

# EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE IN SOME SELECTED EATERIES IN EDO STATE

Imade IDUOZEE<sup>a</sup>, Omoyebagbe R. DANIA<sup>b</sup>, Matthew IDUOZEE<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a,b,c</sup>University of Benin, Benin City.

Corresponding authors: [<sup>a</sup>Imade.iduozee@uniben.edu](mailto:Imade.iduozee@uniben.edu), [<sup>b</sup>omoyebagbe.dania@uniben.edu](mailto:omoyebagbe.dania@uniben.edu),  
[<sup>c</sup>matthewiduozee@gmail.com](mailto:matthewiduozee@gmail.com)

## Abstract

*This study examined the influence of employee engagement on organisational performance in selected eateries in Edo State. It focused on four key dimensions of employee engagement: emotional, cognitive, behavioural, and social engagement. The study's population consisted of 199 employees from the chosen eateries in Edo State. A simple random sampling technique was employed to select 133 respondents for the research. Data was collected using a structured questionnaire and analysed with both descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings revealed that emotional, cognitive, and social engagement had significant relationships with organisational performance, while behavioural engagement did not have a significant impact. Based on these results, the study recommends that the management of eateries in Edo State should regularly recognise, acknowledge, and appreciate employees' contributions and achievements. This approach will help sustain and enhance employees' emotional, cognitive, and social connections to the organisation.*

**Keywords:** Employee Engagement, Emotional Engagement, Cognitive Engagement, Behavioural Engagement, Social Engagement, Organisational Performance

## INTRODUCTION

Employee engagement has emerged as a critical priority for organisations worldwide, given its profound impact on organisational outcomes such as productivity, innovation, and retention (Bailey et al., 2017; Shuck et al., 2017). Contemporary research underscores that engaged employees contribute disproportionately to competitive advantage, prompting leaders to prioritise strategies that foster commitment and discretionary effort (Albrecht et al., 2018). In today's dynamic work environment, organisations increasingly recognise that employee performance is inextricably linked to systemic factors, such as psychological safety, meaningful work, and leadership trust (Kahn & Heaphy, 2014; Saks, 2022). Consequently, managers are urged to adopt evidence-based practices that align employee well-being with organisational goals.

Employee engagement is a psychological state characterized by employees' full involvement and commitment to their work, marked by vigour, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, 2018; Bailey et al., 2017). Building on foundational work, contemporary scholars define engagement as the emotional, cognitive, and behavioural alignment with one's role, enabling individuals to invest their full selves into their tasks (Kwon & Kim, 2020; Saks, 2022). This multidimensional state drives both individual and organisational performance, as employees who are emotionally, cognitively, and behaviourally engaged demonstrate higher productivity, creativity, and loyalty (Albrecht et al., 2018). In today's volatile work landscape, organisations that foster high engagement levels report significant advantages, including reduced turnover, increased innovation, stronger customer satisfaction, and improved financial performance — all of which are critical for long-term sustainability (Gallup, 2023; Deci et al., 2017). Moreover, engaged employees experience greater well-being, as engagement is increasingly tied to autonomy, mastery, and purpose (Van den Broeck et al., 2021). To harness these benefits, organisational leaders must prioritise strategies that align engagement initiatives with systemic factors such as inclusive leadership, psychological safety, and meaningful recognition (Kahn & Katz, 2021; Shuck et al., 2017).

Organisational performance reflects an organisation's ability to achieve strategic objectives, optimize productivity, allocate resources efficiently, and adapt to evolving customer and market demands (Saeed et al., 2023; Gallup, 2023). It encompasses not only financial outcomes but also improvements in internal processes, stakeholder satisfaction, and long-term sustainability (De Smet et al., 2021). Effective leadership is pivotal to this process, as leaders shape workplace cultures that directly influence employee behaviours, mind-sets, and motivation, fostering alignment with organisational goals (Edmondson, 2018; Bailey et al.,

2021). By prioritising practices such as psychological safety, transparent communication, and equitable recognition, leaders cultivate environments where employees feel empowered to contribute meaningfully, driving innovation and operational excellence (Kahn & Katz, 2021; McCauley et al., 2022). The research underscores that organisations with agile, people-centred leadership consistently outperform peers in metrics such as retention, customer loyalty, and profitability, demonstrating the symbiotic relationship between employee commitment and organisational success (Bersin, 2023; Saeed et al., 2023).

Employee engagement significantly influences organisational performance, yet research focusing on its application within eateries and restaurants in Edo State, Nigeria, remains sparse. While studies such as Riyanto et al. (2021), Vercic (2021), and Naqshbandi et al. (2024) have examined engagement across diverse industries, the unique dynamics of Edo State's food service sector—including its high-turnover workforce and customer-centric demands—are largely overlooked. This omission hinders a nuanced understanding of how engagement practices, such as emotional connection to work or collaborative team behaviours, drive outcomes like customer satisfaction and operational efficiency in this context.

A critical gap persists in elucidating how emotional, cognitive, behavioural, and social engagement dimensions collectively shape organisational performance in Edo's eateries. For instance, while emotional engagement (e.g., staff passion for culinary roles) may enhance service quality, and social engagement (e.g., teamwork in kitchens) could reduce workplace stress, these relationships remain underexplored. Current frameworks fail to address how cultural norms, informal employment structures, or leadership styles in Edo's eateries moderate these dimensions. Bridging this gap is essential to develop tailored strategies that align engagement initiatives with the sector's distinct challenges and opportunities.

Although recent studies (e.g., Susanto et al., 2023; Iskandar et al., 2023; Yousf & Khurshid, 2024) have demonstrated the broad impacts of employee engagement on outcomes such as productivity and guest satisfaction, the mechanisms linking specific engagement dimensions to organisational performance remain underexplored, particularly in Edo State's eateries. This study addresses this gap by analysing how emotional, cognitive, behavioural, and social engagement collectively and individually influences performance in this sector. The specific objectives are to:

- i. Find out if employee emotional engagement significantly influences organisational performance.

- ii. Investigate the extent to which employee cognitive engagement influences organisational performance,
- iii. Examine the significant effect of employee behavioural engagement influences organisational performance
- iv. Find out if employee social engagement significantly influences organisational performance of eateries in Edo state.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Concept of Organisational Performance**

Organisational performance has been extensively debated and defined within the realm of management studies, often reflecting the multifaceted and dynamic nature of organisations.

Organisational performance is the level of productivity and achieving organisational goals, increasing resources, meeting customer needs, and improving internal processes (Zumitzavan, 2022). It's the degree to which an organisation positions itself effectively in the market, relying on adapting corporate culture to the external environment (Conțu, 2020). Organisational performance is reflected in the actual results or outcomes of an organisation measured against its targets, combining efficiency, effectiveness, and relevance (Ahmed & Shaffiq, 2014; Jenatabadi, 2015).

Organisational performance is characterised by several critical components and elements that collectively determine its effectiveness. Financial performance remains a cornerstone, encompassing profitability, revenue growth, and return on investment (ROI), as noted by Elbaz and Haddoud (2022). Therefore, organisational performance can be conceptually framed as a comprehensive measure of an organisation's capacity to meet strategic objectives while navigating dynamic market conditions and maintaining stakeholder satisfaction.

In Nigeria, organisational success is further complicated by systemic challenges, including infrastructural gaps, currency fluctuations, and political unpredictability (World Bank, 2023). Recent studies highlight how Nigerian firms leverage hyper-localized strategies, such as community-driven innovation and AI-enabled workforce up-skilling, to counteract these barriers and foster sustainable growth (African Development Bank, 2023). Therefore, the performance of organisations in Nigeria hinges on their ability to navigate systemic challenges while leveraging internal capacities for innovation, employee engagement, and adaptability.

### **Employee Engagement**

Employee engagement is a vital concept in human resource management that refers to the emotional, cognitive, and behavioural state of being fully involved and committed to one's

work. Employee engagement has emerged as a pivotal concept in organisational research and practice, with definitions varying across scholars yet converging on the notion of employees' emotional, cognitive, and behavioural investment in their work roles. Estimo and Villanueva (2023) defined employee engagement as the strength of mental and emotional connection employees have toward their organisation, team, and work, demonstrated by high commitment, motivation, and contribution to company culture. Engaged employees are psychologically attached to organisations and involved with passion and enthusiasm for the success of their work (Sharma, 2024). Schaufeli, Salanova, González-romá, and Bakker, (2002) opined that employee engagement is a positive, fulfilling work-related state characterized by vigour, dedication, and absorption.

These definitions underscore the multifaceted nature of employee engagement, emphasizing emotional connection, intellectual investment, and active participation. Notably, these scholars converge on the central idea that engagement transcends mere job satisfaction or motivation, instead reflecting a deeper alignment between employee goals and organisational objectives. Therefore, employee engagement is a multidimensional psychological state where employees experience a deep emotional connection, cognitive focus, and proactive behavioural commitment to their work, team, and organisational goals.

### **Dimensions of Employee Engagement**

**Emotional engagement** is a spectrum of positive emotions, including enthusiasm, passion, pride, and loyalty, which inspire individuals to exceed their basic job duties (Aquino & Galvez, 2024). This emotional bond is a crucial element of overall employee engagement and significantly influences organisational culture, performance, and success (Singha, 2024). In the workplace, emotional engagement serves as a driving force behind motivation, commitment, and performance (Putra & Kudri, 2024). Organisations that cultivate a culture of emotional engagement foster a workforce that is resilient, innovative, and poised for sustained growth (Ajayi & Udeh, 2024). For eateries staff such as chefs, servers, and kitchen crews, emotional engagement is the emotional fuel that drives them to go beyond transactional tasks, transforming routine service into memorable customer experiences. Emotional engagement shapes how eateries staff interact with guests, collaborate with peers, and represent the brand.

**Cognitive Engagement:** Involves the mental investment employees make in their work, including their attention, focus, and concentration (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002). It is the involvement and stimulation experienced by employees in their work,

encompassing the degree to which individuals are intellectually challenged, stimulated, and motivated to apply their knowledge, skills, and creativity to solve problems, innovate, and contribute to organisational success (Alwaely, Zowid, Alamayreh, Almasarweh, Fraihat & AL-Derabseh, 2024). Cognitive engagement transforms eateries staff from task-doers to strategic contributors. When chefs innovate, servers anticipate needs, and managers leverage data, the eatery thrives in a competitive market. By fostering a culture of intellectual involvement—through training, autonomy, and recognition—leaders unlock staff potential and drive sustained success.

**Behavioural Engagement:** Refers to the physical and behavioural aspects of employee engagement, including employee participation, involvement, and contribution (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002). It is the degree to which employees are physically and behaviourally involved in their jobs, including their actions, behaviours, and activities (Bakker & Leiter, 2010). Behavioural engagement turns routine tasks into opportunities for excellence. When servers go the extra mile, chefs maintain standards under pressure, and teams collaborate seamlessly, eateries thrive. These observable actions are the “visible pulse” of engagement that is critical for translating employee commitment into tangible business outcomes like profitability and customer loyalty.

**Social Engagement:** Social engagement refers to the degree of interaction, collaboration, and connection among employees within an organisation, encompassing the quality of relationships, communication, and teamwork that contribute to a positive work environment (Olaniyi, Ugonna, Olaniyi, Arigbabu & Adigwe, 2024). It involves the mental investment employees make in their work, including their attention, focus, and concentration (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker 2002). It also involves the social connections and relationships employees have with their colleagues, supervisors, and organisations. In eateries, social engagement transforms individual roles into a unified force. When kitchen staff trust each other’s timing, servers collaborate instinctively, and managers nurture inclusivity, the eatery thrives as both a workplace and a business. As Gallup (2013) notes, “Employees with strong social connections at work are 7x more likely to stay engaged”—a critical advantage in high-turnover industries like hospitality.

## Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored in the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), which categorizes workplace factors into job demands (stressors like high workload and emotional strain that deplete energy) and job resources (supportive elements like autonomy and mentorship that facilitate growth). Applied to Edo State eateries, this model explains how demands and resources shape four engagement dimensions: Emotional engagement (reflecting emotional investment) is strained by demands like managing difficult guests but bolstered by resources like peer support and recognition (Chen et al., 2024). Cognitive engagement (intellectual focus) thrives with resources such as skill development opportunities and decision-making autonomy but diminishes under overwhelming, unsupported workloads (Rasool et al., 2024). Behavioural engagement (physical participation and contribution) is sustained by resources like empowerment (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002), while Social engagement (teamwork and connection) flourishes with collaborative resources but suffers from demands like conflict (Cao et al., 2024).

The JD-R model is relevant for linking engagement to organisational performance in Edo eateries. It demonstrates that adequate job resources buffer demands, fostering engagement across all dimensions (Chen et al., 2024; Rasool et al., 2024; Harter et al., 2002; Cao et al., 2024), which drives key performance outcomes: enhanced service quality, customer satisfaction, innovation, and reduced turnover. Conversely, unmanaged demands coupled with insufficient resources trigger disengagement, leading to errors, absenteeism, and reputational damage. Thus, the model provides a clear pathway for Edo eateries: strategic investment in context-specific resources (e.g., supportive leadership aligned with Edo's collectivist culture) mitigates industry-specific demands, elevates multidimensional engagement, and ultimately optimizes operational efficiency and competitiveness.

## Empirical Review

Gede and Huluka (2024) investigated the relationship between employee engagement and organisational performance in Ethiopian public universities, employing a mixed-methods approach that combined quantitative and qualitative analyses. The study surveyed 365 academic and administrative staff across three universities, selected based on their establishment timelines, to assess how engagement dimensions—vigour (energy and resilience), dedication (emotional investment), and absorption (task immersion)—influence

institutional outcomes. All three dimensions of employee engagement (vigour, dedication, and absorption) demonstrated statistically significant and positive effects on organisational performance.

Atolagbe et al. (2024) examined how employee engagement influences organisational productivity in Abuja's hospitality industry. Employing a structured survey approach, the study gathered data from all 841 hotels in the region through comprehensive census-based sampling. Results from advanced statistical analysis demonstrated that both intellectual engagement (employees' problem-solving and innovative contributions) and social engagement (collaboration and interpersonal relationships) significantly enhanced organisational productivity. The findings emphasize the necessity of cultivating these engagement dimensions to optimize workplace efficiency and service quality. Ultimately, the study reaffirms that prioritising employee engagement strategies is vital for boosting productivity in Abuja's hospitality sector

Abubakar and Sanda (2024) explored the effects of employee engagement and psychological empowerment on job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour (voluntary workplace behaviours) within Ghana's hospitality sector, focusing on hotel employees. Their findings demonstrated that practices fostering engagement (e.g., meaningful work, supportive environments) and psychological empowerment (e.g., autonomy, competence, impact) significantly enhanced both job satisfaction and employees' willingness to engage in discretionary, organisationally beneficial actions. The study highlights the importance of cultivating empowered and engaged workforces in hotels to improve staff well-being and promote collaborative, proactive workplace cultures, ultimately driving service quality and operational success in Ghana's hospitality industry.

Chen et al. (2024) examined how psychological capital (PsyCap)—an individual's intrinsic psychological resources such as optimism, resilience, and self-efficacy—shapes nurses' job performance through problem-focused coping strategies and job engagement. The study surveyed 575 nurses in Cameroon's public healthcare system, employing advanced statistical tools (SmartPLS 4.0 and PROCESS 4.2) to analyse the interplay between these variables. Results demonstrated that PsyCap significantly enhances nurses' ability to adopt problem-focused coping mechanisms, boosts their job engagement, and directly improves job performance. Furthermore, the analysis revealed a chain mediation effect: PsyCap fosters proactive problem-solving, which strengthens engagement, ultimately leading to higher performance. These findings underscore the importance of nurturing psychological resources in healthcare workers to improve both workplace well-being and service outcomes.



Yousuf and Khurshid (2024) explored the role of employer branding in enhancing employee commitment, mediated by employee engagement, within the context of two banking institutions. Their findings demonstrated that all dimensions of employer branding (e.g., workplace culture, reputation, career development opportunities) significantly influenced employee engagement. This heightened engagement subsequently acted as a mediator, driving a positive and significant increase in organisational commitment. The study underscores the importance of strategic employer branding initiatives in fostering engaged workforces, which in turn strengthens employees' loyalty and alignment with organisational goals in the banking sector.

Susanto, Sawitri, and Suroso (2023) analysed the interplay among employee performance, job satisfaction, motivation, career development, and employee engagement within transportation and logistics firms. Their findings revealed that employee performance alone did not significantly influence job satisfaction when examined in isolation. However, when combined with motivation, career opportunities, and employee engagement, these factors collectively exerted a positive and significant impact on job satisfaction. This suggests that job satisfaction in this sector arises from a holistic interplay of workplace dynamics, rather than individual performance metrics. The study underscores the importance of adopting integrated strategies—enhancing motivation, career growth, and engagement—to foster employee satisfaction and organisational success in transportation and logistics industries.

Iskandar, Pahrijal, and Kurniawan (2023) examined the interplay of training, employee engagement, social entrepreneurship performance, sustainable business practices, and social impact within Indonesia's Micro, Small, and Medium-Sized Enterprises (MSMEs). Applying Structural Equation Modelling with Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) to data from 487 MSMEs, the study identified employee engagement and effective hiring practices as pivotal drivers of enhanced social entrepreneurship outcomes and sustainable business models. These factors were critical in fostering ethical operations and long-term resilience, highlighting their role in amplifying social impact. The findings underscore the importance of prioritising workforce engagement and strategic recruitment in MSMEs to advance sustainability and community-oriented business practices in Indonesia.

Vercic (2021) investigated the interplay between employee engagement, employer branding, perceived organisational support, and satisfaction with internal communications across 1,805 employees from 12 large corporations. The study identified strong positive correlations among all variables, with regression analysis demonstrating that employee engagement, employer branding, and perceived organisational support collectively accounted for 78.9% of the

variance in internal communication satisfaction. These findings emphasize the critical role of fostering engagement, supportive workplace practices, and strong employer branding in cultivating effective communication and a cohesive organisational culture.

Ahmed et al. (2020) explored the impact of employee engagement on organisational performance in higher education institutions, with knowledge sharing as a mediating factor. Using a quantitative approach and nonprobability convenience sampling, the researchers initially collected data via Google Forms but transitioned to physical questionnaires due to low participation rates. Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) analysis of the adapted survey responses revealed that both employee engagement and knowledge sharing directly and positively influenced organisational performance. However, knowledge sharing only partially mediated the relationship between engagement and performance, suggesting that while fostering engagement and knowledge exchange enhances institutional outcomes, other unmeasured factors may also contribute to performance dynamics. The study underscores the importance of cultivating engaged workforces and collaborative environments in academia to optimize organisational effectiveness.

Based on the identified gap in research, this study has the following hypotheses:

H0<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant relationship between employee emotional engagement and organisational performance in eateries in Edo state

H0<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant relationship between employee cognitive engagement and organisational performance in eateries in Edo state

H0<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant relationship between employee behavioural engagement and organisational performance in eateries in Edo state

H0<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant relationship between employee social engagement and organisational performance in eateries in Edo state

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study adopted a descriptive survey research design. The population of this study comprised of all the one hundred and ninety-nine (199) employees working in the six selected eateries in Edo State. These eateries are Nadia Bakery (28 employees), Reign Restaurant (34 employees), Matice (22 employees), Kilimanjaro (41 employees), Chicken Republic (46 employees), and Kada (28 employees). These eateries were chosen due to their significant workforce and strategic locations, which enhanced accessibility for data collection. The study adopted the simple random sampling technique, which allowed all units in the population to

have an equal chance of being selected. To determine the sample size for this study, the sample size determination formula by Taro Yamane (1967) was used:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where n represent the sample size

N = population of the study

e = is the sampling error which is usually 0.05

Therefore;

$$n = \frac{199}{1 + 199(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{199}{1 + 199(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{199}{1 + 0.4975}$$

$$n = \frac{199}{1.4975}$$

$$n = \underline{\underline{133}}$$

However, to determine the exact number of questionnaires distributed to employees of the various eateries, a simple proportion formula was adopted:  $\frac{P}{N} \times \frac{n}{1}$

Where;

P = eateries employees Population

N= total population

n= sample size

Therefore

$$\text{Nadia Bakery} = \frac{28}{199} \times \frac{133}{1} = \underline{\underline{19}}$$

$$\text{Reign Restaurant} = \frac{34}{199} \times \frac{133}{1} = \underline{\underline{23}}$$

$$\text{MatIce} = \frac{22}{199} \times \frac{133}{1} = \underline{\underline{15}}$$

$$\text{Kilimanjaro} = \frac{41}{199} \times \frac{133}{1} = \underline{\underline{27}}$$

$$\text{Chicken Republic} = \frac{46}{199} \times \frac{133}{1} = \underline{\underline{31}}$$

$$\text{Kada} = \frac{28}{199} \times \frac{133}{1} = \underline{\underline{19}}$$

This study employed a structured questionnaire for data collection, which was validated by three human resource management experts to ensure its appropriateness and relevance. Furthermore, the instrument demonstrated strong internal consistency reliability, as evidenced by a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.80, confirming its suitability for use in the research. The

study analysed questionnaire data using both descriptive statistics (to examine demographic variables and research questions) and inferential statistics, specifically multiple regression (to test the hypotheses). All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS Version 24

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Demographic Profile of the Respondents

**Table 2: Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

S/NO	Demographic Variables	Categories	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
1	Gender	Male	72	54.1%
		Female	61	45.9%
		<b>Total</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>100%</b>
2	Marital Status	Single	58	43.6%
		Married	49	36.8%
		Others	26	19.6%
		<b>Total</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Source: Researcher's Fieldwork (2025)**

**Gender:** The gender distribution among respondents shows a slightly higher representation of males (54.1%) compared to females (45.9%).

#### **Marital Status:**

The marital status of respondents reveals that 43.6% are single, 36.8% are married, and 19.6% fall into the "Others" category, which may include divorced, widowed, or separated individuals.

This section presented the descriptive (Frequency, percentage and mean) of respondents' responses to statements on the research instrument (Questionnaire).

**Table 3: Employee Emotional Engagement**

S/N	ITEM	SA (5) f/(%)	A (4) f/(%)	N (3) f/(%)	D (2) f/(%)	SD (1) f/(%)	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )
3	I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organisation.	36 (27.1%)	69 (51.9%)	18 (13.5%)	8 (6.0%)	2 (1.5%)	3.96
4	I am proud to work for my organisation.	48 (36.1%)	53 (39.8%)	13 (9.8%)	18 (13.5%)	1 (0.8%)	3.97
5	I feel emotionally connected to my work.	60 (45.1%)	47 (35.3%)	14 (10.5%)	10 (7.5%)	2 (1.5%)	4.15
6	My work gives me a sense of purpose and meaning.	46 (34.6%)	57 (42.9%)	14 (10.5%)	13 (9.8%)	3 (2.3%)	3.97

<b>Average</b>	<b>47.5</b> <b>(35.7%)</b>	<b>56.5</b> <b>(42.5%)</b>	<b>14.8</b> <b>(11.1%)</b>	<b>12.3</b> <b>(9.2%)</b>	<b>2.0</b> <b>(1.5%)</b>	<b>4.01</b>
----------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------

**Source: Researcher's Fieldwork (2025)**

The data in Table 3 provide insight into employee emotional engagement based on four key statements. A considerable proportion of employees feel a strong sense of belonging to the organisation, as 27.1% strongly agree and 51.9% agree, resulting in a mean score of 3.96. I am proud to work for my organisation with 36.1% who strongly agree and 39.8% who agree, while 9.8% remain neutral, 13.5% disagree, and 0.8% strongly disagrees, leading to a mean of 3.97. Employee feel emotionally connected to their work, as reflected by 45.1% who strongly agree and 35.3% who agree, whereas 10.5% remain neutral, 7.5% disagree, and 1.5% strongly disagrees, producing the highest mean score of 4.15. Additionally, 34.6% strongly agree and 42.9% agree that My work gives me a sense of purpose and meaning, while 10.5% remain neutral, 9.8% disagree, and 2.3% strongly disagree, with a mean of 3.97. The overall average across all statements shows that 35.7% strongly agree, 42.5% agree, 11.1% remain neutral, 9.2% disagree, and 1.5% strongly disagree, with a final mean of 4.01. These results indicate that while the majority of employees demonstrate a strong sense of belonging and emotionally connected to the organisation, a smaller segment remains neutral or expresses varying levels of disagreement.

**Table 4: Employee Cognitive Engagement**

<b>S/N</b>	<b>ITEM</b>	<b>SA (5)</b> <b>f/(%)</b>	<b>A (4)</b> <b>f/(%)</b>	<b>N (3)</b> <b>f/(%)</b>	<b>D (2)</b> <b>f/(%)</b>	<b>SD (1)</b> <b>f/(%)</b>	<b>Mean</b> <b>(<math>\bar{x}</math>)</b>
7	I feel mentally stimulated by my work.	41 (30.8%)	55 (41.4%)	15 (11.3%)	22 (16.5%)	0 (0.0%)	3.86
8	I am able to concentrate on my work without distractions.	48 (36.1%)	57 (42.9%)	10 (7.5%)	18 (13.5%)	0 (0.0%)	4.02
9	I am satisfied with the level of cognitive challenge in my work.	53 (39.8%)	47 (35.3%)	15 (11.3%)	16 (12.0%)	2 (1.5%)	4.00
10	I prioritise my work effectively to meet deadlines.	46 (34.6%)	65 (48.9%)	11 (8.3%)	10 (7.5%)	1 (0.8%)	4.09
11	Stay focused on my tasks and responsibilities.	50 (37.6%)	56 (42.1%)	13 (9.8%)	12 (9.0%)	2 (1.5%)	4.05
<b>Average</b>		<b>47.6</b> <b>(35.8%)</b>	<b>56.0</b> <b>(42.1%)</b>	<b>12.8</b> <b>(9.6%)</b>	<b>15.6</b> <b>(11.7%)</b>	<b>1.0</b> <b>(0.8%)</b>	<b>4.00</b>

**Source: Researcher's Fieldwork (2025)**

The data presented in Table 4 highlights employees' cognitive engagement within the organisation. A significant proportion of employees feel mentally stimulated by their work, with 30.8% strongly agreeing and 41.4% agreeing, resulting in a mean score of 3.86. Meanwhile, 11.3% remain neutral, and 16.5% disagree. Regarding their ability to concentrate on work without distractions and the support they receive, 36.1% of employees strongly agree and 42.9% agree, leading to a mean score of 4.02. When it comes to satisfaction with the level of cognitive challenge in their work, 39.8% strongly agree and 35.3% agree, while 11.3% remain neutral, 12.0% disagree, and 1.5% strongly disagree, resulting in a mean of 4.00. In terms of prioritising work effectively to meet deadlines, there is strong affirmation, with 34.6% strongly agreeing and 48.9% agreeing. Here, 8.3% remain neutral, 7.5% disagree, and 0.8% strongly disagree, which yields the highest mean of 4.09. Additionally, 37.6% of employees strongly agree that they stay focused on their tasks and responsibilities, with 42.1% agreeing. In this case, 9.8% remain neutral, 9.0% disagree, and 1.5% strongly disagree, resulting in a mean of 4.05. Overall, the average across all five statements reveals that 35.8% strongly agree, 42.1% agree, 9.6% remain neutral, 11.7% disagree, and 0.8% strongly disagree, yielding a final mean of 4.00. These findings suggest that while most employees feel mentally engaged with their organisations, a smaller proportion remain neutral or express concerns about their level of cognitive engagement.

**Table 5: Employee Behavioural Engagement**

S/N	ITEM	SA (5) f/(%)	A (4) f/(%)	N (3) f/(%)	D (2) f/(%)	SD (1) f/(%)	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )
12	I actively participate in team meetings and discussions.	50 (37.6%)	57 (42.9%)	14 (10.5%)	8 (6.0%)	4 (3.0%)	4.06
13	I persist in the face of challenges and obstacles.	41 (30.8%)	67 (50.4%)	18 (13.5%)	7 (5.3%)	0 (0.0%)	4.07
14	I follow organisational policies and procedures.	48 (36.1%)	54 (40.6%)	16 (12.0%)	14 (10.5%)	1 (0.8%)	4.01
15	I contribute to decision-making processes.	41 (30.8%)	62 (46.6%)	19 (14.3%)	11 (8.3%)	0 (0.0%)	4.00
16	I work effectively with my colleagues expectations.	46 (34.6%)	57 (42.9%)	19 (14.3%)	8 (6.0%)	3 (2.3%)	4.02
<b>Average</b>		<b>45.2 (33.9%)</b>	<b>59.4 (44.7%)</b>	<b>17.2 (12.9%)</b>	<b>9.6 (7.2%)</b>	<b>1.6 (1.2%)</b>	<b>4.03</b>

Source: Researcher's Fieldwork (2025)

The findings presented in Table 5 highlight employees' perceptions of their behavioural engagement within the organisation. A significant portion of employees actively participates in team meetings and discussions, with 37.6% strongly agreeing and 42.9% agreeing with this statement. Meanwhile, 10.5% remain neutral, 6.0% disagree, and 3.0% strongly disagree, resulting in a mean score of 4.06. Furthermore, employees indicate they remain persistent when faced with challenges and obstacles, with 30.8% strongly agreeing and 50.4% agreeing. In this case, 13.5% are neutral, and 5.3% express disagreement, leading to a mean score of 4.07. In terms of adherence to organisational policies and procedures, respondents show agreement, with 36.1% strongly agreeing and 40.6% agreeing. Here, 12.0% remain neutral, while 10.5% disagree and 0.8% strongly disagree, resulting in a mean score of 4.01. When it comes to contributions to decision-making processes, 30.8% of employees strongly agree, and 46.6% agree that decisions are influenced by employee performance and contributions. However, 14.3% are neutral, and 8.3% disagree, culminating in a mean score of 4.00. Moreover, 34.6% strongly agree and 42.9% agree that they effectively meet their colleagues' expectations, with 14.3% remaining neutral, 6.0% disagreeing, and 2.3% strongly disagreeing, resulting in a mean of 4.02. Overall, the averages across all five statements indicate that 33.9% strongly agree, 44.7% agree, 12.9% remain neutral, 7.2% disagree, and 1.2% strongly disagree, culminating in an overall mean of 4.03. These findings suggest that while a majority of employees perceive their behavioural engagement as satisfactory and performance-driven, smaller percentage exhibit neutrality or express concerns about its consistency.

**Table 6: Employee Social Engagement**

S/N	ITEM	SA (5) f/(%)	A (4) f/(%)	N (3) f/(%)	D (2) f/(%)	SD (1) f/(%)	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )
17	I regularly interact with my colleagues outside of work.	51 (38.3%)	61 (45.9%)	15 (11.3%)	4 (3.0%)	2 (1.5%)	4.16
18	I feel connected to my organisation's culture and values.	54 (40.6%)	57 (42.9%)	16 (12.0%)	6 (4.5%)	0 (0.0%)	4.19
19	I work effectively with my colleagues to achieve common goals.	48 (36.1%)	52 (39.1%)	21 (15.8%)	11 (8.3%)	1 (0.8%)	4.02
20	I receive support and guidance from my manager and colleagues.	56 (42.1%)	64 (48.1%)	10 (7.5%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.3%)	4.28
21	I have a sense of trust and respect for my colleagues	54 (40.6%)	58 (43.6%)	16 (12.0%)	4 (3.0%)	1 (0.8%)	4.20
<b>Average</b>		<b>52.6 (39.5%)</b>	<b>58.4 (43.9%)</b>	<b>15.6 (11.7%)</b>	<b>5.0 (3.8%)</b>	<b>1.4 (1.1%)</b>	<b>4.17</b>

**Source: Researcher's Fieldwork (2025)**

The data in Table 6 illustrate employees' perceptions of social engagement in the workplace. A majority of employees regularly interact with their colleagues outside of work, with 38.3% strongly agreeing and 45.9% agreeing with this statement. In contrast, 11.3% remain neutral, 3.0% disagree, and 1.5% strongly disagrees, resulting in a mean score of 4.16. When asked about their connection to the organisation's culture and values, 40.6% strongly agree, and 42.9% agree, while 12.0% are neutral and 4.5% disagree. This yields a mean score of 4.19. Regarding collaboration and receiving support to achieve common goals, 36.1% strongly agree and 39.1% agree, but 15.8% are neutral, 8.3% disagree, and 0.8% strongly disagree, resulting in a mean of 4.02. For the statement regarding support and guidance from managers and colleagues, 42.1% strongly agree and 48.1% agree, with 7.5% remaining neutral, none disagreeing, and 2.3% strongly disagreeing. This statement received the highest mean score of 4.28. Furthermore, 40.6% strongly agree and 43.6% agree that they feel a sense of trust and respect for their colleagues, while 12.0% remain neutral, 3.0% disagree, and 0.8% strongly disagree. This results in a mean score of 4.20. The overall average across all five statements shows that 39.5% strongly agree, 43.9% agree, 11.7% remain neutral, 3.8% disagree, and 1.1% strongly disagree, leading to a final mean score of 4.17. These findings suggest that employees



generally perceive a high level of social engagement within their organisation, although a small proportion remains uncertain or express concerns in this regard.

**Table 7: Organisational Performance**

S/N	ITEM	SA (5) f/(%)	A (4) f/(%)	N (3) f/(%)	D (2) f/(%)	SD (1) f/(%)	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )
22	The organisation consistently meets its performance goals and targets.	62 (46.6%)	56 (42.1%)	10 (7.5%)	3 (2.3%)	2 (1.5%)	4.30
23	Customers are generally satisfied with the quality of food and service provided.	52 (39.1%)	58 (43.6%)	17 (12.8%)	6 (4.5%)	0 (0.0%)	4.17
24	The organisation maintains a positive reputation within the industry and among customers.	69 (51.9%)	50 (37.6%)	8 (6.0%)	4 (3.0%)	2 (1.5%)	4.36
25	Employee productivity contributes significantly to the overall success of the business.	61 (45.9%)	55 (41.4%)	10 (7.5%)	6 (4.5%)	1 (0.8%)	4.27
26	Service delivery is efficient, with minimal delays in food preparation and customer service.	66 (49.6%)	52 (39.1%)	13 (9.8%)	2 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)	4.37
Average		62.0 (46.6%)	54.2 (40.7%)	11.6 (8.7%)	4.2 (3.2%)	1.0 (0.8%)	4.29

**Source: Researcher's Fieldwork (2025)**

The data in Table 7 provide insight into employees' perceptions of organisational performance. A majority of employees believe that the organisation consistently meets its performance goals and targets, as 46.6% strongly agree and 42.1% agree, while 7.5% remain neutral, 2.3% disagree, and 1.5% strongly disagree, resulting in a mean score of 4.30. Customer satisfaction with the quality of food and service is also perceived positively, with 39.1% who strongly agree and 43.6% who agree, whereas 12.8% remain neutral and 4.5% disagree, leading to a mean of 4.17. The organisation's reputation within the industry and among customers is viewed favourably, with 51.9% who strongly agree and 37.6% who agree, while 6.0% remain neutral, 3.0% disagree, and 1.5% strongly disagree, producing the highest mean score of 4.36. Employee productivity is considered a significant factor in the organisation's overall success, as 45.9% strongly agree and 41.4% agree, while 7.5% remain neutral, 4.5% disagree, and 0.8%

strongly disagree, leading to a mean of 4.27. Additionally, 49.6% strongly agree and 39.1% agree that service delivery is efficient, with minimal delays in food preparation and customer service, while 9.8% remain neutral and 1.5% disagree, yielding the highest mean of 4.37. The overall average across all five statements shows that 46.6% strongly agree, 40.7% agree, 8.7% remain neutral, 3.2% disagree, and 0.8% strongly disagree, with a final mean of 4.29. These findings suggest that employees perceive the organisation as performing well; meeting its goals, maintaining a strong reputation, ensuring customer satisfaction, and emphasizing efficiency, though a small percentage remain uncertain or express mild concerns in some areas.

### Regression Analysis and Interpretation

Regression analysis model was estimated to establish the relationship between employee engagement and organisational performance. Specifically, employee engagement dimensions used for the study include emotion, cognitive, behavioural and social engagement. The results are shown in Tables 7 to 9:

**Table 7: Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig.F Change	
1	.767 <sup>a</sup>	.588	.575	.41771	.588	45.664	4	128	.000	2.067

a. Predictors: (Constant), EEE, ECE, EBE, ESE

b. Dependent Variable: ORGP

**Source: Field Survey (2025)**

The model summary in Table 7 demonstrates that the independent variables - employee emotional, cognitive, behavioural and social engagement collectively have a strong and significant impact on organisational Performance. The model yields an R value of .767, indicating a strong positive correlation between the predictors and the dependent variable. The R Square value of .588 reveals that approximately 58.8% of the variance in organisational performance can be explained by these four predictors, while the Adjusted R Square of .575 accounts for the number of predictors, suggesting a robust model fit. The F-statistic of 45.664 ( $p < .001$ ) confirms the overall model is statistically significant, indicating that the predictors reliably explain changes in organisational performance. The Durbin-Watson value of 2.067 falls within the acceptable range (1.5–2.5), suggesting no significant autocorrelation in the residuals, thereby affirming the model's validity.

**Table 8: Organisational performance ANOVA<sup>a</sup> results**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	31.870	4	7.968	45.664	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	22.334	128	.174		
	Total	54.204	132			

a. Dependent Variable: ORGP

b. Predictors: (Constant), EEE, ECE, EBE, ESE

The F-statistic of 43.664 is significant at  $p < 0.05$ . This means that there is a statistically significant relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables as a group.

**Table 9: Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	.859	.286		3.005	.003	.293	1.425		
EEE	.192	.066	.246	2.915	.004	-.321	-.062	.452	2.213
ECE	.285	.092	.318	3.113	.002	.104	.467	.309	3.237
EBE	.050	.086	.050	.583	.561	-.220	.120	.443	2.259
ESE	.759	.074	.723	10.231	.000	.612	.906	.645	1.550

a. Dependent Variable: ORGP

The results in Table 9 reveal that organisational performance is positively and significantly related to emotional, cognitive and social engagement but not significantly related to behavioural engagement. The details of the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables are shown as follows: organisational performance and employee emotional engagement ( $\beta = 0.192$ ;  $t = 2.915$ ;  $p = 0.004$ ); organisational performance and employee cognitive engagement ( $\beta = 0.285$ ;  $t = 3.113$ ;  $p = 0.002$ ); organisational performance and employee behavioural engagement ( $\beta = 0.050$ ;  $t = 0.583$ ;  $p = 0.561$ ); organisational performance and employee social engagement ( $\beta = 0.759$ ;  $t = 10.231$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ).

## Hypothesis Testing

### Hypothesis one

*There is no significant relationship between employee emotional engagement and organisational performance*

From the result in Table 9, it shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between employee emotional engagement ( $\beta = 0.192$ ;  $t = 2.915$ ;  $p = 0.004$ ) and organisational performance. Based on the result, the null hypothesis is rejected. It is therefore concluded that employee emotional engagement has a significant relationship with organisational performance of selected eateries in Edo state.

### **Hypothesis Two**

*There is no significant relationship between employee cognitive engagement and organisational performance*

From the result in Table 9, it shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between employee cognitive engagement ( $\beta = 0.285$ ;  $t = 3.113$ ;  $p = 0.002$ ) and organisational performance. Based on the result, the null hypothesis is rejected. It is therefore concluded that employee cognitive engagement has a significant relationship with organisational performance of selected eateries in Edo state.

### **Hypothesis Three**

*There is no significant relationship between employee behavioural engagement and organisational performance*

From the result in Table 9, it shows that there is no significant relationship between employee behavioural engagement ( $\beta = 0.050$ ;  $t = 0.583$ ;  $p = 0.561$ ) and organisational performance. Based on the result, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is therefore concluded that employee behavioural engagement has no significant relationship with organisational performance of selected eateries in Edo state.

### **Hypothesis Four**

*There is no significant relationship between employee social engagement and organisational performance*

From the result in Table 9, it shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between employee social engagement ( $\beta = 0.759$ ;  $t = 10.231$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ) and organisational performance. Based on the result, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is therefore concluded that employee social engagement has a significant relationship with organisational performance of selected eateries in Edo state.

### **Discussion of Finding**

The regression analyses revealed a significant relationship between employee emotional engagement and organisational performance in selected eateries in Edo State ( $\beta = 0.192$ ;  $t = 2.915$ ;  $p = 0.004$ ). This finding underscores the crucial role that emotional engagement—an essential element of employee engagement—plays in influencing the performance of these

establishments. When employees feel a strong emotional connection to their roles, the tasks they undertake, their management, and the organisation as a whole, it cultivates a sense of fulfilment, enhances their morale, reduces turnover, and ultimately improves overall performance. This finding is consistent with the research conducted by Atolagbe, Abdullahi, Ibrahim, Filani, and Gambo (2024), which similarly identified a significant connection between employee emotional engagement and organisational performance within the hospitality sector in Abuja. Furthermore, this study aligns with the findings of Chen, Kewou, Atingabili, Sogbo, and Tcheudjeu (2024), who established a significant relationship between psychological capital and organisational performance in the public health sector in Cameroon. Also, the study agrees with the finding of Abubakar and Sanda (2024) who found a significant relationship between employee engagement and psychological empowerment on job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour within Ghana's hospitality sector,

Secondly, this study revealed that there is a significant relationship between employee cognitive engagement and organisational performance of eateries in Edo state ( $\beta = 0.285$ ;  $t = 3.113$ ;  $p = 0.002$ ). This means employee cognitive engagement is a strong factor that influences the organisational performance of employees at the selected eateries in Edo state. This also implies that when employees evaluate the amount of mental input that they have invested to achieve the organisations and mission and what they would lose if they decided to leave the organisation, they would be more commitment to the organisation and this influences the overall organisational performance. This finding agrees with the findings of Gede and Huluka (2024) who found significant relationship between employee engagement and organisational performance in Ethiopian public universities. In the same vein, this study corroborates the finding of Ahmed, Khan, Thitivesa, Siraphatthada, and Phumdara (2020) who found significant and positive impacts of employee engagement and knowledge sharing on organisational performance in higher institutions

Thirdly, this study revealed that there is no significant relationship between employee behavioural engagement and the organisational performance of selected eateries in Edo state ( $\beta = 0.050$ ;  $t = 0.583$ ;  $p = 0.561$ ). This implies that behavioural engagement has no significant influence on the organisational performance of selected eateries in Edo state. This may be as a result of employee's perception that their leaders do not care about their wellbeing and that they are not adequately involve in decision making especially when the operations of the organisations are based on predetermined decisions of the top managers. This study's finding contradicts recent research by Yousuf and Khurshid (2024), which identified a significant positive relationship between behavioural engagement (e.g., task compliance) and

organisational performance. Similarly, it diverges from Susanto, Sawitri, and Suroso (2023), who concluded that flexible work arrangements indirectly enhance job performance by boosting work engagement. The discrepancies may stem from contextual differences, such as variations in industry focus (e.g., service vs. manufacturing)

Finally, this study revealed a significant relationship between employee social engagement and the organisational performance of selected eateries in Edo state ( $\beta = 0.759$ ;  $t = 10.231$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ). This implies that when employees are socially engaging with their colleagues, supervisors and managers at workplace, it would motivate them to give their best in performing their task which has a significant influence on their organisational performance. Also, when employees are constantly socializing and interaction with each other in the organisation, it creates a sense of cooperation and unity of purpose which is capable of improving organisational performance. This finding agrees with the findings of Iskandar, Pahrijal, and Kurniawan (2023) who found that employee social engagement positively influences entrepreneurship performance and sustainable business practices. Also, the finding of this study aligns with the findings Vercic (2021) who found a significant and positive relationship between employee social engagement, employer brand, and organisational performance of twelve large corporations in Slovenia.

## CONCLUSION

This study was an investigation of the relationship between employee engagement and organisational performance of selected eateries in Edo state. The objectives of this study were to: find out if employee emotional engagement significantly influences organisational performance, investigate the extent to which employee cognitive engagement influences organisational performance, examine if employee behavioural engagement significantly influences organisational performance and to find out if employee social engagement significantly influences organisational performance. The findings showed that employee emotional, cognitive and social engagement had significant relationship organisational performance; however, the findings also revealed that employee behavioural engagement had no significant relationship with organisational performance

## Recommendations

Based on the empirical findings, we recommend the following:

- i. The management of eateries in Edo State should regularly recognise, acknowledge, and appreciate employees' contributions and achievements. They should offer meaningful

and relevant rewards and incentives, as this will help sustain and enhance employees' emotional attachment to the organisation.

- ii. Given that employee cognitive engagement has a significant relationship with organisational performance; management should assign achievable tasks that align with employees' interests and values, allowing them to utilise their skills and expertise. This approach will increase their performance levels and improve overall organisational outcomes.
- iii. Since employee social engagement influences organisational performance, management of eateries should foster a culture of establishing Employee Resource Groups (ERGs) to support diversity, equity, and inclusion. These groups can encourage collaboration and communication among team members.

### **Implication and Contribution to Knowledge**

This study makes vital contributions by addressing gaps in the existing literature on employee engagement and organisational performance of eateries. The study's core implication is that not all dimensions of employee engagement equally drive organisational performance in Edo State eateries. While emotional, cognitive and social engagement show significant positive relationships with performance, behavioural engagement does not. This challenges the assumption that simply ensuring employees exhibit the correct observable behaviours is sufficient for optimal performance.

Furthermore, to enhance organisational performance, Edo State eateries must actively cultivate emotional, cognitive, and social engagement. This means management should prioritise fostering positive emotions like enthusiasm, passion, and a sense of value among employees, creating a supportive environment that boosts morale and well-being. Simultaneously, they need to stimulate cognitive engagement by encouraging mental investment, focus, problem-solving, innovation, and understanding the purpose behind work, providing opportunities for learning and mental challenge. In addition, it is crucial to build strong social engagement by promoting effective teamwork, collaboration, mutual support, positive communication, and a genuine sense of belonging among staff, strengthening the social fabric of the workplace. Focusing resources and strategies on these three interconnected dimensions – the heart (emotional), the mind (cognitive), and social connections – is key to unlocking significant performance gains.

In conclusion, the study enhances engagement theory by questioning the universal relevance of all engagement dimensions, particularly in informal settings. It underscores the critical role

of contextual factors, demonstrating that in Nigeria's community-oriented, interaction-heavy hospitality sector, relational (social) and intrinsic (emotional/cognitive) drivers are more impactful than extrinsic behaviours like task compliance. This finding refines frameworks such as the JD-R model by highlighting cultural and industry-specific dynamics. By revealing that behavioural engagement lacks significance in eateries—contrary to formal sector findings—the research advocates for flexible, context-driven engagement approaches.

### **Suggestions for further studies**

Future research should replicate this study in other Nigerian states (e.g., Lagos, Kano) or West African countries. This is crucial to determine if the non-significant relationship between behavioural engagement and performance is unique to Edo State's specific socio-economic, cultural, or business environment, or if it represents a broader pattern within the Nigerian SME eatery sector. Comparing results across different contexts would highlight the role of location-specific factors.

### **References**

- Abubakar, A., & Sanda, B. (2024). The impact of employee engagement and psychological empowerment on job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behavior in Ghana's hospitality sector. *African Journal of Management Research*, 12(3), 45-60
- African Development Bank. (2023). *African economic outlook 2023: Mobilizing private sector financing for climate and green growth*. <https://www.afdb.org>
- Ahmed, M., & Shafiq, S. (2014). The Impact of Organisational Culture on Organisational Performance: A Case Study of the Telecom Sector. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: Administration and Management*, 14(1) 21-30.
- Ahmed, T., Khan, M. S., Thitivesa, D., Siraphatthada, Y., & Phumdara, T. (2020). Impact of employees engagement and knowledge sharing on organisational performance: Study of HR challenges in COVID-19 pandemic. *Human Systems Management*, 39(4), 589-601
- Ajayi, F. A., & Udeh, C. A. (2024). Agile Work Cultures In It: A Conceptual Analysis Of Hr's Role In Fostering Innovation Supply Chain. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, 6(4), 1138-1156.
- Albrecht, S. L., Breidahl, E., & Marty, A. (2018). Organisational resources, organisational engagement climate, and employee engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 27(1), 67–78. .
- Alwaely, S., Zowid, F., Alamayreh, E., Almasarweh, M., Fraihat, B., & AL-Derabseh, R. (2024). The relationship between transformational leadership and employee creativity: The mediating role of empowerment. *Uncertain Supply Chain Management*, 12(3), 1755-1768



- Aquino, N., & Galvez, D. (2024). Two-Factor Theory Model Testing: A Case of the Department of Foreign Affairs Employees. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 17(6), 565-586.
- Atolagbe E.B., Abdullahi F., Ibrahim W.U., Filani P.A., Gambo N. (2024) Employee Engagement and Organisational Productivity of Hospitality Sector in Abuja, *International Journal of Business and Management Review*, 12 (6), 57-79
- Bailey, C., & Aguinis, H. (2022). Ambidextrous leadership: Navigating innovation and efficiency in turbulent markets. *Academy of Management Review*, 47(4), 567–584.
- Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2017). The meaning, antecedents, and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(3), 155–175. .
- Bailey, C., Mankin, D., Kelliher, C., & Garavan, T. (2021). *Strategic human resource management* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Bakker, A. B., & Leiter, M. P. (Eds.). (2010). *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*. New York: Psychology Press
- Bersin, J. (2023). *The disruption of work: How AI, skills, and sustainability will redefine HR*. Deloitte Insights.
- Cao, F., Li, H., Chen, X., You, Y., & Xue, Y. (2024). Who matters and why? The contributions of different sources of social support to doctoral students' academic engagement. *European Journal of Education*, e12649
- Chen, H., Kewou, N. Y. N., Atingabili, S., Sogbo, A., & Tcheudjeu, L. (2024). The impact of psychological capital on nurses' job performance: A chain mediation analysis of problem-focused coping and job engagement. *BMC Nursing*, 23, 149
- Conțu, E. G. (2020). Organisational performance – Theoretical and practical approaches; Study on students' perceptions. *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Business Excellence* (pp. 398–406).
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- De Smet, A., Dowling, B., & Mugayar-Baldocchi, M. (2023). *The future of organisational performance: A blueprint for resilience*. McKinsey & Company.
- De Smet, A., Dowling, B., Mugayar-Baldocchi, M., & Schaninger, B. (2021). *The new possible: How HR can help build the organisation of the future*. McKinsey & Company.

- Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organisations: The state of a science. *Annual Review of Organisational Psychology and Organisational Behavior*, 4, 19–43.
- Edmondson, A. C. (2018). *The fearless organisation: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. Wiley.
- Elbaz, A. M., & Haddoud, M. Y. (2022). The role of leadership in shaping organisational resilience: Evidence from SMEs in emerging markets. *Journal of Business Research*, 145, 1–12.
- Estimo, E.T., & Villanueva, M.J.C. (2023). Employees' work engagement before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(1), 13–22.
- Gallup. (2023). *State of the global workplace: 2023 report*. Gallup Press.
- Gede, D. U., & Huluka, A. T. (2024). Effects of employee engagement on organisational performance: case of public universities in Ethiopia. *Future Business Journal*, 10(1), 1-15
- 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
- Iskandar, Y., Pahrijal, R., & Kurniawan, K. (2023). Sustainable HR Practices in Indonesian MSMEs from a Social Entrepreneurship Perspective: Training, Recruitment, Employee Engagement, Social Impact of Local Communities. *International Journal of Business, Law, and Education*, 4(2), 904 - 925.
- Jenatabadi, H. S. (2015). An Overview of Organisational Performance Index: Definitions and Measurements. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2599439>
- Kahn, W. A., & Heaphy, E. D. (2014). Relational contexts of personal engagement at work. In C. Truss, R. Delbridge, K. Alfes, A. Shantz, & E. Soane (Eds.), *Employee engagement in theory and practice* (pp. 82–96). Routledge.
- Kahn, W. A., & Katz, R. N. (2021). Leadership, meaningful work, and engagement: Cultivating employee thriving in uncertain times. *Organisational Dynamics*, 50(3), 100849.
- Khan, K. A., Ma, F., Akbar, M. A., Islam, M. S., Ali, M., & Noor, S. (2024). Reverse Logistics Practices: A Dilemma to Gain Competitive Advantage in Manufacturing Industries of Pakistan with Organisation Performance as a Mediator. *Sustainability*, 16(8), 3223.
- Kwon, K., & Kim, T. (2020). An integrative literature review of employee engagement and innovative behavior: Revisiting the JD-R model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(2), 100704.

- McCauley, C., DeRue, D. S., & Yost, P. R. (2023). Leadership agility in the digital age: A meta-analysis of adaptive practices. *Journal of Management Studies*, 60(2), 345–372.
- McCauley, C., DeRue, D. S., Yost, P. R., & Taylor, S. (2022). *Experience-driven leader development: Models, tools, best practices, and advice for on-the-job development*. Wiley.
- Naqshbandi, M. M., Kabir, I., Ishak, N. A., & Islam, M. Z. (2024). The future of work: work engagement and job performance in the hybrid workplace. *The Learning Organisation*, 31(1), 5–26.
- Nwachukwu, C., & Adeleye, I. (2023). Contextual resilience in Nigerian organisations: Bridging indigenous practices and global frameworks. *African Journal of Business Management*, 17(1), 22–39.
- Okeke, M. N., Onyema, J. I., & Eze, T. C. (2024). AI-driven workforce upskilling and SME resilience in Nigeria. *African Journal of Management*, 12(3), 45–67.
- Olaniyi, O. O., Ugonna, J. C., Olaniyi, F. G., Arigbabu, A. T., & Adigwe, C. S. (2024). Digital collaborative tools, strategic communication, and social capital: Unveiling the impact of digital transformation on organisational dynamics. *Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science*, 17(5), 140-156.
- Putra, R., & Kudri, W. M. (2024). Fueling Success: Unleashing the Power of Motivation, Nurturing Work Environments, and Cultivating Organisational Culture for Peak Job Satisfaction and Performance. *Luxury: Landscape of Business Administration*, 2(1), 71-84.
- Rasool, S. F., Almas, T., Afzal, F., & Mohelska, H. (2024). (2024). Inclusion of JD-R Theory Perspective to Enhance Employee Engagement. *SAGE Open*, 14(1), 21582440231220207.
- Riyanto, S., Endri, E., & Herlisha, N. (2021). Effect of work motivation and job satisfaction on employee performance: Mediating role of employee engagement. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 19(3), 162-174.
- Saeed, M. A., Javed, B., & Khan, A. A. (2023). Strategic agility and organisational performance: A meta-analytic review of emerging markets. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 44(2), 177–201.
- Saks, A. M. (2022). Caring human resources management and employee engagement. *Journal of Organisational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 9(2), 180–202.
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2018). Work engagement in Europe: Relations with national economy, governance, and culture. *Organisational Dynamics*, 47(2), 99–106.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V. & Bakker, A. B. (2002), “The measurement of engagement and burnout: a two-sample confirmatory factor analytic approach,” *Journal of Happiness Studies*, (3)1, 71-92

- Shuck, B., Twyford, D., Reio, T. G., & Shuck, A. (2017). Human resource development practices and employee engagement: Examining the connection with employee turnover intentions. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 28(2), 239–271.
- Singha, S. (2024). Nurturing positive organisational climates to enhance work success: A positive psychology approach. In *Fostering organisational sustainability with positive psychology* (84–107). IGI Global.
- Susanto, P. C., Sawitri, N. N. & Suroso, S. (2023). Determinant Employee Performance and Job Satisfaction: Analysis Motivation, Path Career and Employee Engagement in Transportation and Logistics Industry. *International Journal of Business and Applied Economics*, 2(2), 257–268.
- Van den Broeck, A., Howard, J. L., Van Vaerenbergh, Y., Leroy, H., & Gagné, M. (2021). Beyond intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: A meta-analysis on self-determination theory's multidimensional conceptualization of work motivation. *Organisational Psychology Review*, 11(3), 240–273.
- Vercic, A. T. (2021). The impact of employee engagement, organisational support and employer branding on internal communication satisfaction. *Public Relations Review*, 47(1), 102009.
- World Bank. (2023). *Nigeria development update: Resilience through turbulence*. World Bank Group. <https://www.worldbank.org>
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper and Row
- Yousuf, A., & Khurshid, S. (2024). Impact of employer branding on employee commitment: employee engagement as a mediator. *Vision*, 28(1), 35-46.
- Zumitzavan, V. (2022). Strategic agility and organisational performance: A meta-analytic review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 24(2), 234–256.