International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 11, CONFLUENCE - 2026

Research Paper on Employee Engagement, Job Satisfaction and Workplace Performance

Brunda Anand
brundaa9.tews@gmail.com
Student
V Semester, Bachelor of Commerce
BMS College of Commerce and Management

Abstract - Employee engagement plays an important role in improving employee performance and achieving organizational goals. Engaged employees are more likely to demonstrate commitment, motivation, productivity, and willingness to contribute to their organization. This research paper examines the relationship between employee engagement and employee performance, with particular focus on factors such as job satisfaction, workplace environment, leadership support, recognition, communication, rewards, and career development opportunities. The study aims to understand how these factors influence employees' attitudes and performance at work. Primary data can be collected through a structured questionnaire from employees across different organizations, supported by secondary information from journals, books, and relevant reports. The findings are expected to provide insights into the importance of creating an engaging workplace and suggest measures that organizations can adopt to improve employee motivation, productivity, and overall performance.

Keywords: Employee Engagement, Job Satisfaction, Workplace Performance, Employee Motivation, Organizational Commitment, Employee Productivity.

INTRODUCTION

Think of two colleagues who sit at neighboring desks, hold the same job title and earn the same salary. One arrives with energy, loses track of time while working and quietly helps new joiners find their feet. The other watches the clock, does what is asked and not a minute more. On paper they look identical. In practice, they contribute very differently, and they probably go home feeling very differently too. That gap is what researchers mean when they talk about employee engagement. Over the last three decades it has moved from a niche academic idea to a standard item on boardroom agendas. Part of the reason is practical.

Engagement is often mentioned in the same breath as job satisfaction and job performance, sometimes as if they were the same thing. They are not. A person can be quite satisfied with a comfortable, undemanding job and still be disengaged. Another person can be deeply absorbed in a demanding project while being dissatisfied with pay or management.

This paper therefore sets out to do four things:

- Define engagement, job satisfaction and job performance clearly and in plain terms;

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 11, CONFLUENCE - 2026

- Review the theory that explains why engagement should influence satisfaction and performance;
- Summaries what the empirical evidence says, including where it is mixed
- Propose a framework, a research method and practical steps that organisations can use.

The paper is literature-based. It does not report new survey data. Instead, it synthesises established findings and shows how they can be tested in a specific workplace.

Getting the Vocabulary Straight

Most confusion in this field comes from loose language. The three terms below overlap, but each answers a different question.

Concept	The question it answers	What it looks like at work
Job satisfaction	"Am I content with my job and its conditions?"	A judgement about pay, security, colleagues, workload and the work itself. It can be perfectly comfortable and entirely passive.
Employee engagement	"Am I invested in my work, my team and this organisation?"	Energy, dedication and absorption in the work (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Going beyond the job description because you care how it turns out.
Job performance	"What actually gets delivered?"	Output, quality and the extra, unrequested behaviours that keep teams and customers functioning well.

Does a happy worker perform better?

The "happy worker is a productive worker" idea is among the oldest in management, and the evidence is more nuanced than the slogan. A landmark meta-analysis by Judge and colleagues (2001) found a positive but moderate relationship between job satisfaction and performance, a correlation in the region of .30. That is real and worth having, but far from a guarantee. Causality also runs both ways: satisfaction can improve performance, and doing well (and being recognised for it) can raise satisfaction.

Engagement tells a stronger business story. Gallup's long-running meta-analyses of business units, going back to Harter and colleagues (2002), have consistently linked higher engagement with better outcomes. In Gallup's widely cited comparison of top-quartile versus bottom-quartile engagement teams, the most engaged units show about **23% higher profitability**, **18% higher productivity** and **81% lower absenteeism**. As Gallup notes, engagement happens at team level, which is why a single great manager can lift a whole group and a poor one can hollow it out.

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 11, CONFLUENCE - 2026

Indicator (2025 data)	Latest figure	Context
Employees engaged worldwide	20%	Peak 23% (2022–23); 12% when first measured in 2009
Not engaged / actively disengaged	64% / 16%	Four in five employees are not fully engaged
Manager engagement	22%	Down from 31% in 2022; fell 5 points in 2024–25 alone
Non-manager engagement	19%	Roughly flat (20% in 2022)
Employees “thriving”	34%	Up one point; peak was 35% in 2022
Stress “a lot” the previous day	40%	Still above pre-pandemic levels
Anger / sadness / loneliness	22% / 23% / 22%	Daily negative emotions remain elevated
“Good time to find a job”	52%	Peak was 55% in 2019
U.S. employees engaged	32%	Versus 20% global average
Estimated cost of low engagement	≈ $10 trillion	About 9% of global GDP

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

The modern study of engagement began with William Kahn (1990), who described engaged employees as people who bring their physical, cognitive and emotional selves into their work roles. In his view, people engage when work feels meaningful, when they feel safe to be themselves, and when they have the resources, energy and confidence to do the job. Disengagement is the opposite: people pull back and protect themselves from the work. A second and widely used definition comes from Schaufeli and colleagues (2002), who describe engagement as a positive, fulfilling state of mind made up of three parts. Vigour is high energy and willingness to invest effort. Dedication is a sense of significance, enthusiasm and pride in the work. Absorption is being so involved that time passes quickly. This three-part view is measured by the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, which is among the most common tools in the field.

Job satisfaction

It is defined job satisfaction as a pleasant or positive emotional state that results from appraising one's job or job experiences. Put simply, it is how content a person feels with their work. It covers things like pay, promotion prospects, supervision, colleagues and the work itself. Satisfaction is largely an evaluation: people look at their job and judge whether it meets their expectations and values.

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 11, CONFLUENCE - 2026

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To explain the concepts and dimensions of employee engagement, job satisfaction and workplace performance.
2. To review major theories that help explain employee attitudes, motivation and work behaviour.
3. To examine findings from published research on the relationship between engagement, satisfaction and performance.
4. To identify workplace and managerial factors that may strengthen employee engagement and job satisfaction.
5. To suggest practical measures for improving employee experience and sustainable organizational performance.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

10.1 Kahn (1990)

Kahn's foundational article explored how people bring themselves into or withdraw themselves from work roles. The paper identified meaningfulness, safety and availability as important psychological conditions for personal engagement. Its contribution is to show that engagement depends on how employees experience the work environment, not simply on a manager's ability to motivate them through rewards.

10.2 Hackman and Oldham (1976)

Hackman and Oldham developed a model linking job characteristics to critical psychological states and work outcomes. Their work suggests that job design can influence motivation and satisfaction by giving employees meaningful tasks, appropriate autonomy and information about results. The model supports practical initiatives such as job enrichment, task ownership and constructive feedback.

10.3 Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959)

The authors' Two-Factor Theory distinguished factors associated with positive job experiences from factors associated with dissatisfaction. The theory helped draw managerial attention to the content of work, including achievement and responsibility, rather than focusing exclusively on pay and working conditions. Its implications should be applied with sensitivity to individual differences and contemporary employment contexts.

10.4 Saks (2006)

Saks examined antecedents and consequences of employee engagement through a social exchange perspective. The study helped establish engagement as a topic that can be investigated in relation to workplace conditions and employee outcomes. It also encouraged later researchers to distinguish engagement with the job from engagement with the organization and to examine how different forms of support may relate to those experiences.

10.5 Anitha (2014)

Anitha investigated determinants of employee engagement and its relationship with employee performance. The study is frequently discussed in the engagement literature because it connects workplace factors with performance outcomes. Its practical relevance lies in the idea that engagement is influenced by several related conditions rather than by one isolated management practice.

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 11, CONFLUENCE - 2026

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ENGAGEMENT, SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE

Engagement and performance

Engaged employees may be more willing to concentrate on tasks, take initiative, persist when problems arise and help colleagues. These behaviours can support quality and productivity. Corbeanu and Iliescu's (2023) meta-analysis reported a positive relationship between overall work engagement and job performance. Gallup's 2024 meta-analysis also found engagement associated with several business and work-unit outcomes.

Job satisfaction and performance

Job satisfaction can support performance indirectly by strengthening commitment, reducing withdrawal behaviour and encouraging constructive relationships. Employees who feel that their work is fair and worthwhile may be more inclined to remain and contribute. However, satisfaction alone is not a guarantee of high performance. An employee can be satisfied but lack training or clear goals; conversely, an employee may achieve strong short-term results while feeling dissatisfied.

Engagement and satisfaction: a two-way relationship

Engagement and satisfaction may reinforce one another. Meaningful work and opportunities to contribute can create a more positive job experience. In turn, satisfaction with supervisors, colleagues and organizational practices may make it easier for employees to invest energy in their roles. The relationship can also move in the opposite direction: sustained overload, lack of recognition or unfair treatment can weaken satisfaction and engagement together. Because the relationship is complex, organizations should measure both rather than assuming that one is a complete substitute for the other.

The role of leadership and organizational culture

Managers shape everyday employee experience through the way they set expectations, distribute work, respond to mistakes, recognize contributions and make decisions. Leaders who communicate clearly, listen seriously and apply rules consistently can strengthen trust. A culture that welcomes feedback may identify problems earlier and encourage learning. In contrast, inconsistent treatment, blame, unclear priorities and excessive monitoring can undermine employees' willingness to speak openly or take initiative.

The role of resources and job design

Motivation cannot compensate indefinitely for inadequate resources. Employees need the tools, staffing, information and authority appropriate to their responsibilities. Job design should provide meaningful challenge without creating persistent overload. Training, autonomy and feedback can help employees build competence and understand whether their work meets expectations. These practices make engagement more practical because employees can translate willingness into effective action.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF PUBLISHED EVIDENCE

This section analyses published findings rather than presenting fictional primary survey data. The figures below come from the identified research sources and should be attributed to those sources in any submitted version.

Meta-analysis of work engagement and job performance

Corbeanu and Iliescu (2023) reviewed 174 unique studies and reported a meta-analytic correlation of r = .37 between overall work engagement and job performance, based on 166 independent samples. A correlation of

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 11, CONFLUENCE - 2026

this size indicates a positive association: higher engagement tends to occur alongside better performance in the studies reviewed. It does not imply that engagement explains all performance differences, nor does it establish that engagement alone caused the performance outcomes.

Large-scale evidence on organizational outcomes

Gallup's 2024 Q12 meta-analysis included 736 studies across 347 organizations and 53 industries, covering 183,806 business or work units and 3,354,784 employees. The report found that engagement was related to all 11 organizational outcomes examined. In its comparison of top-quartile and bottom-quartile engagement units, median differences included 18% higher sales productivity, 14% higher productivity based on production records and evaluations, and 23% higher profitability for top-quartile units.

Interpretation

The two sources support the view that engagement is meaningfully associated with performance at both individual and work-unit levels. The meta-analysis by Corbeanu and Iliescu focuses on the relationship between engagement and job performance across studies, while Gallup examines a broader set of organizational outcomes. Taken together, they suggest that engagement is relevant to performance management, but they also reinforce the need for careful interpretation. Results may differ across occupations, cultures, industries and measurement methods. Moreover, factors such as staffing, technology, customer demand and management quality can influence performance independently of employee attitudes.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The present study adopts a descriptive research approach to understand employee engagement, job satisfaction, and workplace performance. The study aims to describe the existing levels of employee engagement and job satisfaction among employees and examine how these factors are associated with workplace performance.

Employee engagement refers to the extent to which employees are emotionally, mentally, and physically involved in their work. It includes dedication, commitment, enthusiasm, and willingness to contribute to organizational objectives. Job satisfaction refers to employees' overall feelings and attitudes toward their jobs, including salary, recognition, working conditions, relationships with colleagues and supervisors, and opportunities for career development. Workplace performance refers to how effectively employees carry out their responsibilities, meet organizational targets, maintain work quality, and complete assigned tasks.

The conceptual framework considers employee engagement, job satisfaction, and workplace performance as the major variables of the study. It describes the characteristics and levels of these variables and examines the relationships that may exist among them. The study may also explore whether employees who report higher engagement and job satisfaction tend to report better workplace performance. However, since the study is descriptive in nature, it focuses primarily on describing the situation and identifying patterns rather than establishing cause-and-effect relationships.

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 11, CONFLUENCE - 2026

Conceptual Framework Diagram



DESCRIPTION OF THE VARIABLES

Employee Engagement: The study describes the extent to which employees feel committed to their work, show enthusiasm toward their responsibilities, and participate actively in organizational activities.

Job Satisfaction: The study examines employees' satisfaction with compensation, recognition, job security, working conditions, management support, and career growth opportunities.

Workplace Performance: The study describes employees' perceived productivity, efficiency, ability to meet deadlines, quality of work, and achievement of assigned targets.

Research Focus

The descriptive study focuses on the following aspects:

1. To describe the level of employee engagement among employees.
2. To assess employees' level of job satisfaction.
3. To describe workplace performance in terms of productivity, efficiency, and quality of work.
4. To examine the observed relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction.
5. To identify patterns in workplace performance in relation to employee engagement and job satisfaction.

SUGGESTIONS

Improve communication and clarity
Managers should explain responsibilities, priorities and performance standards in language employees can understand. Regular check-ins can help identify conflicting instructions, uncertainty and barriers before they become larger problems.

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 11, CONFLUENCE - 2026

Recognize meaningful contributions

Recognition should be timely, specific and fair. Instead of relying only on generic praise or annual awards, supervisors can identify the behaviour or result that made a difference. Recognition should not create unhealthy competition or favour only highly visible employees.

Strengthen employee participation

Employees often understand practical workflow problems that may be invisible to senior management. Organizations should provide safe and accessible channels for suggestions, feedback and concerns, and communicate what action was taken. Participation becomes credible when employees can see that their input has been considered.

Design jobs that use employee strengths

Where operational requirements permit, organizations should provide appropriate task variety, responsibility, autonomy and feedback. Job enrichment should be accompanied by training, authority and resources. Additional duties should not be added without reviewing workload, compensation and role clarity.

Invest in learning and career development

Training, mentoring, cross-functional assignments and transparent promotion criteria can help employees see a future in the organization. Development plans should be practical and linked to both employee interests and business needs.

Promote fairness and supportive supervision

Organizations should apply policies consistently and explain decisions concerning workload, scheduling, recognition and advancement. Supervisors should be trained to give constructive feedback, handle disagreements respectfully and identify signs of excessive work pressure.

Protect employee well-being

A sustainable performance strategy should monitor workload, working hours, recovery time and access to support. High engagement should not be defined as constant availability. Managers should review staffing and process problems rather than expecting employees to compensate indefinitely through personal effort.

Use regular, confidential feedback

Short employee surveys, focus groups and confidential feedback channels can reveal patterns in satisfaction and engagement. Results should be communicated in aggregate, with clear action plans and follow-up. Employees should understand how their information will be used and how confidentiality will be protected.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE SCOPE

This paper is based on published literature and does not report an original survey. The selected studies use different populations, measures and analytical methods, so their results should not be combined as though they came from one uniform sample. Some evidence comes from employer-based research, and the strength of the relationships may differ in organizations not represented in those datasets. Future researchers could collect primary data from employees in a specified sector, compare public and private organizations, examine differences by age or tenure where ethically appropriate, or investigate how leadership, workload and job resources influence the relationship between satisfaction and performance.

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 11, CONFLUENCE - 2026

CONCLUSION

Employee engagement, job satisfaction and workplace performance are important elements of effective human resource management. Engagement concerns the energy and personal involvement employees bring to their work; job satisfaction concerns their evaluation of the job and its conditions; and performance concerns the behaviours and results through which organizational objectives are achieved. The concepts overlap, but each provides different information about the employee experience.

The literature reviewed in this paper generally indicates a positive relationship between work engagement and performance. It also shows that meaningful work, fair treatment, supportive leadership, useful feedback, development opportunities and adequate resources can contribute to a healthier and more productive work environment. However, neither satisfaction nor engagement should be treated as a guaranteed cause of high performance.

REFERENCES

[1] Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 63(3), 308–323. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0008
[2] Corbeanu, A., & Iliescu, D. (2023). The link between work engagement and job performance: A meta-analysis. Journal of Personnel Psychology, 22(3). https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000316
[3] Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16(2), 250–279. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7
[4] Harter, J. K., Tatel, C. E., Agrawal, S., Blue, A., Plowman, S. K., Asplund, J., Yu, S., & Kemp, A. (2024). The relationship between engagement at work and organizational outcomes: Q12 meta-analysis (11th ed.). Gallup.
[5] Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). The motivation to work (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
[6] 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
[7] Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1297–1349). Rand McNally.
[8] Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21(7), 600–619. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169
[9] 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, 71–92. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)