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**Abstract**

Employee engagement plays a crucial role in enhancing productivity, job satisfaction, and overall company performance. This research paper examines employee engagement at Hi-Tech Sweet Water Pvt Ltd, analyzing the factors influencing engagement, methodologies used to measure it, and its impact on organizational success. Findings indicate that engagement is closely linked to motivation, leadership, and workplace culture, emphasizing the need for structured engagement strategies.

**Introduction**

Employee engagement refers to the emotional commitment an employee has toward their organization and its goals. A highly engaged workforce leads to improved efficiency, lower turnover rates, and higher job satisfaction. In today’s competitive business environment, organizations are increasingly focusing on engagement strategies to enhance productivity and retain top talent. Engagement is not just about job satisfaction but also about the willingness of employees to go above and beyond in their roles, contributing to organizational success. Hi-Tech Sweet Water Pvt Ltd, a company specializing in water purification solutions, operates in a highly competitive industry where innovation, quality service, and employee motivation are essential. The company has recognized that engaged employees are more productive, creative, and dedicated, leading to improved customer satisfaction and business performance. Employee engagement is influenced by several factors, including leadership effectiveness, career development opportunities, recognition programs, and workplace culture. In many organizations, a lack of engagement leads to decreased morale, reduced productivity, and higher turnover rates. Studies indicate that companies with higher engagement levels experience better financial performance, stronger customer loyalty, and lower absenteeism. This makes engagement an essential area of focus for HR professionals and business leaders alike. The primary objective of this research is to assess the level of employee engagement at Hi-Tech Sweet Water Pvt Ltd and identify the key factors that contribute to or hinder engagement within the company. Furthermore, this study aims to provide actionable recommendations that can help Hi-Tech Sweet Water Pvt Ltd enhance its engagement strategies. By implementing effective engagement initiatives, the company can create a motivated workforce that aligns with its mission and values, ultimately driving long-term success. This research will not only contribute to understanding employee engagement at Hi-Tech Sweet Water Pvt Ltd but will also offer insights applicable to similar organizations seeking to improve workforce engagement.

**Literature Review**

James Harter (2000) indicates that this study examines the connections among managerial talent, employee engagement, and performance at the business-unit level. The research findings reveal that multiple data sets emphasize two key areas within the framework of various external factors that could significantly enhance the likelihood of success at the business-unit level.

Ferguson and Carstairs (2005) indicate that the notion of employee engagement is increasingly becoming prominent and used in the workplace. Researchers find it challenging to keep pace with its surge in popularity within the corporate sector, as employee engagement is also receiving growing attention in academic literature. Many organizations and research agencies view engagement as a significant source of competitive advantage. This study aims to clarify the definition of employee engagement and examine its connection with constructs like organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

Alan Saks (2006) highlights the increasing interest in employee engagement among consulting firms and business media. However, academic research has only scratched the surface when it comes to delving into employee engagement. This study assesses a framework that explores the factors and impacts of job and organizational engagement based on social exchange theory.

Macey and Schneider (2008) indicate that the concept of employee engagement is unclear for both academic researchers and practitioners. The research provides propositions regarding psychological state engagement, behavioral engagement, and trait engagement. The study concludes with insights on measuring these aspects through employee surveys.

Solomon Markos (2010) stated that employee engagement encompasses a wide range of aspects within human resource management. If not properly addressed, employees may struggle to engage fully in their roles. Employee engagement is a robust predictor of favorable organizational performance, demonstrating a reciprocal relationship between employers and employees.

Bruce Louis Rich, Jeffrey Lepine, and colleagues (2010) propose that engagement, defined as the full investment of an individual’s self in a given role, provides a thorough understanding of the connections between performance and various factors. Their findings indicate that engagement mediates the relationships among value congruence, perceived organizational support, core self-evaluations, task performance, and organizational citizenship behavior.

**Research Methodology**

The study investigates employees engagement effectiveness in big organisation.

**• Problem Statement**: Here, I have researched and studied on employee employment effectiveness on employees.

**• Objective:**

➢ To assess the employee satisfaction towards the workplace.

➢ To assess the employee engagement strategies.

➢ To examine the impact of employee engagement on organizational effectiveness.

➢ To identify the challenges on employee engagement.

➢ To identify the influence of organizational inputs on the employee engagement.

➢ To explore how engagement affects employees' psychological and emotional well-being.

**Research Design:** Descriptive in nature, focusing on statistical methods to identify causality and dependence.

**Sampling Technique: Convience Sampling**

A convenience sample is one of the main types of non-probability sampling methods. A Convenience sample is made up of people who are easy to reach. Convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling method where units are selected for inclusion in the sample because they are the easiest for the researcher to access. This can be due to geographical proximity, availability at a given time, or willingness to participate in the research. Sometimes called accidental sampling, convenience sampling is a type of non-random sampling.

**Sampling Frame**:

• Population or universe: Hi-tech Sweet Water Technologies Private Limited, Bardoli.

• Sampling unit: Employees of Hi-tech Sweet Water Technologies Private Limited.

• Sampling size: 80 Respondents.

**Data Collection:** I am collecting primary data for research from employees through questionnaire survey.

**Software Used:**

SPSS software, MS Excel

**Analytical Tools;**

Frequency Distribution, ANOVA Analysis, Cross Tabulation, Chi Square

Research Plan

Firstly, I selected the relevant topic for the research project and the according to the topic I have found out research papers for review of literature and studied on that research papers. Then after primary and secondary objectives were selected according to the research topic and then after research methodology was done choosing primary data source that is by questionnaires method (Survey), according to the responses data was collected and analysed and interpreted. After data analysis and interpretation findings, conclusions, & suggestions were made and suggested to the company.

**Limitation of Study**

• Employee engagement is subjective and can vary based on individual perceptions and Emotions.

• The study may focus on a specific organization or group, limiting the generalizability of Findings.

• Engagement levels can fluctuate over time, and the study may not capture long-term trends.

• Employees may not provide honest feedback in surveys or interviews due to fear of Judgment or repercussions

**Results and Data Analysis**

**Demographics of respondents presented :**

**Respondents age**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Age** | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative percent** |
| **20 to 30** | 32 | 40.00 | 40.00 |
| **31 to 40** | 41 | 51.20 | 91.20 |
| **41 to 50** | 5 | 6.30 | 97.50 |
| **Above 51** | 2 | 2.50 | 100.00 |
| **Total** | 80 | 100.00 |  |

**Interpretation**

From the above chart and frequency distribution table shows 40.00 % of respondents fall between 20-30 age group category, 51.20 % of respondents fall into 31-40 age group category, 6.30 % of respondents fall into 41-50 age group category, and 2.50 % of respondents fall under above 51 ages group category.

**Respondent’s Educational Qualification**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Education Qualification** | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative percent** |
| **Secondary School Leaving Certificate** | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| **Plus two** | 12 | 15.00 | 15.00 |
| **Degree** | 62 | 77.50 | 92.50 |
| **P.G** | 5 | 6.30 | 98.80 |
| **Others** | 1 | 1.20 | 100.00 |
| **Total** | 80 | 100.00 |  |

**Interpretation**

From the above chart and frequency distribution table, we can see that 15.00 % of respondents have plus two educational qualifications, 77.50 % of respondents have degree educational qualification, 6.30 % of respondents have P.G educational qualifications and 1.00 % of employees have other educational qualifications.

**Respondents Industry Experience**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Industry Experience** | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative percent** |
| **Below 5 years** | 27 | 33.80 | 33.80 |
| **6 to 10 years** | 45 | 56.30 | 90.00 |
| **11-15 years** | 8 | 10.00 | 100.00 |
| **Other specify** | 0 | 0 |  |
| **Total** | 80 | 100.00 |  |

**Interpretation**

From the above chart and frequency distribution we can see that 33.80 % of employees have industry experience of below 5 years, 56.30 % of employees have industry experience of 6 to 10 years, 10.00 % of employees have industry experience of 11 to 15 years.

**Department**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department** | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative percent** |
| **Human Resources** | 12 | 15.00 | 15.00 |
| **Finance** | 18 | 22.50 | 37.50 |
| **Marketing and sales** | 20 | 25.00 | 62.50 |
| **Production** | 21 | 26.20 | 88.70 |
| **IT** | 9 | 11.30 | 100.00 |
| **Total** | 80 | 100.00 |  |

**Interpretation**

From the above chart we can see that 15.00 % of employees are from Human Resources Department, 22.50 % of employees are from Finance Department, 25.00 % of employees are from Marketing and Sales Department, 26.20 % of employees are from Production Department and 11.30 % of employees are from IT Department.

**ANOVA ANALYSIS**

ANOVA Analysis has been utilised for analysis of gender of respondents and satisfaction with recognition.

**Null Hypothesis H0**: There is no significant difference in satisfaction with recognition between males and females.

**Alternative Hypothesis H1**: There is significant difference in satisfaction with recognition between males and females.

**Descriptive Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Descriptives** | | | | | | | | |
|  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | | Minimum | Maximum |
|  |  |  |  |  | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |  |  |
| Male | 59 | 2.10 | .607 | .079 | 1.94 | 2.26 | 1 | 3 |
| Female | 21 | 1.81 | .602 | .131 | 1.54 | 2.08 | 1 | 3 |
| Total | 80 | 2.03 | .616 | .069 | 1.89 | 2.16 | 1 | 3 |

**ANOVA analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 1.322 | 1 | 1.322 | 3.602 | .061 |
| Within Groups | 28.628 | 78 | .367 |  |  |
| Total | 29.950 | 79 |  |  |  |

**Interpretation**

The p value is greater than 0.05 (0.061>0.05) so alternative hypothesis h1 is rejected.

Thus, H0 hypothesis is accepted, There is no significant difference in satisfaction with recognition between males and females.

**CORRELATION ANALYSIS**

Correlation Analysis has been utilised for analysis of correlation between the company's recreational activities and innovation or creative solutions.

**Null Hypothesis (HO):** There is no significant correlation between the company's recreational activities and innovation or creative solutions.

**Alternative Hypothesis (H1):** There is a significant positive correlation between the company's recreational activities and innovation or creative solutions.

**Correlation Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | recreational activities | innovation |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | -.056 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .624 |
|  | N | 80 | 80 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | -.056 | 1 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | .624 |  |
|  | N | 80 | 80 |

**Significance Level is Tested at 0.05**

**Interpretation**

The p value is .624 which is greater than the alpha value 0.05 (.624>0.05), hence null hypothesis h0 is accepted. There is no significant correlation between the company's recreational activities and innovation or creative solutions.

**CROSS TABULATION AND CHI SQUARE**

Cross Tabulation and Chi Square analysis has utilised to analyse association between the respondent's gender and their agreement that employee engagement is linked to individual productivity levels.

**Null Hypothesis h0:** There is no significant association between the respondent's gender and their agreement that employee engagement is linked to individual productivity levels.

**Alternative Hypothesis h1:** There is a significant association between the respondent's gender and their agreement that employee engagement is linked to individual productivity levels.

**Cross Tabulation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Crosstabulation** | | | | | | |
|  | | Do you agree that employee engagement is linked to individual productivity levels? | | | | Total |
|  | | Strongly Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Agree |  |
|  | Male | 11 | 8 | 1 | 39 | 59 |
|  | Female | 4 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 21 |
| Total | | 15 | 10 | 1 | 54 | 80 |

**Chi Square Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chi-Square Tests** | | | |
|  | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | .624a | 3 | .891 |
| Likelihood Ratio | .888 | 3 | .828 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .074 | 1 | .786 |
| N of Valid Cases | 80 |  |  |

**Significance Level is Tested at 0.05**

**Interpretation**

The p-value is 0.891 which is greater than alpha value 0.05 (0.891>0.05), hence null hypothesis h0 is accepted and alternative hypothesis h1 is rejected.

Thus, There is no significant association between the respondent's gender and their agreement that employee engagement is linked to individual productivity levels.

**5.C CONCLUSION**

* With respect to the above study and findings the employees are determined to give their best at workplace and the organization sets clear objectives for them to perform to the best of their ability and they feel comfortable giving feedback to their superior in the organization. It also inspires them to give their best at work and grow as an individual. The employees are willing to put best of their efforts if they are given proper working spaces. The employee under proper working environment, with their roles clearly defined and with proper guidance and communication will be engaged in their work. Majority of employees finds supportive management as a factor that drive engagement at work so other factors such as clear communication, recognition and rewards should be improved.
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