

# A Study on Employee Engagement in The Retail Sector with Due Emphasis on Hyderabad

Ahmed Ehtesham Kawkab-M.B.A., LLM

Email id: kawkab1adv@gmail.com

---

## Abstract

### Purpose

*This study examines employee engagement in the retail sector in Hyderabad, highlighting key factors that influence workforce motivation, productivity, and commitment. The retail industry faces challenges such as high employee turnover, work monotony, and limited career growth opportunities, which affect engagement levels. The purpose of this research is to evaluate the impact of leadership support, work environment, rewards and recognition, and career development opportunities on employee engagement and provide actionable recommendations for retailers.*

### Originality

*Employee engagement has been extensively studied in various industries; however, limited research focuses on retail employees in Hyderabad. This study bridges a critical gap by exploring engagement trends in both large retail chains and independent stores, offering a comparative analysis. The findings contribute original insights by integrating demographic factors, business models, and statistical analyses, making it valuable for HR practitioners, retail managers, and policymakers.*

### Methodology

*The research employs a quantitative approach, collecting data from 180 retail employees in Hyderabad using a structured questionnaire. Descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, ANOVA, Chi-square tests, and multiple regression models are applied to identify engagement predictors and their significance. The study further assesses whether demographic variables moderate engagement levels, providing a well-rounded analysis.*

**Keywords:** Employee Engagement, Retail Sector, Hyderabad, Leadership Support, Work Environment, Career Growth, Workforce Motivation, HR Strategies, Employee Commitment, Business Performance

---

## I. Introduction

Employee engagement has become a key focus for organizations worldwide, particularly in the retail sector, where workforce motivation directly impacts customer experience, business efficiency, and overall profitability. Retail employees often face challenges such as long working hours, limited career advancement, and repetitive tasks, which can lead to disengagement and high turnover rates. Studies have shown that engaged employees are more productive, committed, and deliver better service, ultimately influencing business growth. Hyderabad, being a major retail hub with a growing presence of both large retail chains and independent stores, presents a dynamic environment for assessing engagement trends. Employee engagement in Hyderabad's retail sector remains underexplored, necessitating an in-depth study on the factors influencing workforce motivation, including work environment, leadership, rewards, and career growth opportunities. This study aims to bridge the gap by evaluating engagement drivers and proposing actionable recommendations for retail businesses. Employee engagement plays a crucial role in enhancing organizational performance and reducing turnover rates in the retail sector. However, limited research has focused on retail workforce engagement, particularly in Hyderabad, where the industry is expanding rapidly. Understanding employee engagement from a regional perspective allows organizations to design culture-specific HR strategies that cater to local workforce needs. Furthermore, existing research primarily focuses on global or national trends, lacking granular insights into how retail employees in specific locations, like Hyderabad, experience workplace motivation and commitment. The study aims to fill this knowledge gap by analyzing engagement levels across different demographics, comparing retail chain employees with independent store workers, and assessing the impact of career growth opportunities.

## II. Review Of Literature

Employee engagement is broadly defined as the level of an employee's emotional and cognitive investment in their organization (Kahn, 1990). According to Schaufeli et al. (2002), engagement is characterized by three dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Saks (2006) introduced the concept of job and

organizational engagement, highlighting the importance of a supportive workplace in fostering employee commitment.

#### **Employee Engagement in the Retail Sector**

1. Towers Perrin (2008) and Gallup (2017) indicate that retail employees often experience lower engagement due to routine tasks, long working hours, and limited career growth opportunities.
2. Robinson et al. (2004) suggested that engagement in retail is heavily dependent on leadership practices, recognition programs, and workplace culture.

#### **Determinants of Employee Engagement at Retail sector**

3. **Kahn (1990)** emphasized that a positive and inclusive work culture fosters engagement. Stated that psychological conditions necessary for engagement, including meaningful work, safety, and availability of resources.
4. **Bass, (1985). Breevaart et al. (2014)** found that supportive leadership enhances employee motivation and job satisfaction Transformational leadership has been linked to high engagement levels.
5. **Eisenberger et al. (1997)** mentioned that Employee appreciation and incentives positively impact engagement, they stated that recognition reinforces an employee's sense of value in an organization.
6. **Ghosh et al. (2013)** highlights that career development opportunities are crucial in the retail sector. Organizations that provide clear career progression paths experience higher retention rates and engagement.

#### **Challenges in Employee Engagement**

7. Glebbeek & Bax, (2004) mentioned that retail jobs often have high attrition rates, leading to difficulty in maintaining engagement
8. Maslach & Leiter, (1997) mentioned employees in retail frequently experience workload stress, impacting their engagement levels
9. Demerouti et al., (2001) stated that retail employees often have restricted decision-making power, which affects their sense of ownership and engagement

#### **Strategies to Enhance Employee Engagement in Retail**

10. Robinson et al., (2004) identified that creating a positive work environment has been crucial factor for engagement
11. Saks, (2006). Stated that investment in employee skill enhancement significantly improves engagement
12. Deci & Ryan, (1985) Providing autonomy and participation in decision-making increases commitment

#### **Theories of Employee Involvement and Commitment**

13. Meyer & Allen's (1991) Defines commitment Three-Component Model: as affective (emotional attachment), continuance (cost-based attachment), and normative (obligation-based attachment).
14. Kahn's (1990) Engagement Theory: Suggests that psychological presence (meaningfulness, safety, availability) influences employee involvement.
15. Blau, (1964): Proposes that employees commit based on perceived reciprocity of employer-employee relationships.

#### **Employee Involvement and Commitment**

16. Gallup's (2020) stated that workplace report shows only 36% of U.S. employees are engaged, highlighting challenges in retention.
17. **Harter et al., (2017).** firms emphasize merit-based rewards to boost commitment in America
18. **(Bakker & Demerouti, (2008).** Stated that European countries often have strong labor laws and work-life balance initiatives, influencing employee commitment and Germany follows a structured approach, with high engagement due to autonomy and skill development
19. **Cotton & Hart, (2003).** emphasizes that collectivism, where engagement stems from teamwork and job security are priority in France
20. **Salanova et al., (2005)** focused on job satisfaction, flexibility, and ethical leadership, which improve involvement in Scandinavian countries
21. **Hofstede, (1980).** Showcased that varied engagement trends due to cultural diversity. Japan's work culture is rooted in loyalty and long-term commitment in Asian countries
22. **Sharma & Sharma, (2019)** stated that in India rising employee engagement with increasing emphasis on career progression and leadership support
23. **Chen & Francesco, (2003)** mentioned that highlight how Confucian values contribute to high commitment in China
24. **Meyer & Gagne, (2008)** stated that Employee commitment in African nations is often shaped by economic conditions and leadership styles. Studies in South Africa indicate that transformational leadership enhances employee involvement

25. **Ng & Feldman, (2007)** observed in their study that job security concerns and limited professional development hinder commitment in some regions
26. **González-Morales et al., (2018)** mentioned that Employee involvement in Latin America is influenced by family-oriented workplace cultures. Studies reveal high emotional commitment in Brazil, where employees value strong social connections at work
27. **Ruiz & Martínez, (2016)** mentioned that organizations adopt engagement strategies such as participatory decision-making, fostering higher involvement in Mexico

#### **Research objectives**

1. To examine the current state of employee engagement among retail employees in Hyderabad and compare it to global retail engagement trends.
2. To assess how age, gender, and work experience influence employee engagement and determine whether different demographic groups exhibit varied levels of motivation and commitment
3. To analyze how training programs, skill development, and promotion pathways contribute to engagement in the retail workforce and identify whether career progression fosters long-term employee commitment.
4. To examine the sustainability of employee engagement initiatives and their role in enhancing workforce retention over extended periods.
5. To identify key differences in organizational engagement practices, HR policies, leadership support, and workplace culture between structured retail chains and standalone stores.

#### **Hypotheses of the study**

H<sub>1</sub>: Work environment positively influences employee engagement in the retail sector.

H<sub>2</sub>: Transformational leadership enhances employee engagement in retail organizations.

H<sub>4</sub>: Career growth opportunities are directly linked to higher levels of employee engagement.

### **III. Data Analysis And Interpretation**

**Table: 1 Demographic divide-Age**

Age Group	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)	Mean Engagement Score
Below 25 years	50	27.8%	3.2
Between 25–34	60	33.3%	3.8
Between 35–44	45	25.0%	3.5
45 and above	25	13.9%	3.1

**Interpretation:** Engagement is moderate as younger employees are in transition, highest engagement due to career growth and job stability, engagement is steady, but slightly lower than younger employees and lowest engagement due to limited career growth or nearing retirement

**Table: 2 Demographic divide-Age**

Gender	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)	Mean Engagement Score
Male	100	55.6%	3.6
Female	80	44.4%	3.4

**Interpretation:** Slightly higher engagement due to leadership roles, lower engagement, possibly due to career growth barriers.

**Table: 3 Retail Format and Engagement**

	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)	Mean Engagement Score
Large retail chain	110	61.1%	3.9
Independent retail store	70	38.9%	3.2

**Interpretation:** High engagement due to structured HR policies and benefits, lower engagement due to lack of formal employee programs.

**Table: 4 Work Experience and Engagement**

	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)	Mean Engagement Score
Less than 1 year	30	16.7%	3.1
1–3 years	55	30.6%	3.6

4–7 years	60	33.3%	3.9
More than 7 years	35	19.4%	3.3

**Interpretation:** Lowest engagement due to job uncertainty, moderate engagement as employees settle into roles, highest engagement among mid-career professionals, engagement slightly declines due to career stagnation.

**Table: 5 Employee Engagement Factors Analysis**

	Mean Engagement Score
Work Environment	3.7
Leadership Support	3.8
Rewards and Recognition	3.6
Career Growth Opportunities	3.5
Job Satisfaction	3.7

**Interpretation:** Positive workplace culture influences engagement, effective leadership contributes to employee motivation, appreciation and incentives enhance commitment, employees' value training and promotions, but improvement is needed, meaningful work improves engagement.

#### Inferential statistics

#### Correlation Analysis

#### Hypothesis

H<sub>1</sub>: Work environment positively influences employee engagement.

H<sub>2</sub>: Transformational leadership enhances employee engagement.

H<sub>3</sub>: Career growth opportunities are directly linked to higher engagement.

**Pearson's correlation coefficient (rr) is calculated**

**Table: 6 Correlation Analysis**

Variable Relationship	Pearson's r-value	p-value
Work Environment ↔ Engagement	0.65	0.001
Leadership ↔ Engagement	0.72	0.000
Career Growth ↔ Engagement	0.58	0.003

#### Interpretation:

- A strong positive correlation exists between work environment and engagement ( $r = 0.65$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), confirming that a better workplace increases motivation.
- Leadership has the highest correlation ( $r = 0.72$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), meaning that employees thrive when leaders provide direction and support.
- Career growth has a moderate correlation ( $r = 0.58$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), implying that while training and promotions matter, they are not the strongest engagement driver.

#### Summary of Hypotheses

Hypothesis	Null Hypothesis Statement	(Accepted/Rejected)
H <sub>1</sub>	No relationship exists between work environment and engagement.	Rejected ( $p < 0.05$ )
H <sub>2</sub>	Leadership does not influence employee engagement.	Rejected ( $p < 0.01$ )
H <sub>3</sub>	Career growth does not affect engagement.	Rejected ( $p < 0.05$ )

## IV. Conclusion

1. Employees aged 25–34 have the highest engagement, **emphasizing the importance of career progression.**
2. Male employees report slightly higher engagement, **suggesting leadership opportunities may influence motivation.**
3. Large retail chain employees exhibit higher engagement, **reinforcing the role of structured HR policies.**
4. Mid-career professionals (4–7 years of experience) show peak engagement, **highlighting stability and growth.**
5. Leadership and work environment are the strongest engagement factors, **but** career development needs improvement.
6. Employees in large retail chains report higher engagement (3.9) due to better organizational policies and job security.
7. Independent retail stores exhibit lower engagement (3.2), likely due to fewer career growth opportunities.

8. Mid-career employees (4–7 years) exhibit the highest engagement (3.9) due to established roles and benefits.
9. Employees with less than 1 year of experience report the lowest engagement (3.1) due to job adjustment challenges.
10. Leadership support (3.8) and work environment (3.7) have the strongest impact on employee engagement. Career growth opportunities (3.5) require improvement, indicating a need for better promotion structures

### Inferential statistics

**Correlation has been applied and the results indicated below**

<b>H<sub>1</sub></b>	No relationship exists between work environment and engagement. <b>(Rejected)</b>
<b>H<sub>2</sub></b>	Leadership does not influence employee engagement. <b>(Rejected)</b>
<b>H<sub>3</sub></b>	Career growth does not affect engagement. <b>(Rejected)</b>

### References

- [1]. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209–223. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430810870476>
- [2]. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Collier Macmillan.
- [3]. Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Transaction Publishers.
- [4]. Chen, Z. X., & Francesco, A. M. (2003). The relationship between the three components of commitment and employee performance in China. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62(3), 490–510. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(02\)00064-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00064-7)
- [5]. Cotton, J. L., & Hart, P. (2003). Employee participation: Diverse forms and different outcomes. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(3), 435–455. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2003.10196771>
- [6]. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [7]. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- [8]. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1997). Perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(5), 812–820. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.5.812>
- [9]. Gallup. (2017). *State of the global workplace*. Gallup Press.
- [10]. Gallup. (2020). *Employee engagement trends in the workplace*. Gallup Press.
- [11]. Ghosh, P., Rai, A., & Sinha, A. (2013). Organizational commitment and engagement: A study of Indian retail employees. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(12), 2466–2482. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.758101>
- [12]. Glebbeek, A. C., & Bax, G. A. (2004). Is high employee turnover really harmful? *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(2), 277–286. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20159591>
- [13]. González-Morales, M. G., Peiró, J. M., Rodríguez, I., & Bliese, P. D. (2018). Work engagement in Latin America: A cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(1), 150–162. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000072>
- [14]. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2017). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2), 268–279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.268>
- [15]. Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Sage Publications.
- [16]. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256287>