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

Employee Engagement and Organizational Performance

Dr. Deepu M
Assistant Professor, BMS College of Commerce and Management

Madhu Sudana S
Assistant Professor, Ebenezer Group of Institutions

ABSTRACT - Organizations now compete on the quality of their people as much as on technology or capital, and employee engagement has therefore become a priority for both managers and researchers. This article investigates how the engagement of employees is linked to the performance of the organizations that employ them. Engagement is conceptualized as a multidimensional state comprising vigor, dedication and absorption, while organizational performance is assessed through productivity, service quality, teamwork, job satisfaction and retention. The study follows a descriptive, quantitative design: a structured five-point Likert questionnaire is administered to employees, and the responses are examined through descriptive statistics, reliability testing, correlation and multiple regression. The theoretical foundation draws on the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model and Social Exchange Theory and is supported by recent empirical studies from corporate, information technology and higher-education settings. The article proposes that leadership communication, recognition, career development, work–life balance and a supportive culture are the practices most likely to raise engagement, and that stronger engagement leads to better organizational outcomes. Practical recommendations for human resource managers follow from this proposition.

Keywords: employee engagement, organizational performance, productivity, retention, leadership communication, human resource management

1. INTRODUCTION

A committed workforce is one of the few resources that competitors find difficult to copy. Products can be imitated and technology can be bought, but the energy, loyalty and initiative that people bring to their jobs grow slowly and remain with the organization that cultivates them. As a result, employee engagement is no longer dismissed as an HR buzzword; it is now a regular item in boardroom discussions of long-term competitiveness.

Kahn (1990) described engagement as the degree to which people bring their physical, cognitive and emotional selves into their work roles. It is distinct from job satisfaction, which reflects how content a person feels, and from organizational commitment, which reflects how strongly a person is attached to the employer. An engaged employee is willing to do more than

(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

the minimum, supports colleagues, proposes improvements and cares about the customer who ultimately receives the service.

The setting in which this matters is a demanding one. Firms must cope with fast technological change, hybrid work arrangements, high attrition in many industries and steadily rising customer expectations. Under such pressure, the discretionary effort of employees often decides whether an organization delivers dependable service or loses ground. This article therefore examines how engagement relates to organizational performance and which management practices are most likely to strengthen it.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Two theories frame the study. The Job Demands–Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) holds that job resources, such as support, feedback, autonomy and development opportunities, stimulate motivation and engagement, whereas excessive demands without adequate resources lead to strain and withdrawal. This view explains why leadership support, recognition and career growth are treated as drivers of engagement here.

Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) explains why engagement should benefit the organization. When employees feel that the employer treats them fairly and values their contribution, they tend to respond with greater effort, loyalty and cooperation. Engagement can therefore be seen as a reciprocal return for the support employees receive, and performance as the organizational benefit of that return.

3. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Many organizations conduct engagement surveys and run celebrations and reward schemes, yet they continue to report low motivation, absenteeism and the departure of skilled staff. The difficulty lies less in a lack of interest than in uncertainty about what actually produces engagement and what it returns. Managers often cannot tell which practices deserve scarce budgets, and the connection between an engaged workforce and measurable results such as output, service quality and retention is frequently assumed rather than shown.

The problem addressed here therefore has two parts: first, to establish whether and how strongly employee engagement is associated with organizational performance; and second, to identify which workplace factors contribute most to engagement, so that improvement efforts can be directed at the most effective levers.

4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- How engaged are the employees in the organizations studied, and on which dimensions is engagement stronger or weaker?
- Is there a significant relationship between employee engagement and organizational 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

- Which workplace factors (leadership, communication, recognition, growth opportunities and work–life balance) shape engagement most strongly?
- To what extent does engagement influence productivity, service quality, teamwork and employees' intention to stay?
- What practical measures can organizations adopt to build and sustain engagement over time?

5. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Corbeanu and Iliescu (2023): The Link between Work Engagement and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. The authors identified 174 studies and pooled their results to test how work engagement relates to job performance. The overall correlation was r = .37, and each of the three components (vigor, dedication and absorption) correlated at a similar level (r = .36, .36 and .38). Employees who show more energy, dedication and concentration therefore tend to perform better, which supports treating engagement as a factor linked to organizational performance.

2. Kurniawati and Raharja (2023): The Influence of Employee Engagement on Organizational Performance: A Systematic Review. This review covered studies published between 2010 and 2022 and found a significant relationship between engagement and organizational performance. It grouped the connecting factors into themes that included psychological capital, job fit, internal communication, commitment, motivation, satisfaction and retention. The authors conclude that engagement strategies should address employees' psychological needs together with workplace conditions.

3. Wittenberg, Eweje, Taskin and Forsyth (2024): Different Perspectives on Engagement, Where to from Here? A Systematic Literature Review. Using a meta-narrative approach, the authors found that engagement research falls into six groups that conceptualize the construct differently. They argue that the concept remains fragmented and that no single framework captures it fully. For the present study, the review is a reminder to define engagement clearly and to be cautious when comparing findings that rest on different definitions.

4. Panigrahi, Behera and Kumar (2024): The Interplay of Organizational Commitment and Employee Engagement in Driving Performance: A Systematic Review. Covering articles published from 2017 to 2024, the review concluded that engagement and organizational commitment each contribute to performance at the individual and organizational levels. It suggests that organizations should help employees build a stronger bond with both their work and the firm, and it highlights commitment as a factor to consider within the engagement–performance relationship.

5. Nursyidah (2025): Employee Engagement as a Catalyst for Organizational Performance: A Systematic Literature Review. Based on ten journal articles from 2019 to 2023, this review linked engagement to job satisfaction, commitment, motivation, work–life balance and

(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

organizational support. It also pointed to inclusive leadership and organizational justice as conditions that may strengthen engagement. The implication is that firms need coordinated, long-term engagement practices instead of isolated motivational events.

6. Baruah and Jain (2025): A Literature Review-Based Understanding of the Relationship Between Employee Engagement and Organizational Performance. The authors review earlier research on how engagement contributes to organizational effectiveness and business results. Their work is useful because it treats engagement as an organization-wide factor and not merely as a trait of individual employees.

7. Sipayung and Ago (2026): Employee/Work Engagement and Organizational Performance: A Combined Bibliometric and Systematic Literature Review. By combining bibliometric mapping with a systematic review, the authors found that engagement is generally associated with stronger organizational outcomes, especially multidimensional and non-financial ones. They also noted possible indirect routes through job satisfaction, commitment, resilience and HR processes, and called for longitudinal studies, multiple data sources and organization-level performance measures.

Empirical studies in specific settings. A further group of recent studies examines engagement in particular contexts. Al Sabbagh (2024) studied a higher-education institute in Oman, and Sharma (2026) focused on the information technology sector. Kavin Kumar and Kaviya Sri (2025) examined engagement and performance at Deloitte, while Shahani and Khan (2025) investigated organizational culture, engagement and communication in the manufacturing sector. Other work has looked at job satisfaction as a moderator (Raghavendra & Kamaraj, 2025), organizational citizenship behavior as a mediator between engagement, organizational support and performance (Awalia & Yanuar, 2024), the role of organizational culture (Barajas, 2024), psychological traits behind business outcomes (Poorani & Pradap, 2024), and engagement practices in relation to performance and retention (Mohre & Rajeshwari, 2026; Yadav & Mishra, 2026). Earlier and broader contributions include Lorgat and Pillai (2020) and Adamu, Kolo and Kagara (2025). Together, these studies show that the engagement–performance question has been explored across many sectors and with varied mediators and moderators.

6. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To understand the concept of employee engagement and its main dimensions.
- To measure the level of engagement among the employees surveyed.
- To examine the relationship between employee engagement and organizational performance.
- To identify the workplace factors that contribute most to engagement.
- To assess how engagement affects productivity, service quality, teamwork and employee retention.

(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

- To recommend practical strategies that strengthen engagement and improve organizational outcomes.

7. RESEARCH GAP

The literature reviewed above leaves four areas insufficiently addressed. The first is conceptual: authors define and measure engagement in different ways, so findings from one study are not always comparable with those of another. The second is explanatory: although the association between engagement and performance is widely reported, fewer studies show how engagement translates into several outcomes, such as productivity, service quality and retention, at the same time.

The third gap concerns priorities. Many drivers of engagement are listed, but few studies compare them within a single sample to show which carry the most weight. The fourth is practical: much of the research describes the situation and stops there, giving managers little direction on what to do. This article responds by adopting a clear multidimensional view of engagement, testing several drivers against several performance outcomes together, and closing with actionable recommendations.

8. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

8.1 Research design

The study uses a descriptive research design with a quantitative approach. A descriptive design is appropriate because the aim is to describe the level of engagement among employees and to examine how it relates to performance indicators without manipulating any variable.

8.2 Population and sampling

The population comprises employees working in private-sector organizations. Respondents are chosen through convenience sampling, based on accessibility and willingness to participate. To prevent the results from reflecting a single workplace, respondents are drawn from more than one organization and from different job levels.

8.3 Sample size

A sample of 120 employees is targeted. With six predictor variables, this exceeds the commonly used rule of thumb of 50 + 8k respondents for multiple regression (98 for k = 6), while remaining manageable within the available time.

8.4 Sources of data

Primary data are collected from employees through a structured questionnaire. Secondary data come from journals, conference proceedings, books, HR reports and company publications, and are used mainly to develop the literature review and the questionnaire.

(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

8.5 Research instrument

The questionnaire is close-ended and uses a five-point Likert scale from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1). It begins with a short respondent profile, followed by groups of statements covering the constructs shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Constructs measured in the questionnaire

Construct	Illustrative focus of the questionnaire items
Employee engagement	Vigor (energy at work), dedication (pride and involvement) and absorption (immersion in tasks)
Engagement drivers	Leadership support, internal communication, recognition and rewards, career development, work–life balance and organizational culture
Organizational performance	Productivity, service quality, teamwork, job satisfaction, employee retention and growth
Respondent profile	Age, gender, designation, sector and length of service

8.6 Hypotheses

- H1: Employee engagement has a significant positive relationship with organizational performance.
- H2: Leadership communication and recognition have a significant positive effect on employee engagement.
- H3: Career development opportunities and work–life balance have a significant positive effect on employee engagement.
- H4: Higher engagement is significantly associated with better retention and stronger teamwork.

8.7 Tools for data analysis

Responses are coded and analysed using the following techniques: frequency and percentage analysis to describe respondents and their answers; mean and standard deviation to gauge the level of engagement; Cronbach's alpha to check the reliability of each scale (values of 0.70 or above are treated as acceptable); Pearson correlation to test associations between variables; and multiple regression to determine the relative influence of the engagement drivers. Tables and charts are used to present the patterns clearly.

8.8 Scope of the study

The study concentrates on how engagement affects productivity, job satisfaction, teamwork, service quality, retention and organizational growth, as perceived by the employees surveyed.

8.9 Ethical considerations

Participation is voluntary, respondents are told the purpose of the survey, and their answers remain anonymous and are used only for academic purposes.

(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

8.10 Limitations of the study

- The sample is small and chosen by convenience, so it may not represent all employees.
- Self-reported answers may be affected by personal bias or a wish to respond favourably.
- A cross-sectional survey shows association at one point in time and cannot by itself establish cause and effect.
- Time constraints limit the depth of analysis, and the findings may not apply equally to every industry.

9. CONCLUSION

Employee engagement is widely regarded as a source of lasting advantage, yet its practical returns and its most effective drivers are still not clearly established. Building on the Job Demands–Resources model, Social Exchange Theory and the reviewed literature, this article sets out a framework and an empirical design to examine how engagement relates to productivity, service quality, teamwork and retention. If the proposed relationships are supported, managers should prioritize leadership communication, recognition, career development, work–life balance and a supportive culture, and should treat engagement as a continuing strategic effort rather than an occasional event. Future research can strengthen the evidence through larger and more varied samples, longitudinal designs and organization-level performance data.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamu, A., Kolo, J., & Kagara, A. B. (2025). Impact of employee engagement on organizational performance. *Journal of Management Science and Entrepreneurship, 7*(7).

Al Sabbagh, M. (2024). Impact of employee engagement on organizational performance: The case of higher educational institute in Oman. In *Proceedings of ICRES 2024 – International Conference on Research in Education and Science* (pp. 2462–2480). Antalya, Türkiye: ISTES.

Awalia, F. Y., & Yanuar, Y. (2024). The influence of employee engagement and organizational support on employee performance mediated by organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Application on Economics and Business, 2*(2).

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309–328.

Barajas, A. (2024). The role of organizational culture in enhancing workplace performance and employee engagement. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict, 28*(4), 1–3.

Baruah, [initials], & Jain, [initials]. (2025). A literature review-based understanding of the relationship between employee engagement and organizational 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

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.

Corbeanu, A., & Iliescu, D. (2023). The link between work engagement and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 22*(3), 111–122.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(4), 692–724.

Kavin Kumar, K., & Kaviya Sri, M. (2025). A study on employee engagement and its impact on employee performance in Deloitte. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT), 13*(12), 404–411.

Kurniawati, N. I., & Raharja, E. (2023). The influence of employee engagement on organizational performance: A systematic review. *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics, 20*, 203–213. https://doi.org/10.37394/23207.2023.20.20

Lorgat, M., & Pillai, V. (2020). A study on employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (JETIR), 7*(4), 555–558.

Mohre, S. D., & Rajeshwari, R. R. (2026). A study on employee-engagement practices and their impact on employee-performance and employee-retention. *Journal of Advance and Future Research, 4*(7), 984–994.

Nursyidah. (2025). Employee engagement as a catalyst for organizational performance: A systematic literature review.

Panigrahi, A., Behera, S., & Kumar, A. (2024). The interplay of organizational commitment and employee engagement in driving performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Informatics Education and Research, 4*(2).

Poorani, D., & Pradap, R. (2024). The impact of employee engagement on organizational performance: An analysis of key psychological traits and business outcomes. *International Journal of Management and Economics Invention, 10*(11).

Raghavendra, R., & Kamaraj, M. (2025). Impact of employee engagement on organizational performance – moderating role of job satisfaction. *South Eastern European Journal of Public Health,* (S2), 3952–3964.

Shahani, F. A., & Khan, B. (2025). Exploring the impact of organizational culture and employee engagement on organizational performance using organizational communication as mediator (manufacturing sector). *The Journal of Research Review, 2*(02), 316–324.

Sharma, V. (2026). Employee engagement as a driver of organizational performance in IT sector. *International Journal of Enhanced Research in Educational Development (IJERED), 14*(3), 239–246.

Sipayung, [initials], & Ago, [initials]. (2026). Employee/work engagement and organizational performance: A combined bibliometric and systematic literature review.

(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

Wittenberg, H., Eweje, G., Taskin, N., & Forsyth, D. (2024). Different perspectives on engagement, where to from here? A systematic literature review.

Yadav, A., & Mishra, A. (2026). Employee engagement on organizational performance. *International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management*, *2*(5), 1–6.

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