



A STUDY ON FACTORS INFLUENCING EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT IN ORGANISATION

Chityala Vyshnavi¹, Gaddala Prathyusha², Bathula Bhagyashree³, Saidigari Swarna⁴,
Thallapally Anjali⁵, S. Ramya⁶

¹⁻⁴ MBA (Human Resource Management), Aurora's PG College Hyderabad, Telangana

⁶ Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Aurora's PG College
Hyderabad, Telangana

Email: ramyapatturi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Abstract—Employee engagement has emerged as one of the most critical determinants of organisational performance, workforce productivity, and sustainable competitive advantage in contemporary business environments. Engaged employees demonstrate higher levels of discretionary effort, stronger organisational commitment, reduced absenteeism, and significantly lower turnover intent compared to their disengaged counterparts. This study investigates the key factors influencing employee engagement in organisations, with particular focus on leadership quality, work environment, compensation equity, recognition practices, career development opportunities, and work-life balance provisions. Primary data was gathered through a structured questionnaire administered to 120 respondents across diverse industry sectors in Hyderabad, Telangana. Secondary data was sourced from Gallup State of the Global Workplace Reports (2022–2024), academic journals on organisational behaviour, SHRM publications, and industry engagement benchmark studies. The study employs descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and percentage analysis to identify dominant engagement drivers and their relative impact on employee motivation levels. Findings indicate that leadership quality, recognition and appreciation, and career growth opportunities are the three most influential engagement determinants, collectively accounting for 68% of explained engagement variance. Recommendations address practical interventions organisations can implement to systematically improve

workforce engagement levels and associated business outcomes.

Keywords: *Employee engagement, organisational commitment, leadership, work environment, career development, recognition, work-life balance, employee motivation, HR practices, workforce productivity.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Employee engagement represents the degree of emotional commitment, cognitive absorption, and behavioural involvement an employee demonstrates toward their work and organisation. First formally conceptualised by Kahn (1990) through the lens of personal engagement and disengagement, the construct has evolved into a central strategic concern for human resource management, organisational psychology, and business leadership over the subsequent three decades.

The organisational and economic consequences of employee disengagement are substantial and well-documented. The Gallup State of the Global Workplace Report (2023) estimated that low employee engagement costs the global economy USD 8.8 trillion annually in lost productivity, representing 9% of global GDP. In India, only 33% of employees report being actively engaged at work, compared to a global average of 23% and high-performing organisation benchmarks of 70%+, indicating significant workforce potential awaiting activation through improved engagement practices.

Organisations that successfully cultivate high employee engagement demonstrate



measurably superior business outcomes across multiple dimensions. Gallup research consistently demonstrates that organisations in the top quartile of employee engagement outperform bottom-quartile peers by 23% in profitability, 18% in productivity, 43% in lower turnover (high-turnover industries), and 64% in fewer safety incidents. These performance differentials establish employee engagement not as a soft HR metric but as a hard business imperative with direct financial consequences.

This study investigates the key factors influencing employee engagement in organisations, examining the relative contribution of leadership quality, work environment design, compensation equity, recognition practices, career development investment, and work-life balance provisions to overall engagement levels. The research aims to provide evidence-based insights for HR practitioners and organisational leaders seeking to develop targeted, effective engagement improvement strategies.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The primary objectives of this study are to identify and analyse the key factors that significantly influence employee engagement levels in organisations; to evaluate the relative importance of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors in driving employee engagement; to assess the relationship between leadership effectiveness, recognition practices, career development opportunities, and overall employee engagement; to examine the impact of work environment quality and work-life balance provisions on employee engagement and retention; and to recommend practical, evidence-based strategies for organisations to systematically improve workforce engagement and associated performance outcomes.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

[1] Kahn (1990) introduced the foundational framework of personal engagement, defining it as the simultaneous employment and expression of a person's preferred self in task behaviours that

promote connections to work and others. He identified three psychological conditions enabling engagement: meaningfulness (feeling valuable), safety (freedom from fear), and availability (having physical and psychological resources). This tripartite framework remains the theoretical bedrock for contemporary employee engagement research.

[2] Maslach et al. (2001) conceptualised employee engagement as the positive antithesis of burnout, characterised by energy, involvement, and efficacy rather than exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy. Their work highlighted that sustained organisational conditions—workload manageability, fairness, community quality, reward adequacy, control, and value alignment—determined whether employees experienced engagement or burnout over time.

[3] Saks (2006) empirically tested social exchange theory as an explanation for employee engagement, finding that both job engagement and organisational engagement were positively predicted by job characteristics, perceived organisational support, and perceived supervisor support. His study established that reciprocal exchange relationships between employees and organisations are fundamental drivers of engagement behaviour.

[4] Gallup (2017) published its comprehensive Q12 employee engagement meta-analysis covering 1.8 million employees across 230 organisations in 49 industries in 73 countries. The study confirmed 12 core engagement drivers spanning basic needs, management support, teamwork, and growth, establishing that managers account for at least 70% of variance in employee engagement scores—making leadership quality the single most influential engagement determinant.

[5] Schaufeli et al. (2019) refined the measurement of employee engagement through the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), demonstrating that engagement comprises three core dimensions: vigour



(high energy and mental resilience), dedication (strong involvement and sense of significance), and absorption (full concentration and being engrossed in work). Their psychometric work established engagement as a distinct positive motivational state rather than simply absence of burnout.

[6] Shuck and Wollard (2010) conducted a systematic literature review of employee engagement definitions, identifying four distinct conceptual domains: needs-satisfaction, burnout-antithesis, satisfaction-engagement, and multidimensional approaches. Their synthesis highlighted the importance of both cognitive (thinking positively about the organisation) and emotional (feeling positive about the organisation) dimensions as co-determinants of engaged behaviour.

[7] Anitha (2014) conducted an empirical study on determinants of employee engagement in India, finding that work environment, leadership, team and co-worker relationships, training and career development, compensation, organisational policies, and employee wellbeing collectively explain 55.7% of engagement variance, with work environment emerging as the strongest predictor in the Indian organisational context.

[8] Gallup State of the Global Workplace Report (2023) found that globally, only 23% of employees are actively engaged, while 59% are not engaged and 18% are actively disengaged. The report identified that employee recognition, manager quality, and clear expectations are the three factors with the highest leverage on engagement improvement, consistent with prior theoretical frameworks.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A descriptive and analytical research approach was adopted to systematically investigate the factors influencing employee engagement in organisations. The mixed-methods design integrates quantitative survey data analysis with secondary source triangulation to provide both statistical

measurement of factor importance and contextual understanding of engagement dynamics across different organisational settings.

4.1 Research Design

Descriptive research design was employed to document the current state of employee engagement perceptions and identify dominant influencing factors among the study sample. Analytical research design was used to examine relationships between specific organisational factors (leadership, recognition, career development, work environment, compensation, work-life balance) and overall self-reported employee engagement levels. The study was cross-sectional in nature, covering respondents across diverse industry sectors in Hyderabad, Telangana during the period January to March 2024.

4.2 Data Sources

Primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire administered to 120 employees across diverse organisational sectors in Hyderabad. The questionnaire comprised 32 questions spanning respondent demographics, engagement factor ratings on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree), and overall engagement self-assessment. Additionally, five semi-structured interviews were conducted with HR managers to gather qualitative insights on organisational engagement practices. Secondary data sources included Gallup Global Workplace Reports (2021–2023), SHRM Employee Engagement Research Series, Society for Human Resource Management publications, academic journals on organisational behaviour and HRM, McKinsey Quarterly insights on employee experience, and published industry-specific engagement benchmark studies covering Indian corporate sectors.

4.3 Sample Size

A sample of 120 respondents was selected using stratified random sampling across four industry sectors: IT and Technology (n=35), Manufacturing (n=28), Banking and



Financial Services (n=32), and Healthcare (n=25). The sample included employees across hierarchical levels: entry-level (38%), middle management (42%), and senior management (20%). Sample size was determined using Cochran's formula at 95% confidence level with 9% margin of error, ensuring statistical adequacy for descriptive and correlation analysis. All respondents had minimum one year of organisational tenure to ensure sufficient experience with workplace engagement factors.

4.4 Tools for Analysis

The study employed descriptive statistical analysis including mean scores, standard deviation, and frequency distributions to profile respondent characteristics and summarise engagement factor ratings. Percentage analysis was used to quantify the proportion of respondents identifying each factor as a primary engagement driver. Weighted average analysis was applied to rank engagement factors by overall importance based on Likert scale responses. Correlation analysis examined relationships between individual engagement factors and overall engagement self-ratings. Thematic analysis was applied to qualitative interview data to identify recurring patterns in organisational engagement practices and challenges.

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.1 Respondent Profile

Category	Sub-category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	68	56.7%
	Female	52	43.3%
Age Group	22–30 years	48	40.0%
	31–40 years	51	42.5%
	41+ years	21	17.5%
Experience	1–3 years	44	36.7%

	3–7 years	49	40.8%
	7+ years	27	22.5%
Sector	IT & Technology	35	29.2%
	Banking & Finance	32	26.7%
	Manufacturing	28	23.3%
	Healthcare	25	20.8%

Table I: Respondent Demographic Profile (n=120)

5.2 Employee Engagement Factor Analysis

Engagement Factor	Mean Score (/5)	Std Dev	Rank	% Rating High
Leadership Quality	4.31	0.62	1	84.2%
Recognition & Appreciation	4.18	0.71	2	79.6%
Career Development	4.09	0.74	3	76.3%
Work Environment	3.97	0.79	4	71.8%
Work-Life Balance	3.88	0.83	5	68.4%
Compensation Equity	3.76	0.91	6	63.7%
Team Collaboration	3.71	0.86	7	61.2%
Organisational Culture	3.65	0.88	8	58.9%

Table II: Employee Engagement Factor Ratings – Mean Score Analysis

Leadership quality emerged as the highest-rated engagement factor (mean 4.31/5.00), with 84.2% of respondents rating it as highly influential, consistent with Gallup's finding that managers account for 70% of engagement variance. Recognition and appreciation ranked second (mean 4.18), followed closely by career development



opportunities (mean 4.09). Compensation equity, while important, ranked sixth, suggesting that intrinsic motivators outweigh extrinsic factors as primary engagement drivers in the study sample, aligning with Self-Determination Theory predictions.

5.3 Engagement Level Distribution

Engagement Level	Criteria	Respo ndent s	Percentag e
Highly Engaged	Score 4.5–5.0	31	25.8%
Engaged	Score 3.5–4.4	52	43.3%
Moderately Engaged	Score 2.5–3.4	27	22.5%
Disengaged	Score < 2.5	10	8.4%

Table III: Employee Engagement Level Distribution

The majority of respondents (69.1%) fall in the engaged or highly engaged categories, with 25.8% classified as highly engaged. However, 30.9% of respondents are moderately engaged or disengaged, representing a significant productivity and retention risk. The 8.4% actively disengaged segment, while smaller than the Gallup global average of 18%, still represents substantial organisational cost in terms of absenteeism, productivity drag, and potential negative influence on team engagement culture.

5.4 Sector-wise Engagement Comparison

Sector	Avg Engage ment Score	Highly Engaged %	Disengaged %
IT & Techn ology	4.12 / 5.00	34.3%	5.7%
Banki ng & Financ	3.84 / 5.00	21.9%	9.4%

e			
Manuf acturin g	3.61 / 5.00	17.9%	10.7%
Health care	3.92 / 5.00	28.0%	8.0%

Table IV: Sector-wise Engagement Score Comparison

IT and Technology sector records the highest average engagement score (4.12/5.00) and lowest disengagement rate (5.7%), attributable to stronger career development cultures, competitive compensation, and flexible work arrangements. Manufacturing records the lowest engagement (3.61/5.00), reflecting greater operational rigidity, limited flexibility, and relatively lower investment in employee recognition and development programmes. Banking and Finance shows the highest disengagement rate (9.4%), potentially influenced by high-pressure performance environments and limited work-life balance provisions.

5.5 Impact of Engagement Factors on Retention Intent

Factor Improvement	% Increase in Retention Intent	Correlation (r)
Leadership Effectiveness	+38%	0.74
Career Development Access	+34%	0.69
Recognition Frequency	+31%	0.65
Work-Life Balance Support	+27%	0.61
Compensation Equity	+22%	0.55
Work Environment Quality	+19%	0.51



Table V: Engagement Factor Impact on Employee Retention Intent

Leadership effectiveness improvement demonstrates the strongest association with increased retention intent (+38%), followed by career development access (+34%) and recognition frequency (+31%). All factors exhibit statistically significant positive correlations with retention intent ($r > 0.50$, $p < 0.01$), confirming that engagement factor improvement translates directly into measurable retention outcomes. The cumulative effect of addressing top three factors simultaneously would be expected to reduce voluntary turnover by an estimated 25–30% based on industry benchmark studies.

6. FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1 Key Findings

The study identifies leadership quality as the dominant employee engagement factor, rated highly influential by 84.2% of respondents with a mean score of 4.31/5.00. This finding is strongly consistent with Gallup's meta-analytic evidence that manager quality accounts for 70% of engagement score variance, confirming that investment in leadership development represents the highest-leverage engagement intervention available to organisations.

Recognition and appreciation emerged as the second-ranked engagement driver (mean 4.18/5.00), with 79.6% of respondents identifying it as highly influential on their engagement levels. Notably, recognition impact on engagement operated independent of compensation level, suggesting that acknowledgement of contribution fulfils fundamental psychological needs for belonging and esteem that monetary rewards alone cannot satisfy. Frequent, specific, and timely recognition was identified as significantly more impactful than periodic formal recognition programmes.

Career development opportunities ranked third overall (mean 4.09/5.00), with particularly strong influence among respondents aged 22–30 years (87.5% rating

it highly influential) and those with 1–3 years of tenure (91.2%). This generational pattern confirms that career growth visibility is the primary engagement and retention lever for early-career talent, representing the demographic most critical to organisational capability pipeline development.

Sector-wise analysis reveals significant engagement disparities: IT and Technology achieves the highest average engagement (4.12/5.00) and lowest disengagement (5.7%), while Manufacturing records the lowest engagement score (3.61/5.00). These differences correlate strongly with sector-level investment in flexible working, learning and development programmes, and employee recognition culture, reinforcing that engagement is substantially shaped by organisational and industry-level contextual factors in addition to individual manager behaviours.

The overall engagement distribution reveals that 30.9% of the study sample falls in moderately engaged or actively disengaged categories, representing a substantial and economically significant productivity gap. Given Gallup's estimated cost of disengagement at USD 8.8 trillion globally, even modest improvements in the 22.5% moderately engaged segment represent significant potential value recovery for participating organisations through improved productivity, reduced absenteeism, and lower voluntary turnover.

6.2 Suggestions

Organisations should prioritise investment in leadership development programmes as the primary engagement improvement strategy, given leadership's dominant influence ($r = 0.74$) on both engagement and retention. Specifically, managers should receive structured training in employee recognition best practices, coaching conversations, transparent communication, and psychological safety creation. Leadership engagement competency should be incorporated as an explicit performance management criterion with quarterly 360-degree feedback assessment.



A structured, multi-channel recognition framework should be implemented combining immediate peer-to-peer digital recognition (through platforms such as Kudos or Bonusly), monthly team recognition moments, and quarterly formal appreciation events. Recognition programmes should emphasise specificity, timeliness, and public acknowledgement of contribution rather than generic commendation, as specific behavioural recognition demonstrates 2.4 times greater engagement impact than non-specific positive feedback according to SHRM research.

Career development infrastructure should be formalised through individual development plans (IDPs) for all employees, supported by transparent internal mobility pathways, mentorship programme access, and a defined learning and development budget allocation (minimum 2% of payroll recommended by SHRM). Quarterly career development conversations between managers and team members should be mandated in performance management processes, with completion tracked as a managerial accountability metric.

Work-life balance provisions should be systematically enhanced through flexible working arrangements, clear after-hours communication boundaries, and employee wellbeing programmes covering physical, mental, and financial health dimensions. Manufacturing sector organisations in particular should investigate shift flexibility, compressed work week pilots, and remote work applicability for non-production roles to close the sector engagement gap identified in this study. Employee Assistance Programmes (EAPs) providing confidential counselling access should be considered as baseline wellbeing infrastructure.

7. CONCLUSION

This study has comprehensively investigated the factors influencing employee engagement in organisations, providing empirical evidence on the relative importance of leadership quality, recognition

practices, career development, work environment, work-life balance, and compensation equity as engagement drivers. The findings confirm that employee engagement is a multi-dimensional construct shaped by a constellation of organisational factors, with leadership quality (mean 4.31/5.00), recognition and appreciation (mean 4.18/5.00), and career development (mean 4.09/5.00) emerging as the three most influential determinants.

The engagement level distribution reveals that while 69.1% of respondents are engaged or highly engaged, a substantial 30.9% fall in moderately engaged or actively disengaged categories, representing significant unrealised organisational potential. Sector-wise analysis identifies meaningful engagement disparities between IT and Technology and Manufacturing sectors, attributable to differences in flexibility, development investment, and recognition culture, providing targeted sector-specific improvement priorities.

The strong correlations between engagement factor improvements and retention intent ($r = 0.51$ to 0.74) confirm that employee engagement management directly translates into measurable talent retention outcomes, providing a clear economic rationale for organisational investment in engagement improvement programmes. Leadership development emerges as the highest-leverage investment, consistent with Gallup's finding that manager quality accounts for 70% of engagement variance.

Organisations committed to improving employee engagement should adopt a systemic approach addressing all identified factor dimensions simultaneously, with particular emphasis on leadership capability building, structured recognition, and visible career development pathways. Such comprehensive engagement strategies are expected to yield measurable improvements in workforce productivity, voluntary turnover reduction, and ultimately, sustainable organisational performance in an increasingly competitive talent market.



8. REFERENCE

- [1] W. A. Kahn, "Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 692–724, 1990.
- [2] C. Maslach, W. B. Schaufeli, and M. P. Leiter, "Job Burnout," *Annual Review of Psychology*, vol. 52, pp. 397–422, 2001.
- [3] A. M. Saks, "Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement," *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 600–619, 2006.
- [4] Gallup Inc., "State of the American Workplace," Gallup Press, Washington D.C., 2017.
- [5] W. B. Schaufeli, A. B. Bakker, and M. Salanova, "The Measurement of Work Engagement with a Short Questionnaire: A Cross-National Study," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 701–716, 2019.
- [6] B. Shuck and K. Wollard, "Employee Engagement and HRD: A Seminal Review of the Foundations," *Human Resource Development Review*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 89–110, 2010.
- [7] J. Anitha, "Determinants of Employee Engagement and Their Impact on Employee Performance," *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 308–323, 2014.
- [8] Gallup Inc., "State of the Global Workplace 2023 Report," Gallup Press, Washington D.C., 2023.
- [9] Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), "Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement: Revitalizing a Changing Workforce," SHRM Research Report, Alexandria, VA, 2022.
- [10] D. MacLeod and N. Clarke, "Engaging for Success: Enhancing Performance through Employee Engagement," Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, London, 2009.
- [11] A. M. Saks and J. A. Gruman, "What Do We Really Know About Employee Engagement?" *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 155–182, 2014.
- [12] McKinsey & Company, "The Great Attrition is Making Hiring Harder: Are You Searching the Right Talent Pools?" *McKinsey Quarterly*, July 2022.
- [13] R. J. Vance, "Employee Engagement and Commitment: A Guide to Understanding, Measuring and Increasing Engagement in Your Organisation," SHRM Foundation, Alexandria, VA, 2006.
- [14] T. Rath and J. Harter, *Wellbeing: The Five Essential Elements*, Gallup Press, New York, 2010.
- [15] N. R. Lockwood, "Leveraging Employee Engagement for Competitive Advantage," *SHRM Research Quarterly*, vol. 1, pp. 1–12, 2007.