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ABSTRACT

This study is based on how to engage the employee in their work place and to improve for their further career development. In this study primary data and secondary data were collected. Standard questionnaire and personnel interviews were used to collect primary data from the individuals. Secondary data were collected from company broachers, magazines, websites, and books etc. The sample size was 100. The sampling technique used was convenience sampling method. Convenience sampling refers to the collection of formation from the members of the population who are conveniently available to provide it. The data collected was analysis using percentage method, Chi-Square method. The data have analyzed using the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) using the result the analysis findings and suggestion have been derived.
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INTRODUCTION:

“An engaged employee is one who is fully involved in, and excited about, their work, and thus will act according to their organization’s interests”. Talent Engagement is a process of an Organization and industry sectors have its own unique challenges. To identifying a training structure to effectively achieve your organization desired outcomes. HR with you will assist us to identify their organization goals and understand their culture, people and then their training needs. At talent, we will collaboratively design, implement monitor and review on innovative training solution that is unique to your organization. Factors leading to talent engagement includes career development, respectable treatment of employees, ethical behaviour, empowerment and performance appraisal and so on. Employee engagement is a concept that is generally viewed as managing optional effort that is, when employees have choices, they will act according to their organization’s interest. Engaged employee’s bases a strong emotional bond with the organization that employs. This is associated with people exhibiting the willingness to recommend the organization to others and commit effort and time to support the organization succeeds. It suggests that people are motivated by intrinsic factors rather than simply focusing on extrinsic factors. The review stated that engagement with a firm has shown to motivate the employee to work beyond personal factors and work more for the success of the firm. Brad

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Collings & Isichei,(2018) reviewed three significant contemporary issues in global staffing research, specifically, the emergence of global talent management and potentially a more strategic approach to global mobility, specifically shifting patterns of global mobility and the emergence of the non-employees as key substitutes in the global staffing literature.

Naim & Lenka, (2017) examined the talent management (TM) system in an Indian IT organisation. Structured interviews were conducted to collect primary data and the content was analysed to develop the case study.
Recruitment, talent development, knowledge management, social media, performance management, and rewards are the main practices associated with TM. The authors acknowledge that the scope of the study is limited to the IT sector and the study is not empirically tested. HR managers should embrace the practices of TM of the case organisation to effectively manage their workforce.

Bethke-Langenegger, Mahler, & Staffelbach, (2011) revealed on talent management practices with a robust focus on corporate strategy, which have a statistically higher significant influence on organisational outcomes such as company attractiveness, the achievement of business goals, customer satisfaction and, above all, corporate profit, more so than any other areas that talent management focuses upon.

Jeswani & Sarkar, (2008) discussed on how talent engagement is an antecedent of job involvement and what should a company do to make the talents engaged and importance of talent retention strategies with special reference to the leadership style of the superiors within the organization and proposed a Talent Engagement Model, which illuminates the process of Talent engagement, psychological ownership, performance and retention with respect to their relative relationships, to aid and retain the talents and upsurge the performance for the overall development of both the talents and the organization.

Hughes & Rog, (2008) Talent management is an espoused and endorsed commitment to implementing a cohesive, strategic and technology enabled approach to human resource management (HRM). This commitment stems in part from the widely shared belief that human resources are the organization's primary source of competitive advantage; an essential asset that is becoming an increasingly short supply. The aids of an effectually implemented talent management strategy include improved employee recruitment and retention rates, and enhanced employee engagement. These outcomes in turn have been associated with improved operational and financial performance. The external and internal drivers and restraints for talent management are many. Of particular importance is senior management understanding and commitment. Practical implications – Hospitality organizations involved in implementing a talent management strategy would be well recommended to: define what is meant by talent management; ensure CEO commitment; align talent management with the strategic goals of the organization; establish talent assessment, data management and analysis systems; ensure clear line management accountability; and conduct an audit of all HRM practices in relation to evidence-based best practices.

Bhatnagar, (2008) looked at interventions of employee engagement and dialogue. Establishing talent pools and identification of talent through talent matrix is highlighted. A basic HR architecture is emphasized. Global managerial diversity with rotational assignments in different markets is another finding of the case which grooms future leaders for the organization. Originality/value – the study indicated that a good level of engagement may lead to high retention and grooming of future leaders for the organization.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

- To analyze the awareness and implementation of various associate Engagement Initiatives.
- To identify the various influencing factors for employee engagement.
- To find out the effects of employee engagement.

METHODOLOGY:

Primary data is collected by distributing the questionnaire to the projects associates at leading IT company in Chennai. The secondary data was collected from Books, Internet, and Discussion with a senior person. The method used in this study is convenience sampling. The population for the study is 1000 and the size of the sample taken in this study is 100 employees. The following statistical tools were used in this study Chi-Square Analysis, ANOVA, Correlation Test and so on. The scope of the study is limited to the study of the talent engagement of a software company in Chennai.

HYPOTHESIS:

- There is no significant association between the educational qualification of the respondents and they are aware of engagement activity.
- There is no significant difference between the educational qualification of the respondents and their conveyed well for the theme of PROPEL.
- There is no significant difference between the experience of the respondents and their parameters covered in the PEEP session.
**ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION:**

Table No.1 Association between educational qualification of the respondents and their aware of engagement activity

| Sl.no | Educational qualification | Aware of engagement activity | Statistical inference |
|-------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
|       |                           | PEEP (n=38)                  | PROPEL (n=32)         | Maitree (n=27) | NA (n=3) |                     |
| 1     | UG                        | 26(68.4%)                    | 21(65.6%)             | 14(51.9%)     | 3(100%)  | $X^2 = 3.776$ Df = 3 |
|       |                           |                              |                       |               |          | $P > 0.05$ Not Significant |
| 2     | PG                        | 12(31.6%)                    | 11(34.4%)             | 13(48.1%)     | 0        |                     |

The above table shows that there is no significant association between educational qualification of the respondents and their aware of engagement activity [$0.287 > 0.05$]. Hence, the calculated value greater than table value.

**RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS:**

There is a significant association between the educational qualification of the respondents and they are aware of engagement activity.

Table No.2: Association between experience of the respondents and their aware of engagement activity

| Sl. No | Experience       | Aware of engagement activity | Statistical inference |
|--------|------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
|        |                  | PEEP (n=38)                  | PROPEL (n=32)         | Maitree (n=27) | NA (n=3) |                     |
| 1      | Less than 1 Yr   | 9(23.7%)                     | 8(25%)                | 15(55.6%)     | 2(66.7%) | $X^2 = 11.860$ Df = 9|
|        |                  |                              |                       |               |          | $P > 0.05$ Not Significant |
| 2      | 2 to 5 Yrs       | 20(52.6%)                    | 17(53.1%)             | 8(29.6%)      | 1(33.3%) |                     |
| 3      | 5 to 10 Yrs      | 8(21.1%)                     | 7(21.9%)              | 3(11.1%)      | 0        |                     |
| 4      | More than 10 Yrs | 1(2.6%)                      | 0                     | 1(3.7%)       | 0        |                     |

The above table shows that there is no significant association between experience of the respondents and their aware of engagement activity [$0.221 > 0.05$]. Hence, the calculated value greater than table value.

**RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS:**

There is a significant association between the experience of the respondents and they are aware of engagement activity.

Table No.3: Association between the educational qualification of the respondents and they fulfilled the objectives of PEEP session

| Sl. No | Educational Qualification | Fulfilled the objectives of PEEP session | Statistical inference |
|--------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------|
|        |                            | Strongly Agree (n=5) | Agree (n=51) | Disagree (n=4) | Strongly Disagree(n=2) | NA (n=38) |                     |
| 1      | UG                         | 3(60%)                    | 35(68.6%)      | 3(75%)         | 2(100%)              | 21(55.3%) | $X^2 = 3.103$ Df = 4|
|        |                            |                          |               |               |                      |          | $P > 0.05$ Not Significant |
| 2      | PG                         | 2(40%)                    | 16(31.4%)      | 1(25%)         | 0                    | 17(44.7%)|                     |
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The above table shows that there is no significant association between the educational qualification of the respondents and their fulfilled the objectives of THE PEEP session \(0.541 > 0.05\). Hence, the calculated value greater than table value.

**Research Hypothesis:**
There is a significant association between the educational qualification of the respondents and they are fulfilled the objectives of THE PEEP session

**Table No. 4 Association between the experience of the respondents and they are fulfilled the objectives of PEEP session**

| Sl. No | Experience       | Strongly Agree (n=5) | Agree (n=51) | Disagree (n=4) | Strongly Disagree (n=2) | NA (n=38) | Statistical inference |
|-------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| 1     | Less than 1 Yr   | 1(20%)               | 7(13.7%)     | 2(50%)         | 0                      | 24(63.2%) | \(X^2 = 41.327\) Df = 12 P < 0.05 Significant |
| 2     | 2 to 5 Yrs       | 4(80%)               | 30(58.8%)    | 1(25%)         | 2(100%)                | 9(23.7%)  |                       |
| 3     | 5 to 10 Yrs      | 0                    | 13(25.5%)    | 0              | 0                      | 5(13.2%)  |                       |
| 4     | More than 10 Yrs | 0                    | 1(2%)        | 1(25%)         | 0                      | 0         |                       |

The above table shows that there is a significant association between the experience of the respondents and their fulfilled the objectives of the PEEP session \(0.000 < 0.05\). Hence, the calculated value less than the table value.

**Research Hypothesis:**
There is a significant association between the experience of the respondents and they are fulfilled the objectives of the PEEP session

**Table No. 5: One-way ANOVA difference between the experience of the respondents and their parameters covered in the PEEP session**

| Sl. No | Experience       | Mean | S.D | SS  | Df | MS  | Statistical inference |
|-------|------------------|------|-----|-----|----|-----|-----------------------|
|       | Interaction with supervisor                      |      |     |     |    |     |                       |
| 1     | Between Groups                                         | 48.246 | 3  | 16.082 | | |     |
|       | Less than 1Yr (n=34)                                   | 4.09  | 1.443 | | | | F = 7.834 P < 0.05 Significant |
|       | 2 to 5 Yrs (n=46)                                      | 2.63  | 1.496 | | | |                       |
|       | 5 to 10 Yrs (n=18)                                    | 2.72  | 1.274 | | | |                       |
|       | More than 10 Yrs (n=2)                                 | 2.00  | .000 | | | |                       |
|       | Within Groups                                           | 197.064 | 96 | 2.053 | | |                       |
|       | Career Progress                                         | 50.125 | 3  | 16.708 | | |                       |
| 2     | Between Groups                                          | 4.15  | 1.374 | | | | F = 8.814 P < 0.05 Significant |
|       | Less than 1Yr (n=34)                                   | 2.67  | 1.431 | | | |                       |
|       | 2 to 5 Yrs (n=46)                                      | 2.72  | 1.274 | | | |                       |
|       | 5 to 10 Yrs (n=18)                                    | 2.00  | .000 | | | |                       |
|       | Within Groups                                           | 181.985 | 96 | 1.896 | | |                       |
|       | Interaction within the team                             | 53.212 | 3  | 17.737 | | |                       |
| 3     | Between Groups                                          | 4.09  | 1.443 | | | | F = 8.508 P < 0.05 Significant |
|       | Less than 1Yr (n=34)                                   | 2.54  | 1.501 | | | |                       |
|       | 2 to 5 Yrs (n=46)                                      | 2.67  | 1.328 | | | |                       |
|       | 5 to 10 Yrs (n=18)                                    | 2.00  | .000 | | | |                       |
|       | Within Groups                                           | 200.148 | 96 | 2.085 | | |                       |
The above table shows that there is a significant difference between the experience of the respondents and their parameters covered in the PEEP session $[.000<0.05]$. Hence, the calculated value less than table value.

**RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS:**

There is a significant difference between the experience of the respondents and their parameters covered in the PEEP session.
The above table shows that there is no significant difference between educational qualification of the respondents and they conveyed well for the theme of PROPEL \[.219 > 0.05\]. Hence, the calculated value greater than the table value.

Research Hypothesis:
There is a significant difference between the educational qualification of the respondents and their conveyed well for theme of PROPEL

**Table No. 7: Association between the educational qualification of the respondents and their interest in volunteering for the area of community initiatives**

| Sl. no | Educational qualification | interest in volunteering for the area of community initiatives | Statistical inference |
|-------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
|       |                          | Education / Skill Development (n=19)                        |                      |
| 1     | UG                       | 13(68.4%)                                                   |                      |
| 2     | PG                       | 6(31.6%)                                                    |                      |

The above table shows that there is no significant association between the educational qualification of the respondents and their interest in volunteering for the area of community initiatives \[.332 > 0.05\]. Hence, the calculated value greater than the table value.

Research hypothesis:
There is a significant association between the educational qualification of the respondents and their interest in volunteering for the area of community initiatives

**Table No. 8: Association between the experience of the respondents and their interest in volunteering for the area of community initiatives**

| Sl. No | Experience | Interest in volunteering for the area of community initiatives | Statistical inference |
|-------|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
|       |            | Education / Skill Development (n=19)                          |                      |
| 1     | Less than 1Yr | 7(36.8%)                                                   |                      |
| 2     | 2to5 Yrs    | 8(42.1%)                                                    |                      |
| 3     | 5to10 Yrs   | 4(21.1%)                                                    |                      |
| 4     | More than 10Yrs | 0                                                         |                      |

The above table shows that there is no significant association between the experience of the respondents and their interest in volunteering for the area of community initiatives \[.800 > 0.05\]. Hence, the calculated value greater than the table value.

Research hypothesis:
There is a significant association between the experience of the respondents and their interest in volunteering for the area of community initiatives
Table No.9: Relationship between the experience of the respondents and their Parameters

| Experience                        | Correlation value | Statistical inference |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Interaction with supervisor       | .111              | P > 0.05 Not Significant |
| Career Progression                | .080              | P > 0.05 Not Significant |
| Interaction within the team       | .067              | P > 0.05 Not Significant |
| Learning and Development          | .119              | P > 0.05 Not Significant |
| Appraisals                        | .092              | P > 0.05 Not Significant |
| Grievance Management              | .154              | P > 0.05 Not Significant |
| Rewards and Recognition           | .197(*)           | P < 0.05 Significant    |
| Job Content and Context           | .100              | P > 0.05 Not Significant |

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The above table shows that there is no significant relationship between the experience of the respondents and their parameters covered in the PEEP session [Interaction with supervisor, Career Progression, Interaction within the team, Learning and Development, Appraisals, Grievance Management, Job Content and Context]. Hence, the calculated value greater than the table value.

Research Hypothesis:
There is a significant relationship between the experience of the respondents and their parameters covered in the PEEP session [Interaction with supervisor, Career Progression, Interaction within the team, Learning and Development, Appraisals, Grievance Management, Job Content and Context]

SUGGESTION:
- It is observed from the study the management of software company has taken much care about the associate relations.
- The organization has to provide the Maitree events in their location.
- The organization has to improve the PROPEL session.
- Most of the associates expecting the Maitree events at least 2 weeks once.
- They expectation of employees about Maitree events were not satisfied.
- Overall the respondents are satisfied with these engagement activities, PEEP and PROPEL.

CONCLUSION:
The talent engagement is the process, of an associate involvement, attitude, and behaviors with their organization. “An Effectiveness Study on Talent Engagement in a Software company, Chennai” demonstrates the various engagement activities and gives the solution to the organization. From the study, it clearly found that there is not much aware of the engagement activities of Software companies. Most importantly associate must be trained and prepared adequately prior to their participation in involvement. A further improvement as per the suggestion will yield better result to the organization.
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