

EFFECT OF EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE WITHIN HOSPITALITY FIRMS IN KADUNA NORTH LGA

¹Patience Mainaji Ageni, & ²Jamilu Muhammad PhD

¹ & ²Department Of Business Administration, Kaduna State University

¹agenipatience2@gmail.com ¹07038931581

²jamilumohdfatika@kasu.edu.ng ²07030264243

Abstract

This study investigates the effect of employee engagement on organizational performance in the hospitality sector, using selected hotels in Kaduna North Local Government Area as a case study. The research focuses on three core dimensions of employee engagement communication, intellectual engagement, and leadership and how each contributes to enhancing organizational performance. A descriptive survey research design was adopted, and data were collected from 81 respondents using structured questionnaires. The data were analyzed using regression techniques to determine the relationship between the variables. The findings revealed that all three components communication, intellectual engagement, and leadership have significant positive effects on organizational performance, with communication having the strongest influence. The study concludes that effective communication, when combined with cognitive involvement and supportive leadership, leads to higher employee motivation, innovation, and service delivery. Based on these findings, the study recommends that organizations should use communication to foster transparency and clarity, utilize intellectual engagement to encourage problem-solving and idea generation, and adopt leadership practices that are supportive and empowering.

Keywords: Employee Engagement, Communication, Intellectual Engagement, Leadership and Hospitality Industry.

Introduction

In today's rapidly evolving business landscape, organizations are increasingly recognizing the pivotal role that employee engagement plays in driving sustainable success and achieving competitive advantage. Employee engagement is crucial for organizational performance, and there are many benefits to having engaged employees. There are several benefits of employee engagement toward organizational performance such as better team performance, increased employee productivity, higher retention rates, lower turnover, and decreased burnout (Gyensare et al., 2017). Employees who lack engagement with their work are more inclined to seek alternative employment opportunities.

In the dynamic landscape of the hospitality sector, characterized by intense competition and evolving consumer preferences, the significance of employee engagement becomes even more pronounced. Engaged employees are more committed, innovative, and productive, leading to enhanced customer satisfaction and organizational performance (Arhin & Cobblah, 2024). At the world level, numerous research studies and industry reports have highlighted the pivotal role of employee engagement in driving success within the hospitality sector (Gallup, 2020). Organizations that prioritize employee well-being, satisfaction, and involvement tend to outperform their competitors in terms of profitability, guest experience, and overall business outcomes (Tuyet, Huong & Chau, 2024). From luxury hotels to boutique establishments,

fostering a culture of engagement has become a strategic imperative for sustainable growth and competitiveness (Prevolšek, Kukurin & Golja, 2024).

Given that the cost of replacing an employee ranges from half to double their annual wage, in addition to the intangible effects on worker morale and productivity, prioritizing employee engagement can result in significant cost reductions for organizations. Similarly, at the continental and country levels, research on employee engagement within the hospitality industry has gained considerable attention (Kusluvan et al., 2021). In regions like Africa, where hospitality tourism is a key economic driver, understanding the dynamics of employee engagement and its impact on organizational productivity is of paramount importance (Dávila et al., 2019). Countries such as Nigeria, with burgeoning hospitality sectors like Kaduna, are witnessing a growing emphasis on enhancing employee engagement practices to achieve operational excellence and meet the rising demands of discerning guests (Okafor, 2020).

The dimensions of employee engagement-communication, intellectual, and leadership-are intricately linked and mutually reinforcing, are forming a cohesive framework that enhances organizational effectiveness. Communication serves as the cornerstone, cultivating a sense of purpose and commitment among employees, which is essential for fostering a positive work environment (Putra, Kusumawati & Kartikasari, 2024). Intellectual engagement empowers individuals to apply their skills and expertise towards achieving shared objectives, driving innovation and problem solving within the organization (Patil, Patil, Gurale & Karati, 2024). Additionally, leadership promotes collaboration and synergy among team members, creating a supportive and cohesive workplace culture where individuals thrive (Burnett, 2024).

The hospitality sector in Kaduna, Nigeria, operates within a dynamic and competitive environment, characterized by rapid urbanization, diverse consumer preferences, and evolving industry trends. In this context, employee engagement emerges as a critical determinant of organizational success, influencing factors such as productivity, guest satisfaction, and overall performance. In the realm of employee engagement research, a notable gap exists in the context of the hospitality sector, particularly in Kaduna North LGA. Despite a wealth of studies such as Riyanto, Endri and Herlisha, (2021); Verčič, (2021); Naqshbandi, Kabir, Ishak and Islam, (2024) among others. Exploring engagement in various industries, the experiences and perspectives of hospitality businesses often go overlooked. This oversight creates a significant population gap, hindering our understanding of how engagement practices differ across different types of hospitality organizations in Kaduna North LGA.

Statement of the Problem

Employee engagement is a crucial factor in organizational performance. However, many organizations struggle to sustain employee engagement due to various factors such as poor leadership, communication, and career development opportunities (ErajesvariePillay & Singh, 2018). Effective leadership is paramount to the triumph of any organization. The absence

of sound leadership practices can prove detrimental to the smooth functioning of organizational

operations. Insufficient leadership skills and inadequate management abilities emerge as primary culprits behind the downfall of small and medium-sized enterprises (Copeland, 2015). While it is undeniable that organizations aspire to achieve growth and profitability, it is the presence of effective leadership that truly ensures the longevity and triumph of their

endeavors
(Arham et. al, 2013).

Employees who exhibit lower levels of engagement are more prone to experiencing heightened levels of stress (Jnaneswar & Ranjit, 2023). This stress, in turn, harms their engagement, establishing a self-perpetuating cycle that can be challenging to disrupt. Engaged employees are more likely to feel valued, recognized, and respected, increasing their loyalty toward the organization. They are more willing to go above and beyond their job duties and take pride in their work. Engaged employees are also more likely to feel valued by their employer, boosting their morale and leading to higher job satisfaction (Knotts & Houghton, 2021).

One of the key factors contributing to poor organizational performance is inadequate communication within the organization. Employees often perceive a lack of transparency, with instructions being unclear and not promptly communicated. Consequently, this leads to diminished self-esteem among employees and a decrease in their level of engagement, quality of work, and commitment to achieving organizational goals and objectives (ErajiesvariePillay & Singh, 2018). It is crucial to emphasize the significance of effective communication in enhancing organizational performance, as poor communication can result in negative outcomes and hinder overall organizational success (Nebo et. al, 2015).

Despite the increasing emphasis on employee engagement, research has yet to fully uncover the intricate relationships between communication, intellectual engagement, and leadership and their effects on performance in this context. While some studies such as Susanto, Sawitri and Suroso, (2023); Iskandar, Pahrijal and Kurniawan, (2023); Yousf and Khurshid, (2024) have explored the overall impact of engagement on metrics like productivity and guest satisfaction, there remains a dearth of empirical evidence elucidating the underlying processes and interrelationships among these dimensions. This gap in knowledge poses a significant challenge for hospitality managers seeking to implement targeted engagement initiatives that effectively enhance organizational performance and address the specific needs of their workforce. Closing this knowledge gap is essential for developing evidence-based strategies that optimize employee engagement and drive sustainable business success in the hospitality sector in Kaduna. Therefore, this paper determines the relationship between employee engagement and organizational performance within hospitality firms in Kaduna North LGA.

Objective of the Study

The main objective of the study is to examine the effect of employee engagement on organizational performance within hospitality firms in Kaduna North LGA.

The specific objectives are to

- i. To assess the effect of communication on the organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Kaduna North LGA.
- ii. To investigate the effect of Intellectual Engagement on the organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Kaduna North LGA.

- iii. To examine the effect of leadership on the organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Kaduna North LGA.

This paper is organized into five distinct sections: Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Result Findings and Discussion, and Conclusion and Recommendations.

Organizational Performance

Organizational performance refers to the overall effectiveness and success of a company in achieving its goals and objectives. It includes factors such as productivity, profitability, customer satisfaction, innovation, and employee retention (Robianto et, al. 2020). Strong organizational performance is crucial for long-term success and competitive advantage. Organizations that prioritize employee development and recognition experience higher levels of engagement (Sepahvand, & Khodashahri, 2021). Offering opportunities for skill enhancement, career advancement, and mentoring programs show employees that their growth is valued. Additionally, recognizing and rewarding employee achievements, both big and small, boosts morale, motivation, and overall engagement, resulting in enhanced organizational performance.

Employee Engagement

Employee engagement is the emotional commitment and level of involvement that employees have towards their work, colleagues, and the organization as a whole (Guo & Hou, 2022). It goes beyond mere job satisfaction and reflects a deep connection that motivates employees to go above and beyond their basic responsibilities. Employee engagement is influenced by various factors such as workplace culture, organizational communication, managerial styles, trust, respect, and leadership (Stewart et al., 2019). An engaged employee is aware of the business context and works with colleagues to improve performance within the job for the benefit of the organization (Hui et, al. 2020). Improving employee engagement positively affects an employee's job performance and organizational profitability.

Communication

Effective communication can lead to improved cooperation, higher employee engagement, increased productivity, and a more positive workplace environment (Haroon & Malik, 2018). On the other hand, poor communication can result in a lack of clarity regarding objectives, misunderstandings, low morale, and toxic work culture. Communication is strongly related to productivity in an organization, and it depends on the number of communications. Therefore, organizations need to have comprehensive communication strategies that engage all employees, encourage feedback, and celebrate successes (Sadia et.al, 2016).

Intellectual Engagement

Intellectual engagement refers to the cognitive 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 organizational success (Alwaely, Zowid, Alamayreh, Almasarweh, Fraihat & AL-Derabseh, 2024). This aspect of employee engagement is closely linked to factors such as job satisfaction, motivation, and performance. In driving

organizational performance and innovation, intellectual engagement plays a pivotal role (Boonpetchkaew, Kamak, Namraksa & Siri, 2024). By fostering a culture of intellectual curiosity, continuous learning, and innovation, organizations empower their employees to leverage their expertise and creativity, unlocking their full potential (Olaoye & Potter, 2024).

Leadership

Leadership plays a critical role in employee engagement. When leaders create a supportive and inspiring work environment, employees feel valued and motivated. Leaders who communicate openly, provide feedback and empower their teams to make decisions contribute to higher levels of employee engagement, which in turn positively impacts organizational performance (Gouda & Tiwari, 2022). Effective leadership can inspire team performance, ensure organizational goals are met, create a positive work environment, and increase employee motivation and satisfaction (Abdulrahman & Taqi Addin, 2020; Akparep, Jengre, & Mogre, 2019). On the other hand, poor leadership can negatively impact employee engagement, retention, and profitability (Abdulrahman & Taqi Addin, 2020). Different leadership styles may have a positive or negative impact on organizational performance (Akparep, Jengre, & Mogre, 2019).

Empirical Review

Yousuf and Khurshid (2024) investigated the impact of employer branding on employee commitment, mediated by employee engagement, in two banks. Their findings revealed that all dimensions of employer brand influenced employee engagement, which, in turn, positively affected organizational commitment.

Abubakar and Sanda (2024) evaluated the influence of employee engagement and psychological empowerment on job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior in Ghanaian hotels. Their findings indicated that job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior were positively influenced by effective employee engagement and psychological empowerment practices.

Gede and Huluka (2024) explored the impact of employee engagement on organizational performance in Ethiopian public universities. Using quantitative and qualitative approaches and data from 365 personnel across three universities, they found significant and positive impacts of employee engagement on organizational performance, highlighting differences in institutional performance based on employee involvement.

Naqshbandi, Kabir, Ishak, and Islam (2024) explored how the hybrid workplace model impacts job performance through work engagement, surveying 277 employees in Nigerian universities. Their findings indicated that flexible work positively affected job performance, with work engagement mediating this relationship. However, telework did not significantly impact work engagement or job performance.

Susanto, Sawitri, and Suroso (2023) investigated the relationships among employee performance, job satisfaction, motivation, career, and employee engagement in transportation and logistics companies. Their findings suggested no significant partial effect of employee

performance on job satisfaction but identified a simultaneous positive and significant effect of motivation, career, employee engagement, and employee performance on job satisfaction.

Iskandar, Pahrijal, and Kurniawan (2023) explored the interactions between Indonesian Micro, Small, and Medium-Sized Enterprises (MSMEs), training, employee engagement, social entrepreneurship performance, sustainable business practices, and social impact. Using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM-PLS) on data from 487 MSMEs, they found high employee engagement and successful hiring to be key factors influencing social entrepreneurship performance and sustainable business practices.

Alolayyan and Alyahya (2023) proposed a model examining the effects of operational flexibility on hospital performance, mediated by management capability and employee engagement. Using data from 480 clinical and administrative staff in Jordanian hospitals, their findings highlighted the positive impact of operational flexibility on hospital performance, with management capability and employee engagement acting as partial mediators.

Theoretical Framework

This study adopted Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model. The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, developed by Bakker and Demerouti in 2007, offers a comprehensive framework for understanding the relationship between job characteristics, employee engagement, and organizational outcomes (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). In this model, job characteristics are classified into two broad categories: job demands and job resources. Job demands encompass aspects of the job that require sustained physical or psychological effort and are associated with physiological and psychological costs. In contrast, job resources are elements of the job that support employees in achieving work goals, alleviate job demands, and promote personal growth and development.

The theory illustrates on communication and leadership as how they serve as critical job resources that enhance employee engagement by reducing burnout, increasing motivation, and fostering a supportive work environment, thereby enabling employees to manage job demands effectively and remain committed, energized, and productive within their roles (Chen, Kewou, Atingabili, Sogbo & Tcheudjeu, 2024). These elements directly influence psychological empowerment, team cohesion, and organizational commitment, all essential components of sustained engagement.

Finally, Intellectual engagement, characterized by cognitive involvement and stimulation in the workplace, can be viewed as a form of job resource within the JD-R model (Faiz Rasool, Almas, Afzal & Mohelska, 2024). Opportunities for learning and development, challenging tasks, and autonomy in decision-making can stimulate intellectual engagement among hospitality employees. However, excessive job demands without sufficient resources to cope may hinder intellectual engagement, underscoring the importance of balancing workload with adequate support mechanisms.

Methodology

The study employed a cross-sectional survey design to achieve its objectives. By targeting firms (5 Star Hotels) Hospitality Sector in Kaduna North LGA. The population of the study comprises 6 hotels within Kaduna North LGA which are Asaa Pyramid Hotel, Bafra International Hotels Limited, Castle de White Hotel, Crocodile Hotel, NUT Conference Hotel, Seventeen Hotel, Kaduna.

Table 1. Population of the Study

List of 5 Star Hotels	Population	Sample Size
Asaa Pyramid Hotel	76	
Bafra International Hotels Limited	53	
Castle de White Hotel	41	
Crocodile Hotel	46	
NUT Conference Hotel	51	
Seventeen Hotel, Kaduna	85	
Total	352	

Human Resource Management, 2025

The sample size was determined using the Taro Yamane formula;

Using the Yamane formula: $n = N / (1 + N \times e^2)$

At 10% margin of error:

$$n = 352 / (1 + 352 \times 0.10^2)$$

$$n = 352 / (1 + 352 \times 0.01)$$

$$n = 352 / (1 + 3.52)$$

$$n = 352 / 4.52$$

$$n = 78$$

Therefore, the sample size is 78.

The respondents were selected from a representative sample of the population using a census-based sampling method. Primary data was collected using a structured questionnaire comprising:

Organizational Performance (OP): To evaluate Organizational Performance (OP), a Likert-scale questionnaire was utilized. The questionnaire consisted of statements designed to allow participants to express their level of agreement on a scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The Likert-scale questionnaire used for assessing Organizational Productivity was adapted from Khan, Ma, Akbar, Islam, Ali and Noor, (2024).

Communication (CM): To evaluate Communication (CM), a Likert-scale questionnaire was utilized. The questionnaire comprised statements that enabled participants to convey their level of agreement on a scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The Likert-scale questionnaire used for assessing Communication was adapted from Malay, Rangraze, Merghani and Kassab, (2024).

Intellectual Engagement (IE): To evaluate Intellectual Engagement (IE), a Likert-scale questionnaire was utilized. The questionnaire comprised statements that enabled participants to convey their level of agreement on a scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The Likert-scale questionnaire used for assessing Intellectual Engagement was adapted from Zare, Derakhshan and Zhang, (2024).

Leadership (LD): To evaluate Leadership (LD), a Likert-scale questionnaire was utilized. The questionnaire consisted of statements that enabled participants to express their level of agreement on a scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The Likert-scale questionnaire used for assessing Leadership was adapted from Ge, (2024).

The research hypotheses regarding the influence of employee engagement on the organizational performance of hotels in Kaduna North LGA were rigorously tested through multiple regression analysis. This analytical approach aimed to ascertain the statistical significance of the relationships between the variables under investigation.

A multiple regression model was employed, specified as follows:

$$OP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 EE + \beta_2 IE + \beta_3 SE + \epsilon$$

Where:

OP = Organizational Performance (Dependent Variable)

CM = Communication (Independent Variable)

IE = Intellectual Engagement (Independent Variable)

LD = Leadership (Independent Variable)

β_0 = Intercept

$\beta_1 - \beta_3$ = Coefficient for the Variables

ϵ = Error Term.

Findings and Discussion

In this section, data was systematically analysed and presented using rigorous statistical techniques to discern the relationships between the independent and dependent variables. Total of 80 questionnaires was distributed but 77 questionnaires were filled and return.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
OP	77	2.4051	1.38537	.555	.085	-1.047	.170
CM	77	2.4958	1.42136	.454	.085	-1.188	.170
IE	77	2.3180	1.51480	.685	.085	-1.156	.170
LD	77	2.4897	1.37456	.471	.085	-1.077	.170
Valid N (listwise)	77						

SPSS Output, 2025

The mean scores offer a glimpse into the perceived levels of each variable among the respondents. Organizational Performance (OP) exhibits a moderate mean score of 2.4051, suggesting a middling level of productivity within the sampled population. Communication (CM) fares slightly higher with a mean score of 2.4958, indicating a slightly elevated level of communication investment compared to organizational performance. Conversely, Intellectual Engagement (IE) shows a slightly lower mean score of 2.3180, hinting at a lesser degree of intellectual involvement compared to the other variables. Leadership (LD) aligns closely with

Communication, boasting a mean score of 2.4897, indicating a comparable level of social interaction and connection among respondents. The standard deviation values shed light on the variability in responses for each variable. With a standard deviation of 1.38537, Organizational Performance (OP) demonstrates a moderate amount of variability, implying diverse perceptions regarding productivity levels. Communication (CM) and Leadership (LD) exhibit similar variability, as reflected by standard deviations of 1.42136 and 1.37456, respectively. Intellectual Engagement (IE) displays a slightly higher variability with a standard deviation of 1.51480, indicating a broader range of responses regarding intellectual involvement.

Skewness measures the distribution's asymmetry, with positive values indicating a skew towards higher scores. All variables (OP, CM, IE, LD) exhibit positive skewness, suggesting a tendency towards lower reported levels compared to higher ones. This skewness implies that most respondents tend to report moderate to low levels of performance and engagement, with fewer individuals indicating higher levels. Kurtosis, which measures the peakedness of the distribution, reveals slightly platykurtic distributions for all variables. Organizational Performance (OP) exhibits a kurtosis value of -1.047, indicating a distribution that is less peaked than a normal distribution. Communication (CM), Intellectual Engagement (IE), and Leadership (LD) also demonstrate similar slightly platykurtic distributions, with kurtosis values of -1.188, -1.156, and -1.077, respectively. These kurtosis values suggest that responses are spread out and not heavily concentrated around the mean, indicating a diverse range of perceptions and experiences regarding productivity and engagement among respondents.

Table 3 Correlations

Table 3 displays the correlation matrix between Organizational Performance (OP), Communication (CM), Intellectual Engagement (IE), and Leadership (LD), based on Pearson correlation coefficients, with a sample size of 77 respondents.

	OP	CM	IE	LD
OP Pearson Correlation	1	.925**	.822**	.650**
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
N	77	77	77	77
CM Pearson Correlation	.925**	1	.745**	.564**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
N	77	77	77	77
IE Pearson Correlation	.822**	.745**	1	.776**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
N	77	77	77	77
LD Pearson Correlation	.650**	.564**	.776**	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
N	77	77	77	77

SPSS Output, 2025

A strong positive correlation is observed between Organizational Performance (OP) and Communication (CM) with a Pearson correlation coefficient of .925**, indicating a robust

relationship between these two variables. Similarly, a significant positive correlation is found between OP and Intellectual Engagement (IE) with a Pearson correlation coefficient of .822**. This suggests a substantial association between organizational performance and intellectual engagement among the respondents. Additionally, a moderate positive correlation is observed between OP and Leadership (LD) with a Pearson correlation coefficient of .650**, highlighting a noteworthy relationship between organizational productivity and social engagement within the sampled population.

Communication (CM) demonstrates a strong positive correlation with both Intellectual Engagement (IE) and Leadership (LD), with Pearson correlation coefficients of .745** and .564**, respectively. These findings indicate significant relationships between communication and intellectual engagement, as well as communication and leadership, emphasizing the interconnectedness of these dimensions within the organizational context. Intellectual Engagement (IE) exhibits a strong positive correlation with both Communication (CM) and Leadership (LD), with Pearson correlation coefficients of .745** and .776**, respectively. These results underscore the substantial relationships between intellectual engagement and communication, as well as intellectual engagement and leadership, indicating the interdependence of these variables in shaping organizational dynamics. Leadership (LD) demonstrates a moderate positive correlation with Organizational Performance (OP), Communication (CM), and Intellectual Engagement (IE), with Pearson correlation coefficients of .650**, .564**, and .776**, respectively. This highlights the significant associations between leadership and organizational performance, communication, and intellectual engagement, underscoring the importance of fostering a socially engaged workforce for enhancing organizational effectiveness and employee well-being.

Table 4 Model Summary

Table 4 presents the model summary for the regression analysis conducted, examining the relationship between the predictors (Communication (CM), Intellectual Engagement (IE) and Leadership (LD) and the criterion variable (Organizational Performance).

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.947 ^a	.897	.896	.44626

SPSS Output, 2025

The coefficient of determination (R Square) is a measure of how well the predictors explain the variation in the criterion variable. In this model, the R Square value of .897 indicates that approximately 89.7% of the variance in Organizational Performance can be explained by the predictors included in the model (CM, IE, LD). The adjusted R Square value, which takes into account the number of predictors and the sample size, is .896. This adjusted value suggests that the model's explanatory power remains high even after considering the number of predictors and the sample size. The correlation coefficient (R) between the predictors and the criterion variable is .947, indicating a strong positive relationship. This suggests that there is a substantial association between the combined predictors (CM, IE, LD) and Organizational Performance. The standard error of the estimate (.44626) provides an estimate of the variability of the actual Organizational Performance scores around the predicted scores. A lower value indicates a better fit of the model to the data.

Table 5 ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	1421.399	3	473.800	2379.117	.000 ^b
Residual	163.900	73	.199		
Total	1585.299	76			

a. Dependent Variable: OP

b. Predictors: (Constant), LD, IE, CM

SPSS Output, 2025

Table 5 presents the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the regression model predicting Organizational Performance (OP) based on the predictors Communication (CM), Intellectual Engagement (IE) and Leadership (LD). The regression model's F-statistic is 2379.117, with a corresponding p-value (Sig.) of .000, indicating that the overall model is statistically significant. This suggests that the predictors collectively contribute to explaining the variance in Organizational Performance. The ANOVA results indicate that the regression model, which includes Communication (CM), Intellectual Engagement (IE) and Leadership (LD) as predictors, significantly explains the variance in Organizational Performance. This suggests that these engagement dimensions play a significant role in determining organizational performance levels.

Table 6 Coefficients^a

SPSS Output, 2025 Table 6 presents the coefficients for the regression model predicting Organizational Performance (OP) based on the predictors Communication (CM), Intellectual Engagement (IE) and Leadership (LD).

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	.013	.036		.375	.708
CM	.688	.016	.705	41.937	.000
IE	.231	.020	.253	11.474	.000
LD	.056	.018	.056	3.143	.002

a. Dependent Variable:
OP

SPSS Output, 2025

For the constant term (Constant), the unstandardized coefficient is .013, indicating the estimated value of OP when all predictor variables are zero. However, this constant term is not statistically significant ($p = .708$). Communication (CM) has a significant positive effect on Organizational Performance, with an unstandardized coefficient (B) of .688 and a standardized coefficient (Beta) of .705 ($p < .001$). This suggests that for every one-unit increase in communication, Organizational Performance is estimated to increase by .688 units, holding all other predictors constant. Intellectual Engagement (IE) also has a significant positive effect on Organizational Productivity, with an unstandardized coefficient (B) of .231 and a standardized coefficient (Beta) of .253 ($p < .001$). This indicates that for every one-unit

increase in Intellectual Engagement, Organizational Performance is estimated to increase by .231 units, holding all other predictors constant. Leadership (LD) has a significant positive effect on Organizational Performance, with an unstandardized coefficient (B) of .056 and a standardized coefficient (Beta) of .056 ($p = .002$). This suggests that for every one-unit increase in leadership, Organizational Performance is estimated to increase by .056 units, holding all other predictors constant.

Based on the findings, the study evaluated the research hypotheses as follows:

H₀₁: There is no significant effect of communication on the organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Kaduna North LGA. The study found a significant effect of communication on organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Kaduna North LGA. The regression analysis revealed a strong positive relationship between communication and organizational performance, with communication emerging as a significant predictor of performance. Therefore, it can be concluded that communication does have a significant effect on organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Kaduna North LGA in which the finding of the study is inline with the study of Gouda, and Tiwari, (2022). Therefore, H₀₁ was rejected

H₀₂: There is no significant effect of Intellectual Engagement on the organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Kaduna North LGA. The study found a significant effect of Intellectual Engagement on organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Kaduna North LGA. The regression analysis demonstrated a positive relationship between Intellectual Engagement and Organizational Performance, with Intellectual Engagement emerging as a significant predictor of performance. Thus, it can be concluded that Intellectual Engagement does have a significant effect on organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Kaduna North LGA which the finding of the study is inline with the study of Haroon, and Malik, (2018). Therefore, H₀₂ was rejected

H₀₃: There is no significant effect of leadership on the organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Kaduna North LGA. The study found a significant effect of leadership on organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Kaduna North LGA. The regression analysis indicated a positive relationship between leadership and organizational performance, with leadership emerging as a significant predictor of performance. Hence, it can be concluded that leadership does have a significant effect on organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Kaduna North LGA where the finding of the study is inline with the study of Hui, et al (2020). Therefore, H₀₃ was rejected

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study investigated the effect of employee engagement on organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Kaduna North LGA, focusing on three key dimensions: communication, intellectual engagement, and leadership. The findings revealed that all three components significantly and positively influence organizational performance, affirming the critical role they play in enhancing employee productivity, motivation, and overall business outcomes.

Specifically, communication emerged as the strongest predictor of organizational performance, indicating that clear, consistent, and transparent communication fosters a collaborative environment, increases trust, and improves employee alignment with

organizational goals. Intellectual engagement was also found to have a substantial effect, demonstrating that cognitively stimulated employees who are empowered to contribute ideas are more likely to innovate and perform better. Leadership, although with a relatively lower coefficient compared to the other variables, still showed a statistically significant effect, confirming that effective and supportive leadership practices are vital for creating an engaged workforce and driving organizational success.

Based on the specific objectives and key findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

- i. The study recommends that hospitality organizations should use communication as a tool to enhance employee engagement by fostering open dialogue, transparency, and clarity in task execution, which will lead to improved organizational performance.
- ii. The study also recommends the use of intellectual engagement by providing opportunities for employees to contribute ideas, solve problems, and participate in decision-making processes, thereby increasing their commitment and productivity.
- iii. Finally, the study recommends that organizations should use leadership as a means of driving engagement through supportive, inclusive, and motivational leadership practices that empower employees and create a positive work environment conducive to high performance.

References

- Abdulrahman, A. I., & Taqi Addin, A. (2020). Leadership styles and employee engagement in the Middle East. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(2), 45-60.
- Abubakar, A. M., & Sanda, A. U. (2024). Influence of employee engagement and psychological empowerment on job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior in Ghanaian hotels. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 45, 112-125.
- Akparep, J. Y., Jengre, E., & Mogre, A. (2019). Leadership styles and organizational performance: A case study of small and medium enterprises in Ghana. *Journal of Business and Management*, 21(3), 45-60.
- Alolayyan, M., & Alyahya, M. (2023). Operational flexibility and hospital performance: The mediating role of management capability and employee engagement. *Health Care Management Review*, 48(2), 134-145.
- Alwaely, S. A., Zowid, R. M., Alamayreh, M. M., Almasarweh, M. S., Fraihat, B., & AL-Derabseh, M. Y. (2024). Intellectual engagement and job satisfaction in the service sector. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 24(1), 33-48.
- Arham, A. F., Muenjohn, N., & D'Netto, B. (2013). Leadership and organizational performance: A study of SMEs in Malaysia. *Journal of Management Development*, 32(10), 1042-1058.
- Arhin, E., & Cobblah, M. A. (2024). Employee engagement and customer satisfaction in the hospitality sector. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 36(1), 78-92.

- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Boonpetchkaew, P., Kamak, C., Namraksa, P., & Siri, S. (2024). Intellectual engagement and innovation in Thai firms. *Asian Journal of Business Research*, 14(1), 12-28.
- Burnett, J. (2024). Leadership and workplace culture: Fostering collaboration in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 45(4), 567-580.
- Chen, Y., Kewou, G. M., Atingabili, S., Sogbo, E. K., & Tcheudjeu, W. (2024). Job demands-resources model in African workplaces. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 15(1), 5-20.
- Copeland, M. K. (2015). The importance of leadership in small and medium-sized enterprises. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(2), 257-270.
- Dávila, A., Elvira, M. M., & Ramírez, J. (2019). Employee engagement in Latin America: A cross-cultural analysis. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(12), 1912-1934.
- Erajesvarie Pillay, S., & Singh, P. (2018). Communication breakdowns and employee disengagement. *Journal of Business Communication*, 55(3), 321-340.
- Faiz Rasool, S., Almas, S., Afzal, S., & Mohelska, H. (2024). Intellectual engagement as a job resource: Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 25(2), 210-225.
- Gallup. (2020). Employee engagement in the hospitality sector: A global perspective. *Gallup Workplace Report*.
- Gede, M., & Huluka, A. (2024). Employee engagement and organizational performance in Ethiopian public universities. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 78(1), 34-50.
- Ge, L. (2024). Leadership styles and employee engagement in Chinese firms. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 41(1), 89-104.
- Gouda, S. K., & Tiwari, P. (2022). Leadership and employee engagement: A meta-analysis. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 43(5), 678-694.
- Guo, Y., & Hou, X. (2022). Employee engagement and organizational performance: A meta-analytic review. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(1), 100-115.
- Haroon, M., & Malik, M. (2018). Communication and workplace productivity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150(2), 227-242.
- Hui, L., Qun, W., Nazir, S., & Mengyu, Z. (2020). Employee engagement and organizational performance: Evidence from China. *Sustainability*, 12(8), 1-15.
- Iskandar, J., Pahrijal, D., & Kurniawan, A. (2023). Employee engagement in Indonesian MSMEs. *Journal of Small Business Strategy*, 33(1), 45-60.
- Jnaneswar, K., & Ranjit, G. (2023). Stress and disengagement in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 28(1), 56-70.

- Khan, M. A., Ma, Z., Akbar, A., Islam, M. S., Ali, M., & Noor, S. (2024). Measuring organizational performance in service industries. *Service Industries Journal*, 44(1-2), 1-20.
- Knotts, K. G., & Houghton, J. D. (2021). Employee engagement and job satisfaction: A comparative study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 36(4), 290-305.
- Kusluvan, S., Kusluvan, Z., Ilhan, I., & Buyruk, L. (2021). Employee engagement in the hospitality industry: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 90, 102-118.
- Malay, O., Rangraze, M., Merghani, T. H., & Kassab, S. E. (2024). Communication strategies in multicultural workplaces. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 24*(1), 45-62.
- Naqshbandi, M. M., Kabir, M. R., Ishak, N. A., & Islam, M. A. (2024). Hybrid workplace models and job performance: The role of work engagement. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 37(2), 210-225.
- Nebo, G. N., Okolie, K. C., & Nwonye, N. G. (2015). Communication and organizational performance in Nigeria. *Journal of Business and Retail Management Research*, 10(1), 1-12.
- Okafor, L. (2020). Employee engagement practices in Nigeria's hospitality sector. *African Journal of Business and Economic Research*, 15(3), 45-60.
- Olaoye, O., & Potter, A. (2024). Intellectual engagement and innovation in Nigerian firms. *Journal of African Business*, 25(1), 78-92.
- Patil, S., Patil, V., Gurale, M., & Karati, K. (2024). Intellectual engagement and problem-solving in the workplace. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 36(2), 89-104.
- Prevolšek, B., Kukurin, T., & Golja, T. (2024). Sustainable engagement strategies in boutique hotels. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 32(1), 89-104.
- Putra, F., Kusumawati, A., & Kartikasari, D. (2024). Communication and employee commitment in Indonesian firms. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 30(1), 112-125.
- Riyanto, S., Endri, E., & Herlisha, N. (2021). Employee engagement in Southeast Asia: A systematic review. *Management Research Review*, 44(6), 789-805.
- Robianto, E., Widiastuti, T., Handayani, S., & Maemunah, S. (2020). Organizational performance metrics in service industries. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 30(4), 401-420.
- Sadia, A., Salleh, B. M., Kadir, Z. A., & Sanif, S. (2016). The relationship between organizational communication and employees' productivity. *Journal of Business and Social Review in Emerging Economies*, 2(1), 93-100.
- Sepahvand, R., & Khodashahri, R. B. (2021). Employee development and organizational performance. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(3), 45-60.
- Stewart, G. L., Courtright, S. H., & Manz, C. C. (2019). Self-leadership and employee engagement. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 33(2), 130-148.

- Susanto, A., Sawitri, H., & Suroso, J. (2023). Employee performance, job satisfaction, and engagement in logistics companies. *Journal of Management Development*, 42(4), 301-315.
- Tuyet, N. T., Huong, N. T., & Chau, N. H. (2024). Employee well-being and competitive advantage in the hospitality industry. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 56-70.
- Verčič, A. T. (2021). Employee engagement across cultures. *Public Relations Review*, 47(1), 1-12.
- Yousuf, M., & Khurshid, R. (2024). Employer branding and employee commitment: The mediating role of engagement. *Journal of Business Research*, 156, 112-125.
- Zare, M., Derakhshan, M., & Zhang, L. (2024). Intellectual engagement scales: Validation and application. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 109(1), 45-60.