IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

Career Growth, Recognition, and Work-Life Balance as Tools for Building Retention and Employee Experience

Arjit Srivastava[1] and Dr. Sameer Kulkarni[2]
[1] Student, MBA – Human Resource Management, Amity Business School, Amity University Mumbai
[2] Faculty Guide, Amity Business School, Amity University Mumbai

Abstract : *This case examines an HR decision that can arise when employees report broadly positive satisfaction with benefits, yet their retention-related responses point to a wider set of priorities. Based on a six-week HR internship and a small employee questionnaire at a fictional speciality-chemicals manufacturer, the case asks whether the organisation should focus first on benefits, career development, recognition and work-life balance—or test a phased combination. Students must interpret survey evidence cautiously, consider sampling limitations, distinguish perceptions from actual turnover, and develop a feasible, measurable intervention. The case does not establish a retention crisis and does not provide verified turnover, cost or programme-outcome data. Its central challenge is to make a proportionate decision under uncertainty.*

Keywords: Career growth, recognition, and work-life balance as tools for building retention and employee experience

I. INTRODUCTION

During a six-week HR internship at Mavryntel Speciality Chemicals, an employee survey offered an encouraging first impression: most respondents said they were satisfied with the benefits available to them. A closer look, however, raised questions about what employees value beyond benefits—and what the organisation should address first. Career growth and a positive work environment were selected more often as factors associated with staying. Work-life balance and the statement about rarely thinking of leaving received comparatively lower ratings.

The survey was small and based on employees who were available and willing to participate. It did not establish the organisation's actual turnover pattern, the cost of losing employees, or the likely effect of any proposed HR intervention. Still, it gave HR a starting point for listening more closely.

At the end of the internship, the HR function was preparing to consider priorities for its next planning cycle. Should it focus on improving benefits, create more visible career-development opportunities, strengthen recognition and work-life balance, or combine these efforts in a phased pilot? Each option had a case to make—and a different set of practical constraints. The decision was not simply what employees wanted, but what the organisation could test fairly, affordably and credibly, while learning what mattered most to its workforce.

II. THE DECISION AT THE END OF THE INTERNSHIP

At the end of his six-week Summer Internship Programme in Human Resources at Mavryntel Speciality Chemicals, Arjit Srivastava had a set of survey findings to take back to HR management. On the surface, the results looked reassuring: most respondents were satisfied with the employee benefits they received. But the responses did not tell a simple story. Career growth and a positive work environment appeared more often than benefits among the factors employees associated with staying. Work-life balance received a comparatively lower satisfaction score, and respondents were less certain about the statement that they rarely thought about leaving.

Copyright to IJARSCT
www.ijarsct.co.in
DOI: 10.48175/568

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

The findings were not evidence of a retention crisis. The internship research did not include a verified company-wide turnover rate, exit-interview analysis, benefit-utilisation data or cost-of-turnover estimate. The questionnaire was small and non-random. What it offered was a set of signals—useful enough to guide a conversation, but not strong enough to settle it.

For case discussion, the findings are placed before HR as a priority-setting decision for the next planning cycle. This planning scenario is constructed for teaching; it is not presented as an actual meeting, deadline or management decision. HR must decide what to investigate and what, if anything, to pilot first. A benefit review would respond to employee requests, but could carry cost and leave other concerns untouched. Career-development activities may be more closely aligned with the stay-factor responses, yet they require meaningful opportunities and manager time. Recognition and work-life balance may improve the day-to-day experience, but their fairness and practicality across head-office and factory roles would need attention. Combining actions could be sensible, although a broad programme risks spreading limited HR capacity too thin.

III. ORGANISATION AND HR CONTEXT

Mavryntel Speciality Chemicals operates in the speciality chemicals manufacturing sector. The internship report described a business involved in research and development, manufacturing, product testing, quality assurance and quality control, packaging and distribution. Its activities include raw-material procurement and inspection, formulation development, controlled processing, testing, packaging and dispatch. Standard operating procedures and quality checks support consistency, reliability and worker protection. The company's reported product portfolio includes speciality resins and additive packages/components for industrial applications.

The internship report recorded 83 permanent employees: 33 at the head office and 50 at the factory. This workforce split matters when considering HR interventions. Office employees and factory employees may have different access to communications, learning activities, managers, facilities and time away from their regular work. A proposal that is easy to implement at the head office may require different scheduling and delivery at the factory.

Work location	Reported workforce	Share
Head office	33	39.8%
Factory	50	60.2%
Total	83	100.0%

IV. HR EXPOSURE DURING THE SIP

The internship provided exposure to administrative and employee-facing HR activities. Tasks recorded in the internship material included joining formalities and induction support, employee-record maintenance, attendance and leave updates, recruitment support, job postings and CV screening, interview coordination, HR documentation, payroll-related exposure, employee communication, workplace visits and engagement activities. The intern also observed employee interactions and activities intended to support engagement. These activities established practical exposure to HR operations; they did not establish that all processes were formally standardised or that the proposed interventions in this case were already in place.

Reported internship exposure	Possible application to the decision
Employee records, attendance and leave administration	Understand employee groups, locations and practical access constraints
Recruitment support and interview coordination	Consider skill requirements and the importance of realistic role expectations
Benefit-related communication and HR documentation	Assess whether employees understand eligibility, access and use of existing benefits
Factory visits and employee interaction	Recognise that employee needs and intervention access may differ by location and role

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

Engagement activities	Consider recognition and employee-experience improvements while distinguishing observed activities from formal programmed

V. RESEARCH DESIGN AND EVIDENCE BASE

The internship research used a structured questionnaire distributed with HR support. Fifty questionnaires were distributed and 27 were returned, yielding a reported response rate of 54%. Respondents were selected through convenience sampling, based on availability and willingness to participate during the internship period. The analysis used frequencies, percentages, mean ratings and reported Spearman rank correlations. The survey was cross-sectional and self-reported; it was not designed to establish cause-and-effect relationships or to measure actual employee exits. The case relies on the summary results available in the internship material. The original questionnaire and respondent-level file were not available for independent audit at the time this manuscript was prepared.

Exhibit 0. Research design at a glance

Workforce recorded: 83 permanent employees (33 head office; 50 factory) | Questionnaires distributed: 50 | Completed responses: 27 | Response rate: 54% | Sampling: convenience | Analysis: frequency, percentage, weighted mean and reported Spearman correlation.

VI. THE EVIDENCE: ENCOURAGING, BUT NOT CONCLUSIVE

A structured questionnaire was distributed with HR support. Fifty forms were distributed, and 27 completed responses were received, giving a response rate of 54%. The study used convenience sampling and descriptive analysis. The findings should therefore be treated as perceptions of the respondents rather than as estimates that can be generalised confidently to the full workforce.

Research element	Reported detail
Workforce recorded	83 permanent employees (33 head office; 50 factory)
Questionnaires distributed	50
Completed responses	27
Response rate	54%
Respondent location	16 head office; 11 factory
Sampling	Convenience sampling
Analysis	Frequency, percentage, weighted mean and Spearman rank correlation

Exhibit 1. Respondent profile

Profile	Categories	Respondents
Age	Below 25 / 25–35 / 36–45 / Above 45	7 / 14 / 4 / 2
Tenure	Below 2 years / 2–5 years / Above 5 years	18 / 7 / 2
Job level	Executive / Management / Worker	20 / 6 / 1
Location	Head office / Factory	16 / 11

Factory employees represented approximately 60.2% of the reported workforce but 40.7% of the survey respondents. Only one worker-level respondent participated. The sample therefore underrepresents factory and worker-level views. Employee expectations may differ across job levels, work locations and shifts; the available responses do not adequately capture all those perspectives.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

Exhibit 2. Benefit satisfaction

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	6	22.2%
Satisfied	18	66.7%
Neutral	3	11.1%
Dissatisfied	0	0.0%
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0%
Satisfied or very satisfied	24	88.9%

The reported benefit-satisfaction mean was 3.96/5. The distribution suggests that most respondents viewed the benefit arrangements positively. It does not establish that every employee had equal access to, understood or valued every benefit.

Exhibit 3. Job-satisfaction dimensions

Dimension/statement	Mean (out of 5)
Overall job satisfaction	3.98
Satisfaction with current job	4.19
Support to perform efficiently	4.11
Working environment	4.04
Recognition and appreciation	3.89
Work-life balance	3.81
Feeling valued and respected	3.96
Benefits and fulfilment	3.93
Benefits and overall job satisfaction	3.93
Benefits and work motivation	3.93
Satisfaction with overall HR practices	4.00

The mean scores were generally positive. Work-life balance and recognition were comparatively lower than some other dimensions. These are diagnostic signals—not proof that a specific policy, manager or work arrangement caused dissatisfaction.

Exhibit 4. Benefits employees selected as valuable

Benefit category	Selections	% of respondents
Financial benefits	15	55.6%
Medical benefits	10	37.0%
Leave provisions	6	22.2%
Welfare facilities	6	22.2%
Training and development	6	22.2%
Safety-related other response	1	3.7%

This was a multiple-response question. Percentages are calculated using 27 respondents and may exceed 100% in total.

Exhibit 5. Improvement areas selected by respondents

Improvement area	Selections	% of respondents
Medical benefits	8	29.6%
Financial benefits	7	25.9%
Training and development	7	25.9%
Leave provisions	5	18.5%
Welfare facilities	4	14.8%
Benefit communication	3	11.1%

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

Medical benefits, financial benefits and training/development were among the most frequently selected improvement areas. The survey does not establish the cost, feasibility or expected effect of any specific enhancement.

Exhibit 6. Factors associated with staying

Factor	Selections	% of respondents
Career growth opportunities	10	37.0%
Positive work environment	9	33.3%
Competitive salary	6	22.2%
Employee benefits	5	18.5%
Job security	5	18.5%
Recognition and appreciation	4	14.8%

Career growth and a positive work environment were selected more frequently than employee benefits. The question allowed multiple selections. These results indicate employee-stated priorities; they do not establish the causal effect of any intervention on retention.

Exhibit 7. Retention-related perceptions

Measure	Mean (out of 5)
Overall retention-related perceptions	3.93
Benefits strengthen organisational commitment	4.26
Willingness to recommend/continue working	4.19 each
Benefits encourage me to remain	4.00
Better benefits reduce intention to leave	3.63
I rarely think about leaving	3.30

Respondents generally reported positive retention-related perceptions. However, the relatively lower mean for "I rarely think about leaving" suggests a more mixed pattern than benefit satisfaction alone might imply. These are stated perceptions, not verified employee exits or future retention outcomes.

Exhibit 8. Reported correlation results

Relationship tested	Spearman ρ	p-value	Reported interpretation
Benefits and job satisfaction	0.387	0.046	Positive association; statistically significant at 5%
Benefits and retention-related perceptions	0.264	0.184	Positive association; not statistically significant at 5%

The reported analysis indicates a positive association between benefit ratings and job satisfaction in this sample. The association between benefits and retention-related perceptions was positive but not statistically significant at the 5% level. This does not prove that benefits have no retention value. The small, non-random sample and the absence of original respondent-level records limit interpretation. The statistics should be verified against the original questionnaires and analysis file before formal publication.

VII. WHAT THE FINDINGS DO—AND DO NOT—SAY

Observed signal	Possible interpretation (not established cause)	Question for HR
88.9% satisfied/very satisfied with benefits	Existing benefit arrangements may be viewed positively by many respondents	Would broad benefit expansion address the most pressing employee priorities?
Career growth selected by 37.0% as a stay factor	Employees may value skill development and progression visibility	Can realistic skill pathways and learning opportunities be identified?

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

Positive work environment selected by 33.3%	Day-to-day workplace experience may matter	What practices can strengthen employee experience across locations?
Work-life balance mean 3.81/5	Some work-life concerns may merit further diagnosis	Which role-, shift- or location-specific issues can be addressed?
"I rarely think about leaving" mean 3.30/5	Views about leaving appear more mixed than benefit satisfaction	What additional evidence is needed to understand turnover risk?
Benefits-retention correlation p=0.184	The sample does not establish a statistically significant association	How should HR avoid treating perceptions as actual retention?

VIII. WORKING HYPOTHESES FOR HR TO TEST

The survey offers clues, not a diagnosis. Management could test several explanations before committing to a large programme: (1) career-development opportunities may be less visible or unevenly accessible; (2) employees may value benefits but need clearer communication about eligibility and use; (3) recognition and work-life balance may vary by role, shift or location; and (4) employees expressed
willingness to remain may reflect factors beyond benefits. These are hypotheses for listening and validation—not established causes or findings about the company.

IX. EVIDENCE GAPS: WHAT MANAGEMENT KNOWS AND DOES NOT KNOW

Decision-critical information	Available in the case	Not available / needs verification
Employee perceptions	Survey responses and reported summary statistics	Original questionnaire wording, respondent-level file and independent recalculation
Retention outcomes	Retention-related perception items	Verified turnover rate, voluntary/involuntary exits, exit reasons and tenure-at-exit
Benefit arrangements	Employee selections about valued benefits and improvement areas	Eligibility, utilisation, cost, employee awareness and benefit-specific access
Career development	Career growth selected as a stay factor by respondents	Role skill maps, training coverage, internal mobility, promotion pathways and manager capacity
Workplace experience	Working-environment and work-life balance perception means	Shift-wise/department-wise diagnosis, workload and scheduling evidence
Feasibility	Head-office and factory workforce counts	Approved budget, intervention costs, implementation capacity and baseline KPIs

This evidence gap is not a reason to disregard the survey; it is a constraint on the scale and certainty of the decision. HR may need to validate the survey and gather targeted employee input before approving a larger intervention. Any future analysis should distinguish actual company records from planning assumptions or case-writing constructs.

X. WHAT HR HAD ALREADY BEEN DOING

The internship records describe routine HR support rather than a formal retention programme. Activities included recruitment support, job postings and CV screening, interview coordination, joining and induction assistance, employee-file maintenance, attendance and leave updates, HR documentation, payroll-related exposure, employee communication, factory visits and engagement activities. These activities gave the intern a view of employee access

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

and day-to-day HR operations. They should not be read as proof that a formal career-development, recognition or benefits-redesign initiative had already been implemented.

XI. THE MANAGEMENT DILEMMA

A benefits-first strategy could respond to requests for medical, financial or other improvements, but a broad redesign would be difficult to assess without verified utilisation, cost and budget information. A career-development-led strategy aligns with the most frequently selected stay factor, but requires realistic skill opportunities and manager capacity; it must not imply guaranteed promotions. Recognition and work-life balance interventions may improve day-to-day experience, but require transparent criteria, fair access and operational feasibility in both office and factory settings.

An integrated approach could coordinate these elements, but may demand additional time and attention from HR and line managers. Management must choose the first priority, define what a pilot can realistically include, identify the evidence to collect, and set a review gate for continuing, revising or stopping the intervention. No actual budget or resource limit is supplied; affordability and capacity therefore remain criteria to investigate rather than figures to assume.

XII. STRATEGIC ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A – Benefit-first review

Review existing benefit arrangements and eligibility; prioritise medical, financial, leave and welfare concerns; improve benefit communication; and assess costs and utilisation before approving new provisions. This option responds directly to employee benefit-related selections but may not address career growth or work-life experience comprehensively.

Alternative B – Career-development-led intervention

Introduce role-based skill mapping, development conversations, learning opportunities and on-the-job exposure. This option responds to career growth being the most frequently selected stay factor. It requires realistic opportunities, manager capacity and careful communication that development is not a promise of promotion.

Alternative C – Recognition and work-life balance

Strengthen recognition through transparent criteria and identify work-life balance concerns across departments, locations and shifts. This option focuses on the day-to-day employee experience but requires consistent implementation, fairness checks and operational feasibility.

Alternative D – Phased integrated pilot

Combine career development as a lead element with recognition, targeted work-life balance review and benefit communication. A phased pilot could begin with evidence validation and employee listening, move to programme design and cost review, and then test a limited set of actions before wider rollout. The option could be more balanced but would require prioritisation, governance and monitoring to avoid overloading HR and managers.

XIII. COST, CAPACITY AND BENEFIT CONSIDERATIONS

The available case material contains no approved budget, programme cost, benefit-utilisation data, turnover baseline or replacement-cost estimate. A numeric cost-benefit model would therefore create false precision. Management can still compare the options qualitatively and require a costed proposal before approval. The table below identifies the likely cost and value questions for each route; students should make assumptions explicit and label any estimates as scenario assumptions.

Option | Cost and capacity questions | Potential value | Main uncertainty

Option	Cost and capacity questions	Potential value	Main uncertainty
A. Benefit-first review	Policy review, benefit administration, recurring expense, eligibility and	May address specific benefit concerns and improve clarity/access	Whether changes are affordable and valued broadly enough to justify

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

	utilisation analysis		expansion
B. Career-development-led	Manager time, skill mapping, learning resources, operational coverage and access across shifts	Skill growth, clearer development conversations and improved internal opportunity visibility	Whether meaningful opportunities exist and employees perceive them as credible
C. Recognition/work-life balance	Criteria design, communication, supervisor consistency, schedule/workload review	Better daily experience and fairer recognition practices	Whether the issues are consistent across roles and whether interventions can be sustained
D. Phased integrated pilot	Coordination burden, pilot design, measurement, manager capacity and selected activities	A coordinated response while learning which actions are practical and valued	Complexity, competing priorities and whether the pilot produces reliable signals

XIV. DECISION REQUIRED

Management must select a priority for the next HR planning cycle, define the scope of any first-phase pilot, protect access and fairness across head office and factory employees, and identify the measures that will support a continuation or scale-up decision. The case does not provide a verified turnover baseline, replacement cost, approved programme budget or intervention results.

A defensible decision should use the survey as directional evidence, not as a complete diagnosis. It should identify which facts must be validated, which assumptions would be used for planning, who would own implementation, and what evidence would trigger continuation, revision or discontinuation. Students should make and justify their own choice; the case section does not disclose the faculty recommendation.

XV. CONCLUSION

The survey presents a positive but incomplete picture: most respondents reported satisfaction with benefits, while career growth and workplace environment were selected more often as factors associated with staying. Work-life balance and the item about rarely thinking of leaving received comparatively lower mean scores. The findings do not establish that benefits are ineffective or that the organisation faces a retention crisis. They leave HR with a practical choice—select a focused first intervention, validate the evidence, and design a pilot that can be evaluated across head-office and factory employees. The next step should be proportionate to what is known, transparent about what is missing, and specific about how management will learn before scaling.

Discussion Questions

1. What is the central HR problem in this case? Is it employee-benefit satisfaction, retention, employee experience or the quality of available evidence?
2. How should management interpret the gap between 88.9% benefit satisfaction and the 3.30 mean for "I rarely think about leaving"?
3. Should career development lead the intervention, or should medical and financial benefits receive priority? Defend your choice using the exhibits.
4. How should HR improve representation in future employee feedback, particularly among factory and worker-level employees?
5. Compare Alternatives A–D. What criteria should management use, and how would you weight them?
6. What should be measured during an initial pilot? Which indicators are leading indicators, and which outcomes require a longer observation period?
7. What additional information would be needed to evaluate whether the initiative improves actual retention?