



## IMPACT OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT ON JOB PERFORMANCE

SamreenAlam- MBA student, CMS –B school, Jain (Deemed-to-be) University.

Dr.M.Nalini- Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management studies, CMS –B school, Jain ( Deemed-to-be ) University.

### Abstract

Employee engagement has emerged as a defining determinant of organizational performance in today's increasingly competitive and dynamic work environment. This study investigates the impact of employee engagement on job performance among a diverse group of employees, interns, and working professionals. Using a quantitative research design, primary data were gathered from 130 respondents through a structured questionnaire via Google Forms. Descriptive statistics, frequency distribution, and Pearson correlation analysis were employed to analyse the data. The findings reveal a strong positive correlation ( $r = 0.5934$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ) between employee engagement and job performance, with engagement explaining 35.21% of the variance in performance outcomes. Key engagement drivers identified include motivation, recognition, organizational pride, and involvement in decision-making. The study concludes that organizations must prioritize engagement as a strategic imperative to achieve sustained performance, employee satisfaction, and long-term organizational growth.

**Keywords:** *Employee Engagement, Job Performance, Motivation, Workplace Productivity, Organizational Behaviour*

### 1. Introduction

In today's fast-evolving organizational landscape, human capital has become the most critical driver of competitive advantage. Employees are no longer seen merely as operational resources but as the intellectual and emotional backbone of every successful enterprise. Within this context, employee engagement — defined as the degree of emotional, cognitive, and behavioural investment an employee has in their work and organization — has risen to the forefront of management discourse.



Organizations that cultivate high engagement have consistently demonstrated superior performance outcomes, reduced attrition, and stronger workplace cultures. Yet, despite its acknowledged importance, engagement remains underexplored in the Indian workplace setting, where unique socio-organizational dynamics shape employee experience. This study addresses that gap by examining whether and to what extent employee engagement influences job performance among Indian employees and professionals.

Drawing on Kahn's (1990) foundational theory of personal engagement, the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), and Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964), this research provides both empirical and theoretical contributions to understanding engagement as a performance catalyst. Data collected from 130 respondents across employment types form the empirical basis of the study. The findings carry meaningful implications for HR practitioners, managers, and organizational leaders committed to building high-performance workplaces.

## **2. Review of Literature**

The relationship between employee engagement and job performance has attracted substantial scholarly attention across disciplines. Bakker et al. (2015) conceptualized engagement as a positive, fulfilling work-related state characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption — dimensions that naturally translate into higher performance. Bailey et al. (2015), in a comprehensive systematic review, confirmed that engaged employees consistently demonstrate greater organizational citizenship behaviours and exceed formal job requirements.

Breevaart et al. (2016) highlighted that supportive leadership significantly elevates daily engagement levels, a finding echoed by Harter et al. (2016) who linked engagement to productivity, profitability, and employee retention across business units globally. Salanova et al. (2016) demonstrated that enthusiasm and dedication — hallmarks of engagement — directly translate to improved individual and team performance.

Nalini (2024) examines the key factors that negatively influence job satisfaction among IT employees, highlighting issues such as excessive workload, work-life imbalance, and limited career growth opportunities. The findings emphasize that organizational support, effective management practices, and employee engagement play a critical role in enhancing satisfaction levels. The study



underscores the need for organizations to adopt holistic HR strategies to address these concerns and improve overall employee well-being and retention.

The emotional dimension of engagement was underscored by Shuck et al. (2017), who found that emotionally engaged employees show notably higher performance and commitment. Kim et al. (2017) further established engagement's dual role: enhancing performance while simultaneously reducing turnover intent. The significance of performance management practices — feedback, recognition, communication — in sustaining engagement was emphasized by Mone and London (2018).

More recent scholarship has reinforced these connections. Saks (2022) identified engagement as one of the strongest independent predictors of job performance in contemporary organizational settings. Opoku et al. (2024) found that perceived organizational support significantly strengthens the engagement-performance relationship, while Al-Haziazi (2024) confirmed that recognition and meaningful job characteristics are among the most potent drivers of engagement. Across this body of literature, a clear consensus emerges: engaged employees are more productive, more committed, and more capable of delivering sustained performance.

### **3. Research Methodology**

#### **3.1 Research Design and Approach**

This study employs a descriptive, cross-sectional quantitative research design. The quantitative paradigm was selected to systematically measure, analyse, and establish statistical relationships between employee engagement (independent variable) and job performance (dependent variable). Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire administered via Google Forms, ensuring broad accessibility and efficient data collection.

#### **3.2 Sample and Data Collection**

A total of 130 valid responses were obtained from employees, interns, and working professionals using convenience sampling. The sample comprised 50.8% respondents aged 18–25 years, 50% male and 46.2% female respondents, 47.7% postgraduates, and 39.2% early-career professionals



with less than one year of experience. This diversity enriches the representativeness of findings across career stages and employment contexts.

### **3.3 Instrument and Variables**

The questionnaire comprised 20 Likert-scale items (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree), divided into two sections: eight items measuring employee engagement (Q6–Q13) and seven items measuring job performance (Q14–Q20). Engagement items captured excitement about work, motivation, recognition, organizational pride, discretionary effort, appreciation, decision-making involvement, and professional growth. Performance items captured timeliness, target achievement, quality of work, productivity, time management, responsibility handling, and team contribution.

### **3.4 Hypotheses**

H0: There is no significant relationship between employee engagement and job performance.

H1: There is a significant positive relationship between employee engagement and job performance.

### **3.5 Analytical Techniques**

Data analysis employed descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency distribution) and inferential analysis using Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation to test hypotheses and examine item-level relationships between engagement and performance constructs.

## **4. Analysis**

### **4.1 Descriptive Statistics: Employee Engagement**

The composite mean for employee engagement across all eight items was 3.59 (SD = 0.8367), indicating a moderate-to-good engagement level among respondents. Table 1 presents item-wise descriptive statistics for the engagement construct.

*Table 1: Descriptive Statistics – Employee Engagement Items*



Item	Engagement Dimension	Mean	Agree/Strongly Agree (%)
Q6	Excitement about work	3.82	71.5%
Q7	Organizational pride	3.74	69.2%
Q8	Motivation at work	3.73	70.0%
Q9	Recognition received	3.55	63.1%
Q10	Discretionary effort	3.35	58.5%
Q11	Appreciation from org.	3.52	61.5%
Q12	Involvement in decisions	3.42	57.7%
Q13	Professional growth	3.48	60.8%
	Composite Engagement Mean	3.59	SD = 0.8367

Excitement about work (Q6, M = 3.82) and organizational pride (Q7, M = 3.74) emerged as the strongest engagement dimensions, reflecting employees' emotional connection to their roles. Discretionary effort (Q10, M = 3.35) and involvement in decision-making (Q12, M = 3.42) were comparatively weaker, signalling areas where organizations can meaningfully improve their engagement strategies.

#### 4.2 Descriptive Statistics: Job Performance

The composite mean for job performance was 3.97 (SD = 0.6649) — notably higher than the engagement composite, with less inter-individual variability. Table 2 summarizes performance item scores.

*Table 2: Descriptive Statistics – Job Performance Items*



Item	Performance Dimension	Mean	Agree/Strongly Agree (%)
Q14	Timely completion of tasks	3.97	76.2%
Q15	Regular target achievement	4.02	72.3%
Q16	Quality maintenance	4.00	77.7%
Q17	Productivity during work hours	3.85	65.4%
Q18	Time management	3.92	72.3%
Q19	Handling job responsibilities	3.97	76.9%
Q20	Team contribution (Highest)	4.05	76.2%
	Composite Performance Mean	3.97	SD = 0.6649

Team contribution (Q20,  $M = 4.05$ ) and regular target achievement (Q15,  $M = 4.02$ ) ranked as the strongest performance dimensions. Productivity during work hours (Q17,  $M = 3.85$ ) recorded the lowest score, indicating that sustained intra-day productivity presents the most room for improvement — a finding consistent with motivational theory suggesting that sustained productivity requires continuous engagement reinforcement.

### 4.3 Pearson Correlation Analysis

To test the hypotheses, Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was computed between composite engagement and performance scores, as well as between select item-level pairs. Results are presented in Table 3.

*Table 3: Pearson Correlation Matrix – Engagement and Performance*



Variable Pair	Pearson r	R <sup>2</sup> (%)	Significance
Overall Engagement → Overall Performance	0.5934	35.21%	p < 0.0001 ***
Motivation → Productivity	0.483	23.33%	p < 0.001 ***
Motivation → Team Contribution	0.499	24.90%	p < 0.001 ***
Org. Valuation → Timely Completion	0.452	20.43%	p < 0.001 ***
Appreciation → Team Contribution	0.434	18.84%	p < 0.001 ***
Involvement in Decisions → Time Mgmt.	0.421	17.72%	p < 0.001 ***

The primary correlation of  $r = 0.5934$  between overall employee engagement and overall job performance is statistically significant at  $p < 0.0001$ , firmly rejecting  $H_0$  and confirming  $H_1$ . In accordance with Cohen's (1988) conventions for behavioral sciences, an  $r$  value between 0.50 and 0.70 constitutes a large effect — underscoring that engagement is not merely a correlate but a substantive predictor of employee performance.

## 5. Findings and Discussion

The findings of this study confirm, with statistical robustness, that employee engagement has a strong and significant positive impact on job performance. The composite Pearson correlation of  $r = 0.5934$  establishes that over one-third of the variability in job performance can be directly attributed to engagement — a finding that carries profound strategic implications for human resource management.

An analytically notable observation is the structural gap between engagement ( $M = 3.59$ ) and performance ( $M = 3.97$ ) composite scores. Employees appear to maintain good performance levels even when engagement is moderate. This points to a potentially fragile organizational equilibrium: performance is being sustained through professional responsibility and external expectations rather



than deep internal engagement. Research in organizational psychology (Saks, 2022) warns that such performance cannot be sustained in the long term without genuine engagement underpinning it.

At the item level, the weakest engagement dimensions — discretionary effort ( $M = 3.35$ ) and decision-making involvement ( $M = 3.42$ ) — represent critical intervention points. Discretionary effort is widely regarded as the most authentic expression of engagement: it is effort that goes beyond task compliance, driven by internal motivation. Its relative weakness in this study indicates that while employees are meeting their obligations, they are not yet fully unleashing their potential. Similarly, limited involvement in decisions reduces the sense of ownership and psychological investment employees feel toward organizational outcomes.

The motivation-performance nexus is among the most powerful findings: motivation correlates with productivity ( $r = 0.483$ ) and team contribution ( $r = 0.499$ ) at near-moderate-to-strong levels. These relationships affirm the theoretical proposition of the JD-R Model — that job resources like motivational climate serve as fuels for engagement, which in turn powers sustained performance. Organizations that engineer motivationally rich environments see direct, measurable returns in their employees' output quality and collaborative effectiveness.

Recognition and appreciation ( $r = 0.434$  with team contribution) emerged as meaningful levers of performance. The practical implication is elegant in its simplicity: when employees feel seen and valued, they invest more deeply — in their individual tasks and in their teams. The finding that decision-making involvement correlates with time management ( $r = 0.421$ ) is particularly nuanced: it suggests that giving employees agency cultivates self-organizational capabilities, a finding that aligns with Self-Determination Theory, wherein autonomy supports intrinsic motivation and self-regulation.

Team contribution's dominance as the highest-performing dimension ( $M = 4.05$ ) reveals a collaborative orientation that organizations should nurture deliberately. Engaged employees do not merely perform well individually — they elevate collective performance. This has significant implications for team design, culture-building, and leadership development practices.

These findings resonate strongly with global evidence from Gallup (2023), which reports that highly engaged business units achieve significantly higher profitability and productivity, along with lower



absenteeism and turnover. The present study, grounded in the Indian professional context, adds to this body of evidence with first-hand empirical data — affirming that the engagement-performance relationship transcends geographic and cultural boundaries.

## 6. Conclusion

This study set out to examine the impact of employee engagement on job performance among a cross-sectional sample of 130 employees and professionals. The evidence assembled is unambiguous: employee engagement is a powerful and statistically significant predictor of job performance ( $r = 0.5934$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ), accounting for 35.21% of variance in performance outcomes. The null hypothesis is firmly rejected; the alternative hypothesis is substantiated.

The study reveals that while employees demonstrate commendable performance levels, their engagement — particularly in dimensions of discretionary effort, recognition, and participative decision-making — lags behind. This asymmetry is not benign. It signals a performance trajectory that may be difficult to sustain over time unless organizations intervene to deepen engagement at its roots. Motivation, appreciation, and organizational inclusion are not soft, peripheral concerns — they are structural determinants of how people show up for their work.

For organizational leaders, the prescription is clear: employee engagement must be elevated from an HR initiative to a boardroom priority. Investing in recognition systems, democratizing workplace decisions, cultivating motivational leadership, and fostering psychological safety are not just compassionate acts — they are high-return organizational strategies. An engaged workforce does not merely meet targets; it exceeds them, innovates relentlessly, and builds the human architecture upon which enduring organizational success is constructed.

Future research may benefit from longitudinal designs, industry-specific sampling, and the inclusion of mediating variables such as organizational culture, leadership style, and compensation. Qualitative methods — interviews and ethnographic studies — could add richness to the quantitative foundations established here. As workplaces evolve under the pressures of digitalization, remote work, and changing generational expectations, the science of engagement will only grow more consequential.



## References

- Al-Haziati, S. (2024). Drivers of employee engagement and their impact on performance. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22, 1–12.
- Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2015). The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(1), 31–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12077>
- Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. P. (2015). Key questions regarding work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(1), 4–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2010.485352>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.
- Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Derks, D. (2016). Who takes the lead? A multi-source diary study on leadership and work engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 37(3), 309–325. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2041>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gallup. (2023). *State of the global workplace report*. Gallup.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Agrawal, S., & Plowman, S. K. (2016). The relationship between engagement and performance at the business-unit level. Gallup Research Report.
- 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>
- Kim, W., Kolb, J. A., & Kim, T. (2017). The relationship between work engagement and performance: A review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 16(4), 350–376. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484317725967>



- Mone, E. M., & London, M. (2018). Employee engagement through effective performance management. Routledge.
- Nalini, M. (2024). What compromises job satisfaction in IT employees? *International Journal for Research in Applied Sciences and Engineering Technology*, 12(4)
- Opoku, M. A., et al. (2024). Employee engagement and job performance: The role of perceived organizational support. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22, 1–10.
- Saks, A. M. (2022). Caring human resources management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(3), 100835. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100835>
- Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiró, J. M. (2016). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1217–1227.
- Shuck, B., Adelson, J. L., & Reio, T. G. (2017). The employee engagement scale: Initial evidence for construct validity. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 28(4), 453–482. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21290>