

Employee Engagement and Its Effect on Productivity in Dairy Companies

Mr. Parasotam Patolia

Research Scholar, Sankalchand Patel University

Dr. Jitendra Sharma

Professor, Sankalchand Patel College of Engineering, Sankalchand Patel University

Abstract

One of the most important factors affecting dairy firms' productivity and overall performance is employee engagement. This research looks at the link between productivity and employee engagement in the dairy industry, focusing on a number of factors such as motivation, organizational commitment, and work satisfaction. This study uses a mixed-methods approach to discover important determinants of engagement and their effects on productivity indicators. It does this by surveying and interviewing employees of certain dairy firms. The results underscore the importance of proficient communication, leadership assistance, and prospects for career advancement in augmenting worker engagement. In addition, the report offers dairy firms actionable advice on how to cultivate a more engaged staff, which will boost output and lead to long-term, profitable growth. The purpose of this research is to provide managers and HR experts with insights that will help them design strategies that will increase employee happiness while also promoting organizational success.

Keywords: *Workforce management, job satisfaction, organizational dedication, employee motivation, effective communication, professional development, workforce management, sustainable company growth, and human resource strategies are some of the factors that affect employee engagement, productivity, and dairy organizations.*

Introduction

A key factor in determining an organization's performance is employee engagement, especially in the cutthroat dairy industry. In order to continue development and preserve productivity, dairy firms need to make the most out of their resources. The emotional and psychological investment that employees have in their work, known as employee engagement, has a major impact on motivation, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction. All of these things work together to improve output and efficiency. A motivated staff is crucial in the dairy business, which is recognized for its intricate operating procedures. Efficient engagement tactics enhance productivity, quality of work, and corporate results. This study looks at the variables that affect employee engagement in dairy firms and how those variables affect output. Improving engagement requires essential components including good communication, leadership support, and opportunity for professional development.

It is vital for managers and HR experts to comprehend the mechanics of employee engagement in the dairy industry if they want to cultivate a motivated and efficient staff. This study offers useful information and doable suggestions for creating and putting into practice efficient engagement strategies that will promote organizational performance.

Literature Review

The influence of employee engagement on overall performance and productivity has led organizational researchers to place a great deal of emphasis on this topic. Employee engagement was first described by Kahn (1990) as the process of people tying their identities to their jobs, but this idea has since developed into an important field of research. This perspective was broadened by Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, and Bakker (2002), who defined engagement as consisting of energy, devotion, and absorption—qualities that are strongly associated with increased work satisfaction and productivity.

One well-established result of strong employee engagement is job happiness. Strong evidence of a relationship between engagement and job satisfaction was identified by Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002), who also noted that engaged workers often report better job satisfaction, which has a favorable effect on their productivity. Furthermore, involvement is greatly aided by organizational commitment, as shown by Meyer and Allen (1991). Saks (2006) emphasized that workers that have a high level of organizational commitment are more engaged, which leads to increased productivity. Support from the leadership is another important component affecting worker engagement. According to Macey and Schneider (2008), engagement is greatly increased by good leadership, which includes giving clear instructions and appreciating worker contributions. This is consistent with research by Truss et al. (2013), who contend that maintaining high levels of engagement requires supportive leadership behaviors.

Employee engagement in firms is greatly influenced by effective communication. According to Welch (2011), open and regular communication fosters a feeling of community and trust among staff members, which raises engagement levels. Moreover, chances for career advancement are essential for sustaining involvement. Employee engagement is positively correlated with the perception of professional growth prospects, according to research by Schaufeli, Leiter, and Maslach (2001). The inward desire to work for its own sake is known as intrinsic motivation, and it is another important factor affecting engagement. Thomas (2009) discovered that individuals that are genuinely driven exhibit better levels of engagement and productivity, which is consistent with Deci and Ryan's (1985) emphasis on intrinsic motivation as a major driver of employee engagement.

The operational challenges of the dairy business demand a highly engaged staff. According to Susi and Jawaharrani's (2011) research, productivity is greatly increased by engagement strategies designed to meet the unique requirements of dairy workers, such as flexible work schedules and sufficient downtime. Richman et al. (2008), who discovered that companies that encourage work-life balance saw better levels of engagement, also highlight the significance of work-life balance in raising employee engagement.

It is often known that employee engagement affects how effectively a business performs. According to a 2013 Gallup survey, businesses with high levels of involvement beat their competitors in terms of customer happiness, productivity, and profitability. The findings of Markos and Sridevi (2010), who determined that engaged workers positively contribute to organizational success, are consistent with this.

Lastly, it's crucial that engagement efforts are sustainable. Both Truss et al. (2013) and Robinson, Perryman, and Hayday (2004) stress the necessity of continuous assessment and modification of engagement tactics to guarantee their efficacy throughout time.

Objectives and Hypothesis

Objectives

1. Assess the impact of employee engagement on productivity within dairy companies.

2. Identify key drivers of employee engagement in the dairy sector.

Research Methodology

Research Methodology

1. Research Design:

- **Quantitative Approach:** Utilized a quantitative research design to measure and analyze the relationship between employee engagement and productivity.
- **Descriptive and Correlational:** Focused on describing employee engagement levels and their correlation with productivity.

2. Sampling:

- **Sample Size:** Selected a total of 50 employees from various departments within dairy companies.
- **Sampling Method:** Employed stratified random sampling to ensure a diverse representation of employees across different roles and hierarchical levels.

3. Data Collection:

- **Instrument:** Used a structured questionnaire with 15 questions designed to measure employee engagement, key drivers of engagement, organizational commitment, and productivity.
- **Administration:** Distributed the questionnaire in paper format to facilitate participation.
- **Response Rate:** Obtained 50 completed and valid responses from the targeted sample.

4. Data Analysis:

- **Statistical Tools:** Utilized statistical software (e.g., SPSS) for data analysis.
- **Correlation Analysis:** Applied Pearson's correlation coefficient to assess the relationship between employee engagement and productivity.
- **Regression Analysis:** Conducted multiple regression analysis to evaluate the impact of key drivers on employee engagement.
- **Effect Analysis:** Used simple linear regression to analyze the effect of organizational commitment on engagement.
- **Comparison Analysis:** Performed a paired sample t-test to compare productivity levels before and after implementing improved engagement practices.

5. Ethical Considerations:

- **Confidentiality:** Ensured that all participant responses were kept confidential and anonymous.
- **Informed Consent:** Obtained informed consent from all participants, explaining the purpose and nature of the study.

6. Limitations:

- **Sample Size:** Limited to 50 employees, which may affect the generalizability of the findings.
- **Cross-Sectional Design:** The study's cross-sectional nature limits the ability to infer causality between engagement and productivity.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no significant correlation between employee engagement and productivity in dairy companies.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): Higher levels of employee engagement are positively correlated with increased productivity in dairy companies.

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
To what extent do you believe that your engagement levels affect your productivity at work?	2.220	49	.031	.26000	.0246	.4954

The one-sample t-test for the belief that engagement levels affect productivity at work resulted in a t-value of 2.220 with 49 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.031. The mean difference is 0.26000 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.0246 to 0.4954. These results are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), indicating that employees generally believe their engagement levels positively affect their productivity. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis (H0): Key drivers such as leadership support, effective communication, job satisfaction, and professional growth opportunities do not significantly influence employee engagement in the dairy sector.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): Key drivers such as leadership support, effective communication, job satisfaction, and professional growth opportunities significantly influence employee engagement in the dairy sector

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
How satisfied are you with the level of support you receive from your leadership?	2.753	49	.008	.46000	.1242	.7958

The one-sample t-test for satisfaction with leadership support shows a t-value of 2.753 with 49 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.008. The mean difference is 0.46000 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.1242 to 0.7958. These results are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), indicating that employees are generally satisfied with the support they receive from their leadership, which influences their engagement. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis (H0): Improving employee engagement practices will not lead to significant changes in productivity within dairy companies.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): Improving employee engagement practices will result in enhanced productivity within dairy companies.

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
To what extent do you believe that improving employee engagement practices will positively affect the company's overall performance?	2.540	49	.014	.32000	.0668	.5732

The one-sample t-test for the belief that improving employee engagement practices will positively affect the company's overall performance resulted in a t-value of 2.540 with 49 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.014. The mean difference is 0.32000, with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.0668 to 0.5732. These results are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), suggesting that employees believe enhancing engagement practices will positively impact overall company performance. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Overall Interpretation of Respondent

The results of a survey given by fifty workers reveal important patterns in worker productivity and engagement. Remarkably, most workers (60%) gave their total commitment a "High" grade, indicating a high level of devotion and loyalty. Similarly, 58% of respondents said they frequently feel "Very Satisfied" with their employment, while 68% of respondents said they had a "Large" burden. Regarding output, 56 percent of workers rated their own efficacy as "Very Effective" or "Excellent." It's interesting to note that 64% of workers said they were "Very Likely" to stay with their present company, which is consistent with the high levels of dedication seen.

Furthermore, 54% of workers stated that the overall productivity of their work had a "Significant Impact" or a "Very Significant Impact." On the other hand, 24% of workers expressed "Low" engagement and satisfaction, and they mostly mentioned "Poor" performance and a "Slightly Committed" mindset. Upon deeper inspection, 20% of workers reported feeling "Neutral" about their job satisfaction, frequently associating it with a "Moderate" workload and "Slightly Effective" output.

Significantly, employees who assessed their engagement and satisfaction as "High" or "Very Satisfied" were also more likely to judge their effectiveness and impact favorably. This suggests a definite relationship between high engagement and perceived effectiveness. On the other hand, "Low" engagement individuals tended to report "Not Effective" performance, suggesting that management should take notice of this area. These results highlight how crucial it is to create a welcoming and stimulating work environment in order to increase output and retain talent.

Conclusion

According to the study, productivity and employee engagement in dairy firms are significantly positively correlated. More engaged workers are often more productive, and this link is impacted by a number of variables, including chances for professional development, leadership support, effective communication, and job satisfaction. These results imply that improving employee engagement strategies can boost business performance as a whole. In order to boost employee engagement and retain talent, the study highlights how crucial it is to create a positive and engaging work environment.

Accepting the alternative hypotheses and rejecting the null hypothesis, the study demonstrates that key factors including communication and leadership support are important in promoting employee engagement, which in turn has a major influence on productivity. For dairy firms hoping to boost productivity through better employee engagement tactics, this report offers insightful information. The study emphasizes the need for ongoing evaluation and modification of engagement strategies to guarantee their efficacy over time, highlighting the requirement for long-term engagement initiatives to preserve high levels of output and employee satisfaction.

References

1. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. Springer Science & Business Media.
2. Gallup. (2013). State of the global workplace: Employee engagement insights for business leaders worldwide. Gallup, Inc.
3. 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.
4. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
5. Markos, S., & Sridevi, M. S. (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 89-96.
6. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422.
7. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.
8. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
9. Richman, A., Civian, J., Shannon, L., Hill, R., & Brennan, A. (2008). The relationship between perceived work-life balance and organizational outcomes. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(1), 1-24.
10. Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). The drivers of employee engagement. Institute for Employment Studies.
11. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
12. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two-sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92.
13. Susi, S., & Jawaharrani, K. (2011). Work-life balance: The key driver of employee engagement. *Asian Journal of Management Research*, 2(1), 474-483.
14. Thomas, K. W. (2009). Intrinsic motivation at work: What really drives employee engagement. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
15. Truss, C., Shantz, A., Soane, E., Alfes, K., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Employee engagement, organisational performance and individual well-being: Exploring the evidence, developing the theory. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(14), 2657-2669.
16. Welch, M. (2011). The evolution of the employee engagement concept: Communication implications. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 16(4), 328-346.