

MAJOR RESEARCH PROJECT ON

**A Study on Employee Engagement and Its Impact on Job
Satisfaction**

Submitted By:

Mohit Kumar

24/DMBA/141

Under the Guidance of

Dr. Yashdeep

Assistant Professor



DELHI SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

Delhi Technological University

Bawana Road, Delhi 110042

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that Mohit Kumar, roll no. 24/DMBA/141 has successfully completed and submitted his major research project report titled “A Study on Employee Engagement and Its Impact on Job Satisfaction” in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the award of the degree of Master of Business Administration (MBA) from Delhi School of Management, Delhi Technological University, Delhi, for the academic session 2025-2026.

The work carried out by him is original and has been completed under my supervision and guidance. To the best of my knowledge, no part of this report has been submitted for the award of any other degree, diploma or certificate by any other university.

Dr. Yashdeep

Assistant Professor

Delhi School of Management

Delhi Technological University

DECLARATION

I, Mohit Kumar, student of MBA at Delhi School of Management, Delhi Technological University, hereby declare that the major research project report titled “A Study on Employee Engagement and Its Impact on Job Satisfaction” is the result of my own work, undertaken under the supervision of Dr. Yashdeep, Assistant Professor.

I further declare that this report has not been submitted, in part or in whole, to any other institute or university for the award of any degree or diploma. The data, observations and interpretations presented here have been collected and prepared by me, and any sources referred to during the study have been duly acknowledged.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Mohit Kumar

24/DMBA/141

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It would be appropriate to commence by stating that I greatly appreciate the role that Dr. Yashdeep played throughout this study in offering guidance, patience and feedback, which proved to be invaluable to me as an aspiring researcher. His remarks at each step served to hone the definition of the subject matter, and provided the analysis with a clearer focus.

I would also like to credit the members of the faculty and the office staff members at the Delhi School of Management who have helped me to create this type of academic environment. My method in this study was informed by the discussions during the classroom sessions and the contributions received during the review in this case.

I would like to thank the fifty respondents who made a time and responded to the questionnaire. The basis of this work is their open-minded answers, and the research literally could not have been conducted without their consent.

Last, I want to thank my family members and friends who provided me with the constant support at the time of this project. And the days when the work seemed heavy their support kept me going.

Warm Regards,

Mohit Kumar

24/DMBA/141

Delhi School of Management

Delhi Technological University (DTU)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE	1
DECLARATION	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	3
TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
ABSTRACT	5
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION	6-8
1.1 Background of the Study	
1.2 Need of the Study	
1.3 Problem Statement	
1.4 Objectives of the Study	
1.5 Hypotheses	
1.6 Scope of the Study	
CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW	9-12
CHAPTER 3 – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	13-14
3.1 Research Design	
3.2 Sampling Plan	
3.3 Data Collection	
3.4 Tools of Analysis	
CHAPTER 4 – DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	15-26
CHAPTER 5 – FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS	27-28
CHAPTER 6 – CONCLUSION	29-30
REFERENCES	31-32
APPENDIX – 1 (Questionnaire)	33-37
PLAGIARISM REPORT	38

ABSTRACT

The concept of employee engagement has become one of the most actively debated concepts in contemporary human resource management in part due to organisations starting to realise that engaged and motivated employees can be (relatively) directly converted into better business results. The current paper explores the ways in which the workplace engagement influences the overall satisfaction of their jobs among professionals employed in the Indian corporate environment with a specific focus on the post-pandemic, hybrid period. A survey questionnaire was distributed via Google Form and fifty responses were obtained as valid through the employment at IT and ITeS, BFSI, manufacturing, retail, medical and education.

The measure was constructed based on four main themes, which included demographic profile, organisational context, drivers of engagement and self-rated levels of engagement and satisfaction. The data has been analyzed through frequency analysis, tabulation using percentage and simple cross tabulation which have been supplemented with Likert-scale items wherever appropriate with attitudes.

The results imply that engagement is positively predicted by career growth, recognition and quality of manager support with the least frequently identified factor being compensation as a constituent of definition of satisfaction. Approximately eighty four percent of the respondents indicated that they self-rated themselves as highly or moderately engaged and a larger proportion of the respondents indicated minimally low or very high levels of overall job satisfaction. Eighty per cent of the respondents believed that the increased engagement results in the increased job satisfaction thereby justifying the main hypothesis of the research. Perceptions of dissatisfaction in terms of workload, a lack of upward career advancement and a perceived disparity between recognition seemed to be most prevalent. This is complemented by the report giving a list of recommendations including structured recognition, transparent career frameworks, manager-capability training and a more frequent feedback culture which are all practical levers that HR teams in mid-to-large Indian organisations can tug.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

As you discussing near any HR head in India these days, sooner or later, the discussion gets adopted to the subject of engagement. This is simply because organisations have come to appreciate the fact that an increase in headcount does not result in outcomes by itself in organisations whether big or small. The results are a willing workforce which delivers its ideas freely and remains with the company long enough to deliver results and makes the company issues personal to it. The concept of engagement shifted in the 2010s not just to a single slide during an HR review to a metric on a board level but the pandemic also made it more pronounced. When a team of workers was requested to say home within nearly a day, leaders were swift to observe the ones who remained productive and the other who merely fizzled out. The noticeable difference of the two groups, more than any report in consultancy is what solidified engagement as a serious business issue.

In its most basic definition, employee engagement can be viewed as the emotional dedication an employee experiences towards the organisation and its objectives. It is often described as bringing all of oneself, both physically, cognitively, and emotionally, to work; a concept introduced by William Kahn in the academic literature in 1990. It was later beamed by other researchers such as Schaufeli and his associates in the trio of vigour, dedication and absorption. It is measured by the Gallup Q12 tool that has been utilized in tens of thousands of workplaces around the world and is assessed by using twelve statements in a plain language regarding transparency of expectations, recognition, advancements and friendships in the workplace. There is a slight difference of angle in each lens, but again the facilitator is that engagement is an attitude and as such, behaviours are a result of attitude and vice versa.

The second concept, which is in the focal point of this work, is job satisfaction, which is closely related to it, although not the same thing. It, in the general sense, is how satisfied an employee is with the job in totality. The well-known definition by Edwin Locke who sees satisfaction as the pleasant feeling which comes after evaluating the job one does stands the test of time. When the engagement is concerned with energy and desire, satisfaction is concerned with evaluation, to the question: overall, how do I feel about this job? A satisfied employee is typically an engaged employee, although a contented employee is not necessarily an engaged employee, as contentment can sometimes be slothfulness as well as devotion. This report tries to unpack this interaction between the two.

1.2 Need for the Study

There are three reasons as to why this study is of interest at this current time. To begin with, Indian corporate labor force is experiencing the most fluid years in a long time. Attrition in IT and ITeS was eight to twenty-five per cent during FY2022 and FY2023, and despite declines in FY2024 and FY2025, the voluntary exit rates are still more than 1.5 times higher than they were expected to be at the beginning of the pandemic in 2020. The engagement has at some stage or another been openly discussed by companies such as Infosys, TCS, HCL and Wipro in their calls to analysts, as a retention lever. Second, the shift to the hybrid work has transformed the employee experience texture. Daily corridor talks, water- cooler talks and the little gestures of appreciation that occurred naturally previously, now must be planned. Third, a generational change is happening simultaneously: a visible portion of the workforce is now in Gen Z, a generation which on all believable interpretations is placing purpose, growth and flexibility differently than the previous generations. All these forces present a new look of engagement as an enjoyable experience.

As practitioners, in the midst of the dashboards of pulse-survey findings, HR teams nonetheless have a hard time identifying the two or three leverages that actually change satisfaction. A research, which systematizes the connection, using new data of mixed sample, can give something meaningful to HR business partners who must take tough decisions as to where to spend time and money.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Although more writing on engagement is available, much of it is conceptual or uses information collected as references about massive multinationals in the West. The Indian context has not been properly represented and in India there is a dearth of sector cutting research that incorporates the employee group in manufacturing, retail and healthcare as well as IT here. It is also common in the HR commentary popular culture to confuse these two and treat engagement and satisfaction as similar entities that dilute the practical guidance that emanates out of it. The issue addressed by the proposed study, then, is that one should investigate (using primary data) the relationship between engagement and satisfaction in an Indian workplace setting in the modern environment and which of the drivers has the most significant impact.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

- To learn the demographic and organisations profile of engaged and disengaged employees in urban India.
- To determine the most important drivers, according to the employees, making them the most significant to get engaged in.
- To assess self-rated levels of the indices of engagement and the general levels of job satisfaction across the sample.
- Both to test the hypothesis that engagement and satisfaction are related and to test whether the hypothesis that higher levels of engagement are, as a general rule, associated with the higher levels of satisfaction is accepted.
- To elicit actionable recommendations that can be used by HR departments of mid-to-large Indian organisations.

1.5 Hypotheses

The analysis is guided by two working hypotheses.

H 1: Employees who self rate their level of engagement on a high level have higher chances of reporting high levels of overall job satisfaction.

H2: Engagement is most driven by recognition, career development and quality of manager support, rather than solely by compensation.

1.6 Scope and Limitations

The research is limited to the Indian urban workforce, most of the respondents located in Delhi NCR, Mumbai, Bengaluru, Pune and Hyderabad. Due to the sample size being fifty and the method of sampling being convenience-based, the results can be interpreted as indicative, as opposed to being representative nationally. Self-reports of engagement and satisfaction are prone to social- desirability bias and the cross-sectional design only captures attitudes at a specific time and does not track change over a wider period. This was used as a caveat to interpret the findings in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conceptual Framework of Employee Engagement

The scholarly roots of engagement generally run back to Kahn (1990) and his ethnographic research at a summer camp and an architecture firm; that identified three psychological states which he believed required at the workplace, including meaningfulness, safety and availability. In a workplace where these three co-existed, the employees were ready to be able to express themselves to the fullest on the job. Where either or all of them had not been satisfied, they drew away, what Kahn termed a personal disengagement. His power in framing was that it put engagement in the inner reality of the worker, instead of in any aspect of the job structure. Operationalisation of the concept by Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Rom and Bakker (2002) took another angle by the use of Utrecht Work Engagement Scale that measures vigour, dedication and absorption. Vigour refers to energy and strength, dedication refers to pride and inspiration and absorption is referred to involving quality engagement with the work to such an extent that one loses track of time.

Macey and Schneider (2008) also provide another handy distinction between engagement, as a trait, as a state and as a behaviour. The key differences between trait engagement an employee demonstrates a relatively constant disposition, state engagement the daily emotion, and behavioural engagement the noticeable discretionary effort that an employee chooses to apply. The difference is important in practice, in that organisations can do little about the trait dimension but a lot about the state and behavioural dimensions, via their work environment, leadership behaviour and HR systems.

2.2 Theories of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction theories are elderly and more numerous. The hierarchy of needs developed by Maslow though not in an organisation set up is commonly used to justify the progressions of worries about pay and job security to worries about belonging and esteem and self-actualisation as lower-order needs are satisfied. Herzberg conducted interviews with engineers and accountants in Pittsburgh and his theory (two factors) (1959) influenced the distinction between hygiene and motivators. Examples of these hygiene factors include pay, working conditions and company policy which does not make people feel satisfied but by their absence, they feel dissatisfied. Work and recognition and achievement on the other hand are the inspirers that in essence uplift the happiness. According to Locke (1976), satisfaction

was defined as the.

positive affect experienced as a consequence of the evaluation of oneself in relation to job according to meeting or helping one fulfill their job values, a definition that has lasted decades of empirical research.

Hackman and Oldham 1976 job characteristics model provided a benefiting structural perspective when it posited that to bring forth three psychological states, five essential job dimensions; skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback resulted in satisfaction and motivation. They have a model that is among the pioneering bridges between the satisfaction theory and the engagement theory as the psychological states they propose show much in common with what later authors called engagement.

2.3 Drivers of Engagement

Empirical studies of motivational factors that drive engagement have created an approximately consistent shortlist. In his test of an antecedents-and-consequences model, Saks (2006) identified that perceived organisational support and job characteristics led to engagement being strongly predicted. The Gallup Q12 of items, which were targeted at just over a million employee responses, rank clarity of expectations, received recognition in the past week, having a best friend at work, and having opportunities to learn and grow at the centre. Indian studies have been sporadically very similar to this list but have indicated, due to the more hierarchical nature of many Indian work environments, the greater relevance of supervisor support.

In a study with institute of employment studies, Robinson, Perryman and Hayday (2004) defined engagement as a positive attitude to the organisation and its values on the side of the employee and involvement and valued the most effective predictor. The term feeling valued and involved has since become something of a touchstone to the HR practitioners. Purpose, growth and well-being have emerged as the three emerging priorities, especially among younger workers in metro markets, featured by Deloitte and Mercer surveys most recently.

2.4 Indian Studies on Engagement

A number of Indian researcher have provided valuable field evidence. Bhatla (2011) examined the engagement in Indian banks and discovered that the extent of engagement diversity in performance management and in the employee perception of fairness in

performance management and leadership communication had a quantifiable difference on the engagement levels. The Sharma and Joshi (2019) research examined employees of IT in the National Capital Region and found out that career-development opportunities and recognition were the most predictive of engagement, rather than just pay.

In a conceptual paper Bhuvanaiah and Raya (2014) synthesised the international and Indian bodies of work and suggested an approach based on the idea that the engagement is context-sensitive, and the culture, hierarchical patterns and family-based patterns, which are specific to the Indian workplace, need to be taken into consideration.

And more recently, KPMG (2023) in its own People and Change study and the Mercer Marsh Benefits 2024 India Health on Demand survey, also identified a hybrid-era hewtness in engagement metrics, particularly in the IT sector, and a new hunger of employees in flexibility and well-being support. In recent years, these themes have also been highlighted in the industry reports published by NASSCOM in 2023 and 2024 as some of the priority areas of Indian technology companies.

2.5 The Hybrid and Post-pandemic Workplace

The transition to hybrid and remote setups, hastened by the disruption of 2020 and 2021 by the COVID-19 pandemic, has changed the conversation around engagement in a manner that older studies would not have imagined. According to Microsoft Work Trend Index (2022 and 2023), there was an apparent discrepancy between leaders, who tended to think that teams were less engaged at home and individual contributors, who frequently reported the opposite. The implication, which is relatively obvious, is that the definition of the term presence has changed. Observing a desk does not look like interaction, and being an active participant of virtual stand-up does. It has forced the HR systems to do so and as a consequence recognition platforms, manager-effectiveness training as well as outcome-based performance management have been in the spotlight again.

2.6 The Engagement-Satisfaction Linkage

The linkage between the engagement and satisfaction has fairly consistent evidence. In a meta-analysis of almost eight thousand business units, Hart, Schmidt and Hayes (2002) established a positive correlation between engagement and their satisfaction, productivity, customer outcomes and retention. Its directionality, though, is controversial. Other authors

put forward the argument that satisfaction is a precursor of engagement, with engaged employees having first satisfied themselves in terms of hygienic factors being able to then invest themselves in their work with emotional energy. Others such as Macey and Schneider perceive engagement as the bigger concept, the one in which satisfaction is applied within it. The practical view, and that to which this paper inclined, is that the two will support each other in practice, that every measurement instrument which is worth its time ought to measure both.

2.7 Demographic Influences

Age, demographic variables, education, role and industry, tenure has all been analyzed to have an impact on engagement. The results are both positive and negative although some are outstanding. The younger generation of employees, especially those who are below the age of thirty years, place a higher value on purpose and growth, as compared to the older generations. In a number of studies in India, women employees note that when they believe that the organisation is conducive to the work-life balance, they are more engaged. The tenure seems to follow a U-shaped curve; the engagement was quite high during the first two years and decreased between the third and fifth year followed by an increase after the seventh year. These are not universal patterns but they are recurrent in Indian samples to an extent that they may be useful to check them against the data gathered here.

2.8 Research Gap

There are two where the contemporary work is justified. To begin with, Indian literature is mainly focused on the IT industry and the manufacturing, BFSI, retail and healthcare industries are quite under-researched. Second, existing knowledge on the engagement-satisfaction relationship is saturated with theoretical description and has few easy, attitudinal data based on a mixed sample of working professionals. A small, fifty-respondent study which crosses the sectors and divides the questions to employees themselves what makes them engage and get satisfied can thus build a helpful, yet not a major, brick to the wall.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The research is descriptive and cross sectional. Descriptive since the goal is to explain attitudes, perceptions and reported behaviours among working professionals as opposed to determining some causation in a literal experiment way. Cross-sectional in that the data would be collected only at a single point in time, during a two-week span during November 2025, as opposed to being traced through various times. Both options are within the framework of an MBA major research project and are prevalent within the engagement and satisfaction literature.

3.2 Sampling Plan

The target market is the working salaried urban corporate sector of the Indian cities. The researcher picked out the sample using his extended professional network, which comprised of LinkedIn connections, college alumni in industry, and contacts provided by classmates. There was the utilization of a non-probability convenience sampling and it has been cited as a weakness. Fifty perfect and complete forms were analysed and a few incomplete forms were discarded. The sample includes professionals aged eighteen years and older, of any gender, in the fields of IT and ITeS, BFSI, manufacturing, retail and e-commerce as well as in healthcare and education, and with work experience of no less than fifty employees in a start-up up to more than a thousand employees in a large enterprise.

3.3 Data Collection

A questionnaire was mounted on Google Forms and sent out via email, direct messages (WhatsApp and LinkedIn) between 5 November 2025 and 18 November 2025. There were twenty questions in the instrument, in six sections. Section A covered demographic information, Section B covered the organisational setting, like industry, business size and employment system, section C inquired about the motivation to engage, Section D on the degree of engagement, Section E on job satisfaction, and a final open-ended question that sought suggestions. Where the attitudes were addressed, five-point Likert questions were employed. The questionnaire was created in such a way that it would take an average of six to eight minutes to fill out and clearly informed the respondents that nothing will be reported to individual respondents, but only in summary.

3.4 Tools of Analysis

Frequency counts and percentage tabulation have been used to analyse quantitative responses where each closed-ended question has been given in the response table in three columns starting with the response option, the number of respondents who gave that response and the percentage. The selective usage of cross- tabulation was found to provide explanatory value such as assisted details of engagement by work model or industry. In case of Likert items, the percent selecting the highest two boxes (Strongly Agree and Agree) has been employed as a summary statistic of agreement. The final question (open-ended) has been read out and coded into themes and reported in narrative form in Chapter 5. Any further analysis was performed in Microsoft Excel; since the sample size is quite large, it did not seem necessary to use more complicated statistical tests.

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The chapter, question by question presents the answers given to the fifty respondents. Each question is introduced with a short lead-in, frequency table, and a cursory interpretation. The questions are categorised into the six sections to be applied in the questionnaire.

Section A: Demographic Profile

Q1. Age of the Respondent

Firstly, the respondents were requested to demonstrate their age group. It was introduced with the aim of having a decent balance between the early-career, mid-career and senior employees.

Table 4.1: Distribution of Respondents by Age

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
18 – 25 years	11	22%
26 – 35 years	22	44%
36 – 45 years	12	24%
Above 45 years	5	10%
Total	50	100%

The highest cohort of 44 per cent is in the 26-35 age group, which is consistent with the demographics of the average white-collar worker in metro India. Another forty-six per cent is divided between the early-career group (18-25) and the mid-career group (36-45), but the over-45 group is at ten per cent. The combination of the sample biases towards the prime-working-years cohort, which is the most pertinent in relation to the engagement question.

Q2. Gender

The respondents were also asked to give their gender.

Table 4.2: Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Male	29	58%
Female	20	40%

Prefer not to say	1	2%
Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Total	50	100%

The gender element is seventy-eight percent male, 40 percent female and two percent other and did not specify. The female share is not at parity, but, in some way, healthier than several older studies have done of corporate India, and in part because the female participation rate in IT and BFSI has been on the rise.

Q3. Highest Educational Qualification

The other question required the respondents to define their highest level of education.

Table 4.3: Distribution of Respondents by Education

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Undergraduate (B.A./B.Com./B.Tech./B.Sc.)	18	36%
Postgraduate (M.A./M.Com./M.Tech./MBA)	25	50%
Doctorate	2	4%
Diploma / Other	5	10%
Total	50	100%

One-half of the respondents have a postgraduate qualification and one-third of the remaining seventy-six per cent have undergraduate degree. This is in line with the urban, white-collar population of the sample. The small number of doctorate or diploma graduates does not come as a surprise considering the convenience-sampling strategy..

Q4. Total Years of Work Experience

Respondents were to specify the number of years of experience in the workplace.

Table 4.4: Distribution of Respondents by Work Experience

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Less than 1 year	8	16%
1 – 3 years	14	28%
3 – 5 years	12	24%
5 – 10 years	10	20%

More than 10 years	6	12%
Total	50	100%

There is a fair spread across tenure bands. The proportion of early-career window (a period lower than three years) is forty-four per cent, and proportion of three-to- ten years is forty-four per cent, in which most decisions related to discretionary effort are made. The more than a decade group, at twelve per cent, introduces old age wisdom to the data.

Section B: Organisational Context

Q5. Industry / Sector

As a way of testing whether the engagement attitudes are dependent on sector respondents were asked to identify their major industry.

Table 4.5: Distribution of Respondents by Industry

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
IT / ITeS	18	36%
BFSI (Banking, Financial Services, Insurance)	10	20%
Manufacturing	7	14%
Retail / E-commerce	6	12%
Healthcare	4	8%
Education	3	6%
Other	2	4%
Total	50	100%

At thirty-six per cent, IT and ITeS take up the sample which is consistent with the urban-professional sample. An additional forty-six per cent of this is in BFSI, manufacturing and retail, this provides the study with a convenient mixture other than the IT-only frame most engagement studies are limited to. The proportions of healthcare and education are lower, which is known as a limitation.

Q6. Size of the Organisation

The respondents were requested to give the approximate size of the organisation they are currently working in.

Table 4.6: Distribution of Respondents by Company Size

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Less than 50 employees	8	16%
50 – 250 employees	14	28%
250 – 1,000 employees	15	30%
More than 1,000 employees	13	26%
Total	50	100%

The largest and mid-sized organisations are the rule as a half-sixth of them operate in organisations with over 250 employees and twenty-eight per cent in the 50-250 range. The eight participants in start-ups and very small enterprises provide an interesting point of comparison, as the dynamics of engagement in early-organisational settings are frequently predominantly different.

Q7. Current Work Model

Since the situation has changed after the pandemic, the respondents were inquired about their present working scenario.

Table 4.7: Distribution of Respondents by Work Model

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Fully on-site	21	42%
Hybrid	22	44%
Fully remote	7	14%
Total	50	100%

Hybrid arrangements recline at the top at forty four per cent, fully on-site has been placed second at forty two and fully remote occupies the last fourteen per cent. It is almost the same division since the hybrid and on-site includes what the majority of large Indian employers decided until 2024 and 2025, following the more assertive return-to-office calls of 2023. The wholly distant share is smaller though sufficiently big to attract comparisons further into the book.

Section C: Drivers of Engagement

Q8. Most Important Driver of Engagement

The questionnaire required the respondents to select the one most significant driver of engagement at work.

Table 4.8: Most Important Driver of Engagement

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Recognition	10	20%
Career growth opportunities	14	28%
Compensation	12	24%
Manager support	8	16%
Work culture	6	12%
Total	50	100%

The first one is career development with twenty-eight per cent and secondly is the compensation with twenty-four per cent with recognition being the third with twenty per cent. The support of the manager and work culture, although less popular among respondents, still possess significant weight of sixteen and twelve per cent respectively. Two real practices derive out of this. First, although compensation is important, development is more crucial to this sample, which is consistent with much of the new Indian literature. Second, the hybrid era did not push manager support out of the list: it is a non-trivial driver and must not be disregarded when creating engagement programmes.

Q9. Frequency of Meaningful Feedback from Manager

Since the frequency of feedback is a common subject in engagement research, it was agreed that the respondents would identify the frequency in which they receive meaningful feedback given by their manager.

Table 4.9: Frequency of Meaningful Manager Feedback

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Weekly	9	18%
Monthly	14	28%
Quarterly	13	26%
Rarely	11	22%
Never	3	6%
Total	50	100%

Fewer than half of the respondents (46 per cent) obtain feedback at weekly or monthly frequencies, and two-thirds (28 per cent) infrequently or not at all. This is an alarmingly high minority, and it coincides with what Gallup and Mercer have been sounding warning bells

about as the weakest point in most Indian organisations. In case recognition and growth are the most motivating factors yet there is low feedback, the engagement system is leaky in structure. It goes without saying that manager-capability training should also be on the list of priorities.

Q10. 'My work has a clear sense of purpose'

The respondents were requested to specify how well they agreed with the statement, on a five-point Likert scale.

Table 4.10: Sense of Purpose at Work

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	12	24%
Agree	20	40%
Neutral	11	22%
Disagree	5	10%
Strongly Disagree	2	4%
Total	50	100%

Sixty-four per cent of the respondents agree or strongly agree that their work has a clear sense of purpose, with the other fourteen per cent disagreeing. The group that would be interesting to concentrate on is the neutral group at twenty-two per cent which is generally where engagement can be relocated with comparatively few investments in clarity of purpose, and visibility of influence.

Q11. Adequacy of Training and Development Opportunities

To measure the perceptions of growth investment by the employer, respondents were questioned on whether the training and development opportunities that they get are satisfactory.

Table 4.11: Adequacy of Training and Development

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Yes, adequate	21	42%
Somewhat adequate	20	40%

No, not adequate	9	18%
Total	50	100%

Forty-two per cent rate training and development opportunities as sufficient, with another forty per cent rating them as slightly sufficient, and a third of them as insufficient. This, when summed up, translates to nearly six out of ten respondents being completely dissatisfied with the.

significant number of development they get considering that career growth was highly indicated as a driver in Q8.

Section D: Levels of Engagement

Q12. Self-Rated Level of Engagement

The respondents were requested to rate themselves with regard to their existing engagement rate at work.

Table 4.12: Self-Rated Engagement

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Highly engaged	18	36%
Moderately engaged	24	48%
Disengaged	8	16%
Total	50	100%

Eighty-four per cent of the respondents identify themselves in either highly or moderately engaged buckets, and sixteen per cent disengaged. Although the proportion of engaged employees is promising, the group that is more pressing to address is the percentage of disengaged employees, those that according to most literature are responsible of the majority of attrition and quality problems, and thus their minority status.

Q13. Going Beyond Formal Job Duties

Engagement is a behavioural mark of discretion effort, the willingness to do more than the minimal necessary. The frequency with which they exceed their official job responsibilities was requested of respondents.

Table 4.13: Frequency of Going Beyond Formal Duties

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Always	8	16%
Often	17	34%
Sometimes	16	32%
Rarely	7	14%
Never	2	4%
Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Total	50	100%

Fifty percent of the respondents exceed their responsibilities always or frequently, another thirty-two per cent at least some of the time. Eighteen per cent also hardly or not at all, which is approximately in line with the disengaged group that is found in Q12. The fact that these two numbers are so close to each other, is a little internal validity itself to the data.

Q14. Likelihood to Recommend Employer (eNPS-style)

Adopting the concept of Net Promoter Score familiar to most, the respondents were prompted to provide the likelihood of referring a friend to the current employer in case of similar position.

Table 4.14: Likelihood to Recommend Current Employer

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Highly likely	12	24%
Likely	18	36%
Neutral	12	24%
Unlikely	6	12%
Highly unlikely	2	4%
Total	50	100%

Sixty per cent of the respondents are in the likely-or-better category, which is a healthy result within the Indian standards, where all industry eNPS averages are modest. Here it is 16 per cent inforseen or highly inforseen recommend, which generally follows the trend of the disengaged share in the previous questions.

Section E: Job Satisfaction

Q15. Overall Job Satisfaction

The respondents were required to answer a five-point scale on their job satisfaction in general.

Table 4.15: Overall Job Satisfaction

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Strongly Satisfied	10	20%
Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Satisfied	22	44%
Neutral	11	22%
Dissatisfied	5	10%
Strongly Dissatisfied	2	4%
Total	50	100%

Sixty-four per cent overall work satisfaction, which compliments the sixty-four per cent who said they clearly saw purpose in Q10 and the eighty-four per cent who rated themselves engaged in Q12, is also very comfortable with sixty-four per cent who said they are satisfied or strongly satisfied with their jobs. The stack-up indicates that in this sample, engagement is a somewhat broader construct than satisfaction, in line with framing by Macey and Schneider.

Q16. Most Satisfying Aspect of the Current Job

To decant what is bearing the brunt on the satisfaction aspect, the respondents were requested to choose only one aspects among all in their current employment that is making them very satisfied.

Table 4.16: Most Satisfying Aspect

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Salary and benefits	8	16%
The nature of work itself	14	28%
Colleagues and team	10	20%
Career growth opportunities	11	22%

Work-life balance	7	14%
Total	50	100%

The most noted source of satisfaction is the nature of the work itself, at twenty-eight per cent, then career growth taking twenty-two per cent, and then colleagues taking twenty. Salary and benefits are the most effective factor in engagement, although it is a leading item in Q8; it only appears in the most satisfying factor, sixteen per cent. This resonates with the Herzberg point that the pay is perceived to be more of a hygiene factor, rather than a positive motivator.

Q17. Most Dissatisfying Aspect of the Current Job

The respondents were also requested to select the one that was most dissatisfying.

Table 4.17: Most Dissatisfying Aspect

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Workload	15	30%
Pay and benefits	11	22%
Manager / leadership style	8	16%
Limited growth pathways	10	20%
Recognition gap	6	12%
Total	50	100%

Workload is at the head of the dissatisfaction list making thirty per cent then pay makes a close second at twenty two per cent, limited growth at twenty percent, manager style at sixteen percent and recognition gap at twelve percent. The summation of the fifty per cent which is directed towards workload or low growth is a viable planning contribution. It implies that the distribution of resources, planning of capacity and better articulation of growth frameworks would contribute more to the satisfaction than a mere pay increase.

Q18. Likelihood of Leaving the Company in the Next 12 Months

In an attempt to capture intent-to-leave which is in most cases a leading indicator of disengagement, the respondents were interrogated on their tendency to leave within the next twelve months.

Table 4.18: Likelihood of Leaving in the Next 12 Months

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Very likely	4	8%
Likely	8	16%
Unsure	15	30%
Unlikely	15	30%
Very unlikely	8	16%
Total	50	100%

A quarter of them are going to leave over the next year (twenty four per cent) and forty six (forty one) are unlikely or very unlikely. The group to have a retention discussion with regards to the HR teams is the one that is the thirty per cent unsure cohort. Reading in the context of the above engagement statistics and satisfaction statistics, this distribution is widely consistent: The disengaged sixteen per cent and the dissatisfied fourteen per cent overlap extensively with the

likely-to-leave twenty-four per cent, plus some further molliespoil-sprights in the neutral group.

Section F: Engagement-Satisfaction Linkage

Q19. 'Higher engagement leads to higher job satisfaction'

This is the main question of study. The respondents were requested to complete a five-point Likert scale of their agreement with the statement.

Table 4.19: Belief in the Engagement-Satisfaction Link

Response Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	18	36%
Agree	22	44%
Neutral	7	14%
Disagree	2	4%
Strongly Disagree	1	2%
Total	50	100%

Eighty per cent of the respondents agree or strongly agree that with increased engagement, the level of job satisfaction increases. The share of disagreement is only six per cent with a negligible group, fourteen per cent. The one most powerful outcome of the study is this near-consensus, which provides for the definite support of Hypothesis H1. Read and Q12, and Q15, of which the levels of engagement and satisfaction themselves also took a parallel direction, the perceptual evidence and the behavioural evidence are headed in the same direction.

Q20. Suggestions to Improve Engagement at the Workplace

The last question was open-ended, where the respondent could give ideas on how they could enhance employee engagement in their workplace. Browse through the answers, there were a few evident themes. More frequent, more structured recognition came across the most often but a few specifics were made, specifically, peer-to-peer recognition sites and small but visible gifts instead of annual award night. The second theme was career chats: the respondents were seeking clearer maps of growth and more candid and regular meetings with their managers on where they were at. Workload was the third theme, with a significant number of the respondents requesting improved capacity planning and after-hours ping protection. The fourth theme revolved around the hybrid model itself as the respondents demanded more coherent policies and less of an ad-hoc approach to working days in the office. Some responses were also given to invest more in a handful of responses.

mental health, training managers and more meaningful skip-level discussions. These themes are picked up again in the suggestions section of Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Key Findings

Making up the chapters, there are six findings that shine out of the data.

To begin with, the sample comprises predominantly of professionals in their main productive years with seventy per cent being aged twenty-six to forty-five. Postgraduates and undergraduates are eighty six per cent of the group and their sample is fairly balanced between males (fifty eight percent) and females (forty percent).

Second, the sample represents the Indian post-pandemic corporate setting in terms of the workplace. Sixty-four per cent of the people in surveys do it in-hybrid, forty-two per cent on-site and fourteen per cent fully remote. The seventy two per cent of the sample is made up of mid-sized organisations and large organisations, and the three largest sectors represented are IT-ITeS, BFSI and manufacturing.

Third, the top three drivers of the engagement in this sample, in that order are career growth, compensation and recognition. Behind in headline numbers, but not insignificant, manager support and work culture continue to be significant at twenty-eight per cent combined. The illustration lends Hypothesis H2 some spirit, whereby growth and recognition become important factors and compensation, although a major factor, is not at the forefront of most.

Fourth, the sample organisations have an uneven feedback architecture. Forty six per cent of respondents are provided with feedback at a pace of monthly or weekly and twenty-eight per cent provide feedback little or not at all. Since feedback is a cheap lever and that managers can do without spending large budgets to implement, this is a soft area to repair.

Fifth, the level of engagement and satisfaction is comparably healthy on the headline. Eighty four per cent of those who were surveyed are highly or moderately engaged, sixty four per cent of the respondents are generally satisfied with their jobs as a whole, sixty four per cent of the respondents would recommend their employer to a friend. It is the uninspired-and-dissatisfied minority of fifteen to twenty per cent which, however, is the source of most of the attrition risk.

Sixth, and most crucial to the central research question, eighty per cent of the respondents concur or strongly agree with the higher engagement, higher job satisfaction. Hypothesis H1 then is highly supported.

5.2 Suggestions

Applying the results to practice, the subsequent set of recommendations is provided to be used by HR teams in mid-to-large Indian organisations.

- Establish a recognition system which is frequent and structured. Even award nights once a year are not a good alternative to micro-recognition per week. Recognition platforms provided by co-workers are free, and there is a tendency to make the needle move fast as they are integrated with the daily working process via Slack or Microsoft Teams.
- Turn career talks into regular, quarterly, and not annual, conversations. The most effective engagement driver in the sample is career development, and only a few participants in the sample have sufficient development opportunities. Part of this gap can be bridged with quarterly one-on-one career conversations not tied to performance reviews.
- Invest training manager-capability, particularly feedback. The statistics reveal that twenty-eight per cent of the respondents seldom or sometimes never get meaningful feedback. The ability to provide managers with the competence, and the time, to provide regular feedback is one of the greatest pay off investments an HR team can make.
- Tackle the workload and capacity planning. This cannot be left to individual teams to figure out as workload is the top dissatisfier in thirty per cent of the respondents. Better capacity reviews, more transparent scopes and visible limits to after- hours work would all help.
- Sensible hybrid policy defined and adhered to. A number of non-specific responses identified ad- hoc hybrid arrangements as being a source of stress. An imperfect rhythm which is predictable is usually better than one that changes quarter by quarter.
- Check on the disengaged tail. The sixteen per cent that are self-identifying as disengaged is the group that is most apt to quit and likely to affect others unfavorably. Specific listening sessions with this group, not mediated through the line manager, can bring to the fore practical issues that wider surveys would not bring any closer to light.
- Accompany the review of couple compensation with non-monetary investments. Compensation is important and it should be benchmarked, but it has minimal work to do in satisfaction, on its own. Combining recognition, growth and well-being investment with pay reviews is likely to have a more significant effect than either of the aforementioned by

itself.

• **CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION**

The objective of the study was to investigate (using primary data) the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction in the Indian corporate environment, and what drivers are the most significant ones. Through a sample of fifty interviewees (IT and ITeS, BFSI, manufacturing, retail, healthcare and education) the image we see is substantially comparable with the currently available literature, yet with some helpful additional details.

There is a good and vibrant engagement in the urban Indian workforce. It is apparent that a vast majority of the respondents fit within the highly or moderately engaged buckets, have a sense of purpose at work and would recommend their employer to a friend. This, at least, is a handy reference point. The motivating factors behind this baseline can be identified: career development, acknowledgement and quality of managerial assistance. Compensation is important, but is hardly a one-size-fits-all determiner in the satisfaction tale, just as Herzberg, and since then a long procession of researchers, have indicated in relation to hygiene factors as opposed to motivators.

Meanwhile, the data indicates some of the milder spots. Approximately one out of six respondents is disengaged, a corresponding proportion is dissatisfied or actively plans to move within the next 12 months. The generated feedback is not balanced, and only one quarterly or less often do the many respondents actually get meaningful feedback. Between sixty and seventy per cent of the reasons given as causes of dissatisfaction are workload, limited pathways of growth and a recognition gap. All these are not insurmountable, in fact the majority of them are tacklable through interventions that are squarely in the hands of the HR team.

The hypothesis H1, according to which greater engagement is usually followed by greater satisfaction is supported by the data. Hypothesis H2, that recognition, career growth and manager support, rather than compensation, are drivers, is supported in spirit. The development and acknowledgement of the career is going to be ahead, whereas the pay is a major factor but should not be on the limelight of the narrative.

Just like any other research of this type, the limitations are actual. A convenience-sampled estimate of fifty people in urban India can not represent the entire workforce of the country. Mood and recency might colour self-reported engagement and satisfaction. A cross-sectional design only captures attitudes at a specific time and cannot provide rigour of causality. Future research would be helpful in increasing the sample, over-sampling these poorly represented areas like healthcare and education and measuring the attitudinal aspects with objective data including performance ratings, turnover and absenteeism.

The study can provide a tiny yet quite substantial perspective of the current position of Indian corporate engagement story within those confines. The headline message is clear- participation and satisfaction are closely connected, the hands that move them are already familiar, and majority of them are highly accessible to HR teams that chooses to move them.

REFERENCES

- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223.
- Bhatla, N. (2011). To study the employee engagement practices and its effect on employee performance with special reference to ICICI and HDFC Bank in Lucknow. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 2(8), 1-7.
- Bhuvanaiah, T., & Raya, R. P. (2014). Employee engagement: Key to organizational success. *SCMS Journal of Indian Management*, 11(4), 61-71.
- Deloitte (2023). Global Human Capital Trends Report. Deloitte Insights.
- Gallup (2023). State of the Global Workplace Report. Gallup, Washington, D.C.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. John Wiley, New York.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- KPMG (2023). People & Change in India: Annual Outlook. KPMG Advisory Services.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In Dunnette, M. D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Rand McNally, Chicago.
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396.
- Mercer Marsh Benefits (2024). Health on Demand: India Insights. Mercer Marsh Benefits, Mumbai.

- Microsoft (2023). Work Trend Index Annual Report. Microsoft Corporation.
- NASSCOM (2024). Strategic Review: India's Technology Industry. NASSCOM, New Delhi.
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). The Drivers of Employee Engagement. Institute for Employment Studies, Brighton.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92.
- Sharma, R., & Joshi, P. (2019). Employee engagement and its drivers: An empirical study of the Indian IT sector. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, 8(2), 14-22.

APPENDIX: QUESTIONNAIRE

Below is the structured questionnaire used to gather responses for this study. It was administered through Google Forms between 5 and 18 November 2025. Twenty questions were asked across six sections. All responses were recorded anonymously.

Section A: Demographic Profile

Q1. What is your age group?

- 18 – 25 years
- 26 – 35 years
- 36 – 45 years
- Above 45 years

Q2. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to say

Q3. What is your highest educational qualification?

- Undergraduate (B.A./B.Com./B.Tech./B.Sc.)
- Postgraduate (M.A./M.Com./M.Tech./MBA)
- Doctorate
- Diploma / Other

Q4. Total years of work experience?

- Less than 1 year
- 1 – 3 years
- 3 – 5 years
- 5 – 10 years
- More than 10 years

Section B: Organisational Context

Q5. Which industry / sector do you work in?

- IT / ITeS
- BFSI (Banking, Financial Services, Insurance)
- Manufacturing
- Retail / E-commerce
- Healthcare
- Education
- Other

Q6. What is the approximate size of your organisation?

- Less than 50 employees
- 50 – 250 employees
- 250 – 1,000 employees
- More than 1,000 employees

Q7. What is your current work model?

- Fully on-site
- Hybrid
- Fully remote

Section C: Drivers of Engagement

Q8. Which of the following is the single most important driver of your engagement at work?

- Recognition
- Career growth opportunities
- Compensation
- Manager support
- Work culture

Q9. How often does your manager give you meaningful feedback?

- Weekly
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Rarely
- Never

Q10. 'My work has a clear sense of purpose.' (Please rate)

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q11. Are the training and development opportunities at your workplace adequate?

- Yes, adequate
- Somewhat adequate
- No, not adequate

Section D: Levels of Engagement

Q12. How would you rate your current level of engagement at work?

- Highly engaged
- Moderately engaged
- Disengaged

Q13. How often do you go beyond your formal job duties?

- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

Q14. How likely are you to recommend your current employer to a friend looking for a similar role?

- Highly likely
- Likely
- Neutral
- Unlikely
- Highly unlikely

Section E: Job Satisfaction

Q15. Overall, how satisfied are you with your current job?

- Strongly Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neutral
- Dissatisfied
- Strongly Dissatisfied

Q16. Which of the following is the single most satisfying aspect of your current job?

- Salary and benefits
- The nature of work itself
- Colleagues and team
- Career growth opportunities
- Work-life balance

Q17. Which of the following is the single most dissatisfying aspect of your current job?

- Workload
- Pay and benefits
- Manager / leadership style
- Limited growth pathways
- Recognition gap

Q18. How likely are you to leave your current company in the next 12 months?

- Very likely
- Likely
- Unsure
- Unlikely
- Very unlikely

Section F: Engagement-Satisfaction Linkage

Q19. 'Higher employee engagement leads to higher job satisfaction.' (Please rate)

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q20. In your view, what one or two changes would most improve employee engagement at your workplace? (Open-ended)

(Please share your suggestions in a few sentences.)