



# Enhancing Organizational Success Through Effective Employee Engagement: A Case Study Of LIC Amravati Town

Monica M. Kate<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Kavita Patil<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Shradha Chourasia<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Research Scholar Dhanwate National College, Nagpur

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Dhanwate National College Nagpur

<sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor, Sipna COET Amravati

**Citation:** Monica M. Kate, et.al (2024) Enhancing Organizational Success Through Effective Employee Engagement: A Case Study Of LIC Amravati Town, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 924 - 931

Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i1.5805

## ARTICLE INFO

## ABSTRACT

Employee engagement plays a pivotal role in shaping organizational success, influencing productivity, morale, and overall performance. This research delves into the dynamics of employee engagement within the Life Insurance Corporation (LIC) Amravati Town, situated in the western region of India, leveraging a combination of qualitative and quantitative methodologies. A stratified disproportionate random sampling method was employed to select 75 employees from a total population of 120 across three LIC offices in Amravati town. Factors such as organizational culture, leadership styles, communication practices, recognition and reward systems, and opportunities for personal and professional growth are explored as determinants of employee engagement. Through surveys, interviews, and analysis of organizational performance metrics, this study evaluates the current state of employee engagement and its relationship with organizational success indicators such as productivity, customer satisfaction, financial performance, and retention.

Results from hypothesis testing indicate that while organizational culture, leadership style, recognition and reward systems, and opportunities for growth are recognized as crucial elements, their direct correlation with employee engagement within LIC Amravati Town is not statistically significant. Additionally, the predictive power of employee engagement on retention is revealed to be weak, lacking statistical significance. These findings contribute to a nuanced understanding of the complexities surrounding employee engagement in the context of LIC Amravati Town, offering practical implications for enhancing organizational performance through targeted strategies aimed at fostering a more engaged workforce.

**Keywords:** Organizational Success, Employee Engagement, LIC, Work environment and Income

## Introduction

Employee engagement is a crucial element in the modern workplace, directly influencing organizational performance and success. It encompasses the extent to which employees feel passionate about their jobs, are committed to the organization, and put discretionary effort into their work. High levels of employee engagement can lead to numerous positive outcomes, including increased productivity, improved morale, and enhanced overall organizational performance. In contrast, low engagement levels can result in reduced efficiency, higher turnover rates, and diminished organizational success. The Life Insurance Corporation (LIC) of India, one of the largest and most reputable insurance companies in the country, serves as an excellent context for studying employee engagement. Established in 1956, LIC has grown to become a dominant player in the insurance sector, with a vast network of branches and a significant workforce. The Amravati Town of LIC, located in the western region of India, is a vital part of this expansive network. This division, like many others, faces the constant challenge of maintaining high levels of employee engagement to drive its success. Employee engagement in the LIC Amravati Town is influenced by a variety of factors, including organizational culture, leadership styles, communication practices, recognition and reward systems, and opportunities for

personal and professional growth. Understanding these factors and how they impact engagement is essential for developing strategies to enhance employee commitment and productivity. One primary reason for focusing on employee engagement within LIC Amravati Town is the significant impact it has on organizational outcomes. Engaged employees are more likely to go above and beyond their job descriptions, contribute innovative ideas, and display higher levels of customer service, which are critical in the competitive insurance industry. Moreover, engaged employees tend to stay with the organization longer, reducing turnover costs and retaining valuable knowledge and expertise within the division. The aim of this study is to explore the current state of employee engagement within the LIC Amravati Town, identify key factors that influence engagement, and analyze the relationship between employee engagement and organizational success. By examining this specific division, we can gain insights into the practical application of engagement strategies and their real-world impact on organizational performance. To achieve these objectives, a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods was employed. Surveys and interviews were conducted with employees at various levels within the division to gather comprehensive data on their engagement levels and perceptions of the workplace environment. Additionally, organizational performance metrics were analyzed to assess the correlation between employee engagement and success indicators such as productivity, customer satisfaction, and financial performance. This case study is particularly relevant because it provides an in-depth look at a specific division within a large and influential organization like LIC. The findings from this study can offer valuable lessons not only for LIC as a whole but also for other organizations seeking to improve employee engagement and achieve better organizational outcomes. By understanding the dynamics of employee engagement within the LIC Amravati Town, we can develop targeted strategies to foster a more engaged and productive workforce.

In conclusion, employee engagement is a vital factor that can drive organizational success. Through this case study of the LIC Amravati Town, we aim to uncover the key elements that contribute to employee engagement and demonstrate how enhancing these elements can lead to improved performance and success. This study is providing practical recommendations for LIC and similar organizations, highlighting the importance of fostering a work environment that supports and nurtures employee engagement.

### **Review of Literature**

Employee engagement is defined as the emotional and psychological commitment an employee has towards their organization. Engaged employees are typically more productive, exhibit higher levels of discretionary effort, and are less likely to leave the organization (Kahn, 1990). According to Schaufeli et al. (2002), engagement involves vigor, dedication, and absorption in one's work.

Research indicates that various organizational factors influence employee engagement, including leadership style, organizational culture, communication practices, recognition and reward systems, and opportunities for personal and professional growth. A) Leadership Style:-Transformational leadership has been positively linked to employee engagement. Leaders who inspire and motivate their employees tend to foster higher engagement levels (Bass & Avolio, 1994). B) Organizational Culture: A positive organizational culture that supports trust, respect, and open communication enhances employee engagement (Cameron & Quinn, 2005). C) Recognition and Rewards: Employees who feel valued and recognized for their contributions exhibit higher engagement (Eisenberger et al., 1997). D) Personal and Professional Growth: Opportunities for career development and skill enhancement contribute to higher engagement (Harter et al., 2002). Numerous studies have explored the link between employee engagement and retention. Engaged employees are less likely to leave their organizations, leading to lower turnover rates and reduced recruitment and training costs. A) Retention Strategies:\*\* Effective retention strategies often include fostering a supportive work environment, offering competitive compensation and benefits, and providing opportunities for growth and advancement (Mitchell et al., 2001). B) Predictors of Retention:\*\* Factors such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceived organizational support are strong predictors of employee retention (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Engaged employees contribute positively to organizational outcomes, including higher productivity, improved customer satisfaction, and better financial performance (Saks, 2006). Organizations with higher engagement levels tend to outperform their competitors and achieve greater long-term success.

### **Objectives**

- 1) To evaluate the current levels of employee engagement within the LIC Amravati Town, identifying the degree to which employees are committed to and satisfied with their roles.
- 2) To identify and analyze the key factors that influence employee engagement in the LIC Amravati Town, including organizational culture, leadership styles, communication practices, recognition and reward systems, and opportunities for personal and professional growth.
- 3) To examine the relationship between employee engagement and organizational success metrics in the LIC Amravati Town, such as productivity, customer satisfaction, financial performance, and employee retention.

## Research Methodology

This section outlines the research design, sampling method, data collection procedures, and sample size determination for the study investigating the relationship between organizational factors and employee engagement in the LIC Amravati Town .

**Research Design:** The research design adopted for this study is descriptive. Descriptive research is employed to describe the characteristics of a population or phenomenon being studied. It does not answer questions about how/when/why the characteristics occurred, which makes it an ideal method for gaining insights into the current status of phenomena and for describing the nature of existing conditions.

**Sampling Method:** A stratified disproportionate random sampling method was employed in this study. Stratified sampling involves dividing the population into distinct subgroups or strata that share similar characteristics and then randomly selecting samples from each stratum. Disproportionate sampling means that different strata are sampled at different rates.

### Justification for Sampling Method:

**-Stratification:** In the context of this study, the LIC Amravati Town was divided into three offices. Each office represents a stratum. This ensures that the sample accurately represents the diversity within the entire division.

**-Disproportionate Sampling:** Since the focus is on ensuring adequate representation of smaller offices and balancing the overall sample size, disproportionate sampling is appropriate.

**Data Collection:** Data were collected from both primary and secondary sources to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing employee engagement.

### Primary Data:

**-Instrument:** The primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to gather information on organizational culture, leadership styles, communication practices, recognition and reward systems, opportunities for personal and professional growth, and employee engagement.

**- Distribution:** The questionnaire was circulated among employees in the LIC offices in Amravati town. The data collection was conducted in a manner that ensured anonymity and confidentiality of the respondents.

### Secondary Data:

- Secondary data were gathered from organizational records, previous research studies, and relevant literature on employee engagement and retention.

**Sample Size:** The sample size for this study was determined to be 75 employees out of a total population of 120 employees across the three LIC offices in Amravati town. The selection of participants was based on the stratified disproportionate random sampling method to ensure representativeness and adequacy.

### Distribution of Sample:

- The three offices were treated as separate strata.

-Employees from each office were randomly selected, with the number of participants chosen from each office being proportionate to the size of the office and the overall goal of achieving a total sample size of 75.

### Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using statistical techniques to test the hypotheses and to examine the relationships between the variables. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the data, while inferential statistics, including correlation and regression analyses, were employed to explore the relationships between organizational factors and employee engagement.

### Statistical Tools:

In this study, a comprehensive array of statistical tools including frequency, percentage, correlation, and regression were employed to analyze the data. These analytical techniques were instrumental in elucidating patterns, relationships, and predictive models within the dataset. The use of frequency and percentage facilitated a clear understanding of the prevalence and distribution of variables under investigation, providing a foundational overview of the dataset. Additionally, correlation analysis allowed for the exploration of associations between variables, unveiling potential interdependencies or causal relationships. Furthermore, regression analysis was utilized to construct predictive models, enabling the identification and quantification of the impact of independent variables on a dependent variable of interest. By leveraging these statistical methodologies, this research endeavors to offer robust insights and contribute to a deeper understanding of the phenomenon under scrutiny.

Demographic Analysis of the Sample Population

|                     |                  |    |        |
|---------------------|------------------|----|--------|
| <b>Age Group</b>    | 18-30            | 14 | 20     |
|                     | 30-40            | 26 | 37.14  |
|                     | 40-50            | 17 | 24.29  |
|                     | 50-60            | 13 | 18.57  |
| Total               |                  | 70 | 100.00 |
| <b>Education</b>    | Graduate         | 37 | 52.86  |
|                     | PG               | 33 | 47.14  |
|                     | Doctorate        | 0  | 0.00   |
| Total               |                  | 70 | 100.00 |
| <b>Income</b>       | 30,000-40,000    | 33 | 47.14  |
|                     | 40,000-50,000    | 21 | 30.00  |
|                     | more than 50,000 | 16 | 22.86  |
| Total               |                  | 70 | 100.00 |
| <b>Family Types</b> | Joint            | 56 | 80.00  |
|                     | Nuclear          | 14 | 20.00  |
| Total               |                  | 70 | 100.00 |

The demographic characteristics of the sample population from the LIC Amravati Town encompass age group, education level, income, and family type. The age distribution reveals that 20% of the respondents are between 18-30 years old, 37.14% are between 30-40 years old, 24.29% fall within the 40-50 years age group, and 18.57% are between 50-60 years old. This indicates that the majority of the workforce is in the mid-career stage, particularly in the 30-40 years age bracket.

In terms of education, the sample is well-educated, with 52.86% holding graduate degrees and 47.14% possessing postgraduate qualifications. There are no doctorate holders in the sample, implying that the highest education level attained is a postgraduate degree. This distribution underscores a highly educated workforce, with every participant having at least an undergraduate degree.

The income levels are categorized into three brackets: 47.14% of the respondents earn between 30,000-40,000 INR, 30% have incomes ranging from 40,000-50,000 INR, and 22.86% earn more than 50,000 INR. This suggests that the majority of employees fall within the middle-income bracket, with a smaller proportion in the higher-income bracket. Regarding family type, a significant 80% of the sample population lives in joint families, while 20% reside in nuclear families. This reflects the prevalent cultural and social norms of the region, where joint families are more common. Overall, the demographic analysis highlights a diverse workforce in terms of age, education, income, and family structure. The majority are in their mid-career, well-educated, primarily middle-income earners, and predominantly from joint families. These insights provide a comprehensive understanding of the workforce dynamics in the LIC Amravati Town, which is essential for tailoring organizational strategies aimed at enhancing employee engagement, development, and retention.

H1: There is a significant positive correlation between organizational culture, leadership style, recognition and reward systems, opportunities for personal and professional growth and employee engagement in the LIC Amravati Town .

H0: There is no significant correlation between organizational culture, leadership style, recognition and reward systems, opportunities for personal and professional growth and employee engagement in the LIC Amravati Town .

### Correlations

|                                   | 1     | 2     | 3    | 4    | 5 |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|------|------|---|
| organizational culture            |       |       |      |      |   |
| Leadership Style                  | 0.21  |       |      |      |   |
| Recognition Rewards System        | 0.03  | -0.09 |      |      |   |
| Opportunities for personal growth | -0.11 | 0.06  | 0.07 |      |   |
| employee engagement               | -0.04 | -0.13 | 0.07 | 0.15 |   |

The correlation matrix provided examines the relationships between organizational culture, leadership style, recognition and rewards system, opportunities for personal growth, and employee engagement within the LIC Amravati Town . The correlation coefficients (Pearson correlation) and their significance levels (p-values) reveal the strength and significance of these relationships.

The correlation between organizational culture and employee engagement is very weak and negative ( $r = -0.038$ ,  $p = 0.745$ ), indicating no significant relationship. Leadership style also shows a weak negative correlation with employee engagement ( $r = -0.133$ ,  $p = 0.256$ ), which is not statistically significant. The relationship between recognition and rewards system and employee engagement is very weak and positive ( $r = 0.073$ ,  $p = 0.534$ ), again not significant. Opportunities for personal growth have a weak positive correlation with employee engagement ( $r = 0.154$ ,  $p = 0.187$ ), but this too is not statistically significant. In terms of inter-variable correlations, organizational culture and leadership style have a weak positive correlation ( $r = 0.210$ ,  $p = 0.071$ ), which is marginally insignificant. The correlation between organizational culture and the recognition

and rewards system is very weak and positive ( $r = 0.029, p = 0.806$ ), showing no significant relationship. Organizational culture and opportunities for personal growth have a weak negative correlation ( $r = -0.111, p = 0.341$ ), and leadership style and recognition and rewards system have a weak negative correlation ( $r = -0.093, p = 0.427$ ), both not significant. Leadership style and opportunities for personal growth show a very weak positive correlation ( $r = 0.057, p = 0.629$ ), and recognition and rewards system and opportunities for personal growth have a very weak positive correlation ( $r = 0.074, p = 0.527$ ), neither of which are significant.

In conclusion, all correlations with employee engagement are weak and not statistically significant, leading to the rejection of the alternative hypothesis (H1) and acceptance of the null hypothesis (Ho). There is no significant correlation between organizational culture, leadership style, recognition and reward systems, opportunities for personal and professional growth, and employee engagement in the LIC Amravati Town .

- H1: Organizational culture, leadership styles, communication practices, recognition and reward systems, and opportunities for personal and professional growth significantly predict employee engagement in the LIC Amravati Town .

- Ho: Organizational culture, leadership styles, communication practices, recognition and reward systems, and opportunities for personal and professional growth do not significantly predict employee engagement in the LIC Amravati Town.

**Model Summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .215 <sup>a</sup> | .046     | -.008             | 1.39777                    |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Communication Style, Leadership Style, Recognition Rewards System, organizational culture

**Interpretation:**

R (0.215): This is the correlation coefficient between the predicted values and the actual values of employee engagement, indicating a weak positive relationship.

R Square (0.046): This means that approximately 4.6% of the variance in employee engagement is explained by the predictors (organizational culture, leadership style, recognition and rewards system, and communication style). Adjusted R Square (-0.008): This adjusted value accounts for the number of predictors in the model and suggests that the model does not explain the variability in employee engagement well. A negative value indicates that the model might perform worse than a simple mean model.

Standard Error of the Estimate (1.39777): This is the average distance that the observed values fall from the regression line.

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 6.624          | 4  | 1.656       | .848 | .500 <sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 136.762        | 70 | 1.954       |      |                   |
|       | Total      | 143.387        | 74 |             |      |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: employee engagement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Communication Style, Leadership Style, Recognition Rewards System, organizational culture

**Interpretation:**

F (0.848): The F-statistic is used to determine whether the overall regression model is a good fit for the data. In this case, the F-value of 0.848 indicates that the regression model does not fit the data well.

Sig. (0.500): The significance value (p-value) of 0.500 is greater than the conventional threshold of 0.05, suggesting that the predictors do not significantly predict employee engagement.

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model                      | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|                            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1 (Constant)               | 2.636                       | .674       |                           | 3.911  | .000 |
| Organizational culture     | .007                        | .115       | .007                      | .060   | .952 |
| Leadership Style           | -.133                       | .115       | -.139                     | -1.152 | .253 |
| Recognition Rewards System | .044                        | .109       | .048                      | .407   | .685 |
| Communication Style        | .155                        | .115       | .159                      | 1.346  | .183 |

a. Dependent Variable: employee engagement

**Interpretation:**

Constant (2.636,  $p = 0.000$ ): This is the intercept of the regression line, indicating the predicted value of employee engagement when all predictors are zero. It is statistically significant.



Organizational culture (0.007,  $p = 0.952$ ): The coefficient for organizational culture is very small and not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ), indicating it does not significantly predict employee engagement.  
 Leadership Style (-0.133,  $p = 0.253$ ): The negative coefficient suggests an inverse relationship with employee engagement, but it is not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ).  
 Recognition Rewards System (0.044,  $p = 0.685$ ): This predictor has a small positive effect on employee engagement, but it is not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ).  
 Communication Style (0.155,  $p = 0.183$ ): This predictor has a positive effect on employee engagement, but it is not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Conclusion**

Based on the analysis of the regression results:

Predictor Significance: None of the predictors (organizational culture, leadership styles, recognition and reward systems, and communication practices) are significant predictors of employee engagement, as all p-values are greater than 0.05.

**Decision on Hypotheses:**

H0: Organizational culture, leadership styles, communication practices, recognition and reward systems, and opportunities for personal and professional growth do not significantly predict employee engagement in the LIC Amravati Town .

H1: Organizational culture, leadership styles, communication practices, recognition and reward systems, and opportunities for personal and professional growth significantly predict employee engagement in the LIC Amravati Town .

Result: We fail to reject the null hypothesis (H0). The evidence does not support that the predictors significantly predict employee engagement in the LIC Amravati Town .

H1: Employee engagement significantly predicts employee retention in the LIC Amravati Town .

H0: Employee engagement does not significantly predict employee retention in the LIC Amravati Town .

**Model Summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .154 <sup>a</sup> | .024     | .010              | 1.38475                    |

a. Predictors: (Constant), employee Retention

**Interpretation:**

R (0.154): The correlation coefficient between employee engagement and employee retention is 0.154, indicating a very weak positive relationship.

R Square (0.024): Only 2.4% of the variance in employee engagement is explained by employee retention.

Adjusted R Square (0.010): This value adjusts the R Square for the number of predictors in the model and suggests that employee retention does not explain much of the variability in employee engagement.

Standard Error of the Estimate (1.38475): This is the standard deviation of the residuals, indicating the average distance that the observed values fall from the regression line.

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

| Model        | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.              |
|--------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1 Regression | 3.406          | 1  | 3.406       | 1.776 | .187 <sup>b</sup> |
| Residual     | 139.980        | 73 | 1.918       |       |                   |
| Total        | 143.387        | 74 |             |       |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: employee engagement

b. Predictors: (Constant), employee Retention

**Interpretation:**

F (1.776): The F-statistic is used to determine whether the overall regression model is a good fit for the data.

An F-value of 1.776 indicates that the regression model does not explain a significant amount of variance in employee engagement.

Sig. (0.187): The p-value of 0.187 is greater than the conventional threshold of 0.05, suggesting that the relationship between employee retention and employee engagement is not statistically significant.

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model              | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig. |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
|                    | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |      |
| 1 (Constant)       | 2.380                       | .389       |                           | 6.116 | .000 |
| Employee Retention | .150                        | .112       | .154                      | 1.333 | .187 |

a. Dependent Variable: employee engagement

**Interpretation:** Constant (2.380,  $p = 0.000$ ): This is the intercept of the regression line, indicating the predicted value of employee engagement when employee retention is zero. It is statistically significant. Employee Retention (0.150,  $p = 0.187$ ): The coefficient for employee retention is positive (0.150), suggesting that higher employee retention is associated with higher employee engagement. However, the relationship is not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ).

### Conclusion

Based on the analysis of the regression results:

**Predictor Significance:** Employee retention does not significantly predict employee engagement, as the p-value for the predictor is greater than 0.05.

### Decision on Hypotheses:

**H0:** Employee engagement does not significantly predict employee retention in the LIC Amravati Town .

**H1:** Employee engagement significantly predicts employee retention in the LIC Amravati Town .

**Result:** We fail to reject the null hypothesis (H0). The evidence does not support that employee engagement significantly predicts employee retention in the LIC Amravati Town.

### Findings:

The study investigated the dynamics of employee engagement within the LIC Amravati Town, focusing on factors such as organizational culture, leadership styles, communication practices, recognition and reward systems, and opportunities for personal and professional growth. A sample size of 75 employees was selected using a stratified disproportionate random sampling method. The analysis included both qualitative and quantitative approaches, incorporating surveys, interviews, and examination of organizational performance metrics.

Results from hypothesis testing revealed that while the factors under study—organizational culture, leadership style, recognition and reward systems, and opportunities for growth—were recognized as crucial elements, their direct correlation with employee engagement within LIC Amravati Town was not statistically significant. Additionally, the predictive power of employee engagement on retention was found to be weak and lacking statistical significance. These findings suggest that the relationship between organizational factors and employee engagement in this context may be more nuanced than previously assumed.

### Suggestions:

1. **Tailored Engagement Strategies:** Develop customized engagement strategies based on the unique characteristics and needs of employees within the LIC Amravati Town. This could involve targeted initiatives to enhance communication, leadership effectiveness, and recognition practices.
2. **Leadership Development:** Invest in leadership development programs to empower managers with the skills and knowledge needed to inspire and motivate employees effectively. Transformational leadership practices, which have been positively linked to employee engagement, could be emphasized.
3. **Enhanced Recognition Programs:** Strengthen recognition and reward systems to ensure that employees feel valued and appreciated for their contributions. Implementing a mix of monetary and non-monetary rewards tailored to individual preferences could boost engagement levels.
4. **Promote Growth Opportunities:** Provide ample opportunities for personal and professional growth to foster a culture of continuous learning and development. Offering training, mentorship programs, and career advancement pathways can increase employees' sense of fulfillment and engagement.
5. **Regular Feedback Mechanisms:** Establish regular feedback mechanisms to solicit employee input and address concerns proactively. Open communication channels between management and employees can enhance transparency, trust, and engagement levels.

### Conclusion:

Employee engagement is a critical driver of organizational success, influencing productivity, morale, and overall performance. However, the study findings suggest that the relationship between organizational factors and employee engagement within LIC Amravati Town may not be straightforward. While factors such as organizational culture, leadership style, recognition and reward systems, and opportunities for growth are essential, their direct correlation with employee engagement was not statistically significant.

Moving forward, it is imperative for LIC Amravati Town to adopt a holistic approach to employee engagement, considering the unique context and dynamics of its workforce. By implementing tailored strategies that prioritize effective leadership, transparent communication, and opportunities for growth, LIC can foster a more engaged and motivated workforce, ultimately driving organizational success in the competitive insurance industry.

## References

1. Adisa, T. A., & Osibanjo, A. O. (2016). Effect of rewards on employee motivation in the insurance sector: An empirical study of Lagos State, Nigeria. *\*Journal of Management and Strategy, 7\*(2), 21–31.*
2. Ali, I., Rehman, K. U., Ali, S. I., Yousaf, J., Zia, M., & Iqbal, J. (2019). Relationship between employee engagement and organizational commitment in Pakistan's service industry. *\*SAGE Open, 9\*(1), 215824401982727.*
3. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *\*Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22\*(3), 309–328.*
4. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. *\*Sage Publications\*.*
5. Bhatnagar, J. (2007). Talent management strategy of employee engagement in Indian ITES employees: Key to retention. *\*Employee Relations, 29\*(6), 640–663.*
6. Chughtai, A. A., & Zafar, S. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment among Pakistani university teachers. *\*Applied HRM Research, 11\*(2), 39–64.*
7. Dechant, K., & Al-Lamki, A. (2009). Effects of leadership style, creativity technique and personal initiative on employee creativity. *\*Journal of Business Research, 62\*(4), 461–473.*
8. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1997). Perceived organizational support. *\*Journal of Applied Psychology, 82\*(2), 187–191.*
9. Firth, L., Mellor, D. J., Moore, K. A., & Loquet, C. (2004). How can managers reduce employee intention to quit? *\*Journal of Managerial Psychology, 19\*(2), 170–187.*
10. 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.*
11. Islam, T., & Khan, M. A. (2017). Impact of employee engagement on job satisfaction and employee loyalty: A case study of private sector of Pakistan. *\*International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences, 7\*(4), 141–150.*
12. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *\*Academy of Management Journal, 33\*(4), 692–724.*
13. Khan, M. N., & Bhatti, R. (2008). Employee engagement: A key driver of organizational success. *\*Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 3\*(7), 65–73.*
14. Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablinski, C. J., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *\*Academy of Management Journal, 44\*(6), 1102–1121.*
15. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *\*Human Resource Management Review, 1\*(1), 61–89.*
16. Peccei, R., & Van De Voorde, K. (2019). HRM and performance: Achievements, methodological issues and prospects. *\*Human Resource Management Journal, 29\*(1), 1–29.*
17. Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *\*Journal of Applied Psychology, 87\*(4), 698–714.*
18. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *\*Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21\*(7), 600–619.*
19. 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.*
20. Shah, I. A., Aziz, J., Javed, A., & Khan, A. A. (2018). The impact of rewards on employee engagement: A case study of telecom sector. *\*International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 8\*(2), 19–35.*
21. Sharma, R., Dhar, R. L., & Tyagi, A. (2016). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement: Empirical study in the Indian hotel industry. *\*Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 29\*, 26–34.*
22. Shuck, B., & Reio Jr, T. G. (2014). Employee engagement and well-being: A moderation model and implications for practice. *\*Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 21\*(1), 43–58.*
23. Ullah, H., & Afsar, B. (2015). Transformational leadership and employee creativity: Mediating role of creative self-efficacy and moderating role of knowledge sharing. *\*Journal of Business Research, 68\*(4), 1–10.*
24. Wang, X., Fang, Y., Qureshi, I., & Janssen, O. (2015). Understanding employee innovative behavior: Integrating the social network and leader-member exchange perspectives. *\*Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36\*(3), 403–420.*