool. Thus, the survey was conducted for 124 BPO staff.

Statistical tools used:
The various tools identified for carrying out the study are as follows
- Demographic profiling using percentage analysis and Mean calculation
- Chi-square Test
- Correlation Test
- Regression Test

Study Limitations:
- The work involved in this work is specific and may differ from those employed in other disciplines.
- The survey was aimed exclusively at employees of one company and was not necessarily the choice of all employees.

Table 1: The Gender of the Respondents

| Sl.No. | Particulars   | No. of Respondents | Percent |
|--------|---------------|---------------------|---------|
| 1      | Male          | 90                  | 72.6    |
| 2      | Female        | 34                  | 27.4    |
| **Total** | **124**       | **100.00**          |         |

Table 2: The Age of the Respondents

| Sl.No | Particulars       | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------|-------------------|---------------------|------------|
| 1     | 25 years & below  | 8                   | 6.5        |
| 2     | 26 - 35 years     | 84                  | 67.7       |
| 3     | 36 - 45 years     | 21                  | 16.9       |
| 4     | 46 years & above  | 11                  | 8.9        |
| **Total** | **124**       | **100**             |            |

Table 3: The Cross Tabulation of Gender of the Respondents and Employee Engagement

| Gender * Employee Engagement Cross tabulation |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| Count                                         |
| Employee Engagement                           | Total |
| Below Mean | Above Mean |   |
| **Gender** | **Male** | **41** | **49** | **90** |
| **Female** | **1** | **33** | **34** |
| **Total** | **42** | **82** | **124** |
Table 4: The Association of Gender of the Respondents and Employee Engagement

| Chi-Square Test         | Value       | Df | Asymp. Sig (2-sided) |
|-------------------------|-------------|----|----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square      | 20.007a     | 1  | .000                 |
| Continuity Correctionb  | 18.150      | 1  | .000                 |
| Likelihood Ratio        | 25.686      | 1  | .000                 |
| Fisher’s Exact Test     |             |    | .000                 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 19.846  | 1  | .000                 |
| N of Valid Cases        | 124         |    |                      |

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.52
b. Computed only of 2x2 table

Table shows the Pearson Chi-Square value between gender and employee engagement is (p) = 0.000 that is less compared to 0.05, so the null-hypothesis is rejected. There is an important association between gender of the respondents and the employee engagement. Female employees are highly engaged than male. Table shows the Pearson Chi-Square between age and employee engagement is 0.094 > 0.05 so the null-hypothesis is accepted. There is no important association between age-factor and employee engagement.

Table 5: The Cross Tabulation of Respondents-age and Employee-Engagement

| Age * Employee Engagement Cross tabulation |
|--------------------------------------------|
| Count                                      |
| Age                                       |
| 25 years & below                          |
| 26 – 35 years                             |
| 36 – 45 years                             |
| 46 years & above                          |
| Total                                     |

Table 6: The Association of Respondents-age and Employee Engagement

| Chi-Square Tests                          | Value       | Df | Asymp. Sig (2-sided) |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------|----|----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square                        | 6.392a      | 3  | .094                 |
| Likelihood Ratio                          | 6.096       | 3  | .107                 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association              | .694        | 1  | .405                 |
| N of Valid Cases                          | 124         |    |                      |

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.71

Table 7: The Cross Tabulation of Respondents-department and Employee Engagement

| Department * Employee Engagement Cross tabulation |
|--------------------------------------------------|
| Count                                           |
| Department                                      |
| Backend operations                              |
| Voice Based – Customer care                     |
| Non Voice Based – Customer care                 |
| Semi Voice Based – Customer Care                |
| Others                                          |
| Total                                           |
Table 8: The Association of Respondents-department and Employee-Engagement

| Chi-Square Tests                      | Value      | Df | Asymp. Sig (2-sided) |
|---------------------------------------|------------|----|----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square                    | 6.508*     | 4  | .164                 |
| Likelihood Ratio                      | 6.120      | 4  | .190                 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association          | .153       | 1  | .696                 |
| N of Valid Cases                      | 124        |    |                      |

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.06

Table displays the association among respondents-department and the employee-engagement. The Pearson Chi-Square among department of the respondents and the employee engagement is (p) = 0.164 which is bigger than 0.05, so null-hypothesis is accepted and the alternate-hypothesis is rejected. There is no link between respondents-department and the employee-engagement.

**Employee Engagement and Commitment & Involve-ment Null-Hypothesis:**

**Ho:** There is no significant-relationship between the employee-engagement and commitment & involve-ment

**Alternate-Hypothesis:**

**Ha:** There is a significant-relationship between the employee-engagement and commitment & involve-ment

Table shows correlation among the employee engage-ment and the commitment & involve-ment. The substantial value (p) is 0.00 which is smaller than 0.05, so null-hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and alternate hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. There is a link between employee engage-ment and commitment & involve-ment. The test is statistically significant with a positive correlation of magnitude r = 0.697 between employee engagement and commitment & involvement.

Table 9: The Correlation between Employee-Engagement and Commitment & Involve-ment

| Correlation                              | Employee Engagement | Commitment & Involvement |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Employee Engagement                      | Pearson Correlation | 1                        |
|                                         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .697**                   |
|                                         | N                   | 124                      |
| Commitment & Involvement                | Pearson Correlation | .697**                   |
|                                         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                     |
|                                         | N                   | 124                      |

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

**FINDINGS:**

- Majority of the employees (73%) are male.
- Majority of the employees (67.7%) fit in to the age group of 26-35 year’s.
- The respondents-gender has a significant association with the employee engagement.
- The female employees are highly engaged compared to the male employees in the organization.
- Age, Qualification, Department, Years of experience and Experience in the current company have no association with the employee engage-ment.
- There is a significant link between employee engagement, team & co-workers with positive correlation of magnitude r = 0.558.
- Employee engagement is statistically significant with a positive correlation of magnitude r = 0.697 with commitment & involvement.

**SUGGESTIONS:**

- The Association can introduce a basic program for the arrest of workers. The schedule can include regular funding research and annual improvement.
• Each employee has no end and requires specific support for his detention. Some employees are eager to be grateful for their success and this can be a little appreciated and provided with perks.
• Workers who seek change and changing challenges can do different jobs.
• Organize the careers of the staff and do not fill in the role that enables employees to work more effectively with the company.
• It is not enough to accomplish the worker who works with a strong success and can be examined by their supervisors and they can try to solve the problem of workers.
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