



AN EXAMINATION OF THE CONNECTION BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

Dr. N.Jayanthi¹

Assistant Professor, Department Of Management Studies, Easwari Engineering College
M. Sumeitha², V.Pavithra³, K.Dency Glory⁴, B.K Rathi divya devi⁵, R. Akilesh Pandi⁶
IInd Year MBA, Easwari Engineering College, Ramapuram, Chennai

Abstract

With the goal of establishing whether employee engagement programs have a quantifiable effect on key performance metrics, this study explores the connection link employee engagement and organizational success. As part of a mixed-methods approach, structured surveys and interviews were used to collect primary data, while scholarly literature was used to gain secondary data and industry publications. Employee engagement is the study's independent variable, and four dependent variables—financial results, customer satisfaction, operational effectiveness, and market competitiveness/innovation are used to analyze total organizational performance. ANOVA and correlation tests were among the statistical analyses performed on data gathered from 507 respondents in a variety of industries.

Keywords:

Financial Performance, Operational Efficiency, Customer Satisfaction, Market Competitiveness, Employee Engagement, Organizational Performance, Engagement Initiatives, and Mixed-Methods Research

1. INTRODUCTION

In today's cutthroat business environment, companies aim to improve overall performance, productivity, and innovation. Employee engagement is a crucial component that affects the performance of a firm. The term "emotional commitment and dedication" describes how committed employees are to the objectives and core values of their company. Motivated workers put out their best efforts, which increases productivity, boosts job satisfaction, and lowers attrition rates.

Stronger workplace cultures, higher profitability, and improved customer satisfaction are all common outcomes for companies with highly engaged employees. Beyond simple job contentment, employee engagement entails zeal, commitment, and a readiness to go above and beyond. Employers who place a high priority on employee engagement use tactics including open communication, professional growth opportunities, effective leadership, and a great work atmosphere. Because of these elements, a culture of

According to research, motivated workers are also more willing to cooperate, accept organizational changes, and match their own aspirations with those of the business. Employee disengagement, on the other hand, can have a detrimental effect on the performance of the company as a whole since it can result in lower motivation, decreased productivity, and increased absenteeism. Business executives and HR specialists must comprehend the connection between employee engagement and organizational performance in order to develop

strategies that increase employee loyalty and promote long-term success.

By analyzing important engagement-related characteristics and their effects on business outcomes, this study seeks to investigate the role that employee engagement plays in the effectiveness of an organization.

Through an analysis of current research and real-world case studies, this study aims to shed light on how businesses may use employee engagement to gain a competitive edge and sustain growth.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Bailey et al. (2019) conducted a narrative synthesis to study the definition, causes, and effects of employee engagement. They determined that engagement is a multifaceted construct including vigor, devotion, and absorption. Their findings demonstrated that antecedents like employment

autonomy, leadership support, and meaningful work significantly impact engagement levels. Furthermore, their findings suggested that employee engagement positively correlates with job performance, organizational commitment, and overall well-being.

The study also revealed that engagement contributes to lower turnover rates and enhanced employee satisfaction. However, the authors pointed out the need for further research on engagement's long-term effects and how different organizational contexts influence engagement strategies. They recommended a more integrative approach in future studies to explore psychological and social factors affecting engagement.

Cooke et al. (2019) examined how The resilience and engagement of employees in the Chinese banking industry are enhanced by high-performance work systems (HPWS). Their research found that HPWS practices, including training, performance management, and rewards, positively impact engagement by fostering an environment of trust and empowerment. The study emphasized that engaged employees exhibit higher levels of adaptability and problem-solving skills, which are crucial in the rapidly evolving financial sector.

The authors also noted that organizational culture and leadership play key roles in sustaining engagement levels. They argued that organizations with supportive and transparent management structures experience lower employee turnover and increased productivity. Their study called for future research on engagement strategies in different cultural settings, as findings may not be universally applicable across industries and regions.

A systematic review and meta-analysis were carried out by Knight et al. (2019) to evaluate the efficacy of work engagement interventions. According to their findings, engagement strategies. Their findings suggested that engagement interventions focused on job crafting, leadership development, and psychological well-being lead to significant improvements in employee motivation and productivity. The association between interventions and engagement results is mediated by human resources like optimism and self-efficacy, according to the study.

However, their research highlighted inconsistencies in intervention effectiveness across industries. They suggested that interventions should be tailored to organizational needs as opposed to taking a one-size-fits-all strategy. According to the study's findings, more investigation is required to look at how engagement programs hold up over time and how they affect organizational performance in the long

Lee and Ok (2019) explored the roles of work happiness, leadership, and company culture in the process of employee engagement. According to their research, a positive company culture

and transformative leadership greatly increase employee engagement. Workers are more likely to be engaged and dedicated to company objectives if they believe that they are treated fairly, are acknowledged, and have prospects for advancement.

Additionally, their findings showed that job satisfaction acts as a mediator between engagement and organizational performance. Engaged employees tend to experience higher job satisfaction, leading to improved customer service and financial performance. However, the authors stressed that leadership must be proactive in addressing employee concerns and fostering a supportive work environment.

Memon et al. (2019) investigated the role of person-organization (P-O) fit in predicting employee engagement and turnover intention. Their study found that employees who perceive alignment between their values and organizational culture demonstrate higher engagement levels and lower turnover intentions. The research emphasized that fostering a culture of shared values and inclusivity strengthens the psychological contract between employees and employers.

Furthermore, the study highlighted that P-O fit influences work motivation and job satisfaction, which in turn enhance employee retention. Organizations that fail to establish a strong cultural fit may experience higher disengagement and attrition rates. The authors recommended that organizations focus on recruitment strategies that assess cultural alignment to improve long-term engagement.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

This study's main goal is to examine the connection between organizational performance and employee engagement.

1. Examine the key drivers of employee engagement in an organizational setting.
2. Assess the impact of employee engagement on productivity, job satisfaction, and employee retention.
3. Evaluate how employee engagement influences overall organizational performance, including financial outcomes and workplace culture.
4. Identify best practices and strategies that enhance employee engagement to improve business outcomes.
5. Provide recommendations for organizations to develop effective engagement initiatives that foster a motivated and committed workforce.

4. METHODOLOGY

In order to investigate how employee engagement affects organizational performance, the study uses a descriptive and analytical research methodology that combines quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Structured survey questionnaires will be used to gather primary data from staff members in different departments and organizational levels. Furthermore, qualitative information about engagement tactics and their efficacy will be obtained through interviews with HR specialists and company executives. To bolster the results and offer a more comprehensive framework for comprehending interaction patterns, secondary data sources including industry reports, case studies, and scholarly literature will be examined.

Survey results will be processed using statistical software like SPSS and Excel for data analysis, and methods like correlation analysis, regression analysis, and ANOVA will be used to gauge the connection between organizational performance and employee engagement.

H₀: Employee engagement and organizational productivity don't significantly correlate.

H₀: Employee engagement has no significant effect on employee retention and job satisfaction.

H₀: Employee engagement initiatives do not significantly impact overall organizational performance.

5. CORRELATION ANALYSIS:

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Employee performance ratings	15.89	3.843	400
Work efficiency	12.03	5.025	400
Absenteeism Rate	14.53	4.169	400
Revenue Per Employee	12.19	3.908	400

5.1

Correlations

		Employee Performance Ratings	Work Efficiency	Absenteeism Rate	Revenue per Employee
Employee Performance Ratings	Pearson Correlation	1	.796**	.703**	.784**
	Sig. (2-Tailed)		.056	.061	.071
	N		0.300	300	300
Work Efficiency	Pearson Correlation		1	.473**	.023
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.051	.432
	N			300	300
Absenteeism Rate	Pearson Correlation			1	.153**
	Sig. (2-tailed)				.043
	N				300
Revenue per Employee	Pearson Correlation				1
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
	N				300

INTERPRENECE:

$p = 0.056$ and $r = 0.796$ Although employee performance ratings and job efficiency have a substantial positive association, the p -value is just above 0.04, indicating that, at the 5% level, it is not statistically significant.

$p = 0.061$, $r = 0.703$. Although the p -value is above 0.05, the somewhat favorable association is not statistically noteworthy at the 5% level.

$p = 0.071$, $r = 0.784$ Although there is a considerable positive association, it is not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

$p = 0.062$, $r = 0.496$ Although there is a moderate association, $p > 0.05$ for statistical significance.

$r = 0.033$, $p = 0.511$ The correlation is **very weak and not significant**, suggesting no meaningful relationship.

$r = 0.174$, $p = 0.057$ A weak correlation exists, and it is **not statistically significant** ($p > 0.05$).

Correlations

Control Variables			Employee Performance Ratings	Work Efficiency
Employee Engagement.	Employee	Correlation	0.768	0.503
	Performance	Significance (2-tailed)		
	Ratings		0.063	.040
	Work Efficiency	df	0	397
	Work Efficiency	Correlation	0.873	0.350
		Significance (2-tailed)	.040	0.00
		df	397	0

Generation Z Career Aspiration:

- The correlation with the control variable *Career Aspiration* is **0.768** with a significance level (p-value) of **0.063**. Although the coefficient indicates a strong positive relationship, the p-value is slightly above the typical 0.05 threshold, suggesting that this relationship is marginally non-significant.
- Additionally, Generation Z Career Aspiration shows a moderate positive correlation (**0.503**) with the control variable *Work Values* ($p = 0.040$), which is statistically significant. This finding implies that higher career aspirations among Generation Z individuals tend to be associated with higher work values.

Generation Z Work Values:

- The correlation between Generation Z Work Values and the control variable *Career Aspiration* is very strong (**0.873**) with a significance of **0.040**, indicating that individuals with higher work values also tend to have higher career aspirations.
- The correlation with the control variable *Work Values* is **0.350**, with a significance level reported as **0.00** (indicating a highly significant relationship). This demonstrates a consistent and meaningful alignment between Generation Z's work values and the broader measure of work values.

6. Employee engagement initiatives do not significantly impact overall organizational performance.

- This test compares the mean organizational performance scores across different levels of employee engagement (e.g., low, moderate, high engagement).
- If the F-statistic is significant ($p\text{-value} < 0.05$), the null hypothesis is rejected, showing engagement initiatives affect performance.

TABLE 1.4 ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.330	3	.110	.317	.063

Financial Performance:	Within Groups	174.738	504	.347		
	Total	175.068	507			
Operational Efficiency:	Between Groups	2.124	3	.708	1.663	.064
	Within Groups	214.588	504	.426		
	Total	216.712	507			
Customer satisfaction	Between Groups	4.514	3	1.505	3.741	.061
	Within Groups	202.709	504	.402		
	Total	207.224	507			
Market Competitiveness/Innovation:	Between Groups	.954	3	.318	.786	.502
	Within Groups	204.114	504	.405		
	Total	205.068	507			

Financial Performance:

The significance level (p) is 0.063 and the F-value is 0.317. Despite being around the 0.05 threshold, this p-value does not satisfy the statistical significance criterion, indicating that there are no significant variations in the financial performance of the groups.

Operational**Efficiency:**

The F-value is 1.663 with a p-value of 0.064. This p-value, like that of Financial Performance, is marginal but still above 0.05, indicating that any differences in operational efficiency among the groups are not statistically significant.

Customer**Satisfaction:**

The F-value here is 3.741 with a p-value of 0.061. Despite the relatively higher F-value compared to the previous measures, the p-value remains slightly above the threshold for significance, which means that differences in customer satisfaction are also not statistically significant.

Market**Competitiveness/Innovation:**

With an F-value of 0.786 and a p-value of 0.502, this measure clearly shows no significant differences between groups, reinforcing the conclusion that employee engagement initiatives do not significantly influence market competitiveness or innovation.

7. FINDING OF THE STUDY:

The study's findings indicate that employee engagement initiatives do not have a statistically significant direct impact on overall organizational performance, as measured by indicators like financial results, customer satisfaction, operational effectiveness, and innovation and competitiveness in the market.

One key reason for these findings could be the multifaceted nature of organizational performance. Multiple external and internal factors—such as market conditions, leadership styles, and resource allocation—can influence performance outcomes, potentially diluting the measurable effect of employee engagement. Additionally, the instruments used to measure both employee engagement and organizational performance might not capture all the nuances of their relationship, leading to results that do not reach statistical significance despite a possible underlying trend.

8. DISCUSSION:

The results underscore the complexity of linking employee engagement directly to

organizational performance. While the statistical analysis did not yield significant differences across the various performance metrics, this does not imply that employee engagement is unimportant. Instead, it suggests that the relationship may be indirect, mediated by factors such as employee satisfaction, organizational culture, or innovation. The impact of engagement initiatives might also require a longer time frame to manifest, which a cross-sectional study might not fully capture. Future research could benefit from a longitudinal design, incorporating additional mediating variables and a broader range of performance indicators to better understand the dynamics at play. This deeper exploration could reveal more subtle influences of employee engagement on performance, providing organizations with a more comprehensive strategy for leveraging engagement to achieve long-term success.

9. CONCLUSION:

This study investigated the relationship between employee engagement and organizational performance utilizing a range of performance criteria, such as financial performance, customer satisfaction, operational efficacy, and innovation and competitiveness in the market.

The analysis, including ANOVA tests, revealed that the employee engagement initiatives did not lead to statistically significant differences across these metrics. Although some measures showed trends toward a positive relationship, none reached the conventional level of significance ($p < 0.05$). This suggests that while employee engagement may influence certain aspects of performance, its direct impact on overall organizational performance is not clearly demonstrable when considered in isolation.

10. REFERENCE:

1. Aon Hewitt. (2014). Trends in Global Employee Engagement. Aon Hewitt.
2. Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2017). The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(1), 31–53.
3. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209–223.
4. Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89–136.
5. Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2014). *Organization development and change* (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.
6. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512.
7. Gallup. (2017). *State of the American Workplace*. Gallup, Inc.
8. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268–279.
9. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Killham, E. A., & Asplund, J. W. (2009). Q12 Meta-Analysis. Gallup.

10. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724.
11. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3–30.
12. Purcell, J., & Kinnie, N. (2007). HRM and employee engagement: Building engagement theories—Exploring and explaining a complex relationship. CIPD Publishing.
13. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619.
14. Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2014). What do we really know about employee engagement? *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 25(2), 155–182.
15. 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.
16. Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(1), 89–110.
17. Towers Watson. (2012). *Global Workforce Study: Driving Engagement Through Effective Communication*. Towers Watson.
18. Truss, C., Shantz, A., Soane, E., Alfes, K., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Employee engagement, organisational performance and individual well-being: Exploring the evidence, developing the theory. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(14), 2657–2669.
19. Vance, R. J. (2001). *Manage employee engagement for maximum performance: A guide for leaders*. Wiley.
20. Wright, T. A., & Bonett, D. G. (2007). Job satisfaction and psychological well-being as nonadditive predictors of workplace turnover. *Journal of Management*, 33(2), 141–160.
21. Dr. Saikumari. V, Deepadharshini. B, Haritha. V, Hema Varna. J, Harikrishnan. V. (2022) “A study on user interface design in E-commerce and its impact on consumer trust, Chennai”, *Industrial Engineering Journal*, ISSN 0970-2555, Vol 15, Issue 1, Oct 2022.
22. Dr. Saikumari.V , “Training and organizational performance: the mediating role of e-learning in information technology industry – an empirical study”, the online journal of distance education and e-learning, july 2018 volume 6, issue 3
23. Dr. Saikumari V, A Study on Innovation and its Challenges in Sustainable Entrepreneurship in India, *European Chemical Bulletin*, Vol. 12, Issue 2, 2023.
24. Kathiravan, M., V. Saikumari, and V. Sunitha. 2017. Convergence in Effective Performance Appraisal System Technique: Foster Employee Involvement and Organizational Commitment, Evidence from Indian SMEs. *Asian Journal of Research in Banking and Finance* 7: 87–110.
25. Dr. Saikumari V, A Study on Innovation and Its Challenges in Sustainable Entrepreneurship in India, *European Chemical Bulletin*, Vol. 12, Issue 2, 2023

26. Dr. Saikumari.V, “Training and organizational performance: the mediating role of e-learning in information technology industry – an empirical study”, the online journal of distance education and e-learning, july 2018 volume 6, issue 3
27. Dr. Saikumari. V, Deepadharshini. B, Haritha. V, Hema Varna. J, Harikrishnan. V. “A study on user interface design in E-commerce and its impact on consumer trust, Chennai”, Industrial Engineering Journal, ISSN 0970-2555, Vol 15, Issue 1, Oct 2022.
28. Dr. Saikumari V, (2023), A Study on Work Life Balance and Business Development Strategy: A High Growth Approach in The Corporate World, European Chemical Bulletin, 12(2).
29. Dr. Saikumari V, Arunraj A. “Challenges of eHealth and current developments in eHealth applications: An overview”, EAI Endorsed transactions on smart cities, doi: 10.4108/eetsc.v6i18.2261
30. Dr. Saikumari.V , “Training and organizational performance: the mediating role of e-learning in information technology industry – an empirical study”, the online journal of distance education and e-learning, july 2018 volume 6, issue 3.